SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
Kenwood C. Youmans (SBN 68258)
David D. Kadue (SBN 113578)
2029 Century Park East, Suite 3300
Los Angeles, California 90067-3063
Telephone: (310) 277-7200
Facsimile: (310) 201-5219
kyoumans@seyfarth.com
dkadue@seyfarth.com

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
David B. Ross (admitted *pro hac vice*)
1270 Avenue of the Americas
Suite 2500
New York, New York 10020
Telephone: (212) 218-5500
Facsimile: (212) 218-5526
dross@seyfarth.com

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
Gerald L. Maatman, Jr. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
131 S. Dearborn Street, Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
Telephone: (312) 460-5000
Facsimile: (312) 460-7000
gmaatman@seyfarth.com

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
Thomas J. Wybenga (admitted *pro hac vice*)
999 Lake Drive
Issaquah, Washington 98027
Telephone: (425) 313-6794
Facsimile: (425) 313-7922
twybenga@seyfarth.com

Attorneys for Defendant
COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION)

SHIRLEY "RAE" ELLIS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION Defendant.	Case No. C04 3341 MHP **DECLARATION OF MARGARET STOCKDALE, PH.D., RE FIRST REPORT SUBMITTED IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION** Date: November 6, 2006 Time: 2:00 p.m. Courtroom: 15 Judge: Marilyn Hall Patel

I, Margaret Stockdale, declare:

The following declaration is identical in substance to my first report titled "Gender Differences in Job Attribute Preferences" (June 20, 2006), except that it has been placed in declaration form, with only some changes in formatting and pagination.

Table of Contents

Page

I. Overview: Scope of Review and Qualifications of Expert 1

A. Summary of opinions 3

B. Overview of the Report 5

II. Gender Disparities in Costco Upper Management: A review of plaintiff experts' opinions ... 5

A. Overview of Dr. Drogin's Report 5

B. Overview of Dr. Reskin's report 7

C. Review and Discussion of Dr. Reskin's Opinions 9

III. An Alternative View: The "Social Glass Ceiling 14

A. Division of labor at home and at work: The persistence of gender differences 14

B. Gender Differences in Job Attribute Preferences 20

1. Theoretical foundations for gender differences in job attribute preferences 20

a. Gender ideology theory 20

b. Life cycle theory 22

c. Job attraction theory 23

d. Structuralism 24

2. Empirical evidence for sex differences in job attribute preferences 25

3. A closer examination of gender differences in work scheduling arrangements, travel, and relocation 26

a. Flexible Scheduling. 27

b. Overnight Travel. 28

c. Non-standard shifts. 29

d. Willingness to Relocate. 30

Table of Contents
(continued)

Page

C. Summary 33

IV. Application of literature on job attribute preferences to Costco. 35

A. Description of staff management positions 35

1. Merchandise Manager 35

2. Receiving Manager 36

3. Front-End Manager and Administrative Manager 37

B. Summary and analysis of job attribute differences among staff-level management positions. 39

V. References 43

VI. Other Materials Reviewed 46

A. Reports and Depositions 46

B. Other Documents 46

VII. Exhibit A: Margaret S. Stockdale Vitae 47

I. Overview: Scope of Review and Qualifications of Expert

I have been retained by the law firm Seyfarth Shaw, counsel for defendant in *Ellis v. Costco*. I have been asked to review and analyze the report by Dr. Barbara Reskin with regard to her opinion that Costco executives possess stereotypes about women's family roles which serve to keep women from advancing to upper level management positions at Costco. I was also asked to review the social science literature pertaining to gender differences in job attribute preferences. Finally, I was asked to express a professional opinion as to whether gender differences on those attributes could help explain gender differences in the percentage of male and female senior staff positions, especially Merchandise Manager. I anticipate that I may offer further opinions in response to additional information that may be received through discovery if it warrants my further comment.

I am a Professor of Psychology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale and serve as its Area Head of Applied Psychology. I received a Ph.D. in Industrial-Organizational Psychology from Kansas State University in 1990. I also have a B.S. in Psychology from Frostburg State University and an M.S. in Industrial-Organizational Psychology from Kansas State University. I am currently pursuing a Masters of Legal Studies (MLS) from Southern Illinois University School of Law. I teach graduate and undergraduate courses on industrial and organizational psychology, organizational behavior, workplace diversity, and applied social science research methods. I also specialize in research in each of these areas, as well as in smoking behavior. Over the past twenty years, much of my research has focused on issues of workplace discrimination, including sex discrimination and sexual harassment. I have co-authored or edited four books, with a 5th edited book on sex discrimination in progress. My research appears in numerous peer-reviewed journals and books. I am a member of three editorial boards for peer-

reviewed scientific journals and I have served on numerous panels, advisory committees, and professional workshops on topics relating to workplace discrimination. I regularly review manuscripts for scientific journals on topics relating to organizational behavior, employment discrimination, gender and work, and research methodology. My Curriculum Vitae is attached as Exhibit A.

I have testified as an expert witness in the California Superior Court on a case involving workplace discrimination. I have served as a consultant in another case, and I am currently retained in two other cases involving issues of gender discrimination. In one of these classes, I was retained by the plaintiff and in another by the defense. A list of these cases is attached as Exhibit B. My consulting rate is $250 per hour, plus expenses, for report preparation and $400 per hour, plus expenses, for deposition and other testimony.

My work on this case has relied on the theories, principles, reasoning and methods that are similar to those I use in my scholarly research and which are widely accepted and used by my professional colleagues to form opinions and inferences.

This report discusses the scientific research on sex differences on job attribute preferences. To prepare this report, I reviewed the expert reports by Dr. Barbara Reskin and Dr. Richard Drogin as well as data provided to me by Dr. Ali Saad, and the expert reports of Dr. Frank Landy and Dr. Casey Mulligan. I have also reviewed various exhibits and depositions emanating from this case. In addition I have reviewed the scientific literature on job attribute preferences, work-family (also known as work-life) balance and related topics. References to the scientific literature, depositions, exhibits and other reports reviewed are listed at the end of the report. To familiarize myself with the Costco culture and work environment, I toured the Costco Warehouse in Oakbrook, IL and met with senior management staff, assistant general managers,

and the general manager on June 1, 2006. I attest that my testimony is based on sufficient facts and data.

A. Summary of opinions

Each of my formal opinions is listed below. The remainder of the report provides my analysis in support of each of these opinions.

Opinion 1: **Dr. Reskin's opinion that Costco's practices serve to promote gender stereotyping, in-group favoritism, and paternalism and suppresses women's advancement to upper-level management positions is faulty. If such stereotyping and favoritism were pervasive, then there would be very few women in any of the four senior staff positions, significant gender differences in promotion from AGM to GM, significant difference in performance appraisal ratings, and significant gender differences in salaries. Data from Dr. Drogin's report undermine these assertions. There is no gender disparity in movement into the three other senior staff positions; there is no gender disparity in promotion from AGM to GM; gender differences in performance appraisal ratings favor women; and there is no gender disparity in salaries.**

Opinion 2: **Processes that Dr. Reskin describe as contributing to the pervasiveness of gender stereotyping and in-group processes are, in fact, conditions that minimize stereotyping and in-group favoritism. Stereotyping and in-group favoritism are not persuasive explanations for the relative scarcity of women in upper level warehouse management positions at Costco.**

Opinion 3: **In the U.S. population, gender differences in the division of paid work and household labor have persisted despite trends toward egalitarianism. Women devote significantly more time than men to house and family roles and concomitantly slightly less time to work roles, especially when their family demands are high. Men on average work slightly longer average work weeks and are more willing to travel and become more engaged in their work role when family demands are high. Thus the belief that women are more responsive to family demands than are men is not a stereotype when applied as a general observation of the population.**

Opinion 4: **Gender roles, which are influenced by a wide host of factors throughout the course of one's lifetime, affect preferences for various job attributes.**

Opinion 5: **Women are more likely than men to desire flexible or alternative work schedules so that they can better manage family demands; women are less likely than men to have jobs that require overnight travel; and women are more reluctant to relocate for a better position, and their reluctance is more highly associated with needs and concerns of their families than is men's reluctance to relocate. Thus, there are reliable gender differences in job attribute preferences, which are strongly related to gender role ideology differences.**

Opinion 6: **Because of the early and erratic starting times, it is likely that women have less desire than men to occupy merchandise manager positions.**

Opinion 7: **Women are less likely than men to accept management positions requiring relocation.**

Opinion 8: Gender differences in interest expressed for the merchandise manager position is a plausible explanation for the under-representation of women in upper level warehouse management at Costco.

B. Overview of the Report

Section II of this report provides a general overview of the issues raised by Dr. Reskin (2006) and Dr. Drogin (2006) and their opinions about sources of disparity in upper management positions at Costco. Here, I raise doubts about some of the assumptions made in Dr. Drogin's report and in the conclusions regarding sex stereotyping in Dr. Reskin's report. In Section III, I review the social science research on gender differences in job attribute preferences and their theoretical explanations. This background serves as the basis for my opinions about gender disparities in upper management positions at Costco.

II. Gender Disparities in Costco Upper Management: A review of plaintiff experts' opinions

A. Overview of Dr. Drogin's Report

Dr. Richard Drogin, an expert witness for the plaintiffs, prepared a statistical report of gender distributions in four salaried management levels in Costco warehouses: general manager (GM), assistant general manager (AGM), senior staff, and entry level management. His report breaks down the percentage of women in these positions from 1999 to 2005 and their salary levels. He also analyzed promotion and lateral transfer patterns into senior staff positions and AGM positions, and performed various statistical analyses to determine gender differences, if any, in these promotion and transfer patterns. It was not my charge to challenge his analyses, therefore I assume, arguendo, that his statistical results are accurate, although I challenge some of his assumptions and conclusions. For example, he assumes that there is no requirement of experience in any particular Senior Staff job for promotion to AGM (Drogin, p. 9), yet his own

analysis indicates that 85% of AGM's have had prior experience as merchandise manager[1], compared to 37% to 47% of the other three senior staff positions (p. 7). This assumption also does not comport with Dr. Reskin's opinion that merchandise manager is central for promotion to AGM (see Reskin, p. 8).

Dr. Drogin concludes that there is a significant disparity in the percentage of women who transfer laterally from a senior-level staff positions to merchandise manager (Drogin, p. 8) and that there is a significant disparity in the percentage of women promoted from senior staff positions to AGM (Drogin, p. 9). He reports no statistical disparities in lateral transfers to any other senior staff positions. He also concludes that there is *"no overall statistically significant disparity in the promotion of women into GM from the AGM employees"* (Drogin, p. 11, emphasis added). Finally, Dr. Drogin reports, but does not statistically test for, gender differences in salaries for each of the four levels of management, including the four senior staff positions. I assume by the absence of such tests and by visual inspection of salary information provided in Appendix 2 of Dr. Drogin's report that there are no statistically significant gender differences in salaries in each of the management positions.

Further analysis of the promotion data of staff managers to AGM from April 1, 1999 to July 31, 2004[2] performed by Dr. Saad reveals that controlling for the extent and nature of staff manager experience there is no significant difference in the promotion rates of male and female staff managers to AGM (Saad, Exhibit 7), furthermore controlling explicitly for whether

[1] The data base from which Dr. Drogin conducted his analysis contains personnel data from 1999 to 2005. It does not reflect, therefore, the prior managerial experience (e.g., staff manager positions) of AGMS who were promoted into that position before 1999. Thus, it is possible and even likely that a higher percentage of AGMs have had experience as merchandising managers.

[2] This period reflects data that were available for analysis up to the time the law suit was filed. Therefore any assumption or accusation that Costco changed its promotion practices after the suit was filed would be irrelevant in this analysis.

incumbent staff managers held previous merchandise manager experience also yields no significance difference in promotions to AGM (Saad, "Exhibit 8). Read together, Dr. Drogin's and Dr. Saad's reports clearly demonstrate that the only significant gender disparity is in lateral transfers to merchandise manager positions and it is this disparity that fully accounts for gender differences in promotion to AGM. Among women and men promoted to AGM, there is no gender disparity in promotion to GM positions.

Based on my review of Dr. Drogin's report, I conclude that merchandise manager is the most essential of the four senior staff positions for promotion to assistant warehouse manager, and only in lateral transfers to merchandise manager positions is there any sign of significant gender disparity. There is no female under-representation in lateral transfer to other senior staff positions, nor in promotion from AGM to GM.

B. Overview of Dr. Reskin's report

Dr. Reskin, a second expert witness for the plaintiff, opines that Costco has a strong, paternalistic culture, a lack of formal rules and personnel practices, and discretionary decision making, which allows in-group favoritism and sex stereotyping to create biases that adversely affect female managerial employees aspiring to upper-level management. She noted that instead of relying on detailed job descriptions, measurable performance criteria and valid measures of those criteria, job posting, and guidelines for promotion, Costco management assesses their managerial talent through a process known as "walking the warehouse[3]" (Reskin, p. 9). Dr. Reskin cites Costco executives who regard the walk as "integral to Costco's culture" (Reskin, p.

[3] Dr. Landy, in his expert report, opines that Dr. Reskin mischaracterizes Costco's practice of walking the warehouse as being an infrequent activity conducted by senior managers above GM level (but who may invite GMs to participate in a walk). He extensively documents that the "walk" is a daily activity conducted by all levels of management, which provides for an extensive source of knowledge about employees and day-to-day operations (Landy p. 52-57).

10) and that it has multiple functions, including auditing a store's appearance and merchandising, and assessing managerial performance. When executives walk the warehouse, they actively participate in discussions with the warehouse's upper-level management and help to mentor promising candidates for promotion. (Reskin, p. 10). In addition to the walk, Costco executives develop lists of promotable employees and actively mentor and encourage warehouse managers to mentor and assess their readiness for promotion. In Dr. Reskin's view, this form of active managerial engagement leads to self-fulfilling prophecies that favor the chosen few to the detriment of those not regarded as promotable. Thus, the institutionalization of these practices, Dr. Reskin opines, leads to cognitive biases, automatic in-group favoritism, and sex stereotyping that keeps women out of top managerial ranks (Reskin, p. 11).

Dr. Reskin attempts to bolster her opinion that the Costco culture is imbued with cognitive bias by extracting opinions from top management, which she says are indicative of sex stereotyping, such as Sinegal's statement that women have a tendency to be the caretakers (Reskin, p. 19), that women turn down merchandise manager positions because of early and inconsistent starting times (Reskin, p. 20), or by stating herself that "Americans tend to automatically stereotype women as more family oriented than career oriented" (Reskin, p. 19). As I demonstrate in the literature review below, such statements are not stereotypes – reliable gender differences have long been documented in the division of household labor (such as care-taking responsibilities). Stereotyping, by contrast, occurs when a decision maker assumes without knowing for certain that a particular woman prefers to manage domestic responsibilities more than work responsibilities (see Fiske, 1998, for a comprehensive review of stereotyping processes).

Dr. Reskin further argues that various structural barriers exist at Costco which serve to keep women out of upper-level management positions, such as not posting senior-level staff openings, under-employing women in merchandise manager positions, requiring merchandise managers to have very early and irregular working hours, requiring relocation, and requiring merchandise and AGM experience for promotion to GM. In sum, Dr. Reskin concludes that these uniform practices permit cognitive and in-group biases that constrain women in their opportunities to advance as managers at Costco (Reskin, p. 32).

C. Review and Discussion of Dr. Reskin's Opinions

Dr. Reskin regards Costco's managerial practices to be so subjective that they result in a culture that favors men in the in-group and the stereotyping of women as being unsuitable for managerial advancement. There are several holes and inconsistencies in her analysis, however. First, if there were system-wide disadvantages to women at Costco (in terms of stereotyping, in-group favoritism, paternalism and so forth), one would expect to see few women promoted to any of the senior-level managerial positions. Instead, as Dr. Drogin's report illustrates, women are significantly underrepresented in only one of the four senior-level staff positions: merchandise manager. Moreover, these four staff positions are in many ways interchangeable. Many senior staff rotate among these positions, they are all in the same physical environment (Costco warehouse), and staff managers often cover for one another for breaks and absences (personal observation, June 1, 2006). Although there are proportionately more women in administrative staff positions (36% in 2005) than in front end or receiving manager positions (approximately 29% each; Drogin, p. 4), it would be far-fetched to conclude that there is distinctive gender-typing[4] among these positions.

