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Diversity mandates framed in a legalistic manner that tend to take a preventative tone ("Do not discriminate or else risk a discrimination lawsuit") have been widely used to encourage decision-makers to uphold egalitarian values. A set of two studies expands on a series of preliminary results that suggest legalistic diversity messages tend to result in initial positive minority evaluations; however subsequent equally qualified minorities are perceived as less qualified and ultimately are less likely to be selected for admission or hire. The current work expands on this previous research by comparing legally worded diversity messages to value-oriented messages and utilizes both an undergraduate population and a sample of experienced human resource professionals. Both legal and value framed diversity messages appear to function similarly in encouraging decision-makers to be egalitarian in their evaluation and selection process initially. However, on subsequent decisions, legalistically worded diversity messages are particularly damaging to minority women. Two potential explanations for the underlying mechanism are explored: stereotype suppression and moral credentialing. Legalistic messages may be viewed as subtle stereotype suppression instructions that encourage a colorblind ideology. Value messages, on the other hand, may be viewed to encourage a multicultural ideology where differences are actively considered. Moral credentialing would predict that race and gender made salient by photos of applicants would be sufficient to elicit positive evaluations of minorities initially so as to “credential” the decision-maker and immunize
them from accusations of bias in subsequent decisions regardless of message condition. The legalistic worded and value diversity messages did not result in the same outcomes for minority applicants. Minority women emerged as the most negatively impacted in the long term by legalistically worded diversity messages. Given the differences in observed effects between legalistic and value messages, the data suggest stereotype suppression and rebound is, at least in part, the most plausible underlying mechanism for the negative long-term effect of legalistically worded messages. In addition, potential explanations for why minority women are particularly susceptible to negative evaluations when decision-makers are presented with a legalistically worded diversity message are explored.
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Diversity Messages: The Short and Long-Term Effects of Legal vs. Value Messages

Employers and others who are entrusted with the responsibility of making hiring and admission decisions frequently encounter messages and explicit policies that encourage them to be egalitarian and avoid any biases in their decisions. Unfortunately, little research has explored the efficacy of these messages and, more specifically, whether there are differences in efficacy that are dependent on how these messages are framed.

Since the Civil Rights Act of 1964, diversity mandates have become legalistic or preventative in nature, explicitly commanding decision makers not to discriminate and stressing the negative consequences of noncompliance. In similar fashion, diversity training stressing the legal consequences of discrimination has become popular in business settings where managers believe that such mandatory training may lessen corporate culpability if accused of discrimination. While there is little doubt that legalistic messages have increased diversity to some degree within a variety of contexts where individuals are evaluated, the specifics regarding to what degree they work, how they work, and whether they could be improved is less clear. In addition, how legalistically worded messages compare to other types of messages, such as “value diversity” messages where racial and gender differences are acknowledged and considered assets, have also not been explored.

My previous research suggests that diversity messages worded in a legalistic manner—a directive to not discriminate — as compared to the absence of such messages, tend to be initially efficacious but may subsequently backfire. That is, decision-makers evaluated an initial minority (African-American) candidate for an academic scholarship similarly regardless of whether they were exposed to a legalistically worded message or not. However, when participants were then asked to evaluate a second equally qualified
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minority (Latino) candidate, decision-makers’ evaluations of the candidate in the legalistic diversity message condition were less favorable than the evaluations of those not exposed to the legalistic diversity message \((M = 3.881 \text{ versus } M = 5.580)\), \(F(1,88) = 78.222, p < .0001\). Thus, it appears that once participants have satisfied the dictates of the legalistic diversity message, they subsequently show less of an inclination to select a second minority candidate. These discriminatory evaluations of a second highly qualified candidate in the legalistically worded message condition are particularly disturbing given previous social psychological research that demonstrates the reluctance of participants to stereotype and discriminate against highly qualified minority targets (Kunda, 1999).

The most plausible explanations for the effects I have observed thus far are (1) a variation of stereotype suppression and rebound (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Jetten, 1994) or (2) moral credentialing (Monin & Miller, 2001). In the following I review these two explanations.

**Stereotype Suppression and Rebound**

“Don’t think about a white bear!” This is a reliable method to ensure that a person will think of little else but polar bears (Wegner, Schneider, Carter, & White, 1987). As Wegner and his colleagues demonstrated, individuals explicitly told to suppress specific thoughts about a specific object could not help but think about that prohibited object. In workplace or academic settings, individuals may be prohibited from the expression of stereotypes toward racial and ethnic minorities, women, and other stigmatized groups by external constraints such as social norms, public policies, or legal regulations that lead to the suppression of stereotypes. Unfortunately, for some individuals, suppression of
Stereotypes may result in stereotype rebound, or increased levels of bias toward a specific group.

Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, and Jetten (1994) observed the costs following the suppression of a thought specifically within the context of stereotype suppression. They instructed half of their participants to suppress stereotypes of skinheads when asked to write a “day-in-the-life” (DITL) account of a target that was a skinhead while the other half of their participants did not receive the suppression instruction. Participants in the suppression condition were able to successfully suppress and therefore not include stereotypes in their DITL descriptions. After this initial task, participants were asked to write a similar DITL for a second skinhead. In this second description, those given the suppression instructions for the first description wrote significantly more stereotypic descriptions than those not given the suppression instructions. The increase in explicitly stated stereotypes suggests increased stereotype application and activation, and is referred to as stereotype rebound.

Stereotype rebound, as operationalized in the literature, has been defined as either increased stereotype activation or stereotype application (or both) on a second evaluative task after an explicit suppression instruction. Stereotype activation is the increased accessibility of a stereotype as measured typically by implicit measures such as lexical decision tasks (LDT) (Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001). In other words, increased stereotype activation refers to the greater salience of stereotypes for the participant. A participant presented with a task where combinations of letters must be quickly identified as either a word or not a word, will be more accurate at identifying stereotype relevant words if stereotypes have been made salient and are readily cognitively available to the
participant. Stereotype application, on the other hand, refers to the use of stereotypes in guiding explicit judgments of individual members of stereotyped groups (Kunda & Oleson, 1997; Kunda & Spencer, 2003; Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Jetten, 1994; Montieth, Spicer, & Tooman, 1998; Liberman & Forster, 2000). Although effects of explicit suppression instructions on activation and application have been demonstrated, the effects of more subtle directives, such as a reminder of anti-discrimination laws, on subsequent stereotype activation and application are less clear.

In an attempt to tease apart the effects of suppression on both activation and application, Macrae and his colleagues conducted two further studies. Study 2 measured how closely a participant would sit next to a skinhead after a suppression exercise in comparison to those who had not participated in a suppression exercise. Those who had been instructed to suppress their stereotypes toward skinheads chose to sit further away from the skinhead than those who had not. This was a clear demonstration of the rebound effect in application. Lastly, in a third study, the authors demonstrated that on a lexical decision task (LDT) those who had been given suppression instructions had greater activation of stereotypes of the target group than those who had not suppressed. In sum, stereotype rebound was observed through implicit stereotype activation measures, behavioral measures, and explicit evaluative measures.

Subsequent research has not consistently been able to replicate Macrae, et al.’s (1994) findings unless moderators such as level of prejudiced attitudes and internal and external levels of motivation to appear unprejudiced (Plant & Devine, 1998) are taken into account. Individual differences in level of internal motivation to not appear prejudiced offer one potential explanation for the apparent inability to replicate Macrae, et al. (1994)
without moderators. All of the participants in the original set of studies were likely to be low in internal motivation to not appear prejudiced against skinheads and many may, in fact, have been very biased against skinheads. The authors did not measure general attitudes toward skinheads and cannot rule out that their results are quite consistent with the subsequent body of literature that suggests that stereotype rebound depends upon low internal motivation to appear unprejudiced and a high level of bias toward the target group (Gordijn, Hindriks, Koomen, Dijksterhuis, VanKnippenberg, 2004; Montieth, Spicer, & Tooman, 1998; Wyer, 2007).

By and large, the empirical research has been consistent in finding stereotype rebound when it has been operationalized as increased stereotype activation (Macrae, et al., 1994; Liberman & Forster, 2000, Study 1 & 2; Gordijn, et al., 2004; Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Montieth, Spicer, & Tooman, 1998, Study 1), particularly when internal motivation to appear unprejudiced (IMS)(Plant & Devine, 1998) is low and prejudice against the target group is high.

**Explicit versus subtle suppression instructions.** To date, the stereotype suppression and stereotype rebound research has primarily depended on explicit suppression instructions to induce suppression in participants while they complete a specific evaluative task, such as writing a DITL description of a target. Though stereotype suppression is often thought to be a conscious activity where a person actively attempts to not think about a particular stereotype, there is some evidence from the educational psychology literature that suppression may occur as a result of an implicit suppression instruction such as exposure to an egalitarian prime (Oikawa, 2005). If this is the case, then there is a possibility that social context or messages that are not explicit suppression
instructions also result in suppression and ultimately rebound. For instance, a legalistically worded message does not explicitly instruct a person to not think about the stereotypes associated with a stigmatized group. However, a person may still engage in stereotype suppression when directed to avoid discriminating. The legalistically worded message that I have used in my previous research reflects the typical language used in hiring guidelines and diversity training programs, and may be an example of subtle suppression instructions.

