

2011

Personality and Simulated Employment Decisions in Perceived Gay and Lesbian Applicants

Megan Brianne Morris
Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Morris, Megan Brianne, "Personality and Simulated Employment Decisions in Perceived Gay and Lesbian Applicants" (2011). *Browse all Theses and Dissertations*. 482.
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all/482

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Browse all Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

PERSONALITY AND SIMULATED EMPLOYMENT DECISIONS
IN PERCEIVED GAY AND LESBIAN APPLICANTS

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

By

MEGAN BRIANNE MORRIS
B.S., Heidelberg University, 2009

2011
Wright State University

COPYRIGHT BY
MEGAN BRIANNE MORRIS
2011

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

August 2, 2011

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY Megan B. Morris ENTITLED Personality and Simulated Employment Decisions in Perceived Gay and Lesbian Applicants BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF Master of Science.

Gary N. Burns, Ph.D.
Thesis Director

Scott N. J. Watamaniuk, Ph.D.
Graduate Program Director

Committee on
Final Examination

John M. Flach, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Psychology

Corey E. Miller, Ph.D.

Nathan A. Bowling, Ph.D.

Andrew Hsu, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

Morris, Megan Brianne. M. S., Department of Psychology, Wright State University, 2011.
Personality And Simulated Employment Decisions In Perceived Gay And Lesbian Applicants

Currently, there is no research that assesses how individual's perceptions of personality and other characteristics in gay male and lesbian applicants affect employment decisions. I examined individuals' perceptions of personality in gay and lesbian applicants and the effect of these perceptions on employment outcomes. I hypothesized that individuals would prescribe gender atypical traits to gay male and lesbian applicants, and that qualification ratings for these applicants would depend on job-type match with the applicants' gender atypical traits. In the current study, I used a sample of undergraduate students. Each participant evaluated a resume that potentially contained cues reflecting a homosexual sexual orientation. The participant evaluated the personality and femininity/masculinity of the applicant, as well as the applicant's qualification for the job they were applying for. I found partial support for hypotheses concerning femininity and masculinity, suggesting that in regard to some traits individuals perceive gay male and lesbian applicants as gender atypical. Results did not suggest that gay male and lesbian applicants will be at a disadvantage when applying for positions that are traditionally viewed as masculine and feminine, respectively. Nor will gay male and lesbian applicants necessarily have an advantage when applying for positions that are traditionally viewed as feminine and masculine, respectively. However, due to the nature of the sample in the current study, further research involving managers and other human resource professionals is needed to sufficiently address this research topic.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Discrimination and Bias against Sexual Orientation in the Workplace.	3
Perceived and Assessed Characteristics and Personality in Sexual Orientation. . .	6
Resume Cues and Personality.....	9
Consequences of Personality Perceptions.....	10
III. CURRENT STUDY.....	13
IV. METHOD.....	16
Participants.....	16
Materials and Design.....	16
Other-Ratings of the Applicant.....	17
Control Variables.....	21
Procedure.....	24
V. RESULTS.....	26
Personality Judgments.....	26
Femininity/Masculinity Judgments.....	27
Qualification Judgments.....	28
Overall Analyses.....	29
VI. DISCUSSION.....	31

Personality Hypotheses	31
Femininity/Masculinity Hypotheses	32
Qualification Hypotheses	33
Theoretical Implications	35
Practical Implications	36
Future Research	37
Limitations	38
Conclusions	39
VII. APPENDICES	40
APPENDIX A	40
APPENDIX B.	41
APPENDIX C.	42
APPENDIX D.	43
APPENDIX E.	44
APPENDIX F.	45
APPENDIX G.	46
APPENDIX H.	47
APPENDIX I.	48
APPENDIX J.	49
APPENDIX K.	50
APPENDIX L.	51
APPENDIX L-1	52
APPENDIX L-2	53

APPENDIX L-3	54
APPENDIX L-4	55
APPENDIX L-5	56
APPENDIX L-6	57
APPENDIX L-7	58
REFERENCES	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix of Covariates	65
2. Raw Descriptive Statistics	67
3. Estimated Descriptive Statistics	68
4. Estimated Descriptive Statistics for Qualification Rating	69
5. Analysis of Covariance Summary for Personality Traits	70
6. Analysis of Covariance Summary for Masculinity/Femininity	73
7. Analysis of Covariance Summary for Qualification Rating	74

I. INTRODUCTION

Individuals often stereotype gay men and lesbians as possessing characteristics different than their heterosexual counterparts (e.g., Blashill & Powlishta, 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Madon, 1997). These stereotypes extend to many different areas of an individual's life. One particular area that concerns an individual's state of livelihood is the individual's current or potential workplace. Researchers have examined discrimination and bias against gay male and lesbian applicants and workers (e.g., Horvath & Ryan, 2003; Lyons, DeValve, & Garner, 2008) thought to be based on attitudes toward homosexuality. However, researchers have not examined the possible advantages or disadvantages of gay male and lesbian stereotypes in the workplace, independent of discrimination based on attitudes toward homosexuality.

One particular area of interest in the underpinnings of the workplace is the applicant screening process. The resume is an effective tool most companies use in this initial process. Resumes have the capability of reflecting an applicant's sexual orientation based on cues the applicant, intentionally or inadvertently, includes in their resume (Horvath & Ryan, 2003). As a result, resumes can potentially elicit certain perceptions about gay male and lesbian applicants. The current study aimed to examine individuals' perceptions of personality and characteristics in gay male and lesbian applicants and how these perceptions affect the individual's potential employment decision.

My paper examines past literature in regard to sexual orientation discrimination/bias in the workplace. I review studies conducted in both laboratory and naturalistic settings through the perspective of the gay male and lesbian applicant and the employer. I also review studies examining perceived characteristics inferred by others and personality traits in lesbian and gay individuals. Lastly, I address how individuals use resume cues in personality and hiring

judgments and the possible effects perceived personality in applicants might have on employment outcomes.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Discrimination and Bias against Sexual Orientation in the Workplace

Discrimination is prevalent within the United States' business sector. Currently, federal mandates prohibit discrimination against individuals based on race, gender, age, religion, national origin, and disabilities (Cascio & Aguinis, 2005). Although federal mandates prohibit discrimination against the aforementioned minorities, there are other minorities who are legally discriminated against within U.S. industries. Currently, there is no federal law prohibiting discrimination against gay men and lesbians in non-federal employment (Cascio & Aguinis, 2005). Although some companies implement policies and a few states and cities enforce legislature making discrimination illegal against this minority, most companies and areas in the United States have no state laws or organizational policies protecting this group (Human, 2010).

Research on discrimination and bias against sexual orientation is lacking compared to research regarding other minorities (e.g., Badgett, Lau, Sears, & Ho, 2007; Croteau, 1996; Croteau & Lark, 2009; Elmslie & Tebaldi, 2007; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Most of these studies examine the perspective of gay and lesbian employees and their perceptions of discrimination and bias (Croteau, 1996). Gay male and lesbian employees report that discrimination is prevalent in the workplace and the fear of discrimination is widespread (Cornwell, 2001; Croteau, 1996). Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that homosexual employees were more likely to experience discrimination in those workplaces that were primarily heterosexual in employee makeup and which had no legislation or policies prohibiting discrimination against sexual orientation. Recently, Croteau and Lark (2009) and Badgett, Lau, Sears, and Ho (2007) examined workplace experiences of gay male and lesbian workers and found that a large segment of gay and lesbian employees have experienced some form of

discrimination based on their sexual orientation, including: being denied employment, fired, denied promotions, given harmful evaluations, being verbally or physically teased, and experiencing vandalism of their personal workspace. Similarly, Elmslie and Tebaldi (2007) found additional evidence of discrimination reporting that gay males receive lower wages than their heterosexual counterparts in those fields that are traditionally male dominated and blue collar in nature (e.g., construction, production, management, grounds keeping and maintenance). Although Elmslie and Tebaldi found discrimination in wages earned by gay male employees, they found little difference between lesbian and heterosexual female workers. Other researchers have found similar outcomes as well (Badgett et al., 2007).

Studies conducted in both laboratory and naturalistic settings suggest discrimination and bias towards homosexuals is present. Crow (1998) presented hiring scenarios examining different combinations of differing sexual orientations, race, and gender. Crow asked a sample of full-time employees to hire six out of eight equally qualified applicants for a position in a company that was already diverse in regard to employees. Results suggested that black male homosexuals were the most likely to be discriminated against followed by black homosexual females, white homosexual females, and white homosexual males. Hebl, Foster, Mannix, and Dovidio (2002) examined formal bias, interpersonal behavior, and perceptions of bias in regards to homosexual sexual orientation. The study consisted of confederates asking to apply for jobs at local stores. Researchers manipulated the sexual orientation of the confederate by placing one of two possible hats on the confederate's head; one hat reflecting a homosexual orientation. Results suggested that there was no evidence of formal discrimination against perceived homosexual applicants; however, there was increased negative interpersonal behavior against these applicants

as compared to the perceived heterosexual applicants. The confederates portrayed as homosexual also experienced increased perceptions of bias when dealing with the local stores.

Researchers have also found evidence of formal discrimination in naturalistic settings. Weichselbaumer (2003) used correspondence testing in Austria to examine discrimination against lesbian applicants. The researcher sent equally qualified resumes, one referencing a lesbian applicant and the other a heterosexual female applicant, to various businesses. Weichselbaumer assessed discrimination by the number of call backs each applicant received. Lesbian applicants received fewer call backs as compared to the heterosexual applicant, exhibiting evidence of discrimination. Van Hove and Lievens (2003) conducted a study in Belgium examining discrimination in hiring gay male applicants. The researchers constructed job postings and candidate profiles and gave these items to personnel selection professionals to make hiring recommendations. Results suggested discrimination did not occur in regard to hiring decisions. Although there was no evidence of discrimination, these results should not be generalized to the United States. Belgium is considerably more liberal than the U. S. in regards to gay rights, being the second country to allow same-sex marriage (Badgett et al., 2007).

Few studies have examined the perspective of the evaluator (Horvath & Ryan, 2003; Lyons, DeValve, & Garner, 2008). Horvath and Ryan (2003) conducted the first and only study, to my current knowledge, examining the perspective of the discriminator and what predictors arise in hiring discrimination in regard to homosexual employees. Horvath and Ryan found that such factors as religiosity, belief in traditional gender roles, belief in controllability of homosexuality, and previous exposure to homosexuals have a role in determining the individual's attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. The researchers also examined this general attitude and whether it acts as an antecedent in beliefs about hiring homosexuals and suggested

that factors moderate beliefs about hiring homosexuals and the actual act of discrimination. The study revealed instances of discrimination with participants rating gay and lesbian applicants more negatively than male heterosexual applicants. The results of their study suggested, however, that there is no link between attitudes in employing homosexuals and the act of discrimination. The researchers felt that this result occurred due to perceptions of the legality of discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation. Another recent study that examined actual employers and their attitudes toward gay and lesbian applicants and incumbents studied police chiefs (Lyons, DeValve, & Garner, 2008). Lyons et al. found that a majority of Texas police chiefs felt that homosexuality was morally offensive; however, they still hired lesbian and gay male officers.

Although some previous research shows improvements in regard to accepting gay men and lesbians into the workforce, there is still evidence that suggests that homosexuals can be discriminated against in both formal and interpersonal situations and that negative attitudes toward homosexuals still persist. These acts of discrimination and attitudes might be especially prevalent in those states and organizations where there is no legislature or corporate policies protecting the rights of homosexual individuals.

Perceived and Assessed Characteristics and Personality in Sexual Orientation

Stereotyping is a common phenomenon that occurs in order for humans to make generalizations about the world and to maintain a constant environment in which they are comfortable (Lippmann, 1922). There are many stereotypes prevalent within the U.S. society in regards to race, gender, age, religion and other groups. There are especially strong stereotypes regarding homosexuals as indicated by past research involving stereotyping.