[4] Gender-linked stereotypes of occupations arise from historical patterns of occupational segregation, which then correspond to the attributes that are often believed to be important for

Second, if Dr. Reskin's view of pervasive bias was accurate, one would expect to see even greater gender disparities in higher warehouse managerial ranks (consistent with the glass-ceiling phenomenon of proportionately fewer women as managerial ranks ascend, Cleveland, Stockdale & Murphy, 2000, pp. 312-315). However, as reported by Dr. Drogin, the only significant gender significance in promotion or transfer is to the mid-level merchandise manager positions. There is no significant gender discrepancy in the higher-level promotions from AGM to GM.

Third, if gender bias was pervasive, one would expect to see statistically significant sex differences in job performance ratings. An analysis performance evaluations ratings of all staff-level manager positions from 2002-2005 conducted by Dr. Saad of Resolution Economics reveals that female staff managers on average were rated by their supervisors higher than were male managers, especially on the dimensions of personal leadership, initiative/work ethic, and leading others (Saad, Exhibits 38 and 39). These findings undermine Dr. Reskin's contention that there is widespread bias and favoritism that serves to disadvantage women at Costco. Finally, if sex stereotyping were pervasive, one would expect to find gender significant differences in salaries of managerial staff. Dr. Drogin reports none.

Dr. Reskin regards Costco's non-bureaucratic managerial practices in which upper-level management frequently walk the warehouse to assess store performance, mentor up-and-coming managerial talent, and generally get to know staff, as the nesting ground for subjective biases and

---

successful performance in the occupation. To the extent that a particular occupation is predominantly occupied by one gender or the extent to which traits associated with the job are linked to gender-based stereotypes, the occupation will tend to be gender-typed. For example, a job requiring nurturance, interpersonal sensitivity, and caring is likely to be gender-typed as feminine. (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983).

discriminatory practices. She highlights practices, however, that have been found in the scientific literature to *minimize* stereotyping and other biasing processes. Stereotyping, as Dr. Reskin accurately describes (Reskin p. 17), is a cognitive "short-cut" used to speed processing of information or judgments about individuals. Stereotyping occurs when traits or attributes that are assumed to describe (or indeed, do describe, on average) a social category (e.g., women) are activated and applied to perceptions and judgments of a *particular* member of the category. But Dr. Reskin does not explain that stereotyping can be exacerbated as well as minimized under various conditions. When there is little information about the target (the individual being perceived or judged), the tendency to stereotype increases, especially when judging an individual in a job that is counter-stereotypical to their gender, such as a female construction worker, or male nurse (Heilman, 1983; Heilman, Martell & Simon, 1988). Conversely, when job-relevant information about the target is available to the perceiver or when the perceiver has in-depth knowledge of the target, stereotyping decreases (see references cited above).

The fact that upper-level warehouse management positions are typically filled by internal candidates who have many years of experience at Costco, and that Costco managers widely practice "management by walking around", as characterized in Dr. Landy, in which they spend considerable effort getting to know their employees contraindicates the tendency for stereotyping to occur. As Dr. Reskin reports, "Costco is an open company in which communication flows freely, and relationships are based on trust and respect and oriented toward teaching and developing its people…" (p. 5). Moreover, as described by Dr. Landy (p. 68) performance evaluations are made by multiple sources including immediate supervisors, and other upper level warehouse managers. Decision makers who have extensive information about employees whom they consider for promotion and transfer rely on *individuated* not stereotypical information to

inform their judgments (Tosi & Einbender, 1985). In fact, Dr. Reskin appears to underestimate the amount of individuated information that Costco managers rely upon in assessing employee performance and promotability.

According to Dr. Reskin the stated opinions of one or two Costco executives' that women place greater emphasis on family issues than career issues is an example of pervasive stereotypical thinking that is responsible for the lack of women in upper level management positions at Costco. Dr. Reskin stated that "Americans tend to automatically stereotype women as more family oriented than career oriented" (Reskin, p. 19), and she extracted statements by Costco executives as examples of these sex stereotypes. For example, "Women inability to make the hours sacrifices to be accepted by the male establishment" (Matthews ex. 98, CRE 0142029, as cited by Reskin, p. 19); "Our experience is that women have a tendency to be the caretakers" (Quote from Sinegal deposition, p. 140-145, as cited by Reskin, p. 19). Dr. Reskin opines that this statement "reflects the stereotype that women are more oriented to their families than are men" (Reskin, p. 19). Dr. Reskin concludes that "Costco executives are not able to explain – or address – women's under-representation as AGMs and GMs – except to cite the stereotype that [women] don't want certain jobs because of their commitment to their families" (Reskin, p. 25). As I demonstrate below, such statements are not groundless stereotypes – there are real gender differences in orientation toward family vs. work. Dr. Reskin's comments, therefore, do not offer any direct evidence of the operation of these stereotyping processes occurring among upper-level management.

There are abundant data, which Dr. Reskin fails to acknowledge, from several decades of research to indicate that there are reliable gender differences in the division of household labor (women do more than men), preferences for jobs with regular work or flexible work hours to

accommodate family needs (women prefer this more than men), and gender ideologies about work and family roles (both women and men tend to agree that women have greater involvement in the family role than do men, although men possess this attitude more strongly than women). Indeed, gender roles with regard to work and family issues have changed dramatically toward greater egalitarianism over the past several decades, but reliable gender differences still remain. Contrary to Dr. Reskin's view, citing this phenomenon is not to engage in stereotyping. One engages in stereotyping when one assumes that a particular woman needs or wants to spend more time on family matters than a particular man, without any information about these particular people. Following my opinions of Dr. Reskin's report, I review the research on gender roles on work and family division of labor and on job attribute preferences.

Based on my review of Dr. Reskin's report, I offer the following opinions:

Opinion 1: **Dr. Reskin's opinion that Costco's practices serve to promote gender stereotyping, in-group favoritism, and paternalism and suppresses women's advancement to upper-level management positions is faulty. If such stereotyping and favoritism were pervasive, then there would be very few women in any of the four senior staff positions, significant gender differences in promotion from AGM to GM, significant difference in performance appraisal ratings, and significant gender differences in salaries. Data from Dr. Drogin's report undermine these assertions. There is no gender disparity in movement into the three other senior staff positions; there is no gender disparity in promotion from AGM to GM; gender differences in performance appraisal ratings favor women; and there is no gender disparity in salaries.**

Opinion 2: Processes that Dr. Reskin describe as contributing to the pervasiveness of gender stereotyping and in-group processes are, in fact, conditions that minimize stereotyping and in-group favoritism. Stereotyping and in-group favoritism are not persuasive explanations for the relative scarcity of women in upper level warehouse management positions at Costco.

III. An Alternative View: The "Social Glass Ceiling

Researchers at the *Families and Work Institute*, a privately funded research institution, coined the term "social glass ceiling" to capture the concept that impediments to women's advancement can stem from social and cultural factors that are pervasive in our society. These impediments are reflected by the attitudes of all sources of influences on women's and men's lives: media, peers, teachers, employers, counselors and significant others, as well as the expression of gender-related values that affect women's career decisions which can constrain their advancement in relation to men (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky & Prottas, 2002). In this section, I review research literature that supports the concept of the social glass ceiling. I discuss prevailing gender differences in the division of home and paid labor, gender differences in job attribute preferences, and the theoretical explanations that have been forwarded in the literature to explain these differences. The purpose of this review is to refute Dr. Reskin's assertion that gender differences in preferences for family-friendly work arrangements (as an explanation for why women are not well represented in certain managerial jobs, particularly merchandise manager) is merely stereotypical.

A. Division of labor at home and at work: The persistence of gender differences

In the past several decades, national surveys of randomly selected adults have been conducted which address work and non-work roles and attitudes. Relying on data from the 1977

Quality of Employment Surveys, a representative, probabilistic sample of adults living in U.S. households who work at least 20 hours a week, sociologists William and Denise Bielby (Bielby & Bielby, 1989) examined patterns of work and family-related commitments. Confining their analyses to a sub-sample of 270 married women and 761 married men, their data showed that, as expected, working women took greater responsibility for family and home duties than did working men. For example, 44 percent of women but only 4 percent of men reported staying home with a child if both parents were supposed to be at work; working mothers spent 2.03 hours a day on child care whereas working men spent 1.01; working women spent 3.38 hours a day on house chores compared to 1.14 hours a day for men. Also measured in this study were participants' psychological identification with their work and with their family. For example, to measure work identity, respondents indicated their extent of agreement with statements such as "My main satisfaction in life comes from my work"; and "The most important things that happen to you involve your job." Family identity was measured with similar items except that the terms "husband/wife and children" were substituted for "work." Consistent with societal gender role expectations that women's work responsibilities are in opposition to their family responsibilities, whereas men's are complementary,[5] Bielby and Bielby found men to have significantly higher levels of work identification compared to women, whereas women had significantly higher family identification. Moreover, women who work part-time and women who have stronger family identification tend to have weaker work identification. For men, having a non-employed spouse increased work identification. There was a positive, but not statistically significant

[5] Bielby and Bielby (1989) forwarded the hypothesis, based on gender role norms, that women trade off commitment to work for commitment to family because being committed both is contrary to gender role expectations (or put another way, being committed to the family role is consistent with female gender role expectations). Men, on the other hand, can be committed to both work and family because engagement in the work role is viewed as contributing to the family role by way of being the "provider."

relation between men's work identity and their family identity, supporting Bielby and Bielby's gender role norm hypothesis. Thus men made no trade-off between work and family roles, whereas women did.

Drobnic, Blossfeld and Rohwer (1999) used a subset of data (n=4,120 White women) from the 1987-1988 National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) (n=13,017).[6] Through longitudinal analyses of individual-level data, the authors investigated how fluctuations in family responsibilities affected women's employment levels and work schedules. Marriage (with and without children) was significantly associated with transitions from full-time employment to non-employment and to part-time employment. Two groups most likely to transition from employment to non-employment were married women without children, and married women with a pre-school age child. Although this study focused only on changes in full-, part- and non-employment it adds to the body of research indicating that family life course affects women's employment choices.

Presser (1994) also analyzed a sub-sample from the 1987-1988 NSFH, consisting of 2,388 dual-earner married couples from whom complete data were available for the relevant variables, to examine patterns of division of household labor across different work schedule arrangements. Overall, employed wives spent almost twice the number of hours on household tasks (not including child care) than their employed husbands did (33.4 vs. 17.6 hours/week, respectively). Employed wives spent 25.7 hours/week whereas employed husbands spent 6.7 hours on traditional "feminine" tasks, such as preparing meals, and washing clothes. Comparatively, employed husbands spent 7.1 hours/week and employed wives spent 1.7 hours on "masculine" tasks, such as outdoor house and lawn maintenance. Factors that tended to be

[6] Drobnic et al. also analyzed data from the German Socioeconomic Panel, but the German data are not discussed in this report.

associated with an *increase* in the amount of time husbands spent on traditionally feminine tasks were having a work shift that didn't overlap with their wives (e.g., working night shift while wives worked day shift), level of education, equitable earnings ratios within the marriage, wives' egalitarian attitudes, and having children under the age of five. For wives, factors that were associated with *decreases* in time spent on feminine tasks were both spouses having day-time shifts (as opposed to both having non-day time shifts, or having a spouse whose work shift did not substantially overlap with their works shift), educational level and having a professional or managerial job, lower earnings by the spouse, spouse's and their own pro-egalitarian attitudes, and not having children 18 or younger in the house. None of these factors, however, fully explained the difference between women's and men's time spent on household tasks.

Examining a relatively more recent panel of the NSFH (1992-1993), Kaufman and Uhlenberg (2000) studied 1,667 men and 2,242 women to examine predictors of employment effort for both mothers and fathers. As expected, among women, mothers were less likely to be employed or were employed for fewer hours than non-mothers. Mothers with more children, or with children less than age six, as compared to those with fewer or older children, were less likely to be employed or were employed for fewer hours. By contrast, men with children were more likely to be employed than men without children and men with three or more children or with the youngest child less than age 6 worked longer hours than men with fewer or older children. These results, however, were affected by participants' attitudes toward maternal employment. To illustrate, 30-year old white, college-educated professional men who held traditional attitudes (i.e., believe that mothers should not work) and who are fathers worked 11 hours more than non-traditional non-fathers. Modern fathers (who believed it is okay for mothers to work) worked nine hours less per week than did modern non-fathers. Employed 40

year old, white, college educated professional women with traditional attitudes worked an average of 25 hours per week, while similar women with modern attitudes worked about 43 hours per week.

Data from these studies are between 14 and 19 years old and one might assume that such gender differences in the division of labor have become considerably smaller in recent years. The Families and Work Institute has been tracking work and non-work patterns of working adults for the past 15 years, with their most recent survey in 2002 (Bond et al, 2002). Indeed their research does show such trends, but American society is still far from egalitarian with regard to division of labor. The Institute's National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) was modeled after the Quality of Employment Surveys (QES) conducted by the University of Michigan from 1969 to 1977. Several of the questions in the 2002 NSCW survey were compared to responses from the 1977 QES as well as to earlier NSCW surveys. Participants in the 2002 survey were 3,504 employed adults randomly selected from households across the 48 contiguous states. The results indicated that:

- 24% of women compared to only 9% of men had part-time positions as their main or only job, and of part-timers, 68% of women compared to 51% of men stated that they worked part-time voluntarily.
- Women worked 39.8 hours/week compared to 46.1 hours/week for men in their main jobs and women worked about one week less per year than men. Twenty percent of women spend fewer than five days per week at their jobs compared to 12% for men.
- Women with more than one child under 18 (but not a single child) reported working somewhat shorter hours than women without children. (The hours that fathers vs. non fathers spent at work was not reported).

- Women traveled significantly less than men (13% of women vs. 25% of men had overnight business travel in the past 3 months).
- 77% of women in dual earner couples with children reported taking greater responsibility for cooking, 78% taking greater responsibility for cleaning, and 70% taking greater responsibilities than their husbands for routine child care.
- Comparing the 1992 NSCW to the 2002 NSCW survey, there was evidence that men have gradually taken on more family responsibilities. Among those in dual-earner couples, 43% of men in 2002, compared to 28% in 1992 reported taking on greater or equal responsibility for cooking (but no change for cleaning or routine child care). Of women in dual earner couples, 20% and 30% report that their male partners took on equal or more responsibility for cleaning and routine child care, respectively, compared to reports of 11% and 24%, respectively in 1992.
- 72% of mothers, compared to 31% of fathers, claimed that they are the ones who are most likely to take time off work to stay home or do something with their children when both are supposed to be at work.
- In 2002, women in dual career couples reported spending 3 hours/day on home chores (chores, child care), compared to 2 hours/day for men. Women reported allocating 3.5 hours/day to children, compared to 2.7 hours/day for men. Men report allocating 1.3 hours/day to themselves, compared to women's reports of .9 hours/day (Bond et al., 2002).

Taken together, these studies, based on nationally representative samples of employed adults, clearly show that despite trends toward egalitarianism, widespread gender differences in the allocation of work and non-work roles and patterns of employment affected by these roles

persist. Perceptions that women at Costco generally may not work the hours that men work or that women disproportionately leave Costco for family reasons would not be based on stereotypes, as Dr. Reskin suggests (Reskin, p. 19), if trends at Costco are similar to trends in the nation generally. The next section reviews theories and research on gender differences in preferences for a variety of job attributes (e.g., good working conditions, good pay, meaningful work). In general, the research shows that women tend to place more value than men on job attributes that help them manage family demands in terms of time and flexibility, whereas men tend to value job attributes that allow them to advance and gain greater status in the workplace.

B. Gender Differences in Job Attribute Preferences

Given that significant gender differences in division of labor with regard to family, home, and work roles persist, as well as the growth of both individuals from dual-career couples and women with young children (American Association of University Women Education Foundation, 2003), researchers have long been interested in examining the extent to which there may be gender differences for job attribute preferences. Job attributes, also known as work values, refer to the variety of specific qualities and outcomes individuals experience or desire from their paid work, such as performing interesting tasks, receiving valued rewards, and having pleasant working environment (Konrad, Corrigall, Lieb, & Ritchie, 2000). Such research lays the foundation for understanding how various forces shape women's and men's decisions about their careers.