I posit that highly practiced egalitarian individuals may experience stereotype rebound to a greater degree than the current body of literature on the topic suggests. Rebound is most likely to be observed in these individuals when the catalyst for suppression is a subtle suppression instruction, social context, or cue that activates an individual’s internal motivations to avoid appearing prejudiced rather than when induced by external and explicit suppression instructions. This is particularly the case when stereotype application rather than activation is the measure of rebound. Well-practiced egalitarians may be more adept at self-monitoring and therefore may be less likely to demonstrate rebound when stereotype application is the measure of rebound. However, if the suppression instruction does not result in conscious awareness that an individual may betray his or her egalitarian values or demonstrate bias, implicit stereotypes may nonetheless be activated and therefore trigger a rebound response that is not adequately controlled by the individual. This rebound effect, for those who explicitly self-identify as egalitarian, would be consistent with work by Dovidio, Kawakami, and Gaertner (2002) in which individuals with explicitly stated non-biased attitudes were observed to show bias on a behavioral task as a function of implicit stereotype associations.
Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, Wasel, and Schaal (1999) argue that individuals with strong egalitarian goals may have stereotypes activated but also possess a strong association between the activation of a stereotype and the impulse to suppress or counteract that stereotype. This practiced association leads to the ability to control stereotype activation very quickly and potentially at the preconscious level, but not necessarily stop it entirely. Thus, a person may become susceptible to the suppression-rebound cycle (Johns, Cullum, Smith, & Freng, 2008; Bargh, Gollwitzer, Lee-Chai, Barndollar, & Trotschel, 2001; Moskowitz, et al., 2000).

Automatic activation of egalitarian values may translate into automatic activation of internally induced suppression of stereotype-consistent thoughts (Johns, Cullum, Smith, & Freng, 2008). If cues in the social environment or subtle elements in the environment result in making race, gender, or other category salient, suppression of relevant stereotypes may also be activated concurrently, especially if an individual is motivated to not appear prejudiced (internally or externally motivated). Stereotype rebound may then occur without an external suppression instruction, but simply as a result of a stigmatized group being made salient. When individuals suppress stereotypes in this way, without an explicit instruction to do so, they may not be explicitly aware, or be aware to a lesser degree, that suppression has taken place as compared to those exposed to an explicit suppression instruction. This lack of awareness that stereotypes have been activated may result in reduced vigilance by the observer or decision-maker to control biased behavior or attitudes, ultimately resulting in stereotype rebound.

I hypothesize that a legalistically worded diversity message communicates instructions to suppress any stereotypes and avoid prejudices and can therefore lead to
stereotype rebound. Given my previous research, the results I have observed when decision-makers are exposed to a legalistically worded message are consistent with such an explanation.

**Moral Credentialing**

Another potential theoretical explanation for the negative impact of legalistically worded diversity messages on subsequent selection decisions is moral credentialing (Monin and Miller, 2001; Effron, Cameron, & Monin, 2009). Moral credentialing proposes that when individuals are given the opportunity to express or demonstrate their egalitarian values they tend to express greater bias in a subsequent evaluative task. Monin and Miller (2001) argue that individuals given the opportunity to prove their egalitarian values feel “morally credentialed” and therefore free to demonstrate bias in a subsequent evaluative task without fear of appearing biased.

Specifically, by either agreeing or disagreeing with obviously sexist statements, participants who morally credentialed themselves by disagreeing with the statements were then more likely to favor a man for a gender-neutral position. Interestingly, even when participants were simply given the opportunity to hire a qualified applicant who varied as a function of race and gender, those who selected the white woman or African-American man (manipulated so that one or the other would be the most qualified of the applicants) were less likely to do so on a subsequent hiring task. Surprisingly, Monin and Miller (2001) found that individuals felt free to express bias after completing a “credentialing” task even when the audience of the subsequent biased expression had no knowledge of their “moral credentials”.
Legalistically worded diversity messages may therefore increase the salience of race/ethnicity and gender for the participant. Participants then initially evaluate minorities and women positively which results in a sense of freedom from the appearance of being biased. The sense that they have been “morally credentialed” then leads to greater expression of bias in a subsequent evaluative task.

**Legalistically Worded vs. Value-Oriented Messages**

The current research expands upon my previous work by including a value-oriented message in addition to a legalistically worded message to explore if the value message results in different evaluative outcomes than the legalistic worded message in an initial and subsequent task. How decision-makers respond to these two different diversity messages may also clarify whether stereotype suppression or moral credentialing is the underlying mechanism of the effect previously observed in my pre-dissertation research.

**Color-blind vs. Multicultural Ideologies**

The distinction between a legalistic message and a value-oriented message can be framed theoretically in terms of existing social psychological work on interethnic ideologies that has compared a color-blind ideology to a multicultural one (Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000).

A color-blind ideology suggests that the way to promote positive interethnic relations is to avoid the use of ethnic categorization and stereotyping and to evaluate each person simply based on their merits. Such an ideological viewpoint is similar to a legalistic diversity message, in that such a message suggests to participants that they should avoid the use of ethnicity and stereotypes in their evaluations of candidates. On the other hand, a multicultural ideology suggests that more positive interethnic relations ensue from valuing
ethnic diversity and appreciating the unique perspectives and abilities that members of
diverse ethnic groups contribute to an organization. A value-oriented diversity message is
one that encourages the hiring of minority candidates precisely because ethnic diversity is
beneficial to the organization or institution as a whole. A value-oriented message therefore
encourages one to consider the differences that may exist between groups of people and to
value those differences. It is the opposite of a suppression instruction. This type of message
purposely increases the salience of race/ethnicity, gender, etc., for the purpose of
considering those attributes as assets rather than liabilities.

Both ideologies may result in positive evaluations of outgroup members (Correll,
Park, & Smith, 2008; Wolsko, et al., 2000). However, multiculturalism may result in greater
separatism as differences between groups are stressed (Hahn, Judd, & Park, 2010) and a
colorblind ideology may be understood to encourage assimilation and therefore make any
identifiable differences even less acceptable and therefore more stigmatizing (Plaut,
Thomas, & Gorn, 2009). The framing of differences that exist between groups seems to
make a significant difference in how groups may be perceived in the long term (Hahn, et
al., 2010). In a society that endorses multiculturalism, the differences between groups must
be framed in a positive light that emphasizes the positive contribution to the society as a
whole. Likewise, a colorblind ideology must take into account that there are variations
between groups of individuals, but that such differences are irrelevant when evaluating
individuals in employment, admissions, or other contexts. If this is not the case, any
evidence that an individual has not fully assimilated will result in a negative perception and
rejection.
Therefore, legalistically worded messages tend to be consistent with the colorblind ideology in that they direct individuals to avoid acknowledging racial, gender, and other obvious indicators of group identity. The directive to avoid the use of this information in any way may well lead to greater emphasis on selecting individuals that best represent the stereotypical prototype of the person who typically fills the relevant role. In other words, a White male is more likely than a woman to be selected for an accounting position, whereas a woman is more likely than an African-American man to be selected for a human resource position.

Value messages encourage decision-makers to acknowledge differences and stress how these differences can contribute to a stronger society or group overall. The positive framing of these differences may mitigate the tendency for multiculturalism to result in greater separatism and therefore less bias directed at minorities in the long-term.

**Regulatory Focus: Promotion vs. Prevention**

A value-oriented message may also be distinguished from a legalistic message as encouraging a promotion focus (a focus on positive outcomes) rather than a prevention focus (a focus on negative outcomes and the desire to avoid these outcomes) in achieving the goal at hand. As Crowe and Higgins (1997) have outlined, when the regulatory focus is preventative in nature (e.g. legalistic message) there is a tendency for decision-makers to focus on not making an error, in this case, on not discriminating against qualified minorities. When the regulatory focus is promotional in nature, decision-makers tend to be more likely to focus on “making the right choice” or in the context of the current work — selecting qualified individuals and also meeting diversity goals. Interestingly, promotion and prevention regulatory focus research has also found that in managerial contexts, those
who take on a prevention focus tend to be more likely to copy a managerial style or social norm (Zhang, Higgins, & Chen, 2011). The potential implication is that decision-makers encouraged to adopt a prevention focus will be more likely to make decisions consistent with the cultural norms of the company/university/etc. that may or may not be free of bias. A prevention focus is therefore consistent with the colorblind ideology. Alternatively, if decision-makers take on a promotion focus, they may tend to focus on ensuring that their decisions are “fair” and attempt to take a greater amount of information into account and potentially perceive differences among candidates as positive attributes.

A prevention focus, as legalistically worded messages encourage, may therefore lead to a tendency to avoid punishment (e.g., discrimination law suit) or to avoid social disapproval (e.g., being regarded as a racist or sexist). The desire to avoid such disapproval is consistent with the stereotype suppression and rebound literature in that prevention focused individuals will attempt to avoid or suppress the stereotypes that are activated and not demonstrate discriminatory behavior. Alternatively, a promotion focus, as value-oriented messages encourage, emphasizes the positive aspects of diversity, and counter to stereotype suppression, requires that individuals consciously consider the differences that exist between groups as assets rather than liabilities.

**Predictions**

The following two studies expand upon my previous work and attempt to accomplish three aims. First, they explore two potential theoretical explanations for the effect I have observed previously, specifically (1) stereotype suppression and rebound (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, and Jetten, 1994), and (2) moral credentialing (Monin & Miller, 2001). Second, they expand the prior work to determine if there are differences
between legalistically worded versus value-oriented messages. Finally, they explore whether the effects observed thus far with undergraduate participants may also be observed with a sample of human resource professionals.