Common stereotypes of gay males and lesbians involve the *implicit inversion theory*, which states that homosexuals have the same characteristics as opposite sex heterosexuals (i.e., gay men are similar to heterosexual women and lesbians are similar to heterosexual men) (Strachey & Freud, 1975). Kite and Deaux (1987) conducted a study examining adjectives used to describe typical heterosexual and homosexual individuals. The researchers found that participants' responses supported the inversion theory, reporting significant correlations with attributes describing gay men and heterosexual women and, to a lesser extent but still significant, attributes describing lesbians and heterosexual men. Madon (1997) also found support for the inversion theory in a study examining individuals' stereotypes of gay males. Recently, Blashill and Powlishta (2009) reconfirmed gender atypical stereotypes of gay men and lesbians, specifically in regard to femininity and masculinity in activities, occupational interests, and traits. These studies suggested that the general population is likely to stereotype and ascribe atypical sex traits to homosexuals, aligning with the inversion theory.

Researchers have examined five common areas in personality differences among homosexuals and heterosexuals: masculine versus feminine occupational preferences, self-ascribed masculinity-femininity, masculine instrumentality (e.g. aggressive, independent), feminine expressiveness (e.g. sensitive, warm), and the Big Five personality traits (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience) (Lippa, 2008, 2005a, 2000). Past research has shown that overall men and women differ on several personality traits and underlying facets (e.g., Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001; Feingold, 1994; Lippa, 2005a; Lippa, 2008). Women and men differ in occupational and activity interests with women being more interested in "people-oriented" occupations and activities (e.g., nursing, social work) whereas men are more interested in "thing-oriented" occupations and activities

(e.g., mechanics, engineering). Women and men on average also consider themselves more feminine than masculine and more masculine than feminine, respectively, in regard to self-ascribed masculinity-femininity.

In a meta-analysis by Lippa (2005a), men were higher than women on masculine instrumentality and openness to experience, whereas women scored higher on feminine expressiveness, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Other studies have found similar results regarding differences in the Big Five personality traits (Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001; Feingold, 1994). Research has suggested that men score higher on some extraversion facets (e.g., dominance, assertiveness) but lower on other factors (e.g., sociability, warmth) in comparison to women. Research also has suggested women score higher than men in some neuroticism facets (e.g., depression, anxiety) and agreeableness factors (e.g., empathy, tender-mindedness, trust). Women also tended to score higher on openness to feelings, while men score higher on openness to ideas (Costa et al., 2001).

Although there are apparent differences in personality between men and women, do gay men and lesbians also share these same differences? Or do gay men and lesbians ascribe to common stereotypes and share these differences but in an atypical fashion as suggested by the inversion theory? Research has suggested that these stereotypes are similar to actual personality characteristics of a majority of gay men and lesbians. Lippa (2000, 2002, 2005a, 2008) and Lippa and Arad (1997) found that the largest differences occur in masculine versus feminine occupational preferences and self-ascribed masculinity-femininity. Gay men and lesbians appear to be gender atypical in regard to these two factors, suggesting that gay male-typical interests are inclined to be female-typical, and lesbian-typical interests are inclined to be male-typical (Lippa, 2000, 2002). Lippa (2000) cautioned readers, however, with explaining that gay men are not

“like women” and lesbians are not “like men” but instead gay men are more similar to women than heterosexual men are and lesbians are more similar to men than heterosexual women are in regard to these factors. Lippa (2000, 2005a, 2008) and Lippa and Arad (1997) found that homosexual-heterosexual differences were also apparent in other personality measures. On average, gay men were higher on neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and expressiveness compared to heterosexual men. Lesbians were lower on neuroticism and higher on openness to experience and instrumentality compared to heterosexual women. Overall, research has suggested that, on average, gay men and lesbians tend to be gender atypical in regard to occupational and activity interests, self-ascribed femininity and masculinity, and in some personality traits such as neuroticism, conscientiousness, and agreeableness.

Resume Cues and Personality

An individual’s possessions, environment, and behavior can provide a great deal of information to an observer in regard to that individual’s personality. Gosling, Ko, Mannarelli, and Morris (2002) conducted a study examining observers’ impressions of an individual assessed from the individual’s physical environment. The researchers elaborated on Brunswik’s (1956) lens model, in which Brunswik stated that factors in an environment work as a “lens” allowing observers to form perceptions of underlying constructs. For example, an unorganized desk in a female individual’s office might form the impression that she is low in conscientiousness. The observer is using a factor or cue (the unorganized desk) to form a perception of the underlying construct (conscientiousness). The elaboration the researchers included with Brunswik’s lens model is that stereotypes might act as a possible intervening variable when observers form perceptions about constructs. In relation to my proposed study, stereotypes could intervene

when employers are forming personality impressions of an applicant. Consistent with the previous example if the desk had materials regarding gay and lesbian issues, the observer might perceive that person as being gay or lesbian. A stereotype of characteristics in gay and lesbian individuals might intervene with the perception of other underlying constructs such as femininity. The observer might perceive the female individual as being low in femininity due to stereotypical beliefs about lesbians.

A resume can work as a type of physical environment created by an applicant, presenting factors that can be used to form impressions of that applicant. An applicant's education, work history, organization affiliation, extra-curricular activities, and interests are resume cues that other individuals use in forming impressions about the applicant (e.g., Brown & Campion, 1994; Cole, Rubin, Feild, & Giles, 2007; Hakel, Dobmeyer, & Dunnette, 1970; Nemanick & Clark, 2002). Cole, Field, Giles, and Harris (2004) examined recruiters' perceptions of personality in applicants based on resume information. The researchers found that job type, Conventional (e.g., finance, accounting) or Enterprising (e.g., business administration, marketing), moderated the relationship between personality perceptions and hiring recommendations. Specifically, higher perceived levels of conscientiousness and extraversion were related to higher recommendations for Conventional and Enterprising jobs respectively. Similarly, if cues such as organization affiliation or interests elicit the sexual orientation of an applicant, individuals might use stereotypes of gay males and lesbians during the impression formulation process. These stereotypes might lead to misperceptions of personality in applicants and might affect hiring outcomes.

Consequences of Personality Perceptions

Self-identified or perceived homosexual applicants could be susceptible to both formal and interpersonal discrimination in those organizations without policies regarding discrimination, and possibly even in organizations that do implement these policies. Individuals who perceive applicants as homosexual might link atypical sex-type personality traits to these applicants, so an applicant could potentially be associated with a personality projection that is not reflective of their actual personality. Gender atypical stereotypes of applicants could either be advantageous or unfavorable to the applicant when applying for a position. This stereotyping could assist when applying for jobs that are typically sex-type dominated. For example, Glick, Zion, and Nelson (1988) found that women who break traditional stereotypes were less discriminated against in regard to some traditionally masculine jobs compared to stereotypical women. Thus, one would expect a lesbian to have an advantage over a heterosexual woman in a typically male dominated job. This can also be true for gay men applying for female dominated jobs such as nursing. In contrast with Glick et al. (1988), many studies have suggested that women who violate typical female stereotypes might be subject to a *backlash effect* (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 2001, 1999). Agentic women (i.e., assertive), when applying for positions, might be perceived as less favorable when interpersonal skills are deemed as a necessary component for the job. Rudman (1998) suggested that men who violate typical male stereotypes might be subject to this backlash effect as well when applying for masculine typed jobs.

Other than examining masculine and feminine traits within applicants and using those perceptions in hiring, individuals might use their perceptions of the Big Five personality traits in assessing which candidate would be the best for the job. Barrick, Mount, and Judge (2001) conducted a meta-analysis examining Big Five traits and job performance. The researchers

found that conscientiousness, and to a lesser extent, emotional stability (neuroticism) were good predictors of overall job performance. Extraversion and openness were found to be good predictors of training performance; agreeableness and emotional stability were found to be good predictors of teamwork. If personality measures are not used during the hiring process, individuals could use their perceptions of the applicant's personality to aid in making the hiring decision. Individuals might ascribe lesbian and gay male applicants with stereotypical atypical gender traits that are not necessarily characteristic of the applicant's true personality. Individuals then could potentially use these stereotypes in assessing the applicant's personality and then make employment decisions based off of those perceptions. Depending on the nature of the job or the climate of the organization, these perceived stereotyped personality traits might aid or hinder applicants in obtaining a position in that organization.

III. CURRENT STUDY

Recent research suggests that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation still occurs in the hiring process (e.g., Badgett, Lau, Sears, & Ho, 2007; Croteau & Lark, 2009; Elmslie & Tebaldi, 2007, Horvath & Ryan, 2003). With an increase of anti-discrimination policies and laws prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (Day & Greene, 2008; Human, 2010), individuals might be less prone to discriminate on the mere basis that the applicant is homosexual. However, other indirect factors related to sexual orientation might influence the individual's potential employment decision. For those applicants who are homosexual and those heterosexual applicants that are perceived to be homosexual, individuals will create perceptions of the applicant's personality and might use these perceptions in employment decisions. As a result, these perceptions might benefit or obstruct the applicant from securing the position. In the current study I examined individual's perceptions of personality in gay male and lesbian applicants and the effect of these perceptions on simulated employment outcomes.

Past research suggests that individuals hold stereotypes about homosexual individuals that align with the inversion theory (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Madon, 1997). Individuals are likely to ascribe atypical sex characteristics to gay male and lesbian individuals. Research suggests that there are differences between men and women, with men scoring higher on masculinity compared to women and women scoring higher on femininity, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, and lower on emotional stability compared to men (e.g., Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001; Feingold, 1994; Lippa, 2005a, 2008). I predicted that individuals examining gay male and lesbian applicants will also subscribe atypical sex characteristics that align with men and women differences found in past research.

Hypothesis 1: Resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher ratings of agreeableness compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 2: Resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with lower ratings of emotional stability compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 3: Resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher ratings of conscientiousness compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 4: Resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher ratings of femininity compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 5: Resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with lower ratings of masculinity compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 6: Resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with higher ratings of emotional stability compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants.

Hypothesis 7: Resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with lower ratings of agreeableness compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants.

Hypothesis 8: Resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with lower ratings of femininity compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants.

Hypothesis 9: Resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with higher ratings of masculinity compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants.

Past research suggests that female applicants who break traditional sex stereotypes were less discriminated against in regard to some traditionally masculine jobs (Glick, Zion, & Nelson,

1988). This could occur for male applicants who break traditional sex stereotypes as well when applying for traditionally feminine jobs. However, when non-stereotypical females apply for traditionally feminine jobs, those applicants might encounter a backlash effect. The applicant is seen as less favorable because they are lacking important feminine qualities (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 2001, 1999). This might also occur when non-stereotypical males apply for traditionally masculine jobs (Rudman, 1998). Individuals stereotyping homosexuals on the basis of the inversion theory would believe that gay males and lesbians violate traditional male and female stereotypes, respectively. I predicted that individuals examining gay male and lesbian resumes will rate employment decisions on the basis of the inversion theory and how the stereotypes derived from this theory align with traditionally masculine and feminine jobs.

Hypothesis 10: Managerial resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with lower qualification ratings compared to managerial resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 11: Nursing resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher qualification ratings compared to nursing resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 12: Managerial resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with higher qualification ratings compared to managerial resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants.

Hypothesis 13: Nursing resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with lower qualification ratings compared to nursing resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants.

IV. METHOD

Participants

I collected data from 332 undergraduate students recruited from a psychology participant pool database at a Midwestern university, with 284 participants providing usable data (see Check questions below for participant screening information). Participants received course credit for their participation in the study. The majority of the participants were female (63.6%) and 21 years old ($M = 20.52$, $SD = 4.28$). The majority of participants were White (74.3%) and 16.9% were Black, 4.2% were Asian, 3.2% were multiracial, 0.4% were Hispanic, and 0.4% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. The majority of participants were heterosexual (90.5%) and 4.2% were bisexual, 2.5% were homosexual, and 2.1% identified their sexual orientation as other. Of the participants, 10.9% had not been employed in the past.

Materials and Design

My study consisted of a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance design. I created a total of eight resume conditions, with each condition consisting of a unique combination of three manipulations.

Job-type of resume manipulation. I manipulated the job-type of the resume to reflect either a traditionally masculine job or traditionally feminine job. I included moderately qualified information pertaining to a managerial position in one resume to reflect a masculine job. I included moderately qualified information pertaining to a nursing position in a second resume to reflect a feminine job. I ensured that the two resumes were moderately qualified for each respective position and were gender-neutral in nature through a pilot study assessing the perceived qualifications, masculinity, and femininity of the applicant.