1. Theoretical foundations for gender differences in job attribute preferences

a. Gender ideology theory

(similar to gender role theory, Bielby & Bielby, 1989) posits that differences in job attribute preferences stem from gendered socialization pressures on both children and adults. Parents,

peers, teachers, media, and other influential sources have emphasized traditional roles for women as homemakers and men as income providers. Concomitant with these gender role expectations are gender stereotypes and norms that require women to be nurturing, deferent, affiliative and passive (known collectively as "communal" traits) and for men to be autonomous, aggressive, dominant, and achievement oriented (known collectively as "agentic" traits) (Eagly & Karau, 1992; Konrad, Corrigall et al., 2000; Williams & Best, 1990). According to gender ideology theory, the extent to which women and men conform to these gendered socialization expectations will be associated with their preferences for various job attributes (See Reskin and Hartmann, 1986, chapter 3). Therefore, men would be expected to desire jobs that provide responsibility, independence, high earnings, advancement potential, recognition and prestige, whereas women would be expected to desire jobs that provide opportunities for interpersonal relationships, job security, opportunity to help others, and convenient and good working hours in order to accommodate family demands.

Some variations to gender ideology theory include *life cycle* theory and *job attraction* theory (Konrad, Yang, Goldberg & Sullivan, 2005). Life cycle theory examines changes in job attribute preferences over the course of one's life, arguing the gender ideology pressures are stronger during some stages than in others. During the time when children are young, women prefer attributes that are consistent with homemaker and family roles (i.e., more traditionally female roles), such as flexible work scheduling, good hours, and little travel. For women without children or whose children are older, there is less conformity to traditional gender roles and accordingly job attribute preferences may change such that women may seek jobs that require longer hours, more travel and greater financial or other forms of intrinsic rewards.

Konrad, Yang et al., cite research to support the notion that job attribute preferences shift over time. In addition Konrad (2003) investigated family demands and job attribute preference in a 4-year longitudinal study of men and women. She found that the relationship between the importance of work hours and household labor was stronger for women than men, indicating that women were more likely to develop plans for combining work and family. In addition, higher levels of household labor (typically found in women) were associated with increased preferences for short, flexible work hours, and a comfortable work environment. Although not a direct test of life cycle theory, Konrad's (2003) study provides support for both gender ideology and life cycle theory. Women with family demands place more importance on family-friendly job attributes than do men.

b. Life cycle theory

would predict that when women and men are in the stage of their lives when family demands are high, they are likely to experience work-family inter-role conflict (work-family conflict), defined as the simultaneous occurrence of demands from both work and family that make compliance with one role more difficult for compliance with the other role. Based on her review of the literature, Wiersma (1990) predicted that women would experience stronger conflict of this nature because women, more than men, assume responsibility for household management and child-care. She surveyed parents at 26 day care centers in northeastern USA metropolitan areas (n= 155 working fathers and 181 working mothers). She found that women, compared to men, expressed greater desire for job attributes related to parent support (e.g., child care leave, availability of alternative work hours, day care provisions) and work conditions (e.g., job security, good interpersonal relations), in part because they believed such provisions would reduce work-family conflict. Frone and

Yardley (1996) conceptually replicated Wiersma's study with a sample of 252 working parents (74% women) at a large financial services organization in Canada. Women expressed greater desire for family supportive programs, such as job sharing and child care arrangements, and parents (both male and female) who experience family demands interfering with work demands expressed greater desire for family support programs. Similarly, Tausig and Fenwick (2001), in their analysis of the 1992 National Study of the Changing Workforce (n=2,958 employed adults) found that despite working fewer hours than men, women experience significantly less work-life balance than men. Galinsky, Bond & Friedman (1996), analyzing the same data set, reported that "employed mothers were much more likely than fathers to give priority to having control over their work schedules, while fathers gave greater consideration to fringe benefits, management opportunities, and opportunities for advancement (Galinksy et al, p. 119-120). These studies suggest that women are more sensitive than men to the need to negotiate work demands to help them manage work-life balance.

c. ***Job attraction theory***

examines how job seekers respond to a variety of information about jobs and models the importance people place on various job and organizational features in their decisions to apply for or accept job offers. Gender roles can play an important role in shaping the weight that job seekers have for various features. For example, women more than men may prefer jobs that are characterized by fewer work hours because of the need to accommodate family roles.

Derek Chapman and colleagues (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carrol, Piasentin& Jones, 2005) at the University of Calgary conducted a meta-analytic review[7,j] of the correlates of recruiting outcomes in reviewing applicant attraction to organizations and job choice. They found, among other things, that women used information about job characteristics (e.g., location) more than men in determining the attractiveness of the position. They noted that this finding is consistent with role theories (e.g., Wiersma, 1990; Frone & Yardley, 1996) in that women may be more likely than men to seek out positions that offer a location or benefits that minimize conflicts with other life roles (e.g., spouse, parent).

d. *Structuralism*

is an alternative (but not necessarily competing) theory for gender differences in job attribute preferences. Barriers to women's employment opportunities, such as discrimination, biased promotion ladders (e.g., requiring military service or extensive overseas travel) and veterans' preferences are the sources of sex differences in job attribute preferences (Konrad, Corrigall et al., 2000; Gutek, 1993) if they cause women to re-evaluate (i.e., lower) their career aspirations. Structural barriers can come from within and outside the organization. Whereas a hostile work environment constitutes an organizational-based barrier to women's advancement, gender-role expectations that burden women with family responsibilities is an extra-organizational barrier. Both the gender role and structuralism hypotheses posit gender differences in job attributes preferences.

If there were structural barriers to advancement to higher level warehouse management positions at Costco, such as hostile work environment (sexual harassment) or perceptions of gender discrimination, then one expect to see high rates of turnover among women (O'Connell &

[7] See the end note for an explanation of meta-analysis.

Korabik, 2000; Greenglass, 1985; Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau & Oguz, 2000; Sims, Drasgow & Fitzgerald, 2005). Data analyzed by Dr. Saad on termination rates (all turnover) for male and female staff managers, AGMs and GMs from 2000 to 2005 show virtually no differences. Averaging over this period, average annual turnover was 1.95% for female staff managers and 1.99% for male staff managers. Similarly termination rates were 1.67% for female AGMs and 2.22% for male AGMs; and 1.38% for female GMs and 2.01% for male GMs (Saad, Exhibit 40). These termination rates tends to undermine the view that structural barriers, such as sexual harassment or perceptions of gender discrimination, have differentially affected female and male managers at Costco.

2. Empirical evidence for sex differences in job attribute preferences

Indeed, reliable gender differences in a variety of job attribute preferences have been reported in many studies. Konrad and her colleagues (Konrad Corrigall, et al., 2000) conducted a meta-analysis on 31 studies reporting job attribute preference of women and men in management and business schools to examine the extent of gender differences if any. The combined samples sizes ranged from roughly 2000 to over 9000[8]. On almost all factors, women expressed stronger preferences than men, but many of the effect sizes[9] were near 0. However, sizable effects were found for "good hours" (d = -.17; note that negative d values reflect stronger preferences for women than for men) and a good supervisor (d = -.30) as well as a variety of intrinsic job values such as feelings of accomplishment (d = -.18), challenge (d = -.20), and growth and development (d = -.18). Men tend to have stronger preferences for earnings (d = .08) and responsibility (d = .07).

[8] Not all 31 studies examined all forms of job attributes. For example only ten studies examined benefits, hours, and task variety; whereas thirty articles examined preferences for job security.

[9] See endnote 1 for explanation of effect sizes.

In a more extensive meta-analysis covering 242 studies reflecting a combined sample size of up to 600,000 male and female children and adults, Konrad, Ritchie, Lieb & Corrigall (2000) examined whether men and women look for different things in their work and whether these needs and wants have changed over time. They found significant sex differences on 33 out of 40 job attribute preferences, with the largest differences indicating that women value (a) opportunity to help others and working with people (d's = -.35 and -.36, respectively); (b) good supervision (d = -.16), (c) short commute (d = -.30); and (d) and a variety of intrinsic job aspects more frequently than men, who typically look for high earnings and power/prestige in their work. There was a small, but reliable gender difference in preference for good hours, with women expressing stronger preference than men (d = -.03; the 95% confidence interval did not include 0)[10]. The authors noted that the directions of the sex differences were generally consistent with gender role expectations. Many job attributes became relatively more important to women and girls in the 1980s and 1990s compared with the 1970s, indicating that women's aspirations to obtain job attributes rose as gender barriers to opportunity declined (a finding that supports structuralism theory).

3. A closer examination of gender differences in work scheduling arrangements, travel, and relocation

Job attribute preferences run the gamut from intrinsic qualities of the work itself, (such as (perceptions that the work is interesting socially important, autonomous), to physical and interpersonal aspects of the work environment (such as whether the work is performed in

[10] Confidence intervals are a way to establish statistical significance or reliability. Assuming that a reported effect size reflects a sample from a population where the true effect size is unknown, the confidence interval allows you to determine the possible range of the true effect size. A 95% confidence interval is the range in which a researcher can confidently state (with 95% accuracy) that the true population effect size exists. Therefore, if the confidence interval does not include 0, one can confidently state that the true effect size is not 0.

comfortable settings, the quality of supervision and other interpersonal relationships), to extrinsic rewards from the job (such as pay, benefits, opportunities for advancement). In this section, I take a closer look at research examining gender differences in work scheduling arrangements, such as whether the work requires non-traditional day-time hours, flexible schedules, overnight travel and relocation because these were issues that Dr. Reskin raised in her report about why women may not choose managerial positions that have demands in these respects (Reskin, p. 17-19). Dr. Reskin presumed that observations by Costco managers about this phenomenon reflected sex stereotypes. I argue that reliable data exists to show that women indeed place more value than men on work scheduling, travel and relocation preferences that permit them to manage family and household concerns.

a. *Flexible Scheduling.*

Researchers at the University of Missouri analyzed data from both the 1997 current population survey[11] and a local sample from a Midwestern service-based industry[12] to examine correlates of the use of various forms of flexible schedules (flex time, compressed work week, job sharing), and reasons for choosing these schedules (Sharpe, Hermsen & Billings, 2002). Nationally, men utilize flex time more than women but the authors speculated that this is because men are more likely than women to be in jobs with high autonomy. Further analyses supported these conclusions showing that use of alternative schedules is positively correlated with education and having managerial jobs for men, but negatively for women, suggesting that for men, jobs with greater autonomy offer more opportunities for flexible scheduling. Furthermore, men reported using alternative schedules

[11] national probability sample, selecting married workers not self employed (n=7,837)

[12] n=146

to increase their productivity or to take advantage of recreation and exercise. Among women, use of flextime schedules was largest for those with preschool-age child (presence of children did not predict use of flex-time schedules for men). Among employed married women, a significantly larger proportion of those using a flextime schedule had a preschool-age child. These statistical results from the national survey were reinforced by the quantitative and qualitative study of the local sample which revealed that a larger proportion of women than men reporting using alternative work schedule to accommodate family scheduling.

b. *Overnight Travel.*

Harriet Presser of the University of Maryland has done considerable research on the question of alternative work arrangements and their various impacts on women and minorities. She frequently relies on national probability surveys in her research. Using the 1987-1988 panel of the National Survey of Families and Households, selecting employed persons (n=6,810), Presser & Hermsen (1996) examined gender differences in traveling overnight for work-related purposes. Predictions were drawn from research on gendered division of labor, noting that women assume greater allocation of child care and housework responsibilities than men and thus are more likely to be responsive to gender ideology and family status when making particular job decisions. Men (30.2%) were more likely to travel overnight than women (13.1%). Egalitarian attitudes increased the odds of having a travel job for women but not men. Family variables (marital status, number of children younger than or older than age 5) did not affect the odds of having a travel job. Although the expectation for overnight travel was not identified as a problematic job attribute for

managerial positions in Costco warehouses, this study is highlighted as yet another example of how gender roles impact decisions about occupational choices.

c. ***Non-standard shifts.***

In her study of non-standard work shifts, Presser (2003)[13], noted that workers may choose non-standard shifts (e.g., evening shifts from 4pm to midnight; night shifts from midnight to 8am, rotating shifts or other varying shifts). For example, workers may perceive that such shifts permit them as parents to coordinate household and family chores.[14] More often than not, however, non-standard shifts are requirements of the job (not individual choice) and are associated with negative consequences for such things as family functioning, reports Presser (2003). Jobs with non-standard shifts are often lower paying, offer fewer benefits, and have lower promotional opportunities than jobs that primarily have standard day shifts.

Presser (2003) analyzed data from the 1997 Current Population Survey which collected information on work hours to examine patterns of non-standard work schedules by gender and race. Presser restricted her analysis to civilians 18 year or older who worked for pay (full or part-time) in nonagricultural sectors (N=57,192). Indeed the percent of men whose jobs were primarily night shifts (at least half the work hours were between midnight and 8:00am) were .8 percent higher than women (4.5% vs. 3.7%, respectively). However, summing over all non-standard shifts (evening shifts, rotating shifts, and varying schedules), men were more likely than

[13] Dr. Reskin cites this study in footnote 52 of her report to argue that gender differences in non-standard workshifts (esp. night shifts) are miniscule. This statistic misrepresents Presser's conclusions. Furthermore, Dr. Mulligan in his report has provided a more extensive re-examination of data that Presser relied upon to argue that gender differences in non-standard shifts are much larger than Dr. Reskin suggests.

[14] Presser, (1994) in her analysis of the 1986-1987 National Survey of Families and Households found that when dual earners worked shifts that were not completely overlapping, such as when one spouse worked a standard day shift, and the other spouse worked an evening shift, men slightly increased the amount of time they devoted to household chores.

women to have other than a fixed day shift (21.1% vs. 18.6%). Men were also more likely to work weekend shifts than were women (35% vs. 27.9%), which may reflect men's higher rate of self employment. Of particular interest, when asked why a respondent worked a non-standard day shift (if applicable), women were much more likely to state family-related reasons for non-standard hours (34.3% of women stated this compared to 19% of men). These effects are more pronounced when the analyses are limited to parents (46.1 % of working mothers report personal and familial reasons, especially better child care arrangements, compared to 17.2% of working fathers).

Although the focus of Presser's (2003) study was on reasons for having nonstandard hours (and not reasons for having or choosing standard hours), this nationally representative sample shows that family considerations have a stronger influence on women's work schedule preferences whereas job-related factors have a stronger influence on men's work hour preferences. Presser stated that women's choices for non-standard hours, when applicable, are because of their greater role in caregiving and their greater responsiveness to caregiving needs.

d. *Willingness to Relocate.*

Finally, researchers have studied factors that impinge on workers' willingness (or reluctance) to relocate for a better job. I highlight both a classic and a very recent study of gender and family issues with regard to relocation decisions. Bielby and Bielby (1992) tested competing models that explain gender differences in the willingness or reluctance to relocate. As with other research the Bielbys have conducted on gender issues in employment dynamics (e.g., Bielby & Bielby, 1989), the authors forwarded gender-role ideology theory to suggest that net of market and human capital resources that may

influence a couple's decision to relocate,[15] gender-role ideologies will have an asymmetric influence on relocation decisions. To the extent that either or both spouses hold traditional gender role beliefs, men will be more likely to move for a better job than will women because relocation for job advancement is consistent with men's traditional role as provider, but inconsistent with women's traditional role as family caregiver. Data from the 1977 Quality of Employment Surveys, restricted to married respondents in dual-earner families were analyzed (n=162 women and 197 men). As expected women expressed stronger reluctance to relocate than did men. Eighty seven percent of women were reluctant to leave for any reason, compared to 57% of men, and 56% of women were reluctant to leave for family reasons, compared to 16% of men. The data suggested that men's willingness to relocate was much less dependent on their spouse's current earnings than were women's, and the authors noted that men were almost always more likely than women to "pursue personal gain in the sphere of paid employment, regardless of the consequences for family well being" (p. 1256). Traditional gender role beliefs interacted with gender and spousal earnings to affect relocation decisions. Men with traditional gender role beliefs had virtually no reluctance to relocate regardless of their spouses' earnings in their current location; whereas non-traditional men were somewhat sensitive to their spouses' earnings and were generally more reluctant to relocate than traditional men. Traditional females expressed the most reluctance to relocate and their opinions were much more dependent on their spouse's earnings (the greater their spouses' earnings, the more reluctant they were to relocate). Non-

[15] Neoclassic theory argues that couples maximize family utilities in making relocation decisions. If one spouse's potential gains (e.g., earnings potential) from a move outweigh the potential losses to the other spouse for moving, the couple is likely to move. Theoretically, the model is neutral with regard to gender, but because men's salaries and other work-related benefits tend to be higher than women's, women are more often "tied-leavers" (AKA trailing spouses) than are men (Bielby & Bielby, 1992).

traditional women were less reluctant than traditional women, but still more reluctant than either nontraditional or traditional men to relocate. The authors concluded that gender and gender role beliefs have strong and asymmetric influences on decisions to relocate for a better job that cannot be fully explained by gender differences in family earnings potential.