**Legalistically Worded Diversity Messages**

Legalistically worded diversity messages may be said to encourage a colorblind ideology. As such, decision-makers exposed to such a message are actively encouraged to avoid a negative outcome or take a prevention focus so as to *not discriminate*. Such a message may also be said to provide a subtle stereotype suppression instruction. Therefore, decision-makers must suppress any stereotypes that may be made salient within the context of a social interaction (e.g., employment interview) with a minority or female applicant or candidate. And, as my research has shown, this may result in initial positive evaluations, but subsequent evaluations will be less positive of minority and female applicants thereby demonstrating stereotype rebound. This result may also be explained by the moral credentialing effect. When minority groups and the potential for appearing bias are made salient by a legalistically worded diversity message, the decision-maker is likely to want to prove their egalitarian values. After demonstrating their “moral credentials” they are more likely to feel free to show bias.

**Value-Oriented Diversity Messages**

The value-oriented message was added to these studies, in part, to test whether moral credentialing or stereotype suppression and rebound may be best able to explain the underlying mechanism of the negative long-term effects I have observed with the legalistically worded message.
The value message is analogous to a multicultural ideology perspective where decision-makers are encouraged to take differences between groups and individuals as positive attributes that can strengthen the group. The value message encourages the decision-maker to take a promotion focus and actively seek these differences within the applicant pool. If stereotype suppression and rebound is, in fact, the explanation for the effect I have observed, I predict that, in the value condition, we will not see the same pattern of results as were found for the legalistically worded message. In other words, if the legal message communicates a subtle suppression instruction and this is the mechanism for the negative evaluations of minority applicants and a reduction in the numbers of minorities selected in Task 2 as compared to Task 1, then we should not see this effect in the value or control conditions as they do not include an explicit or implicit instruction to suppress stereotypes. Thus, evaluations and selection of minorities should be relatively similar in Task 1 and Task 2 in the control and value conditions.

However, if moral credentialing is the underlying mechanism, the predictions are that in all conditions, an initial positive evaluation will be followed be a negative evaluation in a subsequent task. Monin & Miller (2001) observed moral credentialing when race or gender was made salient simply by describing individuals as either men or women or African-American or White. Therefore, regardless of message condition, the salience of race and gender should be sufficient to result in moral credentialing such that decision makers initially evaluate minorities and women positively, but subsequently demonstrate bias toward minorities and women once they feel they have sufficiently proven their egalitarianism.
Figure 1. Predictions for Minority Applicants Dependent on Underlying Mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suppression &amp; Rebound Task 1</th>
<th>Suppression &amp; Rebound Task 2</th>
<th>Moral Credentialing Task 1</th>
<th>Moral Credentialing Task 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = positive evaluations and greater proportion of minorities selected  
- = negative evaluations and reduced proportion of minorities selected

The following research, therefore, tests whether the efficacy of diversity messages differs as a function of framing — legalistically or value oriented — and explores two potential theoretical explanations for the negative long-term effects I have observed when a legalistically worded message is employed, specifically stereotype suppression and rebound (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, and Jetten, 1994), and moral credentialing (Monin & Miller, 2001). Second, it expands prior work to determine if there are differences between legalistically worded versus value-oriented messages. Finally, it explores whether the effects observed thus far with undergraduate participants may also be observed with a diverse sample of human resource professionals.
Chapter 2

Study 1

Study 1 is an extension and partial replication of my previous work using a paradigm that is more closely aligned with the type of decisions and evaluations an individual would be faced with when making an actual hiring decision. Study 1 explores whether the presentation of no-message, a legalistic message, or a value-diversity message prior to the evaluation of applicants affects initial hiring decisions as well as subsequent hiring decisions when confronted with new minority applicants. My previous work has focused on legalistically worded messages compared to no messages and has found that legalistic messages tend to result in initial positive evaluations of minorities, but that subsequent evaluations of minorities are significantly less positive. The following study expands this previous work by exploring whether a value-oriented diversity message results in a similar pattern of evaluations for minorities or if value messages result in less bias against minorities over time.

Method

Participants

Seventy-eight (52 female) University of Colorado at Boulder undergraduates enrolled in a general psychology course participated in the study. Mean age was 19.5. All of those who participated completed a variety of individual difference measures as part of a battery of prescreen measures collected from prospective participants at the beginning of each semester. These included the internal motivation to respond without prejudice scale (IMS) and the external motivation to respond without prejudice scale (EMS) (Plant & Devine, 1998), the Modern Racism Scale (MRS) (McCanhay, 1998) and Rosenberg's self-
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Esteem measure (1965). Only participants who chose to complete these measures were allowed to participate in Study 1. These measures were collected to test whether individual differences on these constructs were predictive of applicant evaluations or if they interacted with the diversity messages. These individual differences were analyzed using a mixed linear model where each individual measure was centered around the grand mean and interactions with applicant race, gender, and diversity message condition were tested. None of the individual differences interacted with applicant race, applicant gender, or diversity message condition and will therefore not be discussed further.

**Materials and Procedure**

Participants were asked to complete two evaluation and selection tasks. Prior to the first task where participants were asked to evaluate 12 applicants for a scholarship and then select four to receive the scholarship, they were presented with a legalistically worded message, a value message, or no message (control). On the second task participants were asked to evaluate 32 applicants for a summer internship at Google and then select eight to be offered the internship. After participants made their final decisions regarding the applicants in each task, they were asked to rate the chosen applicants on their perceived levels of competence and warmth. Thus, on both tasks, every applicant’s qualifications were evaluated, a subset of applicants were selected as those the participant would recommend for the scholarship or internship, and each selected applicant’s level of warmth and competence was evaluated by the participant.

In the first task, participants were asked to evaluate applicants to a university-sponsored scholarship offered to current juniors to financially support their senior year. The participants were told that the university scholarship committee was interested in
assessing whether their decisions were in line with the values and qualities that current students felt were reflective of top students at the university. The participants were then seated at computers that were directed to a website that explained the criteria the committee used to evaluate applicants. The final screen of instructions was a message from the Scholarship Committee Chair that served as the manipulation. Participants were presented with a legal message or a value message after a screen of general instructions. Those in the control condition were only presented with the general instructions.

General Instructions:

*Please read carefully. You will soon be asked to tell us in detail what guidance Dr. McMillan provided.*

*As a member of the scholarship committee you are entrusted with the task of selecting the applicants that best reflect the qualifications required:*
  - Excellent academic achievement
  - Community involvement
  - Professional promise

Legal Message:

*You are required to be aware of our commitment to avoiding discrimination in our selection process. You may not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status in selection decisions. You must avoid using such information in the process of selecting applicants to recommend for the scholarship.*

Value Message:

*You should be aware of our commitment to a diverse campus community and the importance of granting the scholarships to individuals with diverse backgrounds and experience. A diverse student body provides different perspectives in the classroom and enriches the community as a whole.*

Immediately following the instructions, participants were asked the following question that served as a manipulation check:
You have just read a memo from the Chair of the Scholarship Committee. It is important that you understand what the memo says before you proceed. Please write below, in as much detail as you can, what the Chair is instructing you to do. If you need to, you may go back and refresh your memory by clicking the BACK button below.

The participants then proceeded through a series of screens and were asked to evaluate 12 abridged résumés (these provided only a snapshot of prior experiences and academic credentials and were shorter than typical résumés). The race/ethnicity and gender of applicants was manipulated through a photo (Minear & Park, 2004) presented with each résumé. Eight of the applicants were white and four were minorities (half African-American and half Latino/a). Half of each racial/ethnic group category was female. The qualifications of half of each racial/ethnic category were manipulated to reflect relatively highly qualified applicants (see Appendix A) and half moderately qualified applicants (see Appendix B). Highly qualified applicants had GPA’s that ranged from 4.0 to 3.6 and moderately qualified applicants ranged from 3.60 to 3.25. In addition, highly qualified applicants had work experience at high profile and prestigious companies/organizations, and moderately qualified applicants tended to have work experience in office settings where their main function was mundane office tasks (e.g. answering phones). Level of qualifications varied within the race and gender categories of the applicants. Participants initially evaluated each applicant by indicating how likely they would be to recommend the applicant for the scholarship (e.g., “Do NOT Recommend”, “Maybe Recommend”, “Probably Recommend”, “Definitely Recommend”).

The specific instructions presented to the participants prior to evaluating the applicants were as follows:
You will now view 12 scholarship applications. Please read through each application. On the screen for each applicant, indicate how likely you would be to recommend this individual for the scholarship ("Definitely Recommend", “Probably Recommend”, “Maybe Recommend”, “Definitely NOT Recommend”)

Remember, after reviewing all the applicants, you will have to select 4 out of the 12 to be recommended for the scholarship.

You will be able to look at each application again, if you need to, and you will also have access to how you judged each applicant when you make your final decision.

If you have any questions at this point, please ask the assistant.

After participants evaluated all the applicants they were presented with a screen with the photos, names, and how they rated each applicant (see Appendix C). Participants next selected four applicants to receive the scholarship. Participants then answered two questions for each applicant they had selected, using 7-point Likert scales indicating the degree to which the participant agreed with the proceeding statements:

- I selected the applicant, (Applicant Name), because he/she is highly competent and is obviously destined for success.

- I selected the applicant, (Applicant Name), because he/she is very community minded and concerned with the welfare of others.

Once participants reviewed the résumés, made their selections, and answered specific questions about their choices, the participants were asked to complete a word search exercise that served as a filler task. Participants were then informed that they would
be completing a second evaluative task. This second task was to evaluate applicants for a competitive summer internship with Google.

Google invites students to participate in their student intern program each year. Google’s local office in Boulder has successfully recruited interns (and eventually employees) from CU. Google has a stated goal of granting internships to creative and highly motivated students who are interested in a wide variety of aspects of the company. Google would like to know whether the individuals they grant the internship to are truly reflective of their goals by outside evaluators. You will therefore be asked to go through a set of past applicants to evaluate whether or not you would recommend each one for the internship.