Gender of applicant manipulation. I manipulated the gender of the applicant to reflect either a male or female applicant. Modeled after Horvath and Ryan (2003), I included a male typical name, Charles E. Smith, to reflect a male applicant and a female typical name, Sarah E. Smith, to reflect a female applicant.

Sexual orientation of applicant manipulation. I manipulated applicant sexual orientation to reflect a potentially heterosexual male, heterosexual female, gay male, or lesbian applicant. Modeled after Horvath and Ryan (2003) and Weichselbaumer (2003), I included information regarding undergraduate organizations and current organizations in the resume. I reflected a potential heterosexual applicant by listing the respective undergraduate school's student activities group, Ohio State Student Activities Group, in the education section in the resume and listed American Red Cross in the current organizations section in the resume. I reflected a potential homosexual applicant by listing Gay and Lesbian Alliance in the education section in the resume and listed either Gay Men's Health Crisis or National Lesbian Health Organization in the current organizations section in the resume.

The eight resulting resumes consisted of four managerial resumes reflecting a gay male, heterosexual male, lesbian, and heterosexual female applicant and four nursing resumes reflecting a gay male, heterosexual male, lesbian, and heterosexual female applicant (see Appendix L for resumes).

Other-Ratings of the Applicant

Participants rated the Big Five personality factors, masculinity, femininity, and qualification of the applicant they were assigned to evaluate.

Personality ratings. I assessed participants' personality ratings of applicants using Big-Five Factor Structure marker items derived from Goldberg (1992). Goldberg's Big-Five markers

consist of 100 adjectives that assess personality factors: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness. I included a total of 30 markers in my study with 6 markers reflecting each personality factor. I included adjectives that do not overlap with masculinity and femininity traits found in the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) or Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). I evaluated the internal consistency of each 6- item factor I used in my study from a prior data set of 238 participants that included all 100 Big-Five markers. The Cronbach alphas were .81, .72, .72, .71, and .70 for extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness, respectively. Participants rated applicants on a 5- point scale with 1 being *Strongly Disagree* and 5 being *Strongly Agree*. Sample items are *Talkative*, *Generous*, *Organized*, *Moody*, and *Innovative* (see Appendix B for a complete list of items). I calculated participants' scores for the five personality factors by taking the mean of responses for each factor (I reverse scored negative items).

Reliability coefficients for the current study were .65, .78, .77, .62, and .59 for extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness, respectively. Due to low reliabilities for extraversion, emotional stability, and openness, I increased the alpha coefficients by deleting items with the lowest inter-item correlations. I increased the alpha coefficient for extraversion to .70 by deleting the item *Vigorous*, for emotional stability to .66 by deleting the item *Bashful*, and for openness to .60 by deleting the item *Uninquisitive*.

Masculinity and femininity ratings. I assessed participants' masculinity and femininity ratings of the applicants using items derived from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). The

BSRI and PAQ are two of the most commonly used self-report measures in assessing masculinity and femininity.

Bem (1974) designed the BSRI to research psychological androgyny by developing a measure that would not automatically create an inverse relationship between masculinity and femininity. Instead, a user of the inventory could assess both a masculinity and femininity score for the examinee. The BSRI contains 60 personality traits. Twenty traits are stereotypically feminine, twenty are stereotypically masculine, and the last twenty traits act as filler items. Bem (1978) supported the reliability of the inventory with coefficient alphas of .75 and .78 for femininity scores for females and males, respectively, and coefficients of .87 and .86 for masculinity scores for females and males, respectively. Bem provided additional support with test-retest reliabilities of .82 and .89 for femininity scores for females and males, respectively, and reliabilities of .94 and .76 for masculinity scores for females and males, respectively.

Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974) designed the Personal Attributes Questionnaire to examine self-ratings of masculinity and femininity and stereotypes of men and women. The measure contains 55 traits. Twenty-three traits are male valued, 18 are female valued, 6 are male sex specific, and 7 are female sex specific. Participants rate themselves on the traits and then rate the typical male or female using the same traits. Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp reported alpha coefficients of .91 and .73 for women and men, respectively, and test-retest reliabilities of .91 and .80 for women and men, respectively, for the self-report measure.

A few studies have used BSRI items and PAQ items as other-report measures (Garcia-Retamero & Lopez-Zafra, 2006; Powell, Butterfield, & Parent, 2002; Spence & Buckner, 2000). Lippa (2005b) used adjectives from both scales in constructing personality descriptions in examining other-reports on masculinity and femininity. I used the traits from these measures to

assess masculinity and femininity perceptions. I used the 20 stereotypically masculine and 20 stereotypically feminine traits from the BSRI and the 23 male and 18 female valued traits from the PAQ. The two measures have overlapping adjectives and traits assessing different aspects of masculinity and femininity. I combined the two measures and presented overlapping traits once. I randomly presented masculinity and femininity items from both measures in a single questionnaire format. Many traits in the BSRI and PAQ overlap with Big Five personality traits as well (Lippa, 1991). I did not include items that overlap with the Big Five to ensure that I assessed traits specifically related to masculinity and femininity. I had a total of 47 items in the final masculinity and femininity questionnaire. Participants rated applicants on a 5-point scale with 1 being *Strongly Disagree* and 5 being *Strongly Agree*. Example traits are *Aggressive* and *Childlike* (see Appendix A for a complete list of items). I calculated a masculinity and femininity score by taking the mean of responses to masculinity items and the mean of responses to feminine items. The alpha coefficients in the current study for masculinity and femininity ratings were .87 and .74 respectively.

Qualification ratings. I assessed participants' qualification ratings of applicants using nine different items regarding qualification. The first item was a scale fashioned after Horvath and Ryan (2003). Participants rated the applicant on a 50-point scale in regard to how qualified the applicant is for the managerial or nursing position. Participants answered with any point value (e.g., 26, 43) based on five anchor points (0 = *extremely unqualified*; 10 = *reasonably unqualified*; 20 = *barely qualified*; 30 = *adequately qualified*; 40 = *reasonably qualified*; 50 = *extremely qualified*). In the second item I asked participants to answer how suitable the applicant is for the position. Participants answered on a 7-point scale with 1 being *Strongly recommend rejection* and 7 being *Strongly recommend hire*. The next five items referred to how likely the

participant was to endorse a specific behavior (e.g., How likely would you want to work with this individual?). Participants answered on a 6-point scale with 1 being *Not at all* and 6 being *Definitely*. In the eighth item I asked participants whether they would recommend the applicant to be interviewed. Participants answered with *Yes* or *No*. In the last item I asked participants to give a starting salary for the applicant. I gave a range of \$50,000 to \$70,000 as a typical starting salary for these positions. Participants could answer with any salary amount desired. All nine items were transformed into *z* scores to calculate an overall qualification rating (see Appendix C for items). The alpha coefficient in the current study for the overall qualification rating was .85.

Manipulation check. I used a manipulation check modeled after Horvath and Ryan (2003), asking if the participant noticed the sexual orientation of the participant (see Appendix H for items).

Check questions. I positioned check questions among scale items to ensure that participants are actively answering the questionnaire. An example of a check question is “Answer *Disagree* for this question.” I placed check questions in the hirability rating section of the survey to ensure that participants actively read both the job description and resume, as well as to increase the likelihood that the participants noticed the sexual orientation cue. An example of a check question in this section is “What organizations is this individual involved with?” If participants answered the check questions incorrectly, I excluded their data from the analysis (see Appendix D for a complete list of items).

Control Variables

Participants rated aspects of the respective job and applicant, as well as themselves, to create control variables used when analyzing the various hypotheses.

Political affiliation. Political affiliation could possibly affect perceptions of personality and in result affect qualification ratings. I assessed the participants' perceived social political affiliation ratings of the applicant and the job by asking how likely the social political affiliation of the applicant and job was conservative or liberal. Participants answered on a 5-point scale with 1 being *Not at all likely* and 5 being *Very likely* (see Appendix H for a complete list of items). I used these variables as control variables when examining personality and qualification ratings.

Masculinity/Femininity of Job. I assessed participants' perceptions of the masculinity and femininity of the managerial or nursing position with a single-item measure. Participants could potentially rate the job as *dominantly masculine in personality, dominantly feminine in personality, neither dominantly masculine nor feminine in personality, high in both masculinity and femininity in personality, low in both masculinity and femininity in personality, or Not sure*. For analyzing purposes, I used the ratings *dominantly masculine in personality, dominantly feminine in personality, and neither dominantly masculine nor feminine in personality* as control variables when analyzing the masculinity and femininity hypotheses (see Appendix H for item).

Attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. I assessed participants' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians using The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (ATLG; Herek, 1984). The ATLG consists of two subscales containing 10 items, each totaling 20 items. The first subscale (ATL) assesses attitudes toward lesbians, and the second subscale (ATG) assesses attitudes toward gay men. Participants rated their responses to items on a 5-point scale with 1 being *Strongly Disagree* and 5 being *Strongly Agree*. An example item of the ATL is "Lesbians just can't fit into our society." An example item of the ATG is "I think male homosexuals are disgusting" (see Appendix E for a complete list of items). Herek (1987a, 1987b, 1988) has

found high levels of internal consistency with college student samples. Alphas were usually greater than .90 for the full scale and .85 for the subscales. Herek (1988) demonstrated test-retest reliability with alternate forms where the subscale items were reworded to refer to the opposite sex (i.e., gay men instead of lesbians). Correlations were .90 for the full scale and its alternate, .84 for the ATL and its alternate, and .83 for the ATG and its alternate. Herek has found the ATLG to be correlated with other related constructs such as contact with lesbians and gay men, sex-role attitudes, traditional family beliefs, and religiosity (Herek, 1987a, 1987b, 1988). Herek also established the discriminant validity of the ATLG examining attitudes of samples including members of gay and lesbian organizations, adults who support gay rights, and those adults who opposed gay rights. Members of the gay and lesbian organizations and the adults who supported gay rights scored low on the ATLG whereas the adults who opposed gay rights scored higher (Herek, 1988). I assessed participants' scores by taking the mean of the responses to items in each subscale. A high value on the ATL scale indicated negative attitudes toward lesbians whereas a high value on the ATG scale indicated negative attitudes toward gay men. The alpha coefficient in the current study for the subset scales were .89 and .94, for the ATL and ATG, respectively, and .95 for the full scale. I used the full scale responses as a control variable when analyzing the qualification rating hypotheses.

Beliefs on discrimination and workplace setting policies. I asked participants if they believe that it is illegal to discriminate against sexual orientation, whether it should be legal to discriminate against sexual orientation, and whether the individual believes it is fair to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation. Participants also provided information regarding their current workplace setting. I asked participants whether their workplace has policies prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination, policies prohibiting sexual harassment against

sexual orientation, and policies affirming social diversity (see Appendix F for a complete list of items). I used these items as control variables when analyzing the qualification rating hypotheses.

Gender role attitudes. I assessed participants' gender role attitudes using the short form of the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES; Beere, King, Beere, & King, 1984; King & King, 1990). The SRES assesses attitudes toward the equality between men and women. An individual with an egalitarian attitude does not relate differently with or discriminate against someone on the basis of his or her sex. The short form scale contains 25 items with 5 items pertaining to a specific role category: *marital*, *parental*, *employment*, *social-interpersonal-heterosexual*, and *educational*. Participants rated items using a 5-point scale with 1 being *Strongly Agree* and 5 being *Strongly Disagree*. Example items are "The husband should be the head of the family" and "Home economics course should be as acceptable for male students as for female students" (see Appendix G for a list of items). There are two alternative forms of the short scale: BB and KK. I administered form BB. King and King (1990) reported an internal consistency alpha of .94 and a test-retest coefficient of .88. The equivalence and equivalence-stability coefficients for the BB and KK forms were .87 and .82, respectively. The correlation between BB and the original form was .95. Researchers have provided support for the validity of the short form with BB scores negatively correlating with measures such as use of violence by men in family disputes and other measures involved in alcohol treatment and spousal abuse programs (e.g., King & King, 1990). I assessed participants' scores by taking the mean of responses to items in each role category (I reverse scored negative items). Higher scores indicated an egalitarian response. The alpha coefficient in the current study for the BB short form of the SRES was .91.

I used responses to this scale as a control variable when analyzing the qualification rating hypotheses.

