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Abstract

According to a growing body of research, gender stereotypes can have a profound effect on hiring decisions. However, it is unclear whether information confirming or contradicting gender stereotypes can bias recruiters’ memory and ultimately affect hiring decisions. This study examined whether gender stereotypes about job applicants can affect memory of recruiters to remember stereotype consistent information, specifically when hiring for a predominantly male gender-typed job position as Financial Advisor. In a true experiment, 158 participants screened CVs of fictitious applicants, containing either gender stereotype consistent or inconsistent information in an online hiring scenario conducted mainly through a professional social network site. Recognition of consistent and inconsistent information was measured, as well as the intent to hire and to invite the applicant for a job interview. The results revealed that stereotype consistent information on the CV was not remembered more than stereotype inconsistent information. Additionally, male applicants were not preferred over female applicants in regard to the intent to hire. Female applicants were more likely to be invited for an interview than male applicants, as opposed to our hypothesized presumption. Professional experience in personnel selection did not affect the results. Practical implications are discussed.
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Introduction

Despite great improvements in labor force participation women are still highly underrepresented in traditionally male occupations (European Commission, 2011), making up only 15.2% of the corporate boards of Fortune-500 companies (Catalyst, 2010). Although women today have acquired the necessary experience, education, and skills for upward mobility, there are apparent conditions that hinder their career advancements (Heilman, 2012). As demonstrated by a substantial body of research, gender stereotypes have a tremendous influence in the personnel selection setting since they are consistent across cultures (Williams & Best, 1990), time (Lueptow, Garovich, & Lueptow, 1995; Schein, 2001), and context (Brenner, Tomkiewicz, & Schein, 1989; Dodge, Gilroy, & Fenzel, 1995; Heilman, Block, & Martell, 1995; Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989; Schein, 2001), are widely shared and automatically activated (Devine, 1989; Dovidio, Evans, & Tyler, 1986), and very impactful when it comes to judgment and decision-making (Banaji & Hardin, 1996; Banaji, Hardin, & Rothman, 1993). Generalizations about men and women based on their gender are referred to as descriptive gender stereotypes. Women are perceived as more communal and men as more agentic: The male stereotype is often defined by agentic attributes such as achievement-orientation, inclination to take charge, autonomy, and rationality whereas characteristics of the female stereotype are communal attributes like concern for others, affiliative tendencies, deference, and emotional sensitivity (Heilman, 2012).

Studies show that if women possess attributes that increase the saliency of their gender like physical attractiveness (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985a, 1985b) or motherhood status (Fuegen, Biernat, Haines, & Deaux, 2004; Heilman & Okimoto, 2008), they are evaluated more negatively and are less likely to be selected than men (Heilman & Blader, 2001; also see lack of fit model, Heilman, 1983). Gender stereotypes are not solely descriptive, but also prescriptive. They do not only serve as shortcuts in the evaluation of how men and women are, but also serve as injunctive norms (Cialdini & Trost, 1998) for which features and behaviors are acceptable for men and women and expected from them. If women try to overcome those negative effects induced through gender bias by demonstrating their agentic qualities in accordance with male gender-typed job positions, they are likely to suffer negative consequences. Evidence suggests that violating gender stereotypes produces social disapproval and negativity, usually referred to as backlash (Rudman & Glick, 2001), which
has been shown to result in lower intention to hire and promote (e.g. Rudman, 1998). The dilemma: If women are to succeed in upper level work settings, they have to show counter-stereotypic attributes and are therefore obliged to violate gender stereotypical prescriptions. Concluding, women on the one hand have to show gender inconsistent attributes (e.g. self-assertion, dominance, and achievement orientation) in order to fit to male gender-typed jobs but are on the other hand punished for it due to gender bias.

Pre-existing expectations can influence the way in which information is processed such as attention (Johnson & Judd, 1983), interpretation (Taylor, Fiske, Etoff, & Ruderman, 1978), and even memory (O'Sullivan & Durso, 1984). Studies found that people recall more expectation-consistent than inconsistent information about one another, even falsely remembering expectation-consistent behaviors that did not actually occur (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Higgins & Bargh, 1987). Hence, we can assume that applicants’ gender consistent attributes are more readily recalled by evaluators than attributes which are inconsistent with gender expectations. In turn, this could influence selection decisions. There are numerous biases and perception errors that have been shown to influence hiring decisions significantly, such as the halo effect, confirmation bias, or gender bias, to only name a few. Gender bias usually refers to any distinctions made on the basis of socially constructed gender norms (World Health Organization, 2001) and is considered to be a largely unintentional phenomenon caused by repeated exposure to pervasive gender stereotypes (Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handelsman, 2012).