Each participant evaluated 32 applicants in this second task. Twenty-four of the applicants were white, and 8 were minorities. Half of each racial/ethnic group was female. As in the first task, half the applicants were highly qualified and half were moderately qualified. The highly qualified applicants’ qualifications also reflected programming skills.

The participant’s goal was to recommend 8 of the 32 applicants for the internship. Otherwise, the task was the same as the first evaluative task with the exception of the diversity instructions. The diversity mandate (e.g., legal, value, or control) was only presented prior to the first task.

Results

The manipulation check where participants were asked to paraphrase the diversity message presented was answered overwhelmingly correctly and suggests that participants attended to the message presented prior to the applicants’ qualifications.
Four dependent variables were analyzed for each task: the initial evaluations of each applicant (on a 4 point Likert scale labeled “Do NOT Recommend”, “Maybe Recommend”, “Probably Recommend”, “Definitely Recommend”; higher numbers indicate more positive evaluation); the proportion of whites and minorities ultimately selected in each task; and the ratings of warmth and competence of the applicants that the participant selected.

Evaluations of Each Applicant

The evaluations of the applicants were averaged across the targets defined by Race and Gender and were first analyzed separately for Task 1 and Task 2, as a function of applicant race, applicant gender (both within subjects) and message condition (between subjects). Contrary to predictions, no differences were found in evaluations of applicants as a function of race, gender or message condition for Task 1. However, for Task 2, participants evaluated minority applicants ($M = 2.63$) consistently higher than whites ($M = 2.53$), $F(1,77) = 24.45 < .0001$, and the Race of Applicant X Gender interaction was significant $F(1,77) = 19.80 \ p < .0001$ such that minority women ($M = 2.72$), were evaluated more positively than white women ($M = 2.50$). Minority men ($M = 2.58$) and white men ($M = 2.58$) were evaluated very similarly across conditions. The evaluations of the applicants did not depend on Message Condition in Task 2. Thus, in these analyses, contrary to predictions, message had no impact on applicant evaluations on either task.

The evaluations of applicants were then analyzed using a 3 (Message Condition: legal vs. value vs. control) X 2 (Task: Task 1 vs. Task 2) X 2 (Race of Applicant: minority vs. white) X 2 ( Applicant Gender) mixed model ANOVA where the first factor varied between subjects and the remaining factors varied within subjects.
Overall, men ($M = 2.67$) were evaluated slightly more positively than women ($M = 2.63$), $F(1,77) = 3.91, p = .0517$. However, men were evaluated less favorably in Task 2 ($M = 2.58$) than Task 1 ($M = 2.77$) compared to women who were evaluated similarly at Task 1 ($M = 2.66$) and Task 2 ($M = 2.61$) $F = 8.67, p = .0043$. Interestingly, and counter to the stated predictions, white applicants were evaluated as less qualified in Task 2 ($M_{\text{Task2}} = 2.53$) than Task 1 ($M_{\text{Task1}} = 2.61$) and minorities were evaluated similarly between Tasks ($M_{\text{Task1}} = 2.69, M_{\text{Task2}} = 2.63$), $F(1,77) = 11.32, p = .0012$, but this interaction was not dependent on condition.

The Message Condition X Task interaction was significant, $F(2,76) = 3.18, p = .0472$ (see Figure 1). The evaluations of applicants, regardless of race or gender, were less favorable for Task 2 than Task 1 in the control and value conditions, $F(1, 77) = 5.58, p = .0208$, while this difference was not there in the control condition.

*Figure 1. Evaluations of Applicants as a Function of Condition and Task.*
Surprisingly, none of the predicted interactions between minority status, and condition, or between minority status, condition, and task emerged as significant. A possible reason for this absence of the predicted effects was suggested by further analyses that examined whether evaluations were affected by the manipulated quality of the résumés. Unfortunately, the participants’ evaluations of the applicants did not reflect the differences in qualifications. Overall, the average rating (on a four-point scale) of applicants manipulated to be highly qualified was 2.651549, and for those manipulated to be moderately qualified was 2.651282. Therefore, it appears that although participants answered the manipulation check question immediately following the presentation of the diversity message correctly, the undergraduate participants were not particularly attentive to the applicants’ qualifications presented later in the study or, alternatively, the qualifications were not sufficiently manipulated to result in perceived qualification differences.

Applicants Selected

To analyze the number of minorities and whites selected in Task 1 and in Task 2, proportions were calculated in two ways. The first involved dividing the number of each racial/ethnic group selected by the total number of candidates selected in each task — 4 in Task 1 and 8 in Task 2. The second method involved dividing the number of each racial/ethnic group selected by the total number of candidates from each racial/ethnic group available within the applicant pool. In Task 1 there were 8 whites and 4 minorities in the pool (half of the applicants were female). In Task 2, there were 24 whites and 8 minorities. The proportions, in both cases, were converted to logits and these were used in
the relevant analyses (Judd, McClelland & Ryan, 2008). The means reported in the following section are odds that have been converted from the calculated mean logits.

**Proportions calculated using number of applicants selected.** When the proportions were calculated by taking the number of whites and minorities from the total number selected in each task, not surprisingly, the main effect of race was significant such that whites were generally more likely to be selected than minorities, \( F(1, 77) = 119.72, p < .0001 \). This was true within Task 1, \( F(1, 77) = 80.95, p < .0001 \), as well as within Task 2, \( F(1, 77) = 52.66, p < .0001 \). However, the Race X Message Condition interaction was not significant within either Task.

Differences between Tasks did emerge. It is important to note there was a difference in the proportion of whites and minorities in the applicant pools for Task 1 and Task 2 and a difference in the proportion of applicants that participants were required to select in Task 1 and Task 2. For Task 1, minorities constituted one-third of the applicant pool and participants were asked to select one-third of the pool to recommend for the scholarship. In Task 2, minorities constituted one-fourth of the applicant pool and participants were asked to select one-fourth of the pool. Therefore, the comparisons between proportions of applicants selected for Task 1 and Task 2 must be interpreted with caution. (This issue was addressed in Study 2.)

The Race X Task interaction was significant, \( F(1, 74) = 14.60, p = .0003 \), but contrary to predictions, the greatest difference between Minorities and Whites selected occurred in Task 1 rather than Task 2. The Race X Task X Message condition interaction approached significance, \( F(2, 73) = 2.76, p = .0695 \) such that there was a greater preference for Whites in Task 1 than Task 2 and this was particularly true in the control
and legal conditions as compared to the value condition, $F(1,74) = 3.36, p = .0531$ (see Figure 2). Applicant gender did not moderate any of these effects.

Figure 2. Mean Odds of Applicants Being Selected as a Result of Race, Task, and Message (Calculated using number of applicants selected.)

Proportions calculated using number of racial/ethnic members within applicant pool. The proportions were then calculated by using the number of minorities and whites available within the applicant pool rather than just the total number selected. A 2 (Race: Minority vs. White) X 2 (Applicant Gender) X 3 (Message Condition: Control vs. Legal vs. Value) mixed ANOVA with the first two factors varying within subjects and the last varying between subjects was conducted for each of the Tasks separately.

Within Task 1, a main effect of race emerged such that minorities ($M = .48$) were more likely to be selected than whites ($M = .23$), $F(1,77) = 19.79, p < .0001$, and men ($M = 1.40$) were more likely to be selected than women ($M = .97$), $F(1,77) = 31.58, p < .0001$. Neither race nor gender interacted with message condition within Task 1.
Within Task 2, minorities \((M = .14)\), were again more likely to be selected than whites \((M = .08)\), \(F(1, 77) = 38.49, p < .0001\), and men \((M = .75)\) were more likely to be selected than women \((M = .62)\), \(F(1, 77) = 38.49, p < .0001\). In addition, minority \((M = .34)\) and white \((M = .41)\) men were selected at about the same rate, but minority women \((M = .41)\) were selected more so than white women \((M = .20)\), \(F(1, 77) = 37.19, p < .0001\). Neither race nor gender interacted with message condition within Task 2.

Differences in the likelihood of applicants being selected from Task 1 to Task 2 were analyzed using a 2 (Race: Minority vs. White) X 2 (Applicant Gender) X 2 (Task: Task 1 vs. Task 2) X 3 (Message Condition: Legal vs. Value vs. Control) mixed ANOVA with the first three factors varying within subjects and the last factor varying between subjects. As expected, across Tasks, race, \(F(1, 77) = 32.85, p < .0001\), and gender, \(F(1, 77) = 42.65, p < .0001\), effects were significant such that minorities were more likely to be selected and men were particularly more likely to be selected. The Race X Gender interaction \(F(1, 77) = 32.91, p < .0001\) was significant such that the difference between the proportions of men and women selected was larger for whites than for minorities (see Table 1) or equivalently such that the minority white difference was larger for females than for males.

Table 1

*Odds of Being Selected as a Function of Race and Gender.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A large main effect of Task was found, $F(1, 77) = 2733.83, p < .0001$, such that it appears that applicants had a higher probability of being chosen in Task 1. This effect, however, is due to the fact that overall Task 1 demanded that a larger proportion of applicants be selected (4 out of 12) than Task 2 (8 out of 32). Therefore, the following interactions that include Task must be interpreted with caution.

The Race X Gender X Task interaction was significant, $F(1, 77) = 9.48, p = .0029$. While all ethnic/racial and gender categories were selected less in Task 2 than Task 1, this difference between Tasks was particularly large for minority men (see Figure 3). No interactions involving message condition were observed.