A very recent study replicated and expanded Bielby and Bielby's (1992) research on the impact of family and gender on willingness to relocate (Baldridge, Eddleston & Viega, 2006). This study focused specifically on managers and captured more nuances that affect relocation decisions, such as the presence of pre-school children and both spouse's and children's ties to their communities. Traditional market-based variables, such as spouse's relative income were also measured. The authors reasoned that these factors would all influence managers' decisions to relocate, but that they would have a stronger influence on women's decisions than on men. Specifically, because of gender-role socialization pressures women would be more sensitive to the effect of the move on their families than would men. Having a spouse who contributed more to the family income would have a stronger negative effect on women than men as would the spouse's community ties. Having preschool children and the effects of their community ties would also have a stronger negative influence on women's relocation decisions than it would on men's. Their study of 666 managers in which each respondent was matched with an opposite sex person with regard to level of position, type of industry, age, and geographic position, to control for these influences, found strong support for their hypotheses. Net of all other variables in the model (age, community ties, number of prior relocations, marital status, presence of children, salary and education), women expressed significantly less willingness to relocate than did men. Moreover, gender interacted with variables that are theoretically relevant to gender ideology theory. Spouse's income and spouse's ties to the community had a stronger negative

effect on women's relocation decisions than on men's. The presence of preschool children also had a stronger negative effect on women's willingness to relocate, with virtually no effect for men. Thus, this study demonstrates that gender role ideology issues still have strong effects on women's and men's willingness to relocate – women are much more sensitive to the effects of such a move on their families, even if for a better job, than are men.

C. Summary

As stated earlier in this report, the social glass ceiling represents impediments to women's advancement that are erected by pervasive social and cultural influences that serve to maintain traditional gender role ideologies, despite increasing acceptance of egalitarianism in social and economic roles for women and men. It is not merely stereotypical to observe that women remain saddled with home and family burdens, whereas men can optimize both their work and family roles by focusing their energies primarily in the work role. The research reviewed in this section, which relied heavily on national, random household surveys and on meta-analyses, revealed that women continue to have greater responsibility for family duties, and that their family role has a stronger and almost exclusively negative influence on employment decisions, such as lack of desire to relocate and the desire for work hours and flexibility arrangements that can facilitate family responsibilities. To the extent that family roles influence men's employment or job attribute preferences, they tend to produce positive results for their employment role, such as working full time or working longer hours.

It is also true that employers can erect barriers for women's advancement. Workplaces that are polluted with a hostile work environment, that disregard diversity, that have unreasonable travel or relocation requirements, that allow stereotypes about women to go unchecked, and that have few to no women in top management positions are subject to scrutiny

for potentially discriminatory practices. Dr. Frank Landy, in his report, has thoroughly documented that, contrary to Dr. Reskin's assertions, Costco engages in "best management practices" with regard to employee development – practices which tend to promote egalitarian treatment and minimize if not completely eradicate any role that stereotyping may play. Based on my review above, I conclude that women's lack of interest in this position is best explained by gender role ideology-based influences rather than on discriminatory treatment by Costco, and I offer the following opinions:

Opinion 3: **In the U.S. population, gender differences in the division of paid work and household labor have persisted despite trends toward egalitarianism. Women devote significantly more time than men to house and family roles and concomitantly slightly less time to work roles, especially when their family demands are high. Men on average work slightly longer average work weeks and are more willing to travel and become more engaged in their work role when family demands are high. Thus the belief that women are more responsive to family demands than are men is not a stereotype when applied as a general observation of the population.**

Opinion 4: **Gender roles, which are influenced by a wide host of factors throughout the course of one's lifetime, affect preferences for various job attributes.**

Opinion 5: **Women are more likely than men to desire flexible or alternative work schedules so that they can better manage family demands; women are less likely than men to have jobs that require overnight travel; and women are more reluctant to relocate for a better position, and their reluctance is more highly associated with needs and concerns of their families than is men's**

reluctance to relocate. Thus, there are reliable gender differences in job attribute preferences, which are strongly related to gender role ideology differences.

IV. Application of literature on job attribute preferences to Costco.

Here, I discuss facts known to me about Costco's management pipeline and key entry jobs to upper-level management to support my opinion that it is the required nature of a particular management portal position – merchandise manager – that a significant proportion of women find particularly undesirable. To the extent that upper-level management positions (e.g., assistant warehouse managers – AGMs and warehouse managers – GMs) as well as key portal positions into upper level management positions (i.e., staff level manager, especially merchandise manager) differ on job attributes that have been shown in the literature to be affected by gender role ideology, especially with regard to non-work and family responsibilities, gender differences in preferences for these positions are likely to exist. In this section I review information made available to me about the job attributes of staff level management positions, with particular focus on merchandise manager, because 72% of AGMs have had experience in at least two of these positions before being promoted (Drogin, p. 6, Table 5), and over 85% of all AGMs have had prior experience as merchandise manager (Drogin, p. 7).

A. Description of staff management positions

1. Merchandise Manager

The merchandise manager oversees merchandising and management development in the merchandising area. She or he is responsible for increasing sales and reducing warehouse loss of sales, and manages over $6 Million in inventory (CRE 0010964). Depositions of senior executives agree with Dr. Drogin's statistical analysis revealing that the merchandise manager

position is the most important senior staff position for promotion to assistant warehouse manager and warehouse manager (Hoover dep., pp. 79-80, 113; Omoss dep., p. 276). The merchandise manager's primary responsibility is to get the store ready for "show time" – the opening of each day (Sinegal dep., p, 152-153), bringing in and moving the day's merchandise and optimizing the store for sales. It can take between six and ten hours to get a store ready for opening (Schutt dep., p. 195). Merchandise managers often have begun their day extremely early in the morning. They often need to be at the store no later than 4:00am (Jelinek dep., p. 62; Schutt dep., pp. 193, 194, 199; Zook dep., p. 64), and can need to be there as early 12:00am depending on the type of merchandising tasks that are required for the day (Schutt dep., pp. 200-201). Costco executives agreed that the extremely early and erratic starting hours have taken a heavy toll on merchandise managers. Omoss believed that the hard work and long hours have discouraged some people away from considering rotations or promotions into merchandise manager positions (Omoss dep., p. 276), and although many executives believed that these conditions were challenges for all managers (e.g., Portera dep., p. 203; Schutt dep., p. 193), some observed that women were particularly likely to turn down or leave merchandise manager positions because of difficulties in managing family-related responsibilities (Hoover dep., p. 118[16]; Sinegal dep., p. 150).

2. Receiving Manager

The receiving manager is responsible for all functions within the Receiving Department and Return-To-Vendor (RTV); including safety procedures, and organizing and coordinating flow of merchandise between Merchandising and Receiving. Receiving managers supervise in Receiving, RTV and Facility/Maintenance. In addition, they oversee forklift maintenance and

[16] Hoover related examples of women in almost all of the senior staff positions stating that they were quitting or stepping down from the positions because of family related matters, whereas he knew of no male warehouse or assistant warehouse manager who had called in to say they were going to stay home with the kids (Hoover, dep. P. 119)

safety. Receiving managers apply and execute all Costco policies and procedures and ensure that employees within these departments are doing the same. They ensure that vendors and services are contacted and that follow-up is completed. Receiving managers schedule, develop, counsel and direct shipping and receiving personnel, and they make recommendations for hiring, promotion and termination to warehouse manager. Finally, receiving managers participate in employee reviews, and they review employees' time cards. (CRE 0002571).

Although the receiving manager's day starts early, their starting times have not been as erratic as those of the merchandise managers. Receiving managers start between 4:00am to 7:00am depending on the location (Portera dep., p. 204; Schutt dep., p. 196-197; Sinegal dep., p. 153), although within locations, their start times appear to be stable. Typically they begin when deliveries are made (Zook dep., p. 64). In some communities there are ordinances which deny deliveries early in the morning, thus those positions tend to start at 6:00am or 7:00am (Sinegal dep., p. 153).

3. Front-End Manager and Administrative Manager

Front-end managers are responsible for the entire operation of the front end, including but not limited to: member complaints, employee performance, breaks and lunches, sales and door counts, coupons, bleeds sent to the vault, door audits and cash adjustments, front-end renewals, go backs, manual updates and revisions, membership information, employee relations, employee annual reviews, opening and closing procedures, check approvals, buying and selling change, non-transfers, disposition tags, resale cards, merchandise pick-ups carts, RTV items and maintenance and repair of the register system (CRE 0010405).

Administrative managers oversee and direct administration and maintenance departments and other areas of the warehouse. They schedule, develop, counsel, and direct department personnel, and make recommendations for hiring, promotion and termination to warehouse manager. In addition, administrative manage review and approve area time cards, draft and participate in presentation of employee performance evaluations, oversee workers' compensation and warehouse accident claims for employees and members, complete accident reports, fix Costco claim forms to appropriate parties, implement and uphold safety and security procedures, oversee safety meetings, implement in-house safety programs and oversee safety incentive distribution. Administrative manager track warehouse budget, and write and issue purchase orders and checks, oversee Costco donations to charitable organizations, and monitor department processes and paperwork to ensure department procedures are followed. Administrative managers maintain warehouse procedure books, review warehouse audits by department monthly, and coordinate the acquisition, repair and maintenance of office and facility equipment. Finally, administrative managers provide and ensure prompt and courteous member service (CRE 0010943).

Both front-end managers and the administrative managers begin their days near the time that the store opens. A Costco senior executive, Dennis Zook, stated that their days generally begin at 10:00 am to 12:00 noon and may go until closing (Zook dep., p. 64). None of the depositions of Costco executives stated that front-end or administrative manager schedules were erratic.

B. Summary and analysis of job attribute differences among staff-level management positions.

Clearly, staff level managers at Costco work long hours and possess a great deal of responsibility for the day-to-day management of their warehouses. However, the demands of the merchandise manager position, especially with regard to the early and erratic starting times are likely to be of most concern to managers (or aspiring managers) who have family responsibilities. A job that starts one day at 4:00am (and thus the manager may get to bed at 8:00pm the night before), 2:00am the next (necessitating a 6:00pm bedtime), and 12:00am the next (4:00pm bedtime) would wreak havoc on a parent's ability to spend time on family and home chores. As my literature review thoroughly documented, women are saddled with these family responsibilities to a much greater extent than men are.

In addition, openings for upper-level warehouse management positions at Costco are scarce. Dr. Saad reports that turnover rates from 2000-2005 for staff managers, AGM and GM have been very low, ranging from .99% to 3.46% (Saad, Exhibit 40). Given such low turnover rates,[17] those aspiring to move into upper level management most likely need to be willing to relocate to different warehouses in order to take advantage of rare job openings. Dr. Saad has analyzed information on warehouse relocation patterns (the percentage of male and female Costco employees moving to a different warehouse location controlling for employee tenure) from 2000 to 2005. His analysis revealed that men are significantly more likely to relocate than women (Saad, Exhibit 41)[18]. My literature review documents that because of gender role

[17] I have been told that Costco opens, on average, about 20 warehouses a year. Therefore the number of managerial job openings is somewhat larger than these turnover rates suggest. However, to the extent that the availability of managerial job vacancies are created by warehouse openings, relocation is likely to be necessary, given that most vacancies are filled internally.

[18] His analysis also reveals that relocation rates are significantly higher among those promoted to AGM than among those not promoted. Furthermore there is no apparent gender difference in the

ideology pressures, women are much less likely than men to be willing to take such moves. Such pressures appear to be operating among Costco employees as well.

Based on my review of job attributes of staff level management positions and other working conditions at Costco I offer the following opinions:

Opinion 6: Because of the early and erratic starting times, it is likely that women have less desire than men to occupy merchandise manager positions.

Opinion 7: Women are less likely than men to accept management positions requiring relocation.

To summarize, merchandise manager positions are the primary qualification for movement into upper level management positions (AGM and GM). There is far less female under-representation in any staff manager position other than merchandise manager, and there is no evidence other than this disparity to support the view that Costco culture and practices have a biasing effect on women. Based on my review of the records and reports provided to me and on research literature cited in this report, I offer the following, final opinion:

Opinion 8: Gender differences in interest expressed for the merchandise manager position is a plausible explanation for the under-representation of women in upper level warehouse management at Costco.

---

relocation rates of those promoted to AGM (Saad, Exhibit 42). Thus, relocation appears to be an important attribute for promotion to AGM from staff manager, and there is no gender disparity on the basis of relocatability in these promotions

ENDNOTE

[1] Researchers use meta-analysis to quantitatively aggregate research findings across a large body of studies that have collected data on the same question. The crucial statistic that is collected from each study is an effect size. Although there are different types of effect size statistics, they are virtually interchangeable with algebraic transformations. The most straight forward effect size for studies examining gender differences and similarities is *d* (Cohen, 1988):

$$d = \frac{M_M - M_F}{s_w}$$

Where M_M is the mean score for males, and M_F is the mean score for females, and s_w is the average within-sex standard deviation. Thus *d* provides a standardized index of the difference between women and men on a particular attribute. For example, a *d* of .50 indicates that men, on average, score one-half of a standard deviation[1] above women on the attribute in question. A *d* of -.75 indicates that women, on average, score three fourths of a standard deviation above men on an attribute. Although these are rough guidelines, psychological researchers regard *ds* that are $\leq .10$ as close-to zero; 0.11 to .35 as small, .36 to .65 as medium, .66 to 1.00 as large, and ≥ 1.0 as large (Hyde, 2005).

Meta-analysis proceeds in four steps. (1) The researcher locates all of the studies that have empirically (quantitatively) examined the variables of interest (e.g., gender differences on job attribute preferences). This includes finding all of the published articles as well as unpublished articles (e.g., theses and dissertations, conference papers, and papers by authors known to have conducted research on a topic, but did not publish a particular paper). It is especially important to try to include as much of the unpublished research as possible because of publication bias – the tendency for researchers to only publish statistically significant findings. Meta-analyses that only include published research may yield artificially inflated *d* values. (2) The research extracts statistics from the reports and transforms them into a common effect size statistic, such as *d*. *d* values can be computed from means and standard deviations, test statistics such as *t* and *F*, correlations (*r*), proportions and other such statistics. (3) The effect sizes from each study are weighted by the sample size, so that studies that were based on larger samples are given more importance when computing the average effect size across all studies in the meta-analysis. Some forms of meta-analyses also correct for the unreliability of the attribute measures and for other artifacts of the research before the average effect size is calculated. (4) The homogeneity of the effect sizes is calculated to determine whether the differences in effect size across all the studies in the meta-analysis is due simply to sampling variation (the amount of variation in the studies that one would expect due to random chance or differences in sample sizes). If the effect sizes are not homogeneous, the researcher looks at subsets of the studies in the meta-analysis that differ by theoretically or practically important attributes to determine whether the effect sizes in one subset of studies is different than the effect size in another set of studies.

Meta-analytic studies yield more reliable information than any one particular study because meta-analysis, by averaging over a large set of studies, is based on a much larger number of research participants than any one study and naturally corrects for random bias that may lead to false conclusions in any particular study. Meta analysis is also superior to traditional narrative literature reviews, which may be subject to either the theoretical biases of the reviewer or to the tendency for narrative reviewers to only assess whether findings are significant or not. Counting significance (also known as vote-counting), may lead to false conclusions about the true size of the effect because of the tendency for large samples to yield results that are statistically significant, albeit miniscule in size.

I declare under penalty that the foregoing is true and correct, and that the remaining portions of this document consist of references cited in my report, a list of materials reviewed, and my curriculum vitae. Executed at Carbondale, Illinois, September 22, 2006.

Margaret S. Stockdale

V. References

American Association of University Women Educational Foundation (2003). *Women at Work.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.

Baldridge, D. C., Eddleston, K. A., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). Saying no to being uprooted: The impact of family and gender on willingness to relocate. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79,* 131-149.

Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1989). Family ties: Balancing commitments to work and family in dual earner households. *American Sociological Review, 54,* 776-789.

Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1992). I will follow him: Family ties, gender-role beliefs, and reluctance to relocate for a better job. *American Journal of Sociology, 97,* 1241-1267.

Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prottas, D. (2002). *Highlights of the National Study of the Changing Workforce.* New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.