Procedure

I presented the consent form, materials, and questionnaires to the participants through SurveyMonkey, an online survey tool (see Appendix J for consent form). I assigned each participant randomly to one of eight conditions. Each condition reflected one resume corresponding to one applicant. The participant examined either a resume for a general managerial position or a resume for a nursing position. The participant examined either a male or a female applicant, whose resume reflected either a heterosexual or a homosexual applicant. After the participant agreed to the consent form, I asked the participant to review a job description regarding the respective position and answer questions pertaining to the job description (see Appendix K). I then asked the participant to review the resume and answer questions pertaining to the content of the resume. I presented the resume and questions regarding resume content and the qualification the applicant for the position on one page of the survey. After the participant completed this section they were not be able to view the resume. I constructed the survey in this fashion so the participant could answer honestly to manipulation check questions. Following the resume section, the participant rated the applicant's personality and rated the applicant's masculinity and femininity. After this section of the survey, the participant completed a questionnaire assessing the participant's attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, beliefs of legality of discrimination against sexual orientation, workplace policies, and gender role attitudes. Lastly, the participant answered manipulation check items and completed a brief demographic survey (see Appendix I for items).

IV. RESULTS

I conducted a full 2 (applicant gender) x 2 (applicant sexual orientation) x 2 (job-type) analysis of covariance for each variable (see Table 1 for covariate descriptive statistics and correlations; see Tables 5, 6, and 7 for 2 x 2 x 2 analyses of covariance). However, given the nature of the personality and femininity/masculinity judgment hypotheses which focus on specific cells, I conducted a 2 (applicant gender) x 2 (applicant sexual orientation) analysis of covariance for these hypotheses and tested each hypothesis with the appropriate *t*-test. I conducted the *t*-tests with estimated means and standard deviations derived from the 2 x 2 analysis of covariance for the personality and femininity/masculinity hypotheses (see Table 3) and used estimated means and standard deviations from the 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of covariance for the qualification judgment hypotheses (see Table 4).

Personality Judgments

I examined ratings of personality perceptions by conducting a 2 (applicant gender) x 2 (applicant sexual orientation) analysis of covariance. I controlled for the effects of perceived social political affiliation of the job and the applicant, as well as the age and gender of the participant. I used estimated means and standard deviations to test the hypotheses (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics and Table 5 for ANCOVA results).

In Hypothesis 1 I stated that resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher ratings of agreeableness, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. An independent samples *t*-test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(134) = 0.41, p > .05, d = .07$. In Hypothesis 2 I stated that resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with lower ratings of emotional stability, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. An independent samples *t*-test

indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(134) = 0.48, p > .05, d = .08$. In Hypothesis 3 I stated that resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher ratings of conscientiousness, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. An independent samples t -test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(134) = 0.48, p > .05, d = .07$.

In Hypothesis 6 I stated that resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with lower ratings of agreeableness, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. An independent samples t -test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(141) = 1.40, p > .05, d = .25$. In Hypothesis 7 I stated that resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with higher ratings of emotional stability, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. An independent samples t -test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(141)=0.17, p > .05, d = .02$.

Femininity/Masculinity Judgments

I examined ratings of femininity/masculinity perceptions by conducting a 2 (applicant gender) x 2 (applicant sexual orientation) analysis of covariance. I controlled for the effects of perceived masculinity and femininity of job-type, as well as the age and gender of the participant. Again, I used estimated means and standard deviations to test the hypotheses (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics and Table 6 for ANCOVA results for femininity and masculinity, respectively).

In hypothesis 4 I stated that resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher ratings of femininity, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. An independent samples t -test indicated that participants rated gay male applicants ($M = 3.28, SD = 0.28$) significantly higher in femininity compared to heterosexual male applicants ($M =$

3.15, $SD = 0.28$), $t(134) = 2.78$, $p < .01$, $d = .46$. In hypothesis 5 I stated that resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with lower ratings of masculinity, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. An independent samples t -test indicated that the difference between these two means was significant, $t(134) = 2.27$, $p < .05$, $d = .40$; however, the difference was in the opposite direction of what was hypothesized. Participants rated gay male applicants ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.33$) significantly higher in masculinity compared to heterosexual applicants ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.32$).

In hypothesis 8 I stated that resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with lower ratings of femininity, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. An independent samples t -test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(142) = 1.31$, $p > .05$, $d = .22$. In hypothesis 9 I stated that resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with higher ratings of masculinity, compared to resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. An independent samples t -test indicated that participants rated lesbian applicants ($M = 3.73$, $SD = .33$) significantly higher in masculinity compared to heterosexual female applicants ($M = 3.60$, $SD = .33$), $t(142) = 2.41$, $p < .05$, $d = .40$.

Qualification Judgments

I examined qualification ratings by conducting a 2 (applicant gender) x 2 (applicant sexual orientation) x 2 (job-type) analysis of covariance. I controlled for the effects of perceived social political affiliation of the job and the applicant, participants' attitudes toward lesbian and gay individuals, participants' gender role attitudes, whether participants believe discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation should be legal, whether participants believe it is fair to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, as well as the age and gender of the participant. Whether the participant thought it was legal to discriminate in their resident state, as well as all

workplace policy questions were excluded as covariates from the analyses due to low numbers of definite answers. I used estimated means and standard deviations to test the hypotheses (see Table 4 for descriptive statistics and Table 7 for ANCOVA results).

In hypothesis 10 I stated that managerial resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with lower ratings of qualification, compared to managerial resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. An independent samples *t*-test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(54) = 0.95, p > .05, d = .25$. In hypothesis 11 I stated that nursing resumes reflecting gay male applicants will be associated with higher ratings of qualification, compared to nursing resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. An independent samples *t*-test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(71) = 0.51, p > .05, d = .12$.

In hypothesis 12 I stated that managerial resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with higher ratings of qualification, compared to managerial resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. An independent samples *t*-test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(66) = 1.59, p > .05, d = .40$. Finally, in hypothesis 13 I stated that nursing resumes reflecting lesbian applicants will be associated with lower ratings of qualification compared to nursing resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. An independent samples *t*-test indicated that the difference between these two means was not significant, $t(61) = .17, p > .05, d = .03$.

Overall Analyses

I initially conducted a full 2 (applicant gender) x 2 (applicant sexual orientation) x 2 (job-type) analysis of covariance for each variable. Since my examination of personality and femininity/masculinity judgment hypotheses involved collapsing across job-type and focusing on

mean comparisons, I will not report the results of the full 2 x 2 x 2 analyses of covariance for these variables (see Tables 5, 6, and 7 for 2 x 2 x 2 ANCOVA results). I should note issues with violating the assumption of homogeneity of variance in regard to these initial ANCOVAs which are discussed further in the Limitations section.

V. DISCUSSION

I have divided the discussion section into three sections: personality hypotheses, femininity/masculinity hypotheses, and qualification hypotheses. Within the sections, I discuss hypotheses regarding males and females jointly when concerning particular variables (e.g., hypotheses 1 and 6 regarding agreeableness). I give possible explanations for each finding.

Personality Hypotheses

I did not find support for Hypotheses 1 or 6 regarding individuals' perceptions of agreeableness in applicants. Individuals did not rate gay males significantly higher in agreeableness compared to heterosexual males; nor did they rate lesbians lower in agreeableness compared to heterosexual females. In further examination of these results, a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of covariance indicated a main effect for job-type. This suggests that job-type had an effect on participants' perception of agreeableness of the applicant rather than sexual orientation.

I did not find support for Hypotheses 2 or 7 regarding individuals' perceptions of emotional stability in applicants. Individuals did not rate gay males significantly lower in emotional stability compared to heterosexual males; nor did they rate lesbians significantly higher in emotional stability compared to heterosexual females. There are many possible explanations for non-support of these hypotheses. For example, individuals might not adhere to the inversion theory and might not perceive gay males as less emotionally stable than heterosexual males or lesbians as more emotionally stable than heterosexual females. Another possible explanation might be that resume type, either managerial or nursing, has an effect on the individual's perception of the emotional stability of the applicant. However, a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of covariance indicated that job-type did not have a main effect in regard to emotional stability ratings. Another alternative explanation for this result is that individuals in the gay male and

lesbian resume conditions were aware of sexual orientation manipulation and its significance in the study. As a result the individuals rated the applicant in a manner incongruent with commonly held stereotypical beliefs about gay males and lesbians.

I did not find support for Hypothesis 3, individuals did not rate gay male applicants significantly higher in conscientiousness compared to heterosexual male applicants. Again, there are many possible explanations for lack of support for this hypothesis, similar to what I discussed above. Similar to emotional stability, a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of covariance indicated that job-type did not have a main effect of ratings of conscientiousness.

Femininity/Masculinity Hypotheses

I found support for Hypothesis 4; individuals rated gay male applicants significantly higher in femininity compared to heterosexual male applicants. This result suggests that individuals perceive gay males to be more feminine than heterosexual males, aligning with the inversion theory. Male applicants whom provide information such as past and current membership to gay affiliated organizations are perceived as more feminine. Regardless of whether this is advantageous or disadvantageous in the initial hiring process, perceptions of increased femininity could potentially become a factor in the interviewing process and other future contact with the applicant. It is possible that the applicant might be treated differently or be directed to focus on differing roles within a position compared to perceived heterosexual applicants. For example, a perceived gay male applicant might be encouraged to predominantly handle interpersonal communication and relations due to their supposed femininity.

I did not find support for Hypothesis 8; individuals did not rate lesbian applicants significantly lower in femininity compared to heterosexual female applicants. There are many possible explanations for lack of support for this hypothesis. For example, the effect might not

exist; individuals might not perceive lesbians as less feminine than heterosexual females. Another possible explanation might be that resume type, either managerial or nursing, has an effect on the individual's perception of the femininity of the applicant. However, a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of covariance indicated that job-type did not have a significant main effect for ratings of femininity.

I did not find support for Hypothesis 5. Individuals did not rate gay male applicants significantly lower in masculinity compared to heterosexual males, but rather rated gay male applicants significantly higher in masculinity. Given past research, it is unlikely that individuals would perceive gay males as more masculine than heterosexual males. A plausible explanation for this result is that individuals in the gay male resume condition were aware of sexual orientation manipulation and its significance in the study. As a result the individuals rated the applicant in a manner incongruent with commonly held stereotypical beliefs about gay males. Another possible explanation might be that resume type, either managerial or nursing, had an effect on the individual's perception of the masculinity of the applicant. However, a 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of covariance indicated that job-type had no main effect for masculinity ratings.

I found support for Hypothesis 9; individuals rated lesbian applicants significantly higher in masculinity compared to heterosexual female applicants. This result suggests that individuals perceive lesbians to be more masculine than heterosexual females in accordance with the inversion theory. Discussion for this result is similar to that mentioned above with Hypothesis 4. For example, a perceived lesbian applicant might be encouraged to predominantly handle transactional duties rather than interpersonal relations due to their supposed masculinity.

Qualification Hypotheses

I did not find support for Hypotheses 10; Individuals did not rate managerial resumes reflecting gay male applicants significantly lower in qualification compared to managerial resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. A possible explanation for a lack of support for this hypothesis is that the effect might not exist; individuals might not perceive gay males as less qualified than heterosexual males when applying for a managerial position. Another alternative explanation for this result is that individuals in the gay male resume condition were aware of sexual orientation manipulation and its significance in the study. As a result the individuals rate the applicant in a socially desirable manner.

I did not find support for Hypothesis 11; individuals did not rate nursing resumes reflecting gay male applicants significantly higher in qualification compared to nursing resumes reflecting heterosexual male applicants. A possible explanation for a lack of support for this hypothesis is that the effect might not exist; individuals might not perceive gay males as more qualified than heterosexual males when applying for a nursing position. Another possible explanation is that individuals might discriminate against gay males, perceiving that the applicant is not qualified solely based on the fact that the applicant is homosexual. However, in my analysis of the hypothesis I controlled for gender role attitudes, attitudes toward gay males, and attitudes toward the legality of discrimination against homosexuals. Furthermore, nursing resumes reflecting heterosexual males did not receive significantly higher ratings in qualification compared to nursing resumes reflecting gay male applicants. Thus, discrimination is unlikely. I did not find support for Hypothesis 12; individuals did not rate managerial resumes reflecting lesbian applicants significantly higher in qualification compared to managerial resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. Possible explanations for a lack of support for the hypothesis are similar to those discussed for Hypothesis 11. Also, I did not find support for

Hypothesis 13; individuals did not rate nursing resumes reflecting lesbian applicants significantly lower in qualification compared to nursing resumes reflecting heterosexual female applicants. Possible explanations for a lack of support for the hypothesis are similar to those discussed for Hypothesis 10.