Figure 3. Mean Odds of Applicants Being Selected as a Result of Race, Gender, and Task

Warmth and Competence Ratings of Selected Applicants

Participants were asked to evaluate each of the applicants they ultimately selected in each Task on two social dimensions: warmth and competence. The ratings were analyzed using a 2 (Race: Minority vs. White) X 2 ( Applicant Gender) X 2 (Task: Task 1 vs. Task 2) X 3 (Message Condition: Control vs. Legal vs. Value) mixed model ANOVA with the
first three factors varying within subjects and the last factor varying between subjects. Across both tasks, participants generally judged applicants as more competent ($M = 6.42$) than warm ($M = 5.17$), $F(1, 67) = 174.98, p < .0001$. There was also a significant interaction between Personality Dimension X Message Condition, $F(2, 64) = 5.45, p = .0065$ such that applicants were perceived as particularly more competent than warm in the control condition ($M_{comp} = 6.43, M_{warm} = 4.77$) in comparison to the legal ($M_{comp} = 6.57, M_{warm} = 5.36$) and value ($M_{comp} = 6.33, M_{warm} = 5.37$) conditions, $F(1, 65) = 9.82, p = .0026$. There were no other significant effects related to the warmth and competence ratings of the selected applicants.

**Discussion**

None of the predicted interactions between minority status, and condition, or between minority status, condition, and task in the evaluations of the applicants emerged as significant. Interestingly, across Applicant Race, evaluations of applicants were less positive in Task 2 than Task 1 and this was particularly the case in the control and value conditions. This effect was only predicted for minorities in the legal condition. Differences in the selection tasks (scholarship candidates vs. Google internship candidates) may have resulted in participants setting the minimum requirements for the scholarship candidates lower than for the Google internship and therefore holding applicants in the second Task to a higher standard. However, this explanation does not address why evaluations of the applicants in the legal condition remained relatively similar from Task 1 to Task 2.

Again, though some differences in the number of minorities and whites selected were observed between Task 1 and Task 2, the proportion of applicants the participants were asked to select for each Task differed from Task 1 (one-third) to Task 2 (one-fourth).
The racial/ethnic proportional differences in the selection data must therefore be interpreted with caution. Though some significant message interactions were observed, they were not consistent. The likelihood of minorities and whites being selected decreased from Task 1 to Task 2 in all conditions.

In addition, Study 1 utilized a sample of undergraduates enrolled in an introductory psychology course. These students were required to complete a specified number of study participation hours (or write a research paper). This relatively young sample (19.5 mean age) did not have significant experience evaluating and selecting individuals for jobs or internships. It is also possible that the design of the study was not significantly engaging for this population to ensure adequate attentiveness to the stimuli.

Regardless of the weaknesses apparent in Study 1, one interesting finding — at least when the number of Minority or White selected applicants in each task are divided by the total number of applicants selected— is that though minorities were evaluated very positively by the participants, the participants were still more likely to select whites than minorities when it came time to recommend applicants for the scholarship or internship. Though one could argue that this is exemplary of moral credentialing where participants feel “justified” in demonstrating bias in a second task after they have clearly demonstrated they feel that minority (and white) candidates are qualified, the differences in task make this a difficult argument to accept. Students (our participants) are aware that a stellar evaluation that does not result in a scholarship or internship is rather empty, and the presentation of a screen (see Appendix C) with the participant’s evaluations of each applicant clearly displayed from which to select the applicants to award the scholarship is particularly intriguing.
Unfortunately, the results are also not clear enough to support the stereotype suppression and rebound theory as a feasible alternative explanation. Study 2 therefore was designed to address some of the difficulties inherent in the population used and the design flaws in Study 1.
Chapter 3

Study 2

Study 2 attempts to address two weaknesses in Study 1: a non-attentive sample, and different proportions of minorities and whites in the applicant pool as well as different proportions of applicants selected in Task 1 and Task 2. Study 1 utilized a convenience sample of undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course. The participants in Study 2 were human resource professionals who have day-to-day experience evaluating job applicants. This sample was also compensated for their time with an Amazon gift card. Study 2 attempts to explore whether or not the generally unexpected results of Study 1 may simply be due to a lack of engagement in the task by the undergraduate participants. Study 2 also held the proportion of applicants selected constant in Task 1 and Task 2 (one-third of the applicant pool) and minorities constituted one-third of the entire applicant pools in both Task 1 and Task 2.

Study 2 therefore attempts to clarify the results of Study 1 as well as demonstrate that the effects observed in my pre-dissertation research may be generalized to a sophisticated human resource professional population.

Method

Participants

Fifty-five human resource professionals were recruited through the Society of Human Resource Management Chapters of the Western United States. Participants had a mean age of 41.77 with a range of 26 to 64 years old and were predominately female (48 females and 6 males, one participant declined to state his or her gender). The sample was predominately white (48), but also included two African-Americans and one Asian. Four
participants declined to state their race/ethnicity. Participants were highly educated. Twenty-two held a graduate degree, 29 held bachelors degrees, and the remaining participants attended at least some college. Participants were asked to judge their level of attention to the information presented to them throughout the study on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = “Not Attentive At All” and 7 = “Extremely Attentive”. Participants’ average self-reported level of attention was 5.56.

Materials and Procedures

Participants were recruited by an email sent to Society of Human Resource Management Chapters of the Western United States that invited individuals to visit the study website with the promise of receiving a $10 Amazon gift card in appreciation for their time. In addition, they were told that they would have the chance to be entered into a raffle for a $100 Amazon gift card.

Materials and Procedure

The design of Study 2 was similar to the first study, but several changes were made that are detailed below.

The individuals who chose to participate in the study visited the study website where they were told the study’s purpose was to observe how level of human resource experience and education affected decision-making in the hiring context. The participants were then asked to imagine they had just been hired as an HR manager and asked by a supervisor to attend a university career fair. Participants were told they would review 12 applicants, but eventually select only four for hire. Participants were presented with a legal message or a value message after a screen of general instructions. Those in the control condition were only presented with the general instructions.
General Instructions:

Special Instructions from Your Supervisor

As a hiring manager you are entrusted with the task of selecting the applicants that best reflect the qualifications required:

✓ Excellent academic achievement
✓ Community involvement
✓ Professional promise

Legal Message:

As is the case in all hiring situations, you may not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status in selection decisions. You must avoid using such information in the process of selecting applicants to recommend for the associate consultant position.

Value Message:

You should be aware of our commitment to a diverse workforce and the importance of hiring individuals with diverse backgrounds and experience. Diverse work teams ensure different perspectives and creative problem solving, as well as enriching the work environment generally.

As in Study 1, participants were asked to paraphrase the instructions immediately after reading them to check participant attentiveness.

They were then asked to review the abridged qualifications of 12 applicants and evaluate them. As in Study 1, ethnicity and gender were manipulated through a photo presented along with the applicant’s qualifications. Eight were white and four were African-American with women making up half of each racial group. The qualifications in Study 2 were assigned differently than those in Study 1. In Study 1 all racial/gender combinations were either very qualified or moderately qualified (and counterbalanced by race and gender). In Study 2, half the Whites were highly qualified (e.g., GPA from 4.0 to 3.75) (see Appendix D) and the other half had very low qualifications (e.g., GPA from 3.0 to 2.60) (see Appendix E). Minorities, on the other hand, were always presented as moderately
qualified (e.g., GPA from 3.65 to 3.35)(see Appendix F). The work experience reflected in each category was similar as in Study 1 where highly qualified applicants had worked or interned in prestigious firms, moderately qualified applicants tended to have work experience in entry-level office assistant positions, and finally, those who had very low qualifications had work experience in service industries such as in restaurants and coffee shops. The qualifications were counterbalanced within each racial group. For example, a photo of a white individual was associated with high qualifications for one participant, and associated with low qualifications for another participant. Though all minority applicants had moderate qualifications, each minority applicant was not always associated with the same qualification details.

Participants were asked, as in Study 1, to evaluate applicants initially prior to deciding whom they would select. In Study 1, participants evaluated each applicant by indicating how likely they would be to recommend the applicant for the scholarship on a 4-point scale labeled “Definitely Recommend” to “Definitely Do NOT Recommend”. The scale was changed for Study 2 because there was very little variability in these ratings in Study 1. In Study 2, participants were asked to indicate on a scale from 0 to 100% how likely they would be to ultimately recommend the individual for hire.

The specific instructions presented before the task were as follows:

_You will now be presented with 12 applicants and ultimately asked to select four to hire. For each applicant, please indicate the chance of your hiring this individual on the scale below each applicant’s qualifications. 100% indicates that you would surely hire this person if given the chance and 0%, obviously, indicates there is no chance you would ever hire this applicant. Do your best given the information provided._

_Once you have gone through all 12 applicants, you will have access to how you initially rated each applicant (how likely you would be to hire them) and be given the_
opportunity to review the applicants again before making your final determination of which 4 applicants to hire.

Please do not discuss the applicants with other HR professionals who may also be participating in this study!

After participants evaluated all the applicants they were presented with a screen with the photos, names and how they evaluated each applicant (e.g. 40% chance of hiring “Applicant Name”) (see Appendix G). Participants then selected four applicants to recommend for the associate consultant position.

Participants answered two questions using 7-point Likert scales indicating the degree to which the participant agreed with the proceeding statements:

- I selected the applicant, (Applicant Name), because he/she is highly competent and is obviously destined for success.

- I selected the applicant, (Applicant Name), because he/she is very community minded and concerned with the welfare of others.