Drobnic, S., Blossfeld, H. & Rohwer, G. (1999). Dynamics of women's employment patterns over the family life course: A comparison of the United States and Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61,* 133-146.

Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 928-944.*

Cleveland, J. N., Stockdale, M., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). *Women and men in organizations: Sex and gender issues at work.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ; Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109,* 573-598.

Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & L. Gardner (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 2* (4th ed.). (pp. 357-411. New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.

Frone, M. R., & Yardley, J. K. (1996). Workplace family-supportive programmes: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69,* 351-366.

Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T., & Friedman, D. E. (1996). The role of employers in addressing the needs of employed parents. *Journal of Social Issues, 52,* 111-136.

Greenglass, E. R. (1985). Psychological implicatons of sex bias in the workplace. *American Psychology Bulletin, 7,* 227-240.

Gutek, B. A. (1993). Changing the status of women in management. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 42,* 301-311.

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 5,* 269-298.

Heilman, M.E., Martell, R. F., Simon, M. C. (1988) The vagaries of sex bias: Conditions regulating the undervaluation, equivaluation, and overvaluation of female job applicants. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 41*, 98-110.

Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60,* 581-592.

Kaufman, G., & Uhlenberg, P. (2000). The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women. *Social Forces, 78,* 931-949.

Konrad, A. M. (2003). Family demands and job attribute preferences: A 4-year longitudinal study of women and men. *Sex Roles, 49*, 35-46.

Konrad, A. M., Corrigall, E., Lieb, P., & Ritchie, J. E., Jr. (2000). Sex differences in job attribute preferences among managers and business students. *Group and Organization Management, 25,* 108-131.

Konrad, A. M., Ritchie, J. E., Lieb, P., & Corrigall, E. (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 126,* 593-641.

Konrad, A. M., Yang, Y., Goldberg, C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Preferences for job attributes associated with work and family: A longitudinal study of career outcomes. *Sex Roles, 53,* 303-315.

O'Connell, L. E., & Korabik, K. (2000). Sexual harassment: The relationship of personal vulnerability, work context, perpetrator status, and type of harassment to outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56,* 299-329

Presser, H. B. (1994). Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender. *American Sociological Review, 59*, 348-364.

Presser, H. B. (2003). Race-ethnic and gender differences in nonstandard work shifts. *Work and Occupations, 30,* 412-439.

Presser, H. B., & Hermsen, J. M. (1996). Gender differences in the determinants of over-night work-related travel among employed Americans. *Work & Occupations, 23 (1*), 87-115.

Reskin, B. F., & Hartmann, H, L. (1986). Chapter 3: Explaining sex segregation in the workplace, in *Women's work, men's work: Sex segregation on the job.* (pp. 37-51+). Washington, D.C. National Academy Press.

Shaffer, M. A., Joplin, J. R. W., Bell, M. P., Lau, T., & Oguz, C. (2000). Gender discrimination and job –related outcomes: A cross-cultural comparison of working women in the United States and China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57,* 395-427.

Sharpe, D. L., Hermsen, J. M., & Billings, J. (2002). Gender differences in use of alternative full-time work arrangements by married workers. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 31,* 78-111.

Sims, C. S. Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2005). The effects of sexual harassment in turnover in the military: Time-dependant modeling. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1141-1152.

Tausig, M., & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding time: Alternate work schedules and work-life balance. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 22,* 101-119.

Tosi, H. L., & Einbender, S. (1985). The effects of the type and amount of information in sex discrimination research: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 712-723.

Wiersma, U. J. (1990). Gender differences in job attribute preferences: Work-home role conflict and job level as mediating variables. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63,* 231-243.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

VI. Other Materials Reviewed

A. Reports and Depositions

DiCerchio, Richard Daniel deposition pp, 88-90.

Drogin, R. (2006). Statistical analysis of job movement in management at Costco: Ellis v. Costco.

Hoover, Dennis deposition pp. 77-84; 113-120.

Jelinek, Walter Craig deposition, pp. 54-65.

Landy, F. J. (2006). Expert Report: Shirley "Rae" Ellis et al., v. Costco Wholesale Corp.

Mulligan, C. B. (2006). Expert Report: Shirley "Rae" Ellis et al., v. Costco Wholesale Corp.

Omoss, Mario deposition, pp. 273-280.

Portera, Joseph deposition, pp. 202-209.

Reskin, B. F. (2006). "Expert Report of Barbara F. Reskin, Ph.D.: Shirley "Rae" Ellis et al., v. Costco Wholesale Corp.

Saad, A. (2006). Exhibits 7, 8, 38, 39 (appendices to his expert report: Ellis v. Costco)

Schutt, Douglas, W. deposition pp. 66-69; 190-205.

Sinegal, Jim deposition, pp. 150-154.

Zook, Dennis, R. pp. 57-72.

B. Other Documents

CRE 0010964 (Merchandise manager job description)

CRE 0002571 (Receiving manager job description)

CRE 0010405 (Front end manager job description)

CRE 0010943 (Administration manager job description)

VII. Exhibit A: Margaret S. Stockdale Vitae

Calendar Year: 2006

CURRICULUM VITAE OF MARGARET S. STOCKDALE

I. PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Present University:	Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Department or Unit:	Department of Psychology
Office Address:	LSII 208E Carbondale, IL 62901-6502
Phone and e-mail	618-453-8331; pstock@siu.edu

II. EDUCATION

2005 Masters of Legal Studies (M.L.S.) Southern Illinois University Carbondale School of Law (in progress)

1990 Ph.D. Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS
Major: Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Dissertation: *An Examination of a Process Model of Sex Bias in Personnel Evaluations*

1986 M.S. Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS
Major: Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Thesis: *Token Women in Work Groups: Great Expectations?*

1983 B.S. Frostburg State University, Frostburg, MD, *Summa Cum Laude*
Major: Psychology

III. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

7/04 Professor, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, IL

Area Head, Applied Psychology Program (1998 to present)

7/96 to 6/04 Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, IL

Experimental Psychology Program Director (July, 1999 to April, 2003)

1/97 to 6/97 Visiting Scholar, Department of Management and Policy, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

8/90-6/96 Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, IL

4/89-6/90 Lecturer, Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, North Carolina

IV. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Scholarly Interests and Specialties:

- **Sexual harassment**

- Diversity in the Workplace, esp. gender, race, and cultural issues in the workplace
- Program Evaluation and Needs Assessment
- Evaluation of Public Health Interventions

B. Current Projects:

- *Perceived Knowledge-Skill Fit as a Moderator of Relations between Team Diversity and Team Outcomes.* With Yuqiu Cheng. Manuscript in preparation.
- *Attraction to informally mentoring Asian American protégés: Effects of gender, ethnicity, and influence style.* With L. Batra. Manuscript in preparation.
- *Surveillance and evaluation of a campus-wide anti-smoking campaign.* Principal Evaluator. Data collection in progress.
- *Exploration of sexual harassment experiences and perceptions among women with domestic abuse histories.* Data collection in progress.
- *Sex discrimination In employment An interdisciplinary approach.* Book prospectus accepted by Blackwell publishers. With F. J. Crosby & A. Ropp. (Co-editors)

C. Grants and Contracts Applied for:

1. *Cognitive categorization effects of hidden discrimination toward women as managers.* Office of Research and Development Administration, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, January, 1991 to December 1992.

2. *Mobile mammography demonstration project-focus group research for southern Illinois counties.* American Cancer Society, February 1991 to June 30, 1991.

3. *Misperception of women's friendly behavior. It's validity in a theory of sexual harassment.* Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues. April, 1991.

4. *Evaluation of Chicago/Shawnee Interdisciplinary Health Care Training Partnership.* Chicago School of Osteopathic Medicine, December, 1992.

5. *Sexual harassment in the dental hygiene profession.* SIUC UWPA/Women Studies Juried Competition, 1997.

6. *Customer loyalty: Its meaning and measure.* SIUC ORDA Special Research Program, Spring, 1997.

7. *Effects of complaining on judgments about sexual harassment*, NSF, Date Submitted: Jan. 15, 2003. Co-Principal Investigator. Barbara A. Gutek, University of Michigan, Principal Investigator; Margaret S. Stockdale and Maureen O'Connor, Co-principal Investigators.

8. *Effectiveness of standard-of-care curriculum for tobacco education in a dental hygiene context.* American Cancer Society-Illinois Division. Date Submitted: June 27, 2003. Margaret S. Stockdale, Principal Investigator. Amount requested: $249,964.

D. Research Grants and Contracts Received

- Obtained in conjunction with directorship of Applied Research Consultants (1990 to 1996; Fall 2003):

1. *Job attitude survey*, State University Retirement System, Jan, 1991 – May, 1991 ($800.00).

2. *Focus group study of mammography utilization in southern Illinois.* American Cancer Society – Illinois Division, Jan, 1991 to August, 1991($5,000).

3. *Survey of the Civic Justice Reform Act.* District Court of Southern Illinois, September, 1991 ($1,000).

4. *Focus group needs assessment*, Jackson County Health Department, October, 1991 – December, 1991 ($1,200).

5. *Mentoring Program Evaluation Study*. University Women's Professional Advancement (SIUC); December, 1991 to May, 1993 ($1,000 yearly).

6. *Evaluation of UWPA's Civil Service Connections program*. University Women's Professional Advancement (SIUC), September, 1992 – May, 1993 ($500).

7. *Governor's Task Force on Health and Social Service Reform: Needs assessment and community development*. June, 1993 to December, 1993 ($5,800).

8. *Naturalistic observation of diabetics.* Boehringer Mannheim Corporation, October, 1993 to May, 1994 ($12,000).

9. *Customer satisfaction survey content analysis*. Arthur Andersen, January, 1994 to

May, 1994 ($1,000).

10. *University campus climate survey*. SIUC President's Office, February, 1994 to September, 1994, ($10,000).

11. *Parent involvement survey*. Carbondale, Il, District 95 Schools, September, 1994 to December, 1994, ($600).

12. *Faculty utilization survey*. Office of Research and Administration (SIUC). January, 1995, to April, 1995, ($1,200).

13. *Ridership expectations survey*. Vice President of Student Affairs, SIUC. April, 1995 to June, 1995, ($1,500).

14. *Evaluation of the SIUC Law School Alternative Dispute Resolution Clinic*. SIUC Law School, September, 1995 to May, 1996, ($600).

15. *Oral health WIC-Head Start focus groups*. Illinois Department of Public Health, August, 2003, ($5,500). Reference# 434880587

- Other grants and contracts:

1. *Cognitive categorization effects of hidden discrimination toward women as managers*. Office of Research and Development Administration, SIUC, January 1991 to December, 1991, ($15,000).

2. *Civil Justice Reform Act Survey – Data analysis*. With A. Vaux, Southern District of Illinois Court, 1992, ($1,000).

3. *Evaluation of Microsoft Corporation's System Engineer Certification program.* Microsoft Corporation; contract to J. McKillip, N. Ramanaiah, R. Schmeck, M. Stockdale & A. Vaux, 1995, ($50,000).

4. *Evaluation of Microsoft Corporation's Solution Developer Certification program.* Microsoft Corporation; contract to J. Hetherington, J. McKillip, N. Ramanaiah, R. Schmeck, M. Stockdale & A. Vaux, 1995, ($60,000).

5. *Employee attitude survey*. Maytag-Herrin Corporation, Herrin, Il., 1997, ($5,000).

6. *Customer loyalty literature review*. Maritz Corporation, St. Louis, Il; (1997) ($4,000).

7. *Sexual harassment in the dental hygiene profession*. University Women's Professional Advancement, SIUC, (SIUC UWPA/Women Studies Juried Competition), 1997, ($700.00).

8. *Task analysis of computer professionals*. .Microsoft Corporation; consultant on grant to J. McKillip, 1998, ($5,100).

9. *Evaluation of Hardin and Union county bullying prevention program*. Center for Rural Health and Social Service Development (SIUC), Evaluation Consultant, 1999-2000, ($5, 315).

10. *State planning grant: (access to healthcare for all Illinois residents)*. Health and Human Services (Health Resources and Services Administration, through Illinois Department of Insurance), consultant to grant: 4 P09 OA 00010-01-02 (2001). Consultant, ($16,000).

11. *Tobacco Prevention and Control Intervention Demonstration project*. Illinois Department of Public Health, Evaluation consultant, 2001-2002, (Evaluation component: $90,000; Total grant: $900,000).

12. *Live Free: An SIUC Collegiate Anti-Tobacco Initiative*, Illinois Department of Public Health, Evaluation consultant, 2002-2003, (Evaluation Component: 50,000; Total grant: $500,000).

13. *Live Free: An SIUC Collegiate Anti-Tobacco Initiative*. Illinois Department of Public Health, Evaluation consultant, 2003-2005 (Evaluation Component: $25,000; Total grant: $250,000).

14. *Effectiveness of standard of care curriculum for tobacco education in a dental hygiene context*. American Cancer Society-Illinois Division, Grant #PSB-12. Margaret S. Stockdale, Principal Investigator. August 19, 2003 to August 18, 2006. ($249,963).

15. *Live Free*: An *SIUC Collegiate Anti-Tobacco-Initiative: Year 5*. Illinois Department of Public Health, Evaluation consultant, 2005-2006 (Evaluation Component $37,500; Total grant: $305,000)

E. Papers and Presentations at Professional Meetings

1. Knight, P. A., Stockdale, M. S., & Saal, F. E. (1986, August). Differences in job attitudes: A literature review and critique. In R. G. Downey (chair), *Sex as a social category: Men and woman at work*, symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
2. Lahey, M. A., Stockdale, M. S., Downey, R. G., & Astley, S. (1986, August). A model for gender related bias in personnel decisions. In R. G. Downey (chair), *Sex as a Social Category: Men and Women at Work*, symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
3. Stockdale, M. S. (1986, August). *Token women in management: Affirmative action consequences and sex-role expectations*. Paper presented at Kansas Students' Contributions to Psychology, Emporia, KS, and Industrial Organizational and Organizational Behavior Graduate Student Conference, Minneapolis, MN.

4. Johnson, C. B., Stockdale, M. S., & Saal, F. E. (1987, August). *Men perceive more sexuality - except when it's really there?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
5. Stockdale, M. S., & Saal, F. E. (1990, April). *The relationship between misperceptions and condoning/tolerating sexual harassment.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeast Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.
6. Stockdale, M. S. (1991, May). *Cognitive processes affecting sex bias in personnel evaluations.* Paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association meeting, Chicago, IL.
7. Welshimer, K. J., Oestreich, G., Stockdale, M. S., Klostermann, B., & Chezem, J. (1991, October). *Identifying the invisible: Strategy for involving underserved populations in focus group-based community planning and evaluation activities.* Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association meeting, Chicago, IL.
8. Stockdale, M. S., Klostermann, B., Welshimer, K., Chezum, J. & Hall, M. (1991, October). *Factors affecting rural women's participation in screening mammography: A focus group analysis.* Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association meeting, Chicago, IL.
9. Stockdale, M. S. Schwerin, M. J., Vaux, A., & Stephenson, H. (1992, May) *An Experiential definition of sexual harassment,* paper presented at the Midwest Psychological Association meeting, Chicago.
10. Stockdale, M. S., & Leong, F. T. L. (1992, August). *Confirmatory factor analysis of the women as managers scale.* Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, Washington, D.C.
11. Stockdale, M. S. (1992, August) *Conceptualizations of male and female managers and business executives: Extending Schein's analysis*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, Washington, D.C.
12. Stockdale, M. S. Chair. (1993, May) *Sexual harassment in the workplace: An I/O research agenda.* Symposium to be presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology meeting, San Francisco.
13. Stockdale, M. S. (1993, May). Addressing Sexual Harassment Concerns in Organizations: The Role of the Industrial/ Organizational Psychologist, in M. S. Stockdale, Chair, *Sexual harassment in the workplace: An I/O research agenda.* Symposium presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology meeting, San Francisco, CA.
14. White, J. M., Deniston, W., & Stockdale, M.S. (1993, October). *An investigation of gender composition on sexualized perceptions of women's social behavior: Implications for sexual harassment theory.* Third Annual Tri-State Undergraduate Psychology Conference. Rockford, IL.
15. Stockdale, M. S. (1993, November*). Academic careers in evaluation*, in D. Jinkerson, Chair, *Careers in Evaluation*. Symposium presented at the 1993 American Evaluation Association meeting, Seattle, WA.
16. Stockdale, M. S., Cashin, J., & Vaux, A. (1994, April). *Acknowledging sexual harassment: Experience vs. attribution.* In C. L. Z. DuBois (Chair), *Sexual harassment in the workplace: A look at underresearched issues.* Eighth Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN.
17. Cashin, J., Stockdale, M. S., & Shearer, V. (1994, May). *The moderating influence of response style on psychological and work environment outcomes of sexual harassment.* Presented at the Sixty-sixth annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
18. Brandt, P.S., & Stockdale, M. S., (1994, May). *Developing and implementing and effective sexual harassment policy and educational program.* Presented at the 1994 Midwest College and University Personnel Administrators Conference, Cleveland, OH.
19. Dewey, J, D., Byravan, A., & Stockdale, M. S. (1994, November). *A needs assessment of health and human service concerns in Illinois' southern seven counties.* Presented at the

American Evaluation Association meeting, Boston, MA.