Theoretical Implications

Results suggest that individuals attributed atypical sex traits to gay males in regard to femininity and lesbians in regard to masculinity. These findings partially support past research examining individuals' use of stereotypical traits when assessing characteristics of lesbians and gay males (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Madon, 1997). Individuals perceived lesbians as being more masculine than heterosexual females and gay males as being more feminine than heterosexual males. These perceptions are partially consistent with the idea that femininity and masculinity in lesbians and gay males mirror differences between women and men in an atypical fashion (Lippa, 2005).

Results of hypotheses concerning agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability were not consistent with findings of past research examining differences between gay males and heterosexual males (Lippa, 1997, 2000, 2005, 2008). Nor do the results mirror differences found between females and males (Feingold, 1994; Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001). Results of Hypothesis 7, regarding emotional stability, were not consistent with findings of past research examining differences between lesbians and heterosexual females (Lippa, 1997, 2000, 2005, 2008). This result, along with lack of support for Hypothesis 6, does not mirror differences found between males and females in past research (Feingold, 1994; Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001). Past research supports a majority of stereotypes aligning with the inversion theory; however, the current results suggest that individuals might not adhere to

these stereotypes. In addition, not all homosexual individuals possess gender atypical traits, and similarly, not all heterosexuals possess gender typical traits.

Lack of support for the hypotheses stating that gay males would receive higher ratings of qualification for nursing positions compared to heterosexual males and lesbians would receive higher ratings of qualification for managerial positions compared to heterosexual females was inconsistent with past research (Glick, Zion, & Nelson, 1988). The results suggest that applicants whom individuals perceive to break traditional gender roles, in this scenario gay males and lesbians, might not have an advantage in those jobs that are feminine-typed and masculine-typed, respectively. Non-support for the hypotheses stating that gay males would receive lower ratings of qualification for managerial positions compared to heterosexual males and lesbians would receive lower ratings of qualification for nursing positions compared to heterosexual females was inconsistent with the notion of *backlash effect* (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 2001, 1999). Applicants whom individuals perceive to break traditional gender roles, in this scenario gay males and lesbians, might not be at a disadvantage when applying for those jobs that are masculine-typed and feminine-typed, respectively. Alternatively, lack of support for these hypotheses might have resulted from my manipulation (i.e., sexual orientation resume cues) not being strong enough to elicit these effects. If these effects do occur in interpersonal situations, this would indicate that the resume lacks these characteristics.

Practical Implications

Partial support for the hypotheses concerning masculinity and femininity could help individuals become aware of stereotypical perceptions they might hold of both homosexual and heterosexual individuals. Although not suggested in qualification ratings, these masculinity and

femininity results could present possible biases individuals, possibly managers and human resource professionals, might have in the hiring process when applicants are applying for certain sex-typed jobs. Results suggest that homosexuals and heterosexuals alike should not be at an advantage or disadvantage when applying for certain sex-typed jobs. Information from this study can also be useful for applicants when applying for traditionally sex-typed positions. If individuals make inferences about an applicant's sexual orientation from cues such as organization affiliation in a resume, but do not adopt stereotypic perceptions, applicants might not need to evaluate what information they include in their resume in regard to sexual orientation identification.

However, given the nature of this sample, the behavior of managers and other human resource professionals is unknown. Due to lack of generalizability, it is advised that professionals in the workforce should not hire on the basis of stereotypical traits that align with the traditionally perceived nature of the job, but instead should focus on the qualification of the applicant in regard to past job experience and other related factors. Likewise, applicants might want to be careful with what information they disclose in their resume. Further research involving managers and other human resource professionals is needed to clarify these issues.

Future Research

Future research should include a study in which one adds a gender neutral position along with a masculine and feminine position, and uses managers and human resource professionals as a sample. By including a gender neutral position, one might further examine whether the nature of past job experiences in these resumes affect the individual's perceived masculinity, femininity, extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness of the applicant. Further, by using a sample of managers and human resource professionals, one can

increase the generalizability of the results to managers and human resource professionals in the workforce.

In another future study, one could include a resume cue that is ambiguous in regard to manipulation of sexual orientation. An example of an ambiguous cue is “Gay, Bisexual, and Straight Alliance” where the sexual orientation of the applicant is questionable. Individuals could infer that the applicant is heterosexual, homosexual, or possibly bisexual. One could also include cues that pertain specifically to bisexuality such as “Bisexual Pride.” In this study one could examine individuals’ perceptions of personality and qualification decisions for certain types of jobs with homosexual, heterosexual, and bisexual applicants.

An additional study one could conduct would include two resumes for each sex-typed position. One could examine a fully crossed design where each possible combination of resumes reflecting different sexual orientations can be matched up. This design would allow one to further examine differences in individuals’ personality rating and qualification rating differences between gay males and heterosexual males and lesbians and heterosexual females. A second resume would also offer a reference for the participants when rating personality and qualification.

Limitations

As stated before, I used a student sample for this study, which hinders the generalizability of the results to managers and other human resource professionals whom evaluate resumes in the workforce. I used only a managerial position as a masculine-typed job and a nursing position as a feminine-typed job, which hinders the generalizability of the results to all sex-typed jobs. A possible limitation of this study is that I did not include a gender- neutral sex-typed position. If I would include a gender neutral position I might be able to further examine whether the nature of

past job experiences in these resumes affect the individual's perceived masculinity, femininity, agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness of the applicant. Another possible limitation is that I had participants rate only one resume. I did not allow participants to examine a second resume as a means to compare the applicant to other possibly qualified applicants. If I would add a second resume, I could examine individuals' personality rating and qualification rating differences between gay males and heterosexual males and lesbians and heterosexual females further. This additional resume would be particularly helpful in examining these differences if I paired gay male and heterosexual male resumes in one viewing and lesbian and heterosexual female resumes in another viewing.

Another limitation concerns homogeneity of variance issues. Specific conditions resulted in violation of homogeneity of variance in regard to specific variables. Suppression of variability results in low critical F values. However, I am not concerned with this result given the robustness of ANCOVA regarding homogeneity of variance violations (Keppel, 1991), the between subjects design, sample size, and orthogonal relationships amongst variables. In addition, the results of the ANCOVAs were not the focus of this study.

Conclusions

Individuals' perceptions of personality traits and other characteristics of gay male and lesbian applicants, especially if based on stereotypical beliefs, could be critical when making employment decisions for gender typical positions. In the current study I examined participants' perceptions of personality and characteristics in gay male and lesbian applicants and participants' potential employment decisions in these applicants in managerial and nursing positions. I found partial support for hypotheses concerning femininity and masculinity, suggesting that in regard to some individual traits individuals perceive gay male and lesbian applicants as gender atypical.

Results did not suggest that gay male and lesbian applicants will be at a disadvantage when applying for positions that are traditionally viewed as masculine and feminine, respectively. Nor will gay male and lesbian applicants necessarily have an advantage when applying for positions that are traditionally viewed as feminine and masculine, respectively. However, due to the nature of the sample in the current study, further research involving managers and other human resource professionals is needed to sufficiently address this research topic. Due to such factors as age and work experience, managers and other human resource professionals might have different perceptions of gay male and lesbian applicants compared to undergraduates and might have different behaviors in regard to personality and qualification ratings. Results from my study contribute to several different areas of study including, discrimination against gay male and lesbian applicants, perceptions of gay males and lesbians, the use of these perceptions in employment outcomes, and the use of resume cues in employment outcomes.

Appendix A

Masculinity/Femininity Items BSRI (Bem, 1974) and PAQ (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974)

BSRI Masculine Items

Analytical
Defends own beliefs
Forceful
Individualistic
Masculine
Self-reliant
Self-sufficient
Strong personality
Willing to take risks
Aggressive
Dominant
Assertive

Overlapping Items

Acts as a leader
Ambitious
Competitive
Independent
Makes decisions easily
Willing to take a stand
Athletic
Good at sports

PAQ Masculine Items

Not easily influenced
Skilled in business
Knows ways of world
Outspoken
Interested in sex
Not give up easily
Self confident
Feels superior
Stands up under pressure
Forward
Not excitable, minor crisis
Active
Adventurous
Intellectual
Not timid

BSRI Feminine Items

Feminine
Affectionate
Cheerful
Childlike
Compassionate
Does not use harsh language
Eager to soothe hurt feelings
Flatterable
Gullible
Loyal
Soft spoken
Yielding
Sensitive to the needs of others
Shy
Sympathetic

Overlapping Items

Gentle
Tender
Loves/Likes children
Understanding
Warm

PAQ Feminine Items

Not hide emotions
Tactful
Strong conscience
Kind
Neat
Enjoys art and music
Emotional
Considerate
Grateful
Devotes self to others
Helpful to others
Aware, other feelings
Creative

Note. Italicized traits overlap with the Big Five and are excluded from study.

Appendix B

Personality Items

Personality Items Derived from Big-Five Factor Structure markers (Goldberg, 1992)

Energetic (*E*)
Inefficient (*C*)*
High-strung (*ES*)*
Philosophical (*O*)
Bashful (*E*)*
Uncooperative (*A*)*
Thorough (*C*)
Unenvious (*ES*)
Uninquisitive (*O*)*
Quiet (*E*)*
Cold (*A*)*
Cooperative (*A*)
Undependable (*C*)*
Moody (*ES*)*
Innovative (*O*)
Verbal (*E*)
Generous (*A*)
Sloppy (*C*)*
Self-pitying (*ES*)*
Unimaginative (*O*)*
Talkative (*E*)
Uncharitable (*A*)*
Organized (*C*)
Temperamental (*ES*)*
Introspective (*O*)
Vigorous (*E*)
Selfish (*A*)*
Careless (*C*)*
Relaxed (*ES*)
Imaginative (*O*)

Note. *E* = Extraversion, *A* = Agreeableness, *C* = Conscientiousness, *ES* = Emotional Stability, *O* = Openness and * denotes reversed scored item.

Appendix C

Qualification Ratings

1. Please rate how qualified the applicant is for a managerial (nursing) position in a company (hospital). (Give a number on a scale of 0 to 50. Here are anchors points to help assess what a certain number corresponds to.)

0 = Extremely Unqualified
10 = Reasonably Unqualified
20 = Barely Qualified
30 = Adequately Qualified
40 = Reasonably Qualified
50 = Extremely Qualified
2. How suitable is this applicant for the position you reviewed?
3. How likely would you want to work with this individual?
4. How likely would you see yourself working under this individual?
5. How likely are you to recommend this applicant for the position compared to other reasonably qualified applicants?
6. How likely would you offer this individual an interview?
7. How likely would this individual be to get a bonus their first year?
8. Would you recommend this applicant to be interviewed?
9. The starting salary for this position ranges from \$50,000 to \$70,000. What starting salary would you recommend for this applicant if they were hired?

Appendix D

Check Questions

Reviewing Job Description

1. What is one of the primary tasks for this position?
2. What are the educational requirements for this position?
3. What are the experience requirements for this position?

Evaluating Resume

1. What is the applicant's name?
2. How many jobs are listed in this applicant's work history?
3. What past organizations has this individual been involved in?
4. What undergraduate degree does this applicant have?
5. What organizations is this applicant currently involved in?

Responding to Scales

1. Answer *Disagree* for this question.

Appendix E

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Items

The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (ATLG; Herek, 1984)

The Attitudes Toward Lesbians (ATL) Subscale

1. Lesbians just can't fit into our society.
2. A woman's homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation.*
3. Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes.
4. State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior should be loosened.*
5. Female homosexuality is a sin.
6. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals.
7. Female homosexuality in itself is no problem, but what society makes of it can be a problem.*
8. Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions.
9. Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality.
10. Lesbians are sick.

The Attitudes Toward Gay Men (ATG) Subscale

1. Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples.*
2. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.
3. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school.
4. Male homosexuality is a perversion.
5. Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men.*
6. If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them.
7. I would not be too upset if I learned that my son was a homosexual.*
8. Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.
9. The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me.
10. Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned.*

Note. * indicates reversed scored item.