Once participants reviewed the résumés, made their selections, and answered these two questions about the selected applicants, they were asked to answer a few questions. The questions served as a filler task between Task 1 and Task 2, but also allowed the collection of demographic information about the participants and maintain the cover story that the study’s purpose was to correlate level of educational experience and length of time in the field to how human resource decisions are made.

- What is your current occupational title?
- How long have you been in your current position?
- In total, how long have you worked in human resources?
• *What do you think are the greatest challenges faced by HR professionals?*

Participants were then told they would have a second task to complete. In Study 1 for Task 2 participants were asked to select 8 candidates from a pool of 32. In Study 2, participants were asked to select 6 applicants from a pool of 18. Thus, the proportion of applicants selected from each pool was held constant (one-third of the total pool). The number of candidates in the pool was significantly reduced in Study 2 to reduce participant fatigue and to allow the study to be completed in less than twenty-minutes.

*You will now be asked to review the brief summaries of 18 applicants who are applying to work with another client, a large insurance firm that will need a team of 6 associate consultants to assist the consultants already working with this client.*

*You will now review 18 new applicants and indicate how likely you would be to hire each one.*

*After you have evaluated all 18 applicants, you will be asked to choose 6 applicants to make up the new team of associate consultants for the client.*

The diversity message was not repeated at this point. The message was only presented prior to the first task.

Again, participants evaluated each candidate on a 0 to 100% scale indicating how likely it would be for them to recommend the applicant for hire. The participants then selected the six candidates they would recommend for hire. As in Task 1, participants then evaluated how warm and competent each of the applicants they selected was perceived to be on 7-point Likert scales.

More demographic information was then collected from the participants: age, gender, race, level of education completed, job title, and number of years of HR experience. The participants were then debriefed and given the opportunity to receive a $10 Amazon
gift card in appreciation for completion of the study and to be entered into a drawing to win a $100 Amazon gift card.

Results

Evaluation of Applicants

I first examined how each applicant was evaluated by the participants on the 0% to 100% scale (scale depicted in 10% increments) that indicated how likely they would be to hire the applicant. Overall, the participants did perceive the manipulated qualifications of the applicants as designed. Participants indicated that they would be 66.75% ($SD = 20.51$) certain they would hire a highly qualified applicant, 64.34% ($SD = 19.75$) sure they would hire a moderately qualified applicant, and 37.57% ($SD = 22.99$) sure to hire an applicant that was clearly under qualified. Clearly the difference between perceived likelihood of hiring highly qualified and not qualified applicants was significant, $F(1, 54) = 63.68$, $p < .0001$, as was the difference between moderately qualified and not qualified applicants, $F(1, 54) = 162.63$, $p < .0001$. However, the difference between highly qualified and moderately qualified applicants was not significantly different, $F(1, 54) = 1.07$, $p = .3048$ ns. Therefore, minorities and highly qualified whites were considered similarly qualified.

The percentages were averaged across the targets defined by Race and Gender and ultimately analyzed using a 3(Message Condition: Legal vs. Value vs. Control) X 2 (Race: White vs. Minority) X 2 (Task: Task 1 vs. Task 2) X 2(Applicant gender) mixed ANOVA with the first factor varying between subjects and the remaining factors varying within subjects.

Before reporting that full analysis, I first report analyses separately for each task. On Task 1 participants evaluated minorities as being more likely to be hired than whites in Task 1, $F(1, 77) = 135.75$, $p < .0001$. How likely participants were to indicate they would
hire an individual was predicted by a three way interaction: Applicant Race X Gender X Message Condition, $F(2, 53) = 4.64, p = .0140$. In Task 1, the simple difference between the evaluation of whites and minorities did not depend on message condition. However, the triple interaction suggests that the white vs. minority by condition interaction depends on gender. And indeed, the evaluations of women showed a significant white vs. minority interaction such that the minority women were especially favored over the white women in the legal condition compared to the other two message conditions, $F(1, 53) = 8.95, p = .0042$ (see Figure 4). Thus the legal message seems to result in a relatively high initial rating of minority women.

Within Task 2, minorities again were evaluated as more likely to be hired than whites, $F(1,54) = 80.93, p < .0001$, and women were evaluated as less likely (55.67%) to be hired than men (57.7%), $F(1, 54) = 4.16, p = .0466$. Evaluations were further dependent on message condition such that the three way interaction of Applicant Race X Gender X Message Condition was marginally significant, $F(2, 53) = 3.05, p = .0560$. Again, a different pattern of results was observed in the legal condition than the other two conditions, specifically for females. The minority-white difference was smaller in the legal condition for females than it was in the other two message conditions, $F(1, 54) = 5.88, p = .0188$ (see Figure 4).
Figure 4. Likelihood of Being Hired as a function of Message Condition X Race X Gender X Task

Turning to the analyses that included Task as a factor, differences emerged in evaluations of applicants from Task 1 to Task 2 such that across conditions, minorities experienced a particularly large decrease from Task 1 (68.73%) to Task 2 (61.92%) as compared to whites (Task 1: 53.40%; Task 2: 51.46%), $F(1, 54) = 12.65, p = .0008$. 
As predicted, this was further qualified by a Race X Task X Message Condition interaction, $F(2, 53) = 3.44$, $p = .0395$. On Task 1 minorities showed a particular advantage in the legal condition as compared to the other two conditions. However, on Task 2, that advantage was substantially reduced in the legal condition compared to the other two conditions, $F(1,54) = 6.86$, $p = .0115$ (see Figure 5).

*Figure 5. Evaluations of Applicants: Likelihood of Applicants Being Hired as a Function of Race, Task, and Message Condition.*

As expected, given the separate analyses by task that I have already reported, the four way interaction of Race X Applicant Gender X Task X Message Condition was also significant, $F(2,53) = 4.67$, $p = .0136$. As stated previously, the difference in evaluations between minorities and whites was greatest in Task 1 in the legal condition, however in Task 2 the greatest difference in evaluations between minorities and whites was most pronounced in the value condition. This effect was primarily driven by the fact that minority women were evaluated particularly less likely to be hired in Task 2 than Task 1 in
the legal condition, $F (1,54) = 7.15= p = .01$ (see Figure 4). In other words, on Task 1, minority females were particularly positively evaluated in the legal condition, while on Task 2, that advantaged disappeared and even reversed.

**Applicants Selected**

To analyze the number of minorities and whites selected in Task 1 and Task 2, proportions were calculated in two ways, as they were in Study 1. The first involved dividing the number of each racial/ethnic group selected by the total number of candidates selected in each task — 4 in Task 1 and 6 in Task 2. The second method involved dividing the number of each racial/ethnic group selected by the total number of candidates possible for each racial/ethnic group within the applicant pool. In Task 1 there were 8 whites and 4 minorities in the pool (half of the applicants were female). In Task 2, there were 12 whites and 6 minorities. The proportions of candidates selected, in both cases, were converted to logits as in Study 1. The means reported in the following section are of odds that have been converted from the mean logits, therefore providing the odds of minorities and whites being selected given the study conditions.

**Proportions calculated using number of applicants selected.** Initially, the proportions of candidates selected within Task 1 only were analyzed with a 3 (Message Condition: legal vs. value vs. control) X 2 (Race: minority vs. white) X 2 (Applicant Gender) mixed model ANOVA with the first factor varying between and the remaining factors varying within subjects. There was a main effect of race such that whites (.38) were more likely to be selected than minorities (.33) in Task 1, $F (1, 54) = 4.48, p = .0390$. There were no other condition or gender effects within Task 1 (see Figure 6).
Figure 6. Mean Odds of Applicants Selected for Task 1 and Task 2 as a Function of Race, Gender, and Message Condition

Within Task 2, whites were again more likely to be selected (.40) than minorities (.28), $F(1, 54) = 25.22 \ p < .0001$ and men (.38) were more likely to be selected than women (.28), $F(1, 54) = 6.46 \ p = .0141$. These effects were further qualified by a three way interaction of Applicant Race X Gender X Message Condition, $F(2, 53) = 3.86, \ p = .0274$. Minority women were significantly less likely to be selected than white women in the legal
condition as compared to the other conditions, and minority men were less likely than white men to be selected in the control condition as compared to the other conditions, $F(1, 54) = 6.21, p = .0159$.

When the proportions of applicants selected were analyzed across Tasks, not surprisingly, main effects of race and gender were observed such that whites were more likely to be selected than minorities, $F(1, 54) = 17.79, p < .0001$, and men were more likely to be selected than women $F(1, 54) = 4.39, p < .0411$. The gender effect was particularly true in Task 2, $F(1, 54) = 4.76, p = .0337$.

The four way interaction of Race X Gender X Task X Message Condition was significant, $F(2, 53) = 3.99, p = .0244$, such that in Task 1 the odds of being selected were slightly higher for men than for women regardless of condition, however in Task 2 a significant difference between minority females and white females emerged where minority women were selected significantly less often than white women in the legal condition as compared to all other applicants and conditions, $F(1, 54) = 5.04, p = .0290$.

**Proportions calculated using number of racial/ethnic members within applicant pool.** When proportions were calculated by using the number of minorities and whites available within the applicant pool rather than just the total number selected, minorities were more likely to be selected than whites in Task 1, $F(1, 54) = 80.05, p < .0001$. No other gender or condition effects were observed within Task 1.