20. Dewey, J, D., Cashin, J. R., Shearer, V., & Stockdale, M. S. (1994, November). *Women in the university: Assessing the Chilly Climate.* Presented at the American Evaluation Association meeting, Boston, MA.

21. Henry, J. S., & Stockdale, M. S. (1995, January). *The climate for conducting climate surveys.* Presented at the Eighth Annual Conference on Women in Higher Education. San Francisco, CA.

22. Cashin, J. R., Dewey, J. D., & Stockdale, M. S., (1995, May). *Development of a campus chilly climate survey.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Psychological Association. Chicago, IL

23. *Stockdale, M. S. (1995, May). *Perspectives from Academia.* Discussant for symposium in C. L. Z. DuBois (Chair). Sexual Harassment: New Evidence from Public, Private, and Military Data. Symposium presented at the 10th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Orlando, FL.

24. Stockdale, M.S., & Hope, K. (1996, April). *Confirmatory factor analysis of the USMSPB survey of sexual harassment.* Paper presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

25. Stockdale, M.S., Cashin, J., & Tardino, V.S., (1996 April). *The severity of sexual harassment for women and men: An examination of consequences and coping responses.* In. D. E. Knapp (Chair), *The real "disclosure": Actual consequence of and responses to sexual harassment.* Symposium presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. San Diego, CA.

26. Stockdale, M.S. (1996, April) (Moderator and presenter). *Workplace violence: I/O psychology perspectives.* Panel Discussion presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. San Diego, CA.

27. Desai, S., Sharpe, P., & Stockdale, M. S. (1996, November). *A comprehensive evaluation of a female faculty mentoring program at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.* Paper presented at the 1996 American Evaluation Association Meeting, Atlanta, GA.

28. McKillip, J., Ramanaiah, N., Schmeck, R., Stockdale, M. S., Vaux, A., & Fitzgerald, C. T. (1996, November). *Evaluating certifications: Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer Program.* Poster presented at the 1996 American Evaluation Association Meeting. Atlanta, GA.

29. Stockdale, M.S. (Chair) (1997, April). *Evaluating professional certifications against HR criteria Studies of computer professionals.* Practitioner Forum presented at the 12th annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. St. Louis, MO.

30. Stockdale, M.S., Hetherington, J, McKillip, J., Ramaniah, N. Schmeck, R. & Vaux, A. (1997, April). *Overview of the Computer Professional Certification Evaluations.* Paper presented in M.S. Stockdale (Chair) *Evaluating professional certifications against HR criteria Studies of computer professionals.* Practitioner Forum presentation at the 12th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. St. Louis, MO.

31. McKillip, J., Hetherington, J. Ramaniah, N. Schmeck, R., Stockdale, M., & Vaux, A. (1997, April). *Self study of professional certification for computer professionals.* Paper presented in M.S. Stockdale (Chair) *Evaluating professional certifications against HR criteria Studies of computer professionals.* Practitioner Forum presentation at the 12th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. St. Louis, MO.

32. Vaux, A., Hetherington, J. McKillip, J. Ramanaiah, N. Schmeck, R., & Stockdale, M. (1997). *Supervisor studies of professional certification for computer professionals.* Paper presented in M.S. Stockdale (Chair) *Evaluating professional certifications against HR criteria Studies of computer professionals.* Practitioner Forum presentation at the 12th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. St.

Louis, MO.

33. Stockdale, M.S., Hetherington, L. T., Ellis, T., & Wood, M. (1997, April). *Team membership and employee well-being: testing the demand-control model.* Paper presented at the 12th annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. St. Louis, MO.

34. *Knapp, D.E., Stockdale, M. S., Fitzgerald, L., Lengnick-Hall, M., & Terpstra, D. (1997, April). *Critiques of sexual harassment research.* Panel discussion presented at the 12th annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. St. Louis, MO.

35. *Stockdale, M. S. (Discussant) (1997, August). In Gutek, B. A. (Chair) *Sexual Harassment in the courtroom: New approaches and findings.* Symposium presented at the American Psychological Association annual convention. Chicago, Il. August.

36. Ellis, T.B., Truskosky, D., Wood, M., Duppong, K., Stockdale, M.S. (1997, November). *A practicum in mediation training: An assessment of law student competencies and client satisfaction with services.* Poster presented at the American Evaluation Association annul meeting. San Diego, CA.

37. Stockdale, M. S. (1998, April). *Differential effects of coping with sexual harassment for women and men: Some unexpected findings.* Paper presented at the 1998 UWPA paper competition, "Celebrating scholarship by and about women," Carbondale, Il.

38. Ellis, T., Stockdale, M. S., Heischmidt, C., Aubertin, M., & Jefferies, D. (April, 1998). *Correlates of client harassment in a female-dominated occupation.* Paper presented in M. S. Stockdale (Chair), *New findings in three domains of sexual harassment research: perceptions, perpetrators, and processes*, Symposium at the 1998 meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Dallas, TX.

39. Phillips, B. T., & Stockdale, M. S. (April, 1998). *Direct and intervening processes affecting the severity of sexual harassment outcomes.* Paper in M. S. Stockdale (Chair) *New findings in three domains of sexual harassment research: perceptions, perpetrators, and processes*, Symposium at the 1998 meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Dallas, TX.

40. Wood, M., Stockdale, M. S., Gutek, B. A., O'Connor, M. (1998, April) *The role of plaintiff/defendant attractiveness and observers' sexual harassment attitudes on SH judgments.* Paper presented in M. S. Stockdale (Chair) *New findings in three domains of sexual harassment research: perceptions, perpetrators, and processes*, Symposium at the 1998 meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Dallas, TX.

41. *Gutek, B. A., O'Connor, M., Stockdale, M. S., Geer, T., & Melançon R. (1998, April). *Determining Guilt, Innocence, and Blame in a Sexual Harassment Trial.* Paper presented in M. S. Stockdale (Chair) *New findings in three domains of sexual harassment research: perceptions, perpetrators, and processes*, Symposium at the 1998 meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Dallas, TX.

42. *Stockdale, M. S., & Wood, M. (1998, June; and 1998, August). *Using long scenarios and photographs to explore sexual harassment beliefs and "irrelevant" method factors.* Paper presented at the 1998 meeting of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (Ann Arbor, MI); and presented in B. A. Gutek (Chair). *Using realistic stimulus materials to study sexual harassment decisions.* Symposium presentation at the 1998 meeting of the Academy of Management. (San Diego, CA).

43. O'Connor, M., Melancon, R., & Stockdale, M. S. (1998, August). *Creating a video-trial for use in research on sexual harassment decisions.* Paper presented in B. A. Gutek (Chair), *Using realistic stimulus materials to study sexual harassment decisions.* Symposium presented at the 1998 meeting of the Academy of Management. San Diego, CA.

44. Braitman, K., & Stockdale, M..S. (May, 1999). *The effects of exposure to the thin-ideal on body dissatisfaction in college women.* Paper presented at the 1999 meeting of the Midwest Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

45. *Stockdale, M. S., Wood, M. E., & Batra, L. (August, 1999). Same-sex sexual

harassment against men: Toward a broader theory of sexual harassment. In.D. Knapp, (Chair), *Under-explored issues in sexual harassment*. Symposium presented at the 1999 meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

46. Stockdale, M.S. (April, 2000). *The effectiveness of coping strategies on men's sexual harassment experiences.* Paper presented at the 2000 meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

47. Stockdale, M.S., & Motoike, J. (June, 2000) *The Men's Sexually Harassing Experiences Scale: Development and validation study.* Paper presented at the 2000 meeting for the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Minneapolis, MN.

48. Stockdale, M.S., Hangaduambo, S., Duys, D., Larson, K., & Sarvela, P. (November, 2000). *Students, parents, and teachers' knowledge, attitude and practices towards bullying: Example of seven southern Illinois rural county grade schools.* Paper presented at the 2000 meeting of the American Public Health Association, Boston, MA.

49. Stockdale, M.S., Gandolfo, C., & Schneider, R. (April, 2001). *Perceptions of male sexual harassment.* Paper presented at the 2001 annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

50. Cheng, A., & Stockdale, M. S. (April, 2001). *Organizational commitment in China.* Paper presented at the 2001 annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

51. Stockdale, M.S. (Chair), Gutek, B. A., Bisom-Rapp, S., & O'Connor, M. (April, 2001). A *Critical Examination of Zero-Tolerance Policies.* Panel Discussion presented at the 2001 annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

52. Stockdale, M.S., Hangaduombo, S., McKillip, J., Sarvela, P., Larson, K. (March, 2001). *Bullying in rural elementary schools: Assessment and evaluation of a bullying prevention program.* Paper presented at the Illinois Rural Health Association Meeting, Effingham, IL.

53. *Stockdale, M.S. (Conference Chairperson) (May, 2001). *Doing good well: Diversity in the workplace research.* Nags Heart Conference, Santa Cruz, CA.

54. Stockdale, M. S., Cox, C., Sarvela, P., & Shannon, D. (2001, July). *Focus groups and interviews: Preliminary findings.* Presentation to the Illinois Assembly on the Uninsured. (Springfield, IL).

55. Motoike, J., & Stockdale, M. (August, 2001). *Japanese international students' attitudes toward acquaintance rape*. Poster presented at the 109th American Psychological Association, Annual Convention, San Francisco, CA; also presented at the University Women's Professional Advancement Annual Celebrating Scholarship Symposium, Carbondale, IL, April, 2001.

56. *Stockdale, M. S. (April, 2002). Discussant, in M. Agars, & J. Kottke (chairs), *Integrating theory and practice in gender diversity initiatives.* Symposium presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Annual Meeting, Toronto, ON.

57. Stockdale, M. S., Cox, C. P., Swanson, J., Shannon, D., Sarvela, P. (June, 2002). *Perceptions of the health insurance gap: A focus group study of seven stakeholder groups across the state of Illinois*. Paper presented at the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Toronto, ON.

58. Stockdale, M. S., O'Connor, M., Gutek, B. A., & Geer. T. (June, 2002). *The relationship between prior sexual abuse and reactions to sexual harassment: Literature review and empirical study.* Paper presented at the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Toronto, ON.

59. Stockdale, M. S., & Awad, G. (May, 2002). *SIUC focus group findings: Perceptions, beliefs and smoking behaviors.* In. T. Benjamin (Chair), *A comprehensive college anti-smoking campaign.* Symposium presented at the National Collegiate Tobacco Symposium, College Park, MD.Stockdale, M., & Awad, G. H. (March, 2002). *Smokin': Surveillance of college students behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs.* Paper presented at the 19th Annual Illinois Health Policy Conference, Springfield, IL.

61. *Stockdale, M. S., & Swindler, S. (June, 2002). *Lessons learned from the SIUC survey on smoking*. Paper presented at the Making Tobacco History – Illinois Conference 2002., Naperville, IL.

62. Batra, S. L., & Stockdale, M.S. (August, 2002). *Mentoring breaks the glass ceiling: Asian American women as protégés.* Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting. (August, Chicago) **Presentation also noted in APA Div. 17's Section on Advancement of Women newsletter, *Women View*, Fall, 2002.**

63. *Stockdale, M. S. (August, 2002). *The sexual harassment of men: Articulating the approach-rejection distinction in sexual harassment motives*. Paper presented at the International Consortium Against Sexual Harassment Conference. Chicago, IL.

64. *Stockdale, M. S. (December, 2002). *Looking Back and Heading Forward: Major Themes of The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity*. Paper presented at the Annual Gateway Industrial/Organizational Psychology Conference., St. Louis, MO.

65. Beiner, T., Bisom-Rapp, S., Gutek, B. A., O'Connor, M., Stockdale, M. S., & West, M. (June, 2003). *Ellerth and Faragher five years later: The disconnect between social science research and sexual harassment doctrine*. Panel Discussion at the 2003 Law and Society conference, Pittsburgh, PA.

66. Stockdale, M. S. (June, 2003). *The meaning and measure of men's sexual harassment experiences: An approach-rejection perspective.* Paper presented at the Gender, Work, and Organizations conference, Keele University, England.

67. Gutek, B. A., Stockdale, M. S., & Swindler, S. (July, 2003). *The experiences of sexual harassment scale: A five-item measure of sexual harassment based on a legal definition.* Paper presented at the Psychology and Law International and Interdisciplinary Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland.

68. Stockdale, M. S. (August, 2003). *Understanding sexual harassment of men in the context of gender of perpetrator and harassment motives.* Panel discussion in J. Berdahl (Chair), *Gender harassment: Most common, least understood*. Presented at the Academy of Management meeting, Seattle, WA.

69. Service, A., Sagrestano, L., M., Dilalla, L., A., & Stockdale, M. S., (August, 2003) *Health service utilization in a sample at risk for contracting HIV/AIDS.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of APA, Toronto, ON.

70. Stockdale, M. S., Horvath, A., Ohse, D., Rowald, L., Swindler, S., & Sagrestano, L. (December, 2003). *An in-depth surveillance of tobacco use on a college campus*. Paper presented at the 2003 National Conference on Tobacco or Health. Boston, MA.

71. Stockdale, M.S., Sagrestano, L., Morera, O., & Hubbell, A. (December, 2003). *Surveying Tobacco Use and Evaluating Tobacco Control on College Campuses*. Paper presented at the 2003 National Conference on Tobacco or Health. Boston, MA.

72. Cheng, Y., & Stockdale, M.S. (June, 2004). *Perceived knowledge/skill fit explains the vagaries of team diversity.* Paper presented at the 2004 meeting of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. Washington DC.

73. Swindler, S., & Stockdale, M. S., (April, 2004). *The experiences of sexual harassment scale: Further evidence of its reliability and validity.* Paper presented at the 2004 meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago.

74. Davis, J. M., & Stockdale, M. S. (March, 2005). *Needs assessment for tobacco cessation education/training for collegiate dental hygiene students*. Paper presented at the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco conference. Prague, CZ.

75. Stockdale, M.S., (April, 2005). *Disparate Treatment Sex Discrimination: More than Meets the Eye*. Paper presented in F. Landy (Chair). Issues in Employment Discrimination Litigation. Symposium accepted for presentation at the 2005 meeting of Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Los Angeles.

76. Ohse, D., & Stockdale, M. S. (April, 2005). *Student Status and Age Effects on Sexual Harassment Perceptions.* Poster presented at the 2005 meeting of Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Los Angeles.

77. Stockdale, M.S., Davis, J. M., Cropper, M., & Vitello, E. M. (May, 2005). *Factors*

affecting adoption of tobacco education in dental hygiene programs. Paper presented at the National Conference on Tobacco or Health. Chicago.

78. Stockdale, M. S., Sagrestano, L., Davis, J. M., & Dawson-Owens, H. (May, 2005). *Tobacco Control Goes to College.* Symposium presented at the National Conference on Tobacco or Health. Chicago.

79. Stockdale, M.S. (June 2005). Invited panelist for a "Meet the Author" symposium to discuss *Gender Myths V. Working Realities: Using social science to reformulate sexual harassment law*, by Theresa M. Beiner (2005, NYU Press). *Law and Society.* Las Vegas.

80. Stockdale, M.S., & Kinkner, TK (May, 2006). Sexual harassment experiences of vulnerable women: A comparison of rural and urban women with domestic violence protection orders. Paper presented in M.S. Stockdale (chair), Sexual Harassment of Special and Vulnerable Populations in the Workforce. Symposium presented at the 2006 meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas.

*Invited

V. PUBLICATIONS

A. Books:

1. Vaux, A., Stockdale, M. S., & Schwerin, M. J. (Eds.) (1992). *Independent Consulting in Applied Psychology.* Newbury Park: Sage.