Appendix F

Beliefs on Discrimination in Workplace Items

1. Is discrimination against sexual orientation legal in your state of residence?
2. What state do you live in?
3. Do you believe it should be legal to discriminate against sexual orientation?
4. Do you believe it is fair to discriminate against sexual orientation?

Workplace Setting Policies Items

1. Does your workplace have policies prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination?
2. Does your workplace have policies prohibiting sexual harassment against sexual orientation?
3. Does your workplace have social diversity affirming policies?

Appendix G

Gender Role Attitude Items

Due to copyright only a sample of items from the Sex-Role Egalitarian Scale (SRES; Beere, King, Beere, & King; 1984) can be provided.

1. Male managers are more valuable to an organization than female managers.
2. A male nurse cannot be as effective as a female nurse.
3. Men and women are equally qualified for law enforcement jobs.

Appendix H

Manipulation Checks

Sexual Orientation

1. Did you notice the sexual orientation of the applicant?
2. If so, what sexual orientation?

Masculinity/Femininity of Job Type

3. Which of the following best describes the managerial (nursing) job in regard to what kind of personality it requires to perform the job adequately?
 - a. Dominantly masculine in personality.
 - b. Dominantly feminine in personality.
 - c. Neither dominantly masculine nor feminine in personality.
 - d. High in both masculinity and femininity in personality.
 - e. Low in both masculinity and femininity in personality.
 - e. Not sure.

Social Political Orientation of Job

1. How likely is an employee in this position to have a conservative social political affiliation?
2. How likely is an employee in this position to have a liberal social political affiliation?

Social Political Orientation of Applicant

1. How likely is the social political affiliation of this applicant a conservative social political affiliation?
2. How likely is the social political affiliation of this applicant a liberal social political affiliation?

Appendix I

Demographic Items

1. Gender
2. Ethnicity
3. Age
4. Sexual Orientation
5. Hometown Setting
6. Religion
7. Are you currently employed?
8. Have you been employed in the past?
9. What is/was your job title?
10. How long have you had your current job (or how long did you have your last job)?
11. How many gay males do you personally know?
12. How many lesbians do you personally know?

Appendix J

Hello, I'm Megan Morris and I'm an Industrial/Organizational Psychology graduate student. You are invited to take part in a research study. The purpose of this research is to better understand what qualifications are used in assessing hirability in general managerial (nursing) positions. Your role in the research is to provide responses to a series of questions which will take about 30 minutes to complete.

Your participation is voluntary. There are no known risks in participating in this research. There are no direct benefits from participation in this study. However, participants will receive 1 credit through SONA for participating in the study. This study is anonymous. No information on your identity will be collected. Only aggregate data will be presented or published.

You are free to refuse to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits.

If you have any questions about this research study you may contact the researchers at the number below. If you have general questions about giving consent or your rights as a research participant in this research study, you can call the Wright State University Institutional Review Board at 937-775-4462.

Megan Morris
morris.156@wright.edu
or
Gary N. Burns, Ph.D.
gary.burns@wright.edu

Wright State University
3640 Colonel Glenn Highway
Dayton, OH 45435

1. Do you consent to participate in this research?

Yes
No

Appendix K

Job Description

Title: Staff Nurse

Description: The staff nurse will evaluate patients' needs and health problems, maintain records, develop and implement nursing care plans. They will administer nursing care to injured, ill, or disabled patients.

Key responsibilities:

- Monitor, record, and report symptoms and changes in patients' conditions.
- Maintain accurate, detailed reports and records.
- Direct and supervise less skilled nursing or health career personnel.
- Monitor all aspects of patient care, including diet and physical activity.

Requirements:

- Nursing degree and RN certification
- Nursing experience

Salary Information: \$50,000 - \$70,000, depending on experience.

Title: Industrial Production Manager

Description: The production manager will plan, direct, and coordinate the work activities and resources necessary for manufacturing products. These actions must be in accordance with quality, quantity, and cost specifications.

Key responsibilities:

- Direct and coordinate production, processing, and distribution.
- Review processing schedules and production orders.
- Hire, train, evaluate, and discharge staff.
- Set and monitor product standards.

Requirements:

- Degree in business administration or related field.
- Managerial experience

Salary Information: \$50,000 - \$70,000, depending on experience.

Appendix L

Resumes

Gay Male Managerial Resume

Charles E. Smith

805 Long Hollow Dr. #132

Columbus, OH 43224

(614) 545-0161

charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University

May 2005

Bachelor of Science, Business Administration, Finance

Magna cum Laude graduate

Beta Gamma Sigma (National Business Honorary)

Gay and Lesbian Alliance

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mechatronics** Columbus, OH
Regional Manager
- Initiated and managed over ten multi-million projects with Ohio firms to integrate automation.
 - Researched new and emerging markets to identify areas of growth potential and provide to product design.
 - Developed strategic partnership that increased revenues more than 100%.
 - Led independent representative and distributors to increase sales over 500% on average.
- 2005-2008 **Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals** Columbus, OH
Assistant Manager
- Developed call cycle efficiency program for Ohio area reps that resulted in an average increase of 1.5 doctor visits per day for central Ohio team.
 - Created a managed care initiative to increase brand awareness and market Boehringer Ingelheim medications to HMO formulary boards that resulted in a 23% increase in territory sales.
 - Achieved sales increase of over 30%, recognized by regional office as a “rookie of the year” candidate.
- 2004-2005 **Trust Company Ohio** Columbus, OH
Equity Research Intern
- Completed a comprehensive overview and analysis of the asset management industry including secular trends, the competitive landscape, company valuations, and investment opportunities.
 - Presented an industry investment thesis, framework, and specific recommendations to TCO research analysts and portfolio managers.

Organizations

National Business Association

Gay Men’s Health Crisis (GMHC)

Appendix L-1

Gay Male Nursing Resume

Charles E. Smith
805 Long Hollow Dr. #132
Columbus, OH 43224
(614) 545-0161
charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University May 2005
Bachelor of Science, Nursing
Magna cum Laude graduate
Sigma Theta Tau (The Honor Society of Nursing)
Gay and Lesbian Alliance

License

Ohio Registered Nurse License June 2005

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mount Carmel West Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse, Unit Leader
- Provided nursing care to surgical patients.
 - Completed pre-operative and post-operative procedures.
 - Performed physical assessments, administered medications/IV fluids, and monitored recovery progress.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Operated and inserted Foley catheters and nasogastric feeding tubes, and monitored intake and output.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2005-2008 **Doctors Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse
- Assisted with the admittance and discharge of patients.
 - Performed clinical tasks according to hospital policies.
 - Monitored and maintained patient charts.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Assisted in the orientation of new staff members.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2004-2005 **Apple Grove Retirement Home** Columbus, OH
Nursing Aid
- Assisted nursing staff in the care of all patients including bathing, changing, and feeding.
 - Charted and documented activities.
 - Managed confidential patient files.

Organizations

American Nurses Association
Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC)

Appendix L-2

Heterosexual Male Managerial Resume

Charles E. Smith
805 Long Hollow Dr. #132
Columbus, OH 43224
(614) 545-0161
charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University May 2005
Bachelor of Science, Business Administration, Finance
Magna cum Laude graduate
Beta Gamma Sigma (National Business Honorary)
Ohio State Student Activities Group

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mechatronics** Columbus, OH
Regional Manager
- Initiated and managed over ten multi-million projects with Ohio firms to integrate automation.
 - Researched new and emerging markets to identify areas of growth potential and provide to product design.
 - Developed strategic partnership that increased revenues more than 100%.
 - Led independent representative and distributors to increase sales over 500% on average.
- 2005-2008 **Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals** Columbus, OH
Assistant Manager
- Developed call cycle efficiency program for Ohio area reps that resulted in an average increase of 1.5 doctor visits per day for central Ohio team.
 - Created a managed care initiative to increase brand awareness and market Boehringer Ingelheim medications to HMO formulary boards that resulted in a 23% increase in territory sales.
 - Achieved sales increase of over 30%, recognized by regional office as a “rookie of the year” candidate.
- 2004-2005 **Trust Company Ohio** Columbus, OH
Equity Research Intern
- Completed a comprehensive overview and analysis of the asset management industry including secular trends, the competitive landscape, company valuations, and investment opportunities.
 - Presented an industry investment thesis, framework, and specific recommendations to TCO research analysts and portfolio managers.

Organizations

National Business Association
American Red Cross

Appendix L-3

Heterosexual Male Nursing Resume

Charles E. Smith
805 Long Hollow Dr. #132
Columbus, OH 43224
(614) 545-0161
charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University May 2005
Bachelor of Science, Nursing
Magna cum Laude graduate
Sigma Theta Tau (The Honor Society of Nursing)
Ohio State Student Activities Group

License

Ohio Registered Nurse License June 2005

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mount Carmel West Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse, Unit Leader
- Provided nursing care to surgical patients.
 - Completed pre-operative and post-operative procedures.
 - Performed physical assessments, administered medications/IV fluids, and monitored recovery progress.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Operated and inserted Foley catheters and nasogastric feeding tubes, and monitored intake and output.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2005-2008 **Doctors Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse
- Assisted with the admittance and discharge of patients.
 - Performed clinical tasks according to hospital policies.
 - Monitored and maintained patient charts.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Assisted in the orientation of new staff members.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2004-2005 **Apple Grove Retirement Home** Columbus, OH
Nursing Aid
- Assisted nursing staff in the care of all patients including bathing, changing, and feeding.
 - Charted and documented activities.
 - Managed confidential patient files.

Organizations

American Nurses Association
American Red Cross

Appendix L-4

Lesbian Managerial Resume

Sarah E. Smith
805 Long Hollow Dr. #132
Columbus, OH 43224
(614) 545-0161
charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University May 2005
Bachelor of Science, Business Administration, Finance
Magna cum Laude graduate
Beta Gamma Sigma (National Business Honorary)
Gay and Lesbian Alliance

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mechatronics** Columbus, OH
Regional Manager
- Initiated and managed over ten multi-million projects with Ohio firms to integrate automation.
 - Researched new and emerging markets to identify areas of growth potential and provide to product design.
 - Developed strategic partnership that increased revenues more than 100%.
 - Led independent representative and distributors to increase sales over 500% on average.
- 2005-2008 **Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals** Columbus, OH
Assistant Manager
- Developed call cycle efficiency program for Ohio area reps that resulted in an average increase of 1.5 doctor visits per day for central Ohio team.
 - Created a managed care initiative to increase brand awareness and market Boehringer Ingelheim medications to HMO formulary boards that resulted in a 23% increase in territory sales.
 - Achieved sales increase of over 30%, recognized by regional office as a “rookie of the year” candidate.
- 2004-2005 **Trust Company Ohio** Columbus, OH
Equity Research Intern
- Completed a comprehensive overview and analysis of the asset management industry including secular trends, the competitive landscape, company valuations, and investment opportunities.
 - Presented an industry investment thesis, framework, and specific recommendations to TCO research analysts and portfolio managers.

Organizations

National Business Association
National Lesbian Health Organization

Appendix L-5

Lesbian Nursing Resume

Sarah E. Smith

805 Long Hollow Dr. #132

Columbus, OH 43224

(614) 545-0161

charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University May 2005
Bachelor of Science, Nursing
Magna cum Laude graduate
Sigma Theta Tau (The Honor Society of Nursing)
Gay and Lesbian Alliance

License

Ohio Registered Nurse License June 2005

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mount Carmel West Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse, Unit Leader
- Provided nursing care to surgical patients.
 - Completed pre-operative and post-operative procedures.
 - Performed physical assessments, administered medications/IV fluids, and monitored recovery progress.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Operated and inserted Foley catheters and nasogastric feeding tubes, and monitored intake and output.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2005-2008 **Doctors Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse
- Assisted with the admittance and discharge of patients.
 - Performed clinical tasks according to hospital policies.
 - Monitored and maintained patient charts.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Assisted in the orientation of new staff members.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2004-2005 **Apple Grove Retirement Home** Columbus, OH
Nursing Aid
- Assisted nursing staff in the care of all patients including bathing, changing, and feeding.
 - Charted and documented activities.
 - Managed confidential patient files.