This research project is allocated in the broad area of judgment and decision-making, examining the impact of gender stereotypes in the personnel selection context. The proposed experiment aims to determine whether gender stereotypic and counter-stereotypic attributes of applicants have an influence on recruiters’ memory in application screening. Based on a profound body of research, we predict that gender stereotypes will affect memory and more specifically, that recruiters will remember more gender stereotype consistent information about an applicant, confirming the pre-existing belief. Therefore, we have formulated the following research question: Which influence do applicants’ gender stereotype consistent and inconsistent attributes have on recruiters’ memory of expectation-consistent information? More precisely, we predict that when a woman applies for a male gender-typed job and the attributes conveyed through a CV (Curriculum Vitae) are inconsistent with gender expectations, they are less likely to be remembered than expectation-consistent attributes.
This could in turn influence the likelihood to be considered for the further selection process or to be hired.

Since several candidates are generally compared in a selection scenario, attention and memory processes are of particular interest. In order to perform complex tasks, working memory and attention are two critical processes allowing to maintain task-relevant information in an accessible state over time while selectively processing information in our surrounding (Fougnie, 2008). As one of the major cognitive processes, selective attention enables efficient processing of relevant stimuli (Monsell & Driver, 2000), however, resulting in the predominant processing of salient and available information over contradictory information (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Hence, the attention system determines which of the perceived information is being transferred into working memory. The cognitive system of working memory is responsible for keeping important information active and available for other cognitive processes and comprises the three major processes of encoding, storage, and retrieval of information (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974). Generally, two methods of accessing memory can be distinguished. Recognition is a largely unconscious process that associates an event or physical object with one previously encountered, and therefore represents a response to a sensory cue. While recognition involves a process of comparison of information with memory, recall however requires the direct uncovering or remembering of information from memory without the event or object being physically present. Thus, recognition involves a single process of familiarity decision only, while recall requires an active reconstruction of information (Baddeley, Eysenck, & Anderson, 2015).

In regard to the interdependence between memory and attention, recent evidence suggests that information stored in working memory regulates selective attention processing, and vice versa (Chun & Turk-Browne, 2007; Abrahamse, Majerus, Fias, & Van Dijck, 2015). Expectations about others can act as a perceptual filter directing attention. As explained by confirmation bias, information confirming expectations generally receive more attention than disconfirming information (Johnson & Judd, 1983). Processing information in accordance with pre-existing beliefs in the form of prototypes about a certain personality type is easier than processing information deviating from this prototypical belief (Cantor & Mischel, 1979). Moreover, incongruent information to a certain schema of a person makes schematic information more memorable (O’Sullivan & Durso, 1984).
However, in research there are two conflicting points of view on whether expectancy-confirming or disconfirming information is recalled better. According to the *incongruency effect* established by Hastie and Kumar (1979), information which is incongruent with expectations is recalled with higher probability than information confirming existing beliefs. Nonetheless, recent evidence suggests that attention is only directed towards stereotype inconsistent information when cognitive capacity is constrained, but shifts towards stereotype consistent information under full processing capacity (Sherman, Conrey, & Groom, 2004; Allen, Sherman, Conrey, & Stroessner, 2009). Since in our proposed study we expect participants to respond under full capacity conditions, we assume the attention towards congruency to be more applicable in this context.

As one of the major features of a person, gender has an influence on the interpretation of men’s and women’s behavior, and implications drawn from it (Taylor et al., 1978). In addition to that, evidence suggests that expectations about another person based on their gender can bias memory, even evoking false memories (Lenton, Blair, & Hastie, 2001). This suggests that expectations about applicants in a recruitment context based on their gender might bias recruiters’ memory leading them to remember more information matching their expectations of an applicant than information inconsistent with their expectations. This could play an important role when comparing several applicants after their initial evaluation. There are often several suitable applicants for a vacant job position. Therefore, recruiters are forced to rely on their memory in order to compare these candidates. As the gender stereotype can be considered a strong effect, we expect that more gender stereotype consistent than inconsistent information will be remembered for both male and female applicants. This effect should occur even when the CV contains more gender stereotype inconsistent information than consistent information. More formally, we predicted that:

*Hypothesis 1:* More information consistent with the descriptive gender stereotype of an applicant will be remembered than information inconsistent with the descriptive gender stereotype, regardless of the actual information presented on the CV.