2. Stockdale, M. S. (Ed.) (1996). *Sexual Harassment: Perspectives, Frontiers, and Response Strategies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

3. Cleveland, J., Stockdale, M. S., & Murphy, K. (2000). *Women and Men in Organizations: Gender Issues at Work.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

4. Stockdale, M. S., & Crosby, F. J. (Eds.) (2004). *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell

B. Articles in Peer-Reviewed, Professional Journals:

1. Downey, R. G., & Stockdale, M. S. (1987). A computer program to compute Lord's item bias statistic for a three-parameter ICC. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47*, 637-641.

2. Johnson, C. B., Stockdale, M. S., & Saal, F. E. (1991). Persistence of men's misperceptions of friendly cues across a variety of interpersonal encounters. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 463-475.

3. *Stockdale, M. S. (1993). The role of sexual misperceptions of women's friendliness in an emerging theory of sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 84-101.

4. Tinsley, H. E. A., & Stockdale, M. S. (1993). Sexual harassment in the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 1-4.

5. Stockdale, M. S., & Vaux, A. (1993). What sexual harassment experiences lead respondents to acknowledge being sexually harassed: A secondary analysis of a university survey. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 43*, 221-234.

6. Stockdale, M. S., & Leong, F. T. L. (1994). Barriers to women in management careers: Confirmatory factor analysis of the Women as Managers scale. *Journal of Career Assessment, 2,* 70-81.

7. Henry, J. S., Stockdale, M. S., Hall, M., & Deniston, W. (1994). A formal mentoring program for junior female faculty: Description and evaluation. *Initiatives, 56*(2), 37-46.

8. Stockdale, M. S., Vaux, A., & Cashin, J. (1995). Acknowledging sexual harassment: A test of alternative models. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*(4) 169-196.

9. Stockdale, M. S., Hope, K. (1997). Confirmatory factor analysis of U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board's survey of sexual harassment: The Fit of a Three-Factor *Model. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 338-357.

10. Stockdale, M.S. (1998). The direct and moderating influences of sexual harassment pervasiveness, coping strategies, and gender on work-related outcomes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22,* 521-535.

11. *Stockdale, M. S., Visio, M., & Batra, L. (1999). The sexual harassment of men: Evidence for a broader theory of sexual harassment and sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy and the Law, 5*, 630-664.

12. *Gutek, B. A., O'Connor, M., Melancon, R., Stockdale, M. S., Geer, T. M., & Done, R. (1999). The utility of the reasonable woman legal standard in hostile environment sexual harassment cases: A multi-method, multi-study examination. *Psychology, Public Policy and the Law, 5*, 596-629.
Reprinted in *Women and the Law, Release #15.* Rochester, NY: West Group

13. Stockdale, M.S., Hangaduamo, S., Duys, D., Larson, K., & Sarvela, P. (2002). Rural Elementary Students', Parents', and Teachers' Perceptions of Bullying. *American Journal of Health Behavior. 26*, 266-277

14. Stockdale, M. S., O'Connor, M., Gutek, B. A., & Geer, T. M. (2002). The relationship between prior sexual abuse and reactions to sexual harassment: Literature review and empirical study. *Psychology, Public Policy and the Law, 8,* 64-95.

15. Stockdale, M.S. (2002). Analyzing focus group data with spreadsheets. *American Journal of Health Studies, 18*, 55-60.

16. Cheng, Y., & Stockdale, M. S. (2003). The validity of the three-component model of organizational commitment in a Chinese context. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62,* 465-489.

17. *Stockdale, M. S., Bisom-Rapp, S., O'Connor, M., & Gutek, B. A. (2004). Coming to terms with zero-tolerance sexual harassment policies. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, *4*, 65-78.
    a. Abstracted in *Discrimination, Law & Justice Abstracts*, Vol. 6, No. 31: September 16, 2004

18. O'Connor, M., Gutek, B. A., Stockdale, M., Geer, T. M., Melançon, R. (2004). Explaining sexual harassment judgments: Looking beyond gender of the rater. *Law and Human Behavior 28(1),* 69-95.

19. Stockdale, M. S., Gandolfo, C., Schneider, R. W. & Cao, F. (2004). Perceptions of the

sexual harassment of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5,* 158-167.

20. Stockdale, M. S., Dawson-Owens, H. L., & Sagrestano, L M. (2005). Social and attitudinal correlates of college-age smoking initiation. *American Journal of Health Behavior.*

21. Davis, J.M., Stockdale, M.S., & Cropper, M. (2005). Needs Assessment for Tobacco Cessation Education and Counseling of Collegiate Dental Hygiene Clients. *Journal of Dental Education, 69(12)*, 1340-1352.

22. Stockdale, M. S., Davis, J. M., Cropper, M., & Vitello, E. M. (Accepted for publication). Factors affecting adoption of Tobacco Education in Dental Hygiene Programs. *Journal of Cancer Education.*

*Invited (and peer-reviewed)

C. Book chapters:

1. Vaux, A., & Stockdale, M. S. (1992). Applied Research Consultants: A model of graduate training for applied psychological consulting. In A. Vaux, M. Stockdale, & M. Schwerin, (Eds), *Independent Consulting for Evaluators*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

2. Stockdale, M.S. (1996). What we know and what we need to learn about sexual harassment: An introduction to *Women and Work, Vol. 5.* In M. S. Stockdale (Ed.) *Sexual Harassment: Perspectives, Frontiers, and Response Strategies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

3. Stockdale, M. S., & Kenny, T. (1996). Conducting a Literature Search. In. F. T. Leong, & J. T. Austin (Eds.), *The Psychology Research Handbook: A Primer for Graduate Students and Research Assistants.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

4. Stockdale, M. S. & Cao, F (2004). Looking Back and Heading Forward: Major Themes of *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity* In. M. S. Stockdale & F. J. Crosby. *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

5. Cokley, K., Dreher, G., & Stockdale. M. S. (2004). Ethnic minority issues in the workplace. In. M. S. Stockdale & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *The Psychology and Management of Workplace Diversity.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell

6. Stockdale, M. S. (2005) The sexual harassment of men: Articulating the approach-rejection distinction in sexual harassment motives. In J. E. Gruber & P. Morgan (Eds.) *In the Company of Men: Re-Discovering The Links Between Sexual Harassment and Male Domination.* Pp 117-142. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

7. Gutek, B. A., & Stockdale, M.S. (2005). Sex discrimination in employment. In F. Landy (Ed.) *I/O Psychology and Employment Discrimination Litigation.* I/O Professional Practice Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

b. D. Book Reviews

1. Stockdale, M. S. (2000). Review of *Intimate Betrayal: Understanding and Responding to the Trauma of Acquaintance Rape*. By Vernon R. Wiehe, and Ann L. Richards. *Journal of Sexual Deviance, 29,* 519-521.

2. Stockdale, M.S. (2001). Of things that should be within arm's reach: A review of *Handbook of Gender and Work. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25*, 87-88.

3. Stockdale, M. S. (2001). Review of *Mothers at Work: Effects on Children's Well-being*, by Lois Hoffman and Lise Youngblade. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 1015-1019.

4. Cheng, Y., & Stockdale, M. S. (2002). Review of *Sex, Gender and Jobs*, Edited by Louis Diamant and Jo Ann Lee. *Personnel Psychology, 55*, 1020-1021.

E. Other:

- Editorships

1. Tinsley, H. E. A., & Stockdale, M. S. (1993). Special issue editors, "Sexual Harassment in the Workplace." *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42* (1).

- Submitted, Under Revision

1. Cheng, Y., & Stockdale, M.S. (Revise and resubmit). Perceived knowledge-skill fit as a moderator of team diversity effects: A multi-level analysis: *Group and Organization Management.*

2. Ohse, D. M., & Stockdale, M. S. (Submitted for publication). Student/Non-Student and Age Differences in Sexual Harassment Perceptions. *Law and Human Behavior.*

- In progress

1. Stockdale, M. S., Dawson, H., Awad, G., Sagrestano, L., Swindler, S., Rowald, L. (manuscript in preparation). Smoking trends on a college campus: Results from a campus-wide survey.

2. Stockdale, M. S., & Logan, TK. (data collection in progress). Sexual harassment experiences and perceptions among a sample of women with domestic abuse histories.

3. Crosby, F. J., Stockdale, M.S., & Ropp, S. A. (edited book, contract received). *Sex Discrimination in Employment: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

4. Bisom-Rapp. S , & Stockdale, M. S.,. (book chapter, in progress). Organizational remedies for sex discrimination. In. F. J. Crosby, M. S., Stockdale, & S. A. Ropp (Eds.), *Sex Discrimination in Employment: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Technical Reports

1. Stockdale, M. S. (1987). *Final report on the Wonderlic Test Validation Project.* Circuit Court of Jackson County, Kansas City, MO.

2. Phelps, J., Stockdale, M. S., & Downey, R. G. (1988). *Evaluation of a program to teach collaboration in the College of Architecture and Design at Kansas State University.* (Report No. G00854107). Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.

3. Phelps, J., Stockdale, M. S., Downey, R. G., & Barnes, A. (1988). *Collaboration in the design disciplines: Comments from practitioners.* (Report No. G00854107). Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.

4. Stockdale, M. S. (1989). *Final report on the K-State Union classification study.* K-State Union, Manhattan, KS.

5. Kinkner, T., & Stockdale, M. S. (1991). *SURS job attitude study: Final report.* Applied Research Consultants, Carbondale, IL.

6. Klostermann, B., Welshimer, K., Stockdale, M., Chezem, J., & Hall, M. (1991). *The southern Illinois mammography focus group report.* American Cancer Society -- Illinois Division.

7. Detwiler, F. R. J., Dewey, J. D., & Stockdale, M. S. (1992). *A focus group study of health perceptions and needs in Jackson county.* Jackson County Health Department.

8. Dewey, J, D., Hall, M. M., & Stockdale, M. S. (1993). *College of technical careers Southern Illinois University at Carbondale census data report.* College of Technical Careers, SIUC.

9. Cashin, J., Stockdale, M. S., & Shearer, V., (1993). *The 1993 survey of sexual harassment at SIUC.* Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

10. Hall, M., Deniston, D., & Stockdale, M. S. (1993). *An evaluation of the University Women's Professional Advancement mentoring program.* Applied Research Consultants, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

11. Dewey, J. D., Byravan, A., Detwiler, F. R. J., Kimball, K. C., & Stockdale, M. S., (1993). *Overview of health and human service concerns in Illinois' southern seven counties.* Applied Research Consultants, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

12. Hall, M., Byravan, A., Dewey, J., Kimball, K. & Stockdale, M. (1994). *Perceptions and opinions of psychology graduate students and faculty members toward training.* Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

13. Stockdale, M. S., & Vaux, A. (1994). *Attorney evaluation of the Civil Justice Delay and Expense Reduction Plan for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois.* Technical Report to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois.

14. Cashin, J., Dewey, J, D., Tardino, V., & Stockdale, M. S. (1995). *Survey of the working climate at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.* Technical Report to the Office of the President, SIUC.

15. Hall, M. & Stockdale, M. S. (1995). *A naturalistic observation study of five diabeties mellitus patients.* Technical Report to Boehringer Mannheim Corporation.

16. Tardino, V. M., Leichliter, J. S., Sadler, M. A., & Stockdale, M. S., (1995). *A survey of parental involvement: Carbondale District 95.* Technical Report to the Public Relations Committee, Carbondale District 95 School Board.

17. McKillip, J., Stockdale, M. S., Ramanaiah, N., Schmeck, R., & Vaux, A. (1995). *Evaluation of the Microsoft Systems Engineer Certification.* Technical Report to Microsoft Corporation.

18. Cashin, J. R., Hall, M., & Stockdale, M. S. (1995). *Survey of rider expectations for the SIUC mass transit system.* Technical report to the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

19. Stockdale, M. S., Desai, S., Sadler, M. Sharpe, P., & Skerly, A. (1995). *Evaluation of the 1994-1995 University Women's Professional Advancement's faculty mentoring program.* Technical report to UWPA, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

20. Hall, M., Deniston, W., & Stockdale, M. S. (1995). *An evaluation of the University Women's Professional Advancement Civil Service Connections program.* Technical report to UWPA, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

21. McKillip, J., Stockdale, M. S., Ramanaiah, N., Schmeck, R., & Vaux, A. (1995). *Evaluation of the Microsoft Systems Engineer Certification: International study.* Technical Report to Microsoft Corporation.

22. Ellis, T. B., Truskosky, D., Wood, M., Duppong, K. Stockdale, M. (1996). *Evaluation of the SIUC School of Law Alternative Dispute Resolution Clinic: An assessment of student skills, knowledge, and attitudes pertaining to mediation and client satisfaction with services.* Technical report to the SIUC School of Law ADR clinic: Applied Research Consultants.

23. Stockdale, M. S., Hetherington, L. Ellis, T., & Wood, M. (1996). *1996 Maytag Herrin employee attitude survey: Final report.* Technical report to Maytag Herrin, Herrin, IL.

24. Desai, S., Sharpe, J. P. Stockdale, M.S. (1996). *A comprehensive evaluation of a female faculty mentoring program at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.* Technical Report to University Women's Professional Advancement, SIUC: Applied Research Consultants.

25. McKillip, J., Hetherington, J. Stockdale, M.S. Ramanaiah, N., Schmeck, R., & Vaux, A. (1996). *Evaluation of the Microsoft Solution Developer Certification.* Technical Report to Microsoft Corporation.

26. Stockdale, M. S. (1996). *Customer loyalty: Theories, models and measures.* Technical Report to Maritz Corporation.

27. Stockdale, M.S., Hangaduambo, S., Duys, D., & Sarvela, P. (2000). *Union and Hardin county bully prevention program pretest report.* Technical report to Southern Illinois Healthcare, Inc.

28. Stockdale, M.S., Hangaduambo, S., McKillip, J., & Sarvela, P. (2000). *Union and Hardin county bully prevention program post-test report.* Technical report to Southern Illinois

Healthcare, Inc.

29. Cox, C., Stockdale, M. S., Sarvela, P., & Shannon, D. (2001). *Opinions concerning access to health insurance in Illinois: A report of focus group and key informant interviews.* Technical report to the Illinois Department of Insurance.

30. Swindler, S., Rowald, L., Cao, F., Stockdale, M. S., & Sagrestano, L. (2002). *Tobacco needs assessment pretest data: Phase one*. Applied Research Consultants, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

31. Swindler, S., & Stockdale, M. S., (2002). *City of Carbondale sexual harassment survey report.* Technical report to the City of Carbondale. Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

32. Stockdale, M. S. (2002). SIUC Anti-Tobacco Initiative: Year 1 executive summary. Technical report to the Illinois Department of Public Health. Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

33. Stockdale, M. S. (2003). *Evaluation and surveillance toolbox for the Live Free: Collegiate Anti-Tobacco Initiative.* Technical report to the Illinois Department of Public Health. Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

34. Briggs, C. S., Ohse, D. M., Rowald, L., Lovett, G., Sagrestano, L. & Stockdale, M. S. (2003). Oral Health Toolbox Pilot Project Evaluation. Technical report to the Illinos Department of Public Healt. Applied Research Consultants, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

35. Ohse, D. M., Swindler, S. D., Dawson, H. & Stockdale, M. S. (2004). Evaluation of Early Childhood Oral Health Education Flip Charts. Technical report to the Illinos Department of Public Healt. Applied Research Consultants, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

36. Rowald, L. A., Dawson, H. L., Pinero, S., & Stockdale, M. S. (2003). SIUC Image Survey. Technical report to the SIUC Media and Communication Services Department. Applied Research Consultants, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

37. Seneca, P. J., Wheeler, A. M., Edwards, J. K., Sagrestano, L. M., & Stockdale, M. S. (2005). Examination and evaluation of student athletes' perceptions of diversity concerns in the SIUC Athletics Program. Technical report to the SIUC Athletics Department. Applied Research Consultants, Department of Psychology, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

VI. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

A. Teaching Interests and Specialties:

Undergraduate	Graduate
Industrial/Organizational	Applied Research Consultants
Psychology of Employee Relations	Proseminar in Applied Psychology
Senior Seminar in I/O	Personnel Training
Psychology of Women	Research in Organizational Psychology
General Psychology	

Diversity in the Workplace
Needs Assessment (also graduate)
Applied Social Science Research Methods (also graduate)

B. Teaching and Training Grants:

1. University Core Curriculum Teaching Enhancement Award, Spring, 1998, $3000.00.

2. Proposal to develop a specialization in Occupational Health Psychology. Submitted to the American Psychological Association, 1998 (unfunded).