Organizations

American Nurses Association
National Lesbian Health Organization

Appendix L-6

Heterosexual Female Managerial Resume

Sarah E. Smith
805 Long Hollow Dr. #132
Columbus, OH 43224
(614) 545-0161
charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University May 2005
Bachelor of Science, Business Administration, Finance
Magna cum Laude graduate
Beta Gamma Sigma (National Business Honorary)
Ohio State Student Activities Group

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mechatronics** Columbus, OH
Regional Manager
- Initiated and managed over ten multi-million projects with Ohio firms to integrate automation.
 - Researched new and emerging markets to identify areas of growth potential and provide to product design.
 - Developed strategic partnership that increased revenues more than 100%.
 - Led independent representative and distributors to increase sales over 500% on average.
- 2005-2008 **Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals** Columbus, OH
Assistant Manager
- Developed call cycle efficiency program for Ohio area reps that resulted in an average increase of 1.5 doctor visits per day for central Ohio team.
 - Created a managed care initiative to increase brand awareness and market Boehringer Ingelheim medications to HMO formulary boards that resulted in a 23% increase in territory sales.
 - Achieved sales increase of over 30%, recognized by regional office as a “rookie of the year” candidate.
- 2004-2005 **Trust Company Ohio** Columbus, OH
Equity Research Intern
- Completed a comprehensive overview and analysis of the asset management industry including secular trends, the competitive landscape, company valuations, and investment opportunities.
 - Presented an industry investment thesis, framework, and specific recommendations to TCO research analysts and portfolio managers.

Organizations

National Business Association
American Red Cross

Appendix L-7

Heterosexual Female Nursing Resume

Sarah E. Smith
805 Long Hollow Dr. #132
Columbus, OH 43224
(614) 545-0161
charles.e.burns@gmail.com

Education

The Ohio State University May 2005
Bachelor of Science, Nursing
Magna cum Laude graduate
Sigma Theta Tau (The Honor Society of Nursing)
Ohio State Student Activities Group

License

Ohio Registered Nurse License June 2005

Experience

- 2008-2010 **Mount Carmel West Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse, Unit Leader
- Provided nursing care to surgical patients.
 - Completed pre-operative and post-operative procedures.
 - Performed physical assessments, administered medications/IV fluids, and monitored recovery progress.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Operated and inserted Foley catheters and nasogastric feeding tubes, and monitored intake and output.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2005-2008 **Doctors Hospital** Columbus, OH
Staff Nurse
- Assisted with the admittance and discharge of patients.
 - Performed clinical tasks according to hospital policies.
 - Monitored and maintained patient charts.
 - Assessed patient conditions and advised of changes in status.
 - Assisted in the orientation of new staff members.
 - Assisted patients and family members in the education of health care needs.
- 2004-2005 **Apple Grove Retirement Home** Columbus, OH
Nursing Aid
- Assisted nursing staff in the care of all patients including bathing, changing, and feeding.
 - Charted and documented activities.
 - Managed confidential patient files.

Organizations

American Nurses Association
American Red Cross

REFERENCES

- Badgett, M. V., Lau, H., Sears, B., & Ho, D. (2007). *Bias in the workplace: Consistent evidence of sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination*. Los Angeles: The Williams Institute, University of California.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 9-30.
- Beere, C. A., King, D. W., Beere, D. B., & King, L. A. (1984). The Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale: A measure of attitudes toward equality between the sexes. *Sex Roles*, 10, 563-576.
- Bem, S. (1978). *Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Manual, Test Booklet, Scoring Key*. Redwood City: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
- Blashill, A. J., & Powlishta, K. K. (2009). Gay stereotypes: The use of sexual orientation as a cue for gender-related attributes. *Sex Roles*, 61, 783-793.
- Brown, B. K., & Campion, M. A. (1994). Biodata phenomenology: Recruiters' perceptions and use of biographical information in resume screening. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 897-908.
- Brunswik, E. (1956). *Perception and the representative design of psychological experiments*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2005). The law and human resource management. In *Applied psychology in human resource management* (6th ed.) (pp. 15-43). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Cole, M.S., Field, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Harris, S. G. (2004). Job type and recruiters' inferences of applicant personality drawn from resume biodata: Their relationships with hiring recommendations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *12*, 363-367.
- Cole, M. S., Rubin, R. S., Feild, H.S., & Giles, W. F. (2007). Recruiters' perceptions and use of applicant resume information: Screening the recent graduate. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *56*, 319-343.
- Costa, P. T. Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 322-331.
- Croteau, J. M. (1996). Research on the work experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: An integrative review of methodology and findings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *48*, 195-209.
- Croteau, J. M., & Lark, J. S. (2009). On being lesbian, gay or bisexual in student affairs: A national survey of experiences on the job. *NASPA Journal*, *46*, 382-394.
- Crow, S. M., Fok, L. Y., & Hartman, S. J. (1998). Who is at greatest risk of work-related discrimination-women, blacks, or homosexuals? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *11*, 15-26.
- Day, N. E., & Greene, P. G. (2008). A case for sexual orientation diversity management in small and large organizations. *Human Resource Management*, *47*, 637-654.
- Elmslie, B., & Tebaldi, E. (2007). Sexual orientation and labor market discrimination. *Journal of Labor Research*, *28*, 436-453.
- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*, 429-456.

- Garcia-Retamero, R., & Lopez-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55*, 51-61.
- Glick, P., Zion, C., & Nelson, C. (1988). What mediates sex discrimination in hiring decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 178-186.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*, 26-42.
- Gosling, S. D., Ko, S. J., Mannarelli, T., & Morris, M. E. (2002). A room with a cue: Personality judgments based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 379-398.
- Hakel, M. D., Dobmeyer, T. W., & Dunnette, M. D. (1970). Relative importance of three content dimensions in overall suitability ratings of job applicants' resumes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 54*, 65-71.
- Hebl, M. R., Foster, J. B., Mannix, L. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). Formal and interpersonal discrimination: A field study of bias toward homosexual applicants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 815-825.
- Herek, G. M. (1984). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: A factor analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 39-51.
- Herek, G. M. (1987a). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*, 285-303.
- Herek, G. M. (1987b). Religious orientation and prejudice: A comparison of racial and sexual attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13*, 34-44.
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research, 25*, 451-477.

- Horvath, M., & Ryan, M. A. (2003). Antecedents and potential moderators of the relationship between attitudes and hiring discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. *Sex Roles, 48*, 115-130.
- Human Rights Campaign. (2010). *Issues: Workplace*. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/issues/workplace/workplace_intro.asp
- Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and Analysis: A Researcher's Handbook* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1990). Abbreviated measures of Sex Role Egalitarian Attitudes. *Sex Roles, 23*, 659-673.
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*, 83-96.
- Lippa, R. (1991). Some psychometric characteristics of gender diagnosticity measures: reliability, validity, and consistency across domains, and relationship to the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 1000-1011.
- Lippa, R. A. (2000). Gender-related traits in gay men, lesbian women, and heterosexual men and women: The virtual identity of homosexual-heterosexual diagnosticity and gender diagnosticity. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 900-926.
- Lippa, R. A. (2002). Gender-related traits of heterosexual and homosexual men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 31*, 83-98.
- Lippa, R. A. (2005a). Sexual orientation and personality. *Annual Review of Sex Research, 16*, 119-153.

- Lippa, R. A. (2005b). How do lay people weight information about instrumentality, expressiveness, and gender-typed hobbies when judging masculinity-femininity in themselves, best friends, and strangers. *Sex Roles, 53*, 43-55.
- Lippa, R. A. (2008). Sex differences and sexual orientation differences in personality: Findings from the BBC Internet Survey. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 37*, 173-187.
- Lippa, R., & Arad, S. (1997). The structure of sexual orientation and its relation to masculinity, femininity, and gender diagnosticity: Different for Men and Women. *Sex Roles, 37*, 187-208.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). Stereotypes as defense, In *Public Opinion* (pp. 95- 103). New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.
- Lyons, P. M., Jr., DeValve, M. J., & Garner, R. L. (2008). Texas police chiefs' attitudes toward gay and lesbian police officers. *Police Quarterly, 11*, 102-117.
- Madon, S. (1997). What do people believe about gay males? A study of stereotype content and strength. *Sex Roles, 37*, 663-685.
- Nemanick, R. C. Jr., & Clark, E. M. (2002). The differential effects of extracurricular activities on attributions in resume evaluation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 206-217.
- Phelan, J. E., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Competent yet out in the cold: Shifting criteria for hiring reflect backlash toward agentic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 406-413.
- Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: Have the times changed? *Journal of Management, 28*, 177-193.

- Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1244-1261.
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 629-645.
- Rudman, L. A. & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 1004-1010.
- Rudman, L. A. & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 743-762.
- Spence, J. T., & Buckner, C. E. (2000). Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, and sexist attitudes: What do they signify? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 44-62.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. *Journal Supplement Abstract Service Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4*, 43. (Ms. No. 617)
- Strachey, J., & Freud, S. (1975). *Three essays on the theory of sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Van Hove, G., & Lievens, F. (2003). The effects of sexual orientation on hirability ratings: An experimental study. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 18*, 15-30.
- Weichselbaumer, D. (2003). Sexual orientation discrimination in hiring. *Labour Economics, 10*, 629-642.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix of Covariates

Covariate	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Job Conserv	284	3.17	.89	-----								
2. Job Liberal	284	3.14	.85	-.24**	-----							
3. App Conserv	284	2.74	.96	.36**	-.04	-----						
4. App Liberal	283	3.42	.95	.05	.28**	-.56**	-----					
5. Job Masc	284	.17	.38	.06	-.13*	-.00	-.03	-----				
6. Job Fem	284	.15	.36	-.11	.07	-.04	.06	-.19**	-----			
7. Job Neither	284	.34	.48	.04	.04	.02	-.00	-.33**	-.30**	-----		
8. Att Gender	284	4.20	.49	-.05	.06	-.14*	.03	.01	.03	.07	-----	
9. Att Les & Gay	284	2.23	.87	.09	.03	.11	-.02	-.05	.09	-.08	-.51**	-----
10. Discr Legal	175	.18	.39	-.02	.02	-.09	.04	-.16*	-.12	.19*	.12	-.12
11. Bel Legal	269	.09	.29	-.06	.13*	.05	.01	-.08	.08	.04	-.06	.21**
12. Fair Discr	272	.08	.27	-.01	-.02	-.06	.04	.00	-.01	-.02	-.11	.27**
13. Wrk Discr P	169	.49	.50	-.10	.02	-.09	.09	.13	.15*	-.06	.12	-.04
14. Wrk Sex P	158	.90	.30	.05	-.05	.01	-.02	.09	.03	-.00	.07	-.03
15. Wrk Affirm	117	.79	.41	-.18	-.08	-.16	.10	-.08	.03	.02	.04	-.02
16. Age	280	20.52	4.28	.04	-.06	-.06	.03	-.04	-.04	.13*	.11	.06
17. Gender	283	1.36	.48	.01	.06	.02	.02	-.01	.03	.04	-.18**	.21**

Notes. $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$ Job Conserv = conservative social political affiliation of job, Job Liberal = liberal social political affiliation of job, App Conserv = conservative social political affiliation of applicant, App Liberal = liberal social political affiliation of applicant, Job Masc = masculinity of job, Job Fem = femininity of job, Job Neither = job neither masculine or feminine, Att Gender = gender role attitudes, Att Les & Gay = attitudes toward lesbians and gay males, Discr Legal = believe that it is illegal to discriminate against sexual orientation, Bel Legal = believe it should be legal to discriminate against sexual orientation, Fair Discr = believe it is fair to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, Wrk Discr P = workplace has policies prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination, Wrk Sex P = workplace has policies prohibiting sexual harassment against sexual orientation, Wrk Affirm = workplace has policies affirming social diversity, Age = participant age, Gender = participant gender.