Within Task 2, again, minorities were more likely to be selected than whites, $F(1, 54) = 9.19, p = .0038$ and men were more likely than women to be selected, $F(1,54) = 6.72, p = .0124$. Neither race nor gender alone interacted with message condition. However, the Race X Gender X Message Condition interaction was significant, $F(2,53) = 4.35$,.
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\( p = .0179 \), such that the difference in minority and white applicants selected was similar in the control and value conditions where whites were selected less often than minorities. However, in the legal condition, minority men were particularly more likely to be selected than white men and minority women were much less likely to be selected than white women, \( F(1,54) = 7.18, p = .0098 \).

The predictions for this study included a Task effect such that the selection of minorities would decrease in Task 2 as compared to Task 1 as a function of message condition. When a 3(Message Condition: Control vs. Legal vs. Value) X 2 (Race: White vs. Minority) X 2 (Task: Task 1 vs. Task 2) X 2 (Applicant Gender) mixed model ANOVA was conducted, the main effects of race and gender again emerged such that minorities were more likely to be selected than whites, \( F(1,54) = 41.88, p < .0001 \), and men were more likely than women to be selected, \( F(1,54) = 4.75, p = .0339 \). Neither race nor gender alone interacted with message condition.

However, a significant Race X Gender X Task X Message condition four-way interaction did emerge, \( F(2,53) = 4.15, p = .0213 \), such that overall minorities were the most likely to be selected and in Task 1 the difference between minorities and whites was particularly large for women in the legal condition, however the greatest difference between minorities and whites in Task 2 was observed for men in the legal condition. Most surprisingly, the only case where minorities were selected less often than whites was in Task 2 where minority women were selected less often than white women in the legal condition, \( F(1,54) = 5.54, p = .0224 \) (see Figure 7).
Therefore, though the predicted pattern of results did not depend on gender, a significant difference in observed outcomes for minority men and women was observed. The results for minority women were consistent with the predictions such that in the legal message condition minority women were selected in relatively high numbers in the first
task, but significantly less so in the subsequent task. Minority men, on the other hand, were more likely to be selected in the subsequent selection task than the first task in the legal condition.

**Warmth and Competence Ratings**

Participants were asked to evaluate the applicants they chose to recommend for hire on two personality dimensions: warmth and competence. Because participants only evaluated those applicants they chose, not all gender/minority groups were necessarily evaluated. For this reason, these evaluations were evaluated using a mixed linear model (proc mixed in SAS).

As expected, participants generally found the participants they selected to be more competent \((M = 5.98)\) than warm \((M = 5.05)\). No significant warmth interactions were observed. There was a task X condition interaction such that the overall greatest difference in competence evaluations between Task 1 and Task 2 was observed in the value condition \((.167)\) as compared to the legal condition \((.03)\), \(F(1, 417) = 4.40, p = .0365\) (see Figure 8). However, race did not moderate this effect.

Furthermore, participants generally found the white applicants \((M = 6.14)\) they selected to be more competent than minority applicants \((M = 5.77)\) on a 7-point Likert scale, \(F(1, 32) = 13.19, p = .001\). Interestingly, the difference in ratings of competence between whites and minorities was greatest in the value condition as compared to the legal and control conditions, \(F(1, 49.5) = 5.14, p = .0277\).

---

\(^1\) This was not an issue in Study 1 because the number of applicants chosen was higher.
Figure 8. Perception of Selected Applicants’ Competence by Each Message Condition

**Perception of Competence**

**Control Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Competence Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Minority Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Minority Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perception of Competence**

**Legal Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Competence Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Minority Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Minority Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perception of Competence**

**Value Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Competence Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Minority Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Minority Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Discussion**

Surprisingly, the results observed for minority women and minority men differed as a function of message condition. Minority women emerged as the group most likely to experience adverse long-term effects from decision-makers’ exposure to legalistically worded messages whereas minority men benefited in the long term.

As was predicted by the stereotype suppression and rebound literature the legal message, and not the value message, resulted in bias in the long-term versus the short-term for minority women. Surprisingly, minority men did not suffer the same adverse effects from the legalistic message. In fact, they were more likely to be selected for hire in the second task in the legalistic message condition. White men appeared to be immune to the message condition and white women joined minority men as experiencing less bias in the second task in the legal condition. Again, as in Study 1, the evaluations of minority applicants in Study 2 were significantly more positive than the evaluations of whites, and, as in Study 1, minorities were also less likely to be selected in the second task across conditions when the number of each ethnic/racial group selected was divided by the total number of candidates selected in each task. However, when the proportions were calculated by dividing the number of each racial/ethnic group selected by the total number of candidates possible for each racial/ethnic group within the applicant pool, the opposite was true. Minorities were more likely to be selected than whites.

Study 2 provides support for the argument that legalistically worded diversity messages are subtle suppression instructions that ultimately result in stereotype rebound in the long-term. Though the stereotype suppression and rebound theory would predict that minority females and males would experience adverse effects from the legalistic
message, minority women were at a particular disadvantage. In fact, the legalistic message appeared to provide a positive boost to minority men in the long-term. Minority women may therefore have suffered from “double jeopardy” — membership in two stigmatized groups that results in greater bias than if that individual was a member of only one (Beale, 1970).

The explanation for participants’ apparent irrational decision process in positively evaluating minority applicants, but then not selecting them for hire when proportions were calculated using the number of applicants selected in each task may be exemplary of moral credentialing. Participants initially evaluated the minorities very positively (more so than the white applicants) and may have then felt immunized from accusations of bias when choosing to not hire the minority applicants. However, a positive evaluation without a job offer is of little worth to a job applicant and it is somewhat difficult to accept that a pool of experienced human resource professionals was not aware of the inconsistency given that they were presented with a screen with their evaluations of each applicant as they chose the final applicants (see Appendix G). Regardless, without further study, moral credentialing cannot be ruled out as a plausible explanation for the inconsistency between evaluations and selections of applicants.

However, in regards to the applicants that were selected for hire, the fact that minority women were negatively affected by the legalistically worded message in the long-term and the pattern of results for minorities differed between the legal and value conditions provides some evidence that the ultimate effect of diversity messages was not moral credentialing. In this situation, moral credentialing would predict that the legal and value messages both make race and gender salient and therefore trigger the desire to
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protect oneself from appearing biased. An initial selection of a minority applicant would therefore protect the participant from a future decision that reflected his or her bias. This was not the case. Minority women were selected less often in the legal condition.

The significant difference in the perception of competence of minority and white selected applicants in the value condition as opposed to the legal and control conditions is of particular interest and warrants further exploration in the future. The greater difference in evaluations of competence between minorities and whites appears to be a function of both whites being evaluated as more competent and minorities as less competent in the value condition than in the legal or control condition. Why may the value condition have this effect on evaluations of applicants that have already been selected for hire? One potential explanation is that in the value condition decision-makers took different backgrounds into account and considered them as criteria for hire. However, the question regarding perceived competence was not nuanced. The question simply asked the participants to indicate to what degree they agreed with the statement that a specific applicant was generally competent. Therefore, the results suggest that though the decision-makers did select minorities for hire in the value condition as a function of diverse backgrounds and perspectives, they tended to believe these applicants to not generally be as competent as their white counterparts.
Chapter 4

General Discussion

The results from these two studies were not consistent with each other or with initial predictions. In Study 1, none of the predicted interactions between minority status and condition, or between minority status, condition, and task in the evaluations of the applicants emerged as significant. Evaluations of applicants were less positive in Task 2 than Task 1 and this was particularly the case in the control and value conditions. Again, this did not depend on applicant race and is contrary to the predictions made. Some differences in the number of minorities and whites selected were observed between Task 1 and Task 2, however the racial/ethnic proportional differences in the selection data must be interpreted with caution given that the proportion of applicants chosen in each Task were not the same.

In addition, Study 1 utilized a sample of undergraduates enrolled in an introductory psychology course and the results suggest that the students were not sufficiently engaged with the task and attentive to the stimuli. I will therefore focus the general discussion on the results from Study 2.

Minority women emerged as the group most likely to experience adverse long-term effects from decision-makers’ exposure to legalistically worded messages in Study 2. Surprisingly, minority men did not suffer the same adverse effects from the legalistic message. In fact, they were more likely to be selected for hire in the second task in the legalistic message condition. White men appeared to be immune to the message condition and white women joined minority men as experiencing less bias in the second task in the legal condition.
Interestingly, participants in the legal diversity message condition evaluated the applicants they selected to hire as significantly more competent than those in the value condition. Though unexpected, the legal message appeared to have triggered in the participants the desire to select competent individuals to a greater extent than the value message. This finding is consistent with the color-blind literature where such an ideology tends to encourage a greater emphasis on merit (Ferdman, 1989). Person perception research that has focused on the two fundamental social dimensions of warmth and competence has also repeatedly found that women are perceived as warm, but less competent, and that men are perceived as competent, but less warm (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004). Similarly, African-American professionals are perceived as moderately competent and moderately warm (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002).

Thus, minority women applicants may have been particularly less likely to be selected for hire in the second task in the legal message condition because the desire to select applicants perceived as highly competent was not satisfied by minority women. The stereotypical belief that minority women are the least competent and most warm of all the gender/racial categories represented within the applicant pool may have resulted in fewer minority women being selected. Competence may have been made particularly salient in the legal condition, therefore it is reasonable to conclude that men, even minority men, would be more likely to be selected than women.

**Stereotype Suppression or Moral Credentialing?**

The present research set out to empirically test whether the detrimental effect of legalistic diversity messages on minorities observed in my previous research was best explained by the stereotype suppression literature or the moral credentialing literature.
Adding a value diversity message, the predictions were that if the legal and value conditions resulted in similar patterns of results, moral credentialing may be the best explanation. However, if only the legal message produced the negative long-term effects on minority applicants, stereotype suppression and rebound would be a better explanation for the effect.