3. SIUC Graduate School- Graduate Training Recruitment Grant to M. Morgan (History), M. Stockdale (Psychology), B. Turley (Political Science) & F. Betz (Foreign Language and Literatures, 2002, $11,000.

C. Teaching Awards and Honors:

1. Distinguished Graduate Teaching Award, College of Arts and Science, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS. 1989

D. Current Graduate Faculty Status: Regular graduate faculty status

E. Number of Master's and Ph.D. Committees on which I have served:

- 15 (estimate from 1990-2003)

F. Dissertations and Theses Supervised:

Ph. D. Dissertations	**Title**
Ann Barich-Wescot	The Moderating Role of Coping and Control on the Experience of Work Family Conflict.
Barbara Eldredge	Psychometric Evaluation of A Measure of A Measure of Organizational Socialization
Michelle Wood	Examination of the Role of Sexism in the Overvaluation of Female Leaders.
Tchicaya Ellis	The Development, Psychometric Evaluation, and Validation of Customer Loyalty Scale.
Alan Goodwin	The Development of a Measure to Assess Behavior-Based Inter-role Conflict.
Bryan Bolwahn	Development and Validation for a Critical Incident Based Rating Instrument for Psychology Graduate Student Selection.
Jeni Heineman	Personality and the Relation of Need-Reinforcer Correspondence and Job

Ph. D. Dissertations	Title
	Satisfaction.
*Leena Batra	Mentoring Breaks the Glass Ceiling: Asian American as Protégés.
Amy Cheng	An Examination of the Moderating Effect of Person-Team Fit on the Relations between Team Heterogeneity and Team Performance
Kenji Yamazaki	Team membership and attitudes toward organizational change: An investigation of attitudinal mediators
Laura Mastrangelo	Utilizing qualitative data in multirater feedback systems: An examination of upper administration in a university setting
Hayley Dawson-Owens	The Role of Consumer-Level Variables on Consumer Consideration Set Size And Composition
Feng Cao	Exploring the Relations among Flexibility of Flextime, work-to-Family Conflict, and Job Satisfaction: A Test of Mediators at Organization, Supervisor and Employee Levels
Gigi Awad	Psychosocial and cultural predictors of test performance for African American college students
Cynthia Berry	The role of leader member exchange theory and multi-rater feedback on evaluating the performance appraisal process

MA Theses	Title
Keli Braitman	A Correlational and Experimental Examination of Mediated Relationships Between Media Exposure to the Thin-Ideal and Body Dissatisfaction in College Women.
Janice Motoike	Japanese International Students' Attitudes Toward Acquaintance Rape.
*Amy Cheng	Organizational Commitment in China: An Examination of Meyers and Allen's Three-

MA Theses	Title
	Component Model.
Kenji Yamazaki	The Influence of Negative Affectivity on Job Perceptions and Satisfactions.
Germine Awad	Affirmative Action and Diversity Initiatives: The Effect of Framing on Evaluations of African American Applicants.
Stephanie Swindler	A Comparison of Legal and Psychological Measurements of Sexual Harassment on Detection of Gender Differences in Acknowledgement of Sexual Harassment.
Hayley Dawson	Factor Confirmation and Construct Validation of a Brand Loyalty Scale
Dawn Ohse	The Effects of Age and Sample Type Of Sexual Harassment Perceptions.

*Psychology Department Outstanding Thesis or Dissertation

In Progress	*Degree*
Zarko Vukmirovic	Ph.D. – Co-chair
Stephanie Swindler	Ph.D.

G. Other: Senior Honor Thesis mentor:

Sean Morrissey
Jason Smith
Dawn Campbell
Tchicaya Ellis
Garrett Neufal
Jennifer Stombaugh
Wendy Kelly
Erin Aholt
Kimberly Holt
Gina Young

VII. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

A. Department Committees:

- Psychology Department Retreat Planning Committee (University North Carolina, Charlotte, 1989)
- Applied Experimental Faculty Search Committee (1994)

- Graduate Admissions Committee (1993, 1994, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002)
- Applied Experimental Faculty Search Committee (1996-1997)
- Counseling Faculty Search Committee (1997-1998)
- Department Visioning Committee (aka ID) (1997-1998)
- Undergraduate Committee (1999-2000)
- Applied Psychology Faculty Search Committee, Chair (4 positions) (1999, 2001-2003)

B. College and University Committees and Councils:

- Faculty Orientation Advisory Committee, SIU Human Resources
- Center for Rural Health and Social Service Development, SIUC Office of Economic and Rural Development: Research Associates Board
- Summer Research Fellowship Committee, Office of Research and Development (1994)
- ORDA Special Research/Summer Fellowship Committee (1995-1996)
- University Women's Professional Advancement Mentor (1997-1998)
- College of Liberal Arts (CoLA) Council (1998-1999)
- CoLA Mentor (1998-1999)
- CoLA Dean Search Committee (1998 – 1999)
- Provost's Committee to Develop a University-Wide Dean Review Process (1999)
- Vice Chair and Recording Secretary, CoLA Council (1999-2000)
- Cola Dean's Advisory Committee for Associate Dean Search (1999)
- University Women's Professional Advancement, reviewer for paper competition (1999)
- UWPA Mentor (2000-2001)
- Center for Rural Health and Social Service Development, Board Member, (2002 to present, Vice Chair, 2002-2004; Chair 2004-2006).
- Master's Fellowship Review Committee, Graduate School (2003-2005)
- SIUC Public Policy Institute: Steering Committee Member for the *Live Free Collegiate Anti-Smoking Initiative* (2001 to present)
- Faculty Senate (Summer, 2004 to present). Budget Committee member and Committee on Committees member.
- Sexual Harassment grievance investigator (Spring, 2004)
- Judicial Affairs Grievance Panelist (Spring, 2005)
- SIU Presidential Search and Advisory Committee (Fall, 2005)
- Judicial Review Board member (Spring 2006 to present)

C. Other:

- Workshops for SIUC Personnel, Supervisor Series (Managing Conflict Effectively)
- SIUC - Personnel: Conducted campus-wide survey of sexual harassment to assist with the revision of the SIUC SH policy
- Faculty supervisor to First and Second Annual Applied Experimental Psychology Conference (Feb, 1994, and Feb, 1995). A national conference for students and faculty in Applied Experimental psychology programs developed and operated by Applied Research Consultants
- Invited presentation to Maritz Marketing Research, Research Advisory Council on customer loyalty (February, 1997)
- Consultant to the SIUC Athletics Department (Diversity Survey), Fall, 2004-Spring, 2005.

VIII. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

A. Memberships in Professional Associations:

- American Psychological Association
- Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology (Apa Div. 14)

- Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (APA Div. 9)
- Academy of Management
- American Evaluation Association
- Law and Society

B. Consultantships:

1. Kansas State Student Union—Classified salary review and revision;

2. Kansas State Alumni Association—Job description updates;

3. Applied Research Consultant Assistant Director (Fall, 1990 to Summer, 1991), Director (Fall, 1991 to August, 1996; Fall 2003)
   a) Job attitude survey for State University Retirement System
   b) Focus group study of mammography utilization in Southern Illinois for American Cancer Society
   c) Survey revision for District Court of Southern Illinois
   d) Survey revision for Department of Accounting, SIU
   e) Focus group needs assessment for Jackson County Health Department
   f) Census feasibility study for Fred Isberner, College of Technical Careers
   g) Mentoring Evaluation for University Women's Professional Advancement (UWPA)
   h) Evaluation of UWPA's Civil Service Connections program (in progress)
   i) Needs assessment and community building for Governor's Task Force on Health and Social Service Reform
   j) Naturalistic observation of diabetics study for Boehringer Mannheim Corporation
   k) Customer satisfaction survey content analysis for Arthur Andersen
   l) University campus climate survey for the President's Office
   m) Development, administration, and analysis of a parent survey for Carbondale District 95 schools
   n) Evaluation of Microsoft Corporation's System Engineer Certification program
   o) Survey development for Office of Research and Administration, ORDA
   p) Evaluations of University Women's Professional Advancement programs on faculty mentoring, and civil service connections
   q) Survey of Ridership Expectations for the proposed SIUC transit system for the V.P. of Student Affairs, SIUC
   r) Consultant to Prof. Connie Armstrong, re Survey research to evaluate training police officers for the elderly population
   s) Evaluation of the SIUC Law School Alternative Dispute Resolution Clinic
   t) Evaluation consultant for NSF grant on long-term field experiments for teaching ecology (D. Gibson & B. Middleton, co-PI's)
   u) Web-survey for Staebler & Associates
   v) Focus group study on oral health education tools for WIC/Head Start; funded by Illinois Department of Public Health
   w) SIU image study. Survey research in progress for SIUC Department of Communication and Media Resources (Public Relations)
   x) SIUC Chancellor's study on perceptions of executive performance. Study for the SIUC Office of the Chancellor.

4. Managerial consultant, Archway, Carbondale, IL 62901

5. Consultant to Dean Harry Haynsworth for the Civil Justice Reform Act Survey

6. Workshops:

a) Dealing with Difficult People (For Midwest SRA)
b) Customer Service (3 workshops for SIUC Library Affairs)
c) Introduction to SPSS (for McNair Scholars Program, May, 2006)

7. Independent consultant to Maytag-Herrin corporation. Conducted plantwide survey of employee attitudes. With. L. Hetherington, T. Ellis, and M. Wood. 1996.

8. Consultant to Maritz Corporation, St. Louis, MO. Conducted and prepared a literature review on Customer Loyalty. 1996.

9. Consultant to TWA, St. Louis, MO. Developed and conducted training program to 100+ managers on sexual harassment. 1997

10. Expert Witness/Consulting

a) Michael A. Owsley, Esq. of English, Lucas, Priest & Owsley, re: Barbara Bobbett v. Bando Manufacturing of America, Inc.; Warren Circuit Court, Div. I; Civil Action No. 97-CI-00708 (served as a consultant to the defense attorney; 1998)
b) Anastasio v. Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc. Superior Court of the State of California. Case No. 03CC12680. (served as expert witness for the plaintiff, represented by Blumberg Law Corporation, John P. Blumberg, Esq.). 2004-2005.
c) Browning v. Southwest Research Institute. U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division (Case pending; serving as expert witness for the plaintiff)
d) E.E.O.C. v. LA Weight Loss, U.S. District Court for the Northern Division of Maryland (retained as an expert witness for defense)
e) Ellis v. Costco. U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (retained as an expert witness for the defense).

12. Evaluator: Southern Illinois Healthcare Bullying Prevention Program for Union and Hardin Counties: With the Center for Rural Health and Social Service Development. (1999-2000).

13. Managerial Consultant: JABAT Corp. Olney, IL (2000-2001)

14. Research consultant: Focus group interview study, team leader. U.S. Health and Human Services grant to the Illinois Department of Insurance. (2000-2001)

15. Evaluator: Public Policy Institute, Anti-Smoking Initiative (2001 – 2002)

16. Sexual Harassment trainer: City of Carbondale (2002)

17. Gateway Industrial Organizational Psychology (GIOP) Student Travel Award Committee (2002, 2003)

18. Invited member of the Illinois Department of Public Health's five-year strategic planning committee for tobacco control (2003)

C. Evaluation of Manuscripts for Journals and Book Publishers and of Grant Proposals for Agencies.

- Member, Editorial Board,
  - *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (1993 to 1998; 2001 to present)
  - *Sex Roles* (January, 2004 to present)
  - *Equal Opportunities International* (January, 2006 to present)

- Ad hoc reviewer:
  Journal of Vocational Behavior
  Journal of Personality and Social Relationships
  Academy of Management Review
  Sex Roles
  Journal of Sexual Deviance
  Law and Human Behavior
  Journal of Applied Psychology
  Basic and Applied Social Psychology
  Social Science and Medicine
  Psychology of Women Quarterly
  Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
  Journal of Applied Social Psychology
  Psychology, Public Policy and Law
  Journal of Social Issues (full issue reviewer)
  Cultural and Ethnic Minority Psychology
  Group and Organizational Management

- **Book Proposal Reviewer**

  Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates
  Brunner/Mazel (Taylor and Francis)
  Kluwer Academic Publishers
  Sage Publications
  NYU Press

- Grant reviewer
  Cleveland State University - University Research Council
  Social Science and Humanities Research Council (Canada)
  National Science Foundation: Law and Social Science Division

- National Awards
  American Society for Training and Development Outstanding Dissertation: Review committee (1999-2000)

- Regional Award
  Gateway I/O Psychology Student Travel Award (2002-2003)

- Conference Program committee reviewer
  American Psychological Association Program Committee --1994, 1995
  Society for Industrial/Organizational Program Committee --1995 – 1998, 2000, 2003, 2004
  Academy of Management Program Committee – 2000, 2001, 2002, 2005

D. Other:

- National Committees

1. Scientific Affairs Committee of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) (2000-2001)
2. SIOP ad hoc committee on the revision of the APA ethics code (2001)
3. SIOP ad hoc committee to respond to APA's Undergraduate Psychology Major Learning Goals and Outcomes (appointed by R. Lowe, chair of SIOP's Education committee; 2002)
4. SIOP Education and Training Committee (2003-2004)
   Consulting Psychology/Organizational Consulting Psychology Graduate Guidelines subcommittee (Fall, 2004)

- Conference Chairperson:

1. Doing good well: Diversity research in organizations (2001, May). *Nags Heart Conference*, Santa Cruz, CA.

- Invited Evaluations of Contract, Tenure, and Promotion dossiers:

1. Dr. Paula Popovich, promotion to full professor, Ohio University (1996)
2. Dr. Donna Chrobot-Mason, 3-year contract evaluation, University of Colorado-Denver (2001)
3. Dr. TK Logan, promotion to associate professor with tenure, University of Kentucky (2002)
4. Dr. Barry Goldman, promotion to associate professor with tenure, The University of Arizona (2003)
5. Dr. TK Logan, promotion to full professor, University of Kentucky (2005)
6. Dr. Charles A. Pierce, promotion to associate professor with tenure, The University of Memphis (2005)

IX. COMMUNITY SERVICE

- Guest speaker at the Southern Illinois Personnel Management Association meeting (Spring, 1991)
- Guest panelist for Women in Communication Club's discussion on sexual harassment (Fall, 1991)
- Guest speaker at the Psychology Student Association Meeting (Fall, 1991)
- Guest speaker at American Association of University Women meeting, *Managing Diversity in the Workplace* (Spring, 1992)
- Invited speaker, Southern Illinois Women's Health Conference, *The Ill Effects of Good Ol' Boys' Clubs* (Fall, 1992)
- Invited speaker, Southern Illinois University Personnel Conference, Navigating the Nineties, *Breaking the Glass Ceiling* (Spring, 1993)
- Invited speaker, SIUC Women's Caucus, *Report of the 1993 Sexual Harassment Survey,* (Fall, 1993).
- Invited speaker to the SIUC Marketing Department Brown Bag luncheon, *Combining consulting and research: Results from an employee survey study* (October, 1996).
- Speaker at the SIU Psychology Department Friday Forum, *Workplace Hostility* (with A. Vaux and M. Wood) (April, 1996)
- Speaker at the SIU Psychology Department Friday Forum, *Report of the Maytag Employee Survey* (w. L. Hetherington, T. Ellis, and M. Wood) (October, 1996)
- Invited speaker for the Hispanic Student Council Annual Dinner Celebrating Diversity (1999)
- Invited speaker for the Southern Illinois Women's Business Council (1999)
- Invited speaker to Psi Chi-SIUC chapter, *Policy Relevant Research in Psychology*

(September, 2001)

- Invited participant for the Illinois Tobacco-Free Communities Strategic Planning Committee (Invited by Dr. Eric Whitaker, Director of the Illinois Department of Public Health) (2003).
- Invited speaker for Southern Illinois Personnel Management Association Meeting (2005).

VIII. Exhibit B: List of cases served as expert witness in past four years

- Anastasio v. Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc. Superior Court of the State of California. Case No. 03CC12680. (served as expert witness for the plaintiff, represented by Blumberg Law Corporation, John P. Blumberg, Esq.). 2004-2005.
- Browning v. Southwest Research Institute. U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division (retained as expert witness for the plaintiff)
- E.E.O.C. v. LA Weight Loss, U.S. District Court for the Northern Division of Maryland (retained as an expert witness for defense)
- Ellis v. Costco. U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (retained as an expert witness for the defense).