Table 1 (Continued)

Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix of Covariates

Covariate	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Job Conserv								
2. Job Liberal								
3. App Conserv								
4. App Liberal								
5. Job Masc								
6. Job Fem								
7. Job Neither								
8. Att Gender								
9. Att Les & Gay								
10. Discr Legal	-----							
11. Bel Legal	.25**	-----						
12. Fair Discr	.07	.27**	-----					
13. Wrk Discr P	-.05	-.06	-.03	-----				
14. Wrk Sex P	.03	.02	.03	.31**	-----			
15. Wrk Affirm	.02	.01	.07	.36**	.55**	-----		
16. Age	.05	-.02	.07	.21**	.01	.05	-----	
17. Gender	.07	.03	.06	.21**	.16*	-.04	.17**	-----

Notes. $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$ Job Conserv = conservative social political affiliation of job, Job Liberal = liberal social political affiliation of job, App Conserv = conservative social political affiliation of applicant, App Liberal = liberal social political affiliation of applicant, Job Masc = masculinity of job, Job Fem = femininity of job, Job Neither = job neither masculine or feminine, Att Gender = gender role attitudes, Att Les & Gay = attitudes toward lesbians and gay males, Discr Legal = believe that it is illegal to discriminate against sexual orientation, Bel Legal = believe it should be legal to discriminate against sexual orientation, Fair Discr = believe it is fair to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, Wrk Discr P = workplace has policies prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination, Wrk Sex P = workplace has policies prohibiting sexual harassment against sexual orientation, Wrk Affirm = workplace has policies affirming social diversity, Age = participant age, Gender = participant gender.

Table 2
Raw Descriptive Statistics

Condition	<i>N</i>	Extra <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Agree <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Cons <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Emot <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Open <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Fem <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Masc <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Qual <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
GMM	28	3.82 (.51)	3.86 (.61)	4.27 (.50)	3.41 (.59)	3.76 (.40)	3.23 (.30)	3.78 (.29)	.13 (.65)
GMN	37	3.71 (.54)	4.12 (.48)	4.23 (.51)	3.52 (.46)	3.36 (.50)	3.34 (.28)	3.63 (.29)	.15 (.72)
HMM	34	3.66 (.62)	3.93 (.65)	4.30 (.39)	3.44 (.57)	3.53 (.50)	2.99 (.26)	3.70 (.38)	-.06 (.53)
HMN	40	3.54 (.43)	4.00 (.54)	4.26 (.42)	3.51 (.47)	3.23 (.38)	3.27 (.21)	3.45 (.21)	.13 (.66)
LM	38	3.79 (.42)	3.68 (.47)	4.16 (.50)	3.37 (.48)	3.54 (.45)	3.07 (.19)	3.84 (.33)	-.02 (.67)
LN	33	3.73 (.37)	4.03 (.48)	4.18 (.47)	3.53 (.50)	3.40 (.38)	3.36 (.30)	3.59 (.31)	.04 (.41)
HFM	36	3.76 (.40)	3.89 (.49)	4.11 (.47)	3.34 (.52)	3.46 (.48)	3.10 (.30)	3.67 (.42)	-.23 (.85)
HFN	38	3.61 (.48)	4.12 (.55)	4.20 (.48)	3.57 (.51)	3.26 (.39)	3.42 (.30)	3.53 (.32)	.20 (.45)

Notes. GMM = Gay Male Managerial, GMN = Gay Male Nursing, HMM = Heterosexual Male Managerial, HMN = Heterosexual Male Nursing, LM = Lesbian Managerial, LN = Lesbian Nursing, HFM = Heterosexual Female Managerial, HFN = Heterosexual Female Nursing, Extra = Extraversion, Agree = Agreeableness, Cons = Conscientiousness, Emot = Emotional Stability, Open = Openness, Fem = Femininity, Masc = Masculinity, Qual = Qualification.

Table 3
Estimated Descriptive Statistics

Condition	<i>N</i>	Extra <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Agree <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Cons <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Emot <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Open <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Fem <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Masc <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
GM	63	3.75 (.49)	4.00 (.56)	4.23 (.48)	3.52 (.53)	3.48 (.48)	3.28 (.28)	3.68 (.33)
HM	73	3.58 (.50)	3.96 (.56)	4.27 (.49)	3.48 (.54)	3.40 (.48)	3.15 (.28)	3.55 (.32)
L	69 70*	3.80 (.52)	3.87 (.57)	4.15 (.51)	3.46 (.56)	3.46 (.50)	3.21 (.28)	3.73 (.33)
HF	74	3.66 (.50)	4.01 (.56)	4.18 (.49)	3.45 (.54)	3.38 (.48)	3.27 (.28)	3.60 (.33)

Note. GM = Gay Male conditions, HM = Heterosexual Male conditions, L = Lesbian conditions, HF = Heterosexual Female conditions, Extra = Extraversion, Agree = Agreeableness, Cons = Conscientiousness, Emot = Emotional Stability, Open = Openness, Fem = Femininity, Masc = Masculinity, Qual = Qualification. Sample size of Masculinity and Femininity denoted by *. Estimated descriptive statistics derived from 2 x 2 analysis of covariance.

Table 4

Estimated Descriptive Statistics for Qualification Rating

Condition	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Gay Male Managerial	.07	.61	26
Heterosexual Male Managerial	-.08	.60	30
Gay Male Nursing	.12	.59	35
Heterosexual Male Nursing	.19	.60	38
Lesbian Managerial	.07	.62	35
Heterosexual Female Managerial	-.17	.61	33
Lesbian Nursing	.14	.62	28
Heterosexual Female Nursing	.12	.60	35

Note. Estimated descriptive statistics derived from 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of covariance.

Table 5
Analysis of Covariance Summary for Personality Traits

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Partial Eta Squared
Extraversion					
Job Liberal	.49	1	.49	2.18	.01
Job Conservative	.10	1	.10	.44	.00
Applicant Liberal	.00	1	.00	.01	.00
Applicant Conservative	.12	1	.12	.52	.00
Gender	1.97	1	1.97	8.83**	.03
Age	.14	1	.14	.64	.00
Applicant Sexual Orientation	1.11	1	1.11	4.98*	.02
Applicant Gender	.24	1	.24	1.09	.00
Applicant Job	.75	1	.75	3.37	.01
AppSOrien x AppGend	.03	1	.03	.13	.00
AppSOrien x AppJob	.03	1	.03	.12	.00
AppGend x AppJob	.04	1	.04	.17	.00
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.03	1	.03	.12	.00
Error	59.08	265	.22		
Agreeableness					
Job Liberal	.05	1	.05	.19	.00
Job Conservative	.04	1	.04	.14	.00
Applicant Liberal	.21	1	.21	.77	.00
Applicant Conservative	.21	1	.21	.77	.00
Gender	1.89	1	1.89	7.03**	.03
Age	2.39	1	2.39	8.88**	.03
Applicant Sexual Orientation	.13	1	.13	.48	.00
Applicant Gender	.07	1	.07	.25	.00
Applicant Job	3.10	1	3.10	11.51**	.04
AppSOrien x AppGend	.36	1	.36	1.35	.01
AppSOrien x AppJob	.34	1	.34	1.26	.01
AppGend x AppJob	.66	1	.66	2.44	.01
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.00	1	.00	.00	.00
Error	71.37	265	.27		

Note. $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$. SS = Sum of Squares and MS = Mean Square.

Table 5 (Continued)
Analysis of Covariance Summary for Personality Traits

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Partial Eta Squared
Conscientiousness					
Job Liberal	.02	1	.02	.07	.00
Job Conservative	.22	1	.22	.99	.00
Applicant Liberal	.14	1	.14	.66	.00
Applicant Conservative	.10	1	.10	.46	.00
Gender	.76	1	.76	3.48	.01
Age	.04	1	.04	.19	.00
Applicant Sexual Orientation	.03	1	.03	.15	.00
Applicant Gender	.61	1	.61	2.81	.01
Applicant Job	.00	1	.00	.00	.00
AppSOrien x AppGend	.00	1	.00	.02	.00
AppSOrien x AppJob	.03	1	.03	.11	.00
AppGend x AppJob	.31	1	.31	1.43	.01
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.00	1	.00	.00	.00
Error	57.80	265	.22		
Emotional Stability					
Job Liberal	.11	1	.11	.43	.00
Job Conservative	.01	1	.01	.05	.00
Applicant Liberal	.02	1	.02	.09	.00
Applicant Conservative	.02	1	.02	.08	.00
Gender	.10	1	.10	.38	.00
Age	.49	1	.49	1.90	.01
Applicant Sexual Orientation	.05	1	.05	.20	.00
Applicant Gender	.09	1	.09	.35	.00
Applicant Job	1.00	1	1.00	3.84	.01
AppSOrien x AppGend	.00	1	.00	.02	.00
AppSOrien x AppJob	.01	1	.01	.02	.00
AppGend x AppJob	.27	1	.27	1.03	.00
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.05	1	.05	.18	.00
Error	68.84	265	.26		

Note. $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$. SS = Sum of Squares and MS = Mean Square.

Table 5 (Continued)
Analysis of Covariance Summary for Personality Traits

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	Partial Eta Squared
Openness					
Job Liberal	.11	1	.11	.61	.00
Job Conservative	.18	1	.18	.98	.00
Applicant Liberal	.26	1	.26	1.35	.01
Applicant Conservative	.05	1	.05	.25	.00
Gender	.64	1	.64	3.38	.01
Age	.02	1	.02	.08	.00
Applicant Sexual Orientation	.39	1	.39	2.08	.01
Applicant Gender	.14	1	.14	.76	.00
Applicant Job	5.10	1	5.10	26.99**	.09
AppSOrien x AppGend	.01	1	.01	.05	.00
AppSOrien x AppJob	.01	1	.01	.06	.00
AppGend x AppJob	.83	1	.83	4.39*	.02
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.18	1	.18	.94	.00
Error	50.06	265	.19		

Note. $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$. *SS* = Sum of Squares and *MS* = Mean Square.

Table 6
Analysis of Covariance Summary for Masculinity/Femininity

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Partial Eta Squared
Masculinity					
Job Dominantly Masculine	.35	1	.35	3.47	.01
Job Dominantly Feminine	.01	1	.01	.08	.00
Job Neither	.02	1	.02	.15	.00
Gender	.65	1	.65	6.36*	.02
Age	.21	1	.21	2.04	.01
Applicant Sexual Orientation	1.08	1	1.08	10.66**	.04
Applicant Gender	.11	1	.11	1.04	.00
Applicant Job	1.03	1	1.03	10.16**	.04
AppSOrien x AppGend	.00	1	.00	.00	.00
AppSOrien x AppJob	.01	1	.01	.06	.00
AppGend x AppJob	.00	1	.00	.01	.00
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.15	1	.15	1.47	.01
Error	27.08	267	.10		
Femininity					
Job Dominantly Masculine	.57	1	.57	8.23**	.03
Job Dominantly Feminine	.00	1	.00	.00	.00
Job Neither	.00	1	.00	.00	.00
Gender	.04	1	.04	.54	.00
Age	.10	1	.10	1.40	.01
Applicant Sexual Orientation	.14	1	.14	2.00	.01
Applicant Gender	.06	1	.06	.88	.00
Applicant Job	1.72	1	1.72	24.65**	.09
AppSOrien x AppGend	.60	1	.60	8.60**	.03
AppSOrien x AppJob	.21	1	.21	2.97	.01
AppGend x AppJob	.36	1	.36	5.09*	.02
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.11	1	.11	1.60	.01
Error	18.62	267	.07		

Note. $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$. *SS* = Sum of Squares and *MS* = Mean Square.

Table 7
Analysis of Covariance Summary for Qualification Rating

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Partial Eta Squared
Job Liberal	.10	1	.10	.29	.00
Job Conservative	.43	1	.43	1.27	.00
Applicant Liberal	.24	1	.24	.71	.00
Applicant Conservative	.28	1	.28	.82	.00
Believe Legal	.53	1	.53	1.57	.01
Fair to discriminate	.14	1	.14	.42	.00
Gay and Lesbian Attitudes	.13	1	.13	.37	.00
Gender Attitudes	3.77	1	3.77	11.26**	.04
Gender	.64	1	.64	1.92	.01
Age	.39	1	.39	1.17	.01
Applicant Sexual Orientation	.30	1	.30	.90	.00
Applicant Gender	.07	1	.07	.21	.00
Applicant Job	1.74	1	1.74	5.18*	.02
AppSOrien x AppGend	.12	1	.12	.37	.00
AppSOrien x AppJob	.74	1	.74	2.22	.01
AppGend x AppJob	.00	1	.00	.01	.00
AppSOrient x AppGend x AppJob	.00	1	.00	.00	.00
Error	81.10	242	.34		

Note. $p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$. SS = Sum of Squares and MS = Mean Square.