Most surprisingly, minority women were evaluated significantly less likely to be hired and were ultimately selected in lower numbers than minority men in the legal condition in Task 2. The fact that the legal and value conditions resulted in different patterns of results for minority women suggests that moral credentialing is not the appropriate explanation for the observed effect. Moral credentialing, according to Monin and Miller (2002) would predict that the salience of gender and ethnicity triggered by the photos associated with each applicant would be sufficient to result in participants’ desire to immunize themselves from accusations of bias by initially evaluating the minorities positively, and selecting minority and female applicants in greater numbers, in the first task. Participants would then evaluate the minorities less favorably and select fewer minority and women applicants in the second task. The legal and value diversity messages both result in greater salience of race and gender. Therefore, if moral credentialing explains the underlying mechanism, the prediction is that in both message conditions we should observe a similar pattern of evaluation and selection for minority applicants.

As in Study 1, the evaluations of minority applicants in Study 2 were significantly more positive than the evaluations of whites, and minorities were less likely to actually be selected in Task 2 than Task 1, at least when the number of each ethnic/racial group selected was divided by the total number of candidates selected in each task. However,
when the proportions were calculated by dividing the number of each racial/ethnic group selected by the total number of candidates possible for each group within the applicant pool, the opposite was true: minorities were more likely to be selected than whites. Minorities were therefore selected in greater proportions than would be predicted given their number in the applicant pool, however as a proportion of who was actually hired, they were less likely to be hired. This may be evidence that participants did feel “morally credentialed” after judging minority applicants to be “hireable”, but then chose to not select them in the hiring task. This would assume that the human resource professionals felt that evaluating an applicant positively, but not offering them a position was sufficient to offer immunity from the perception of bias. Though this is possible, the fact that the participants selected the applicants to hire from a screen that presented the participant with the photos, names of the applicants, and how they evaluated each minority in the previous task, suggests this was a very conscious act. In other words, participants had to consciously choose to select applicants they had just evaluated as less hirable — the opposite of what human resource professionals are trained to do.

Alternatively, value messages encourage a decision-maker to consciously consider the differences between individuals and therefore take a multicultural perspective when evaluating individuals. Legalistic messages encourage a decision-maker to take a color-blind position — and therefore attempt to ignore racial and gender information — that may lead to unavoidable suppression of stereotypes that are automatically activated upon viewing a minority applicant or candidate and ultimately resulting in stereotype rebound.

Stereotype suppression and rebound may be triggered by a legalistically worded message that may be considered a subtle suppression instruction leading decision-makers
to “override” stereotypes associated with a minority applicant. Consistent with the results of Study 2, suppression then results in stereotype rebound, or increased observed bias, in a subsequent task. Surprisingly, stereotype rebound was only observed for minority women and not minority men. Theoretically, suppression of stereotypes would not be isolated to minority women. The prediction for these studies was that a legalistically worded diversity message would adversely affect minority women and men similarly. Why then may minority women be negatively impacted to such a degree by the legalistic message in comparison to minority men?

The stereotype suppression and rebound literature has identified low internal motivation to not appear prejudiced and prejudice against the target group as moderators of the effect. In other words, the results observed in Study 2 may have been a result of low internal motivation to not appear prejudiced against minority women given the lingering societal bias against women. Unfortunately, due to time constraints, IMS and EMS (Plant & Devine, 1998) and gender attitudes were not measured in the field sample. However, motivation to not appear prejudiced does offer a plausible explanation for the minority gender difference and suggests, as other literature has, that self-regulatory depletion (Gailliot, Plant, Butz, & Baumeister, 2007; Gailliot, Peruche, Plant, & Baumeister, 2009; Gordijn, et al., 2004) may result in stereotype rebound.

Those who are the most prejudiced and not internally motivated to control prejudice must invest the most resources to control their biases. These individuals do, in fact, appear to demonstrate the greatest rebound effect after suppression (Gordijn, et al., 2004; Montieth, Spicer, & Tooman, 1998; Wyer, 2007). Therefore, a decision-maker confronted with an applicant who may be identified as a member of multiple categories
may expend greater cognitive energy to avoid bias, even if that individual strongly identifies as an egalitarian (Moskowitz, Salomon, & Taylor, 2000; Montieth, Spicer, & Tooman, 1998). The greater the depletion of decision-maker’s self-regulatory control, the greater the possibility to observe stereotype rebound.

Another possibility is that as a minority woman, an individual experiences “double jeopardy” (Beale, 1970) — being a member of two low-status negatively stereotyped groups may result in additive if not multiplicative discriminatory outcomes (Reid & Comas-Diaz, 1990). The question of whether minority women are particularly susceptible to prejudice and discrimination has been addressed from a variety of perspectives. Sociologists have used wage and promotional data to demonstrate that minority women are paid less and are highly concentrated in lower status employment positions as compared to minority men or white women (Browne & Misra, 2003; Browne, 1999). Though such data offers evidence that minority women do face greater impediments to equity in employment, it does not bring us closer to understanding the mechanism, or more likely — the mechanisms, underlying the obvious disparity.

The concept of double jeopardy appears intuitively accurate given employment data, however empirical attempts to support the hypothesis have not been clear (Hurley & Giannantonio, 1999; Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, & Taylor, 2002). Furthermore, other research on multiple categorization activation have found that for those who may be identified as members of multiple groups, the characteristics that are relevant to the social interaction will be attended to more so than the irrelevant characteristics (or identities). Macrae, Bodenhausen, & Milne (1995), for instance, found that an Asian woman eating with chopsticks resulted in greater activation of Asian stereotypes. However, if the Asian woman
was depicted as applying lipstick, greater activation of female stereotypes was observed. In the context of the current research, the entry-level consultant position requirements were race and gender neutral and are therefore unlikely to have resulted in increased salience in one or the other category (e.g., race or gender). Whether minority women are particularly susceptible to legalistic messages because the additive stereotypes of two stigmatized groups results in greater rebound or if minority women activate a unique constellation of stereotypes, cannot be discerned given the current data.

In conclusion, initially, diversity messages appear to function similarly in encouraging decision-makers to be egalitarian in their evaluation and selection process. However, subsequently, legalistically worded diversity messages are particularly damaging to minority women. Given the differences in observed effects between legalistic and value messages, the data suggest stereotype suppression and rebound is, at least in part, the most plausible underlying mechanism for the negative long-term effect of legalistically worded messages. Legalistic mandates were unquestionably instrumental in reducing societal discrimination against minorities after a long history of sanctioned segregation. Legalistic mandates appear to still benefit minorities initially. However, the framing of diversity messages in a legalistic manner may also lower numbers of minorities in academic and employment settings in the long term. Future research will attempt to address why minority women appear to be the most susceptible to these mandates and also explore what methods of encouraging diversity and egalitarianism may be less detrimental in the long term.

“All progress is precarious, and the solution of one problem brings us face to face with another problem.”
-Martin Luther King, Jr.
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Appendix A
Study 1: Sample Résumé
Highly Qualified Applicant

CHARLES BROCHE

EDUCATION

University of Colorado at Boulder
Major: Marketing
GPA: 3.96

WORK EXPERIENCE

Janus Capital Group, Denver, CO
Marketing Summer Intern

• Assisted senior marketing manager with the production of materials for two new financial products

ADDITIONAL SKILLS & INTERESTS

Conversational Spanish
Certificate in Digital and Graphic Design
Appendix B
Study 1: Sample Résumé
Moderately Qualified Applicant

HALEY ROSS

EDUCATION
University of Colorado at Boulder
Major: Political Science
GPA: 3.24

WORK EXPERIENCE
Recreation Center
University of Colorado at Boulder
Front Desk: Customer Service August 2009 – May 2010
• Enrolled patrons in classes
• Assisted patrons with access problems
• Managed locker rentals

ADDITIONAL SKILLS & INTERESTS
Jogging
Snow-boarding
Appendix C

Example: Selection screen from Study 1 where participants view how they evaluated each applicant and must select a number of applicants to hire.
Appendix D

Study 2: Sample Résumés

Highly Qualified White Applicant.

MARISSA MONROE

EDUCATION

University of Colorado at Boulder
Major: MARKETING
GPA: 3.92

WORK EXPERIENCE

Marketing Intern (8 months)
Rally Software Development, Boulder, CO
• Assisted with marketing budget
• Researched market events and competitor information
• Assisted in outbound communications such as email and social media

ADDITIONAL SKILLS & INTERESTS

Intermediate French
Snow-boarding
Appendix E
Study 2: Sample Résumés
Not Qualified White Applicant

Scott Turner

EDUCATION

University of Colorado at Boulder
Major: ART & ART HISTORY
GPA: 2.88

WORK EXPERIENCE

Customer Service Representative (4 months)
Hotel Boulderado, Boulder, CO
• Checked-in guests
• Assisted guests with special requests

ADDITIONAL SKILLS & INTERESTS

Piano
Dance
Appendix F
Study 2: Sample Résumés
Moderately Qualified Minority Applicant

EBONY PRICE

EDUCATION
University of Colorado at Boulder
**Major:** MANAGEMENT
**GPA:** 3.52

WORK EXPERIENCE
*Receptionist (Work-Study) (6 months)*
University of Colorado, Boulder, CO
Political Science Department
- Answered phones
- Handled mailings for the department
- Assisted with departmental events

ADDITIONAL SKILLS & INTERESTS
Spanish
Appendix G

Example: Selection screen from Study 2 where participants view how they evaluated each applicant and must select a number of applicants to hire.