In order to assess the gender stereotype consistent recognition of information, male and female stereotypes will be investigated separately. Agentic attributes are consistent with the male gender stereotype, whereas communal attributes are consistent with the female gender stereotype. Thus, we hypothesized the following:
**Hypothesis 1a:** More communal attributes of a female applicant will be remembered by a recruiter than agentic attributes of a female applicant, regardless of the information presented on the CV.

**Hypothesis 1b:** More agentic attributes of a male applicant will be remembered by a recruiter than communal attributes of a male applicant, regardless of the information presented on the CV.

Male gender-typed job positions are believed to necessitate characteristics stereotypically conceded of men and not of women (Gaucher, Friesen, & Kay, 2011). Moreover, masculine wording in job advertisements leads women to experience less anticipated belongingness and job interest than advertisements for female gender-typed jobs, whilst at the same time not negatively influencing women’s appraisals of their personal ability to carry out that job (Gaucher et al., 2011). Management and executive positions, such as leadership and high-level organizational positions count to these male gender-typed job positions and characteristics that are perceived to be necessary for success in these jobs are largely agentic qualities (Schein, 2001). Negative performance expectations can arise through the perceived lack of correspondence between female stereotypic characteristics and male gender-typed requirements (Heilman, 2001). Therefore, more corresponding candidates, in this case male applicants, might be favored by recruiters leading to a biased selection decision. Women, even when from their qualifications and personal attributes able to properly carry out these jobs, might be disadvantaged simply by their gender. Thus, we hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 2:** Women applying for a male gender-typed job position are less likely to be considered for the further selection process than men.

**Hypothesis 3:** Women applying for a male gender-typed job position are less likely to be hired than men.

Gender stereotypes in the recruitment context have been widely studied by various scholars. However, the specific role of gender stereotypes affecting memory in the personnel selection context has not been researched sufficiently. This research focuses on helping to
close this research gap. The aim of this study is to raise awareness of biases in the hiring process and specifically draw attention to the effect gender stereotypes have on memory. This could prevent faulty decision-making in the selection process and in turn have a large economical impact on organizations, ensuring an efficient use of human capital and talent. Moreover, the results of this research can help prevent discrimination against women in the professional context aiming to ascend in traditionally male gender-typed work settings.

In the present research, we investigated whether gender stereotype consistent expectations about job applicants influence memory of recruiters. In an online experiment, participants were presented with the job description of the position as Financial Advisor, a traditionally male gender-typed occupation, and the CVs of fictitious job applicants. The CVs were manipulated with either the name of a male or female applicant and either stereotype consistent or stereotype inconsistent attributes, while the education and qualifications of the applicants remained the same. The extent to which stereotype consistent attributes were recognized after the screening of the CV by the participants served as a measure of the effect of gender stereotypes on memory. Participants were asked about the likelihood of their intent to consider the applicant for the further selection process and to hire. Our first hypothesis was that more information consistent with the descriptive gender stereotype would be recognized than inconsistent information, regardless of the actual attributes presented to the participant. Our second hypothesis was that women applying for the male gender-typed occupation would be less likely to be considered for the further selection process and our third hypothesis was that women applying for the male gender-typed job would be less likely to be hired.

Method

Participants and Design

Participants were recruited online primarily through posts in professional social networks (Xing and LinkedIn). Additionally, a link to the study was distributed through a mailing list of the Association of German Business Psychologists (BDP) and on a website of a German psychological magazine (Psychologie Heute). To make the experiment accessible for all nationalities, the questionnaire was developed in English. By distributing the link in recruitment-related groups, professionals with relevant experience were targeted. However,
non-recruiters were allowed in the sample as well in order to draw inferences from the possible effects of selection experience. Participants were offered to receive the results of the study as an incentive for participation after its completion.

One hundred fifty-eight participants (99 women, 57 men, 2 other) completed the online questionnaire. Due to the extensive distribution on the platform Xing (primarily used in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria), 52.5% of the participants are German, followed by Americans (19%), British (4.4%), and Other (3.2%). In regard to the age, the descriptive values confirm that a convenience sample of students was avoided by instead targeting more experienced individuals indicated by an average age of 35.68 years ($M = 35.68, SD = 11.17$). As measured by the amount of applications screened per year, 72.2% of participants in the sample have selection experience whilst 27.8% are not regularly confronted with the screening of candidates in their job. The particularly high dropout rate of 50.47% could be ascribed to the survey length or language difficulties of German participants. The intended sample size of about 400 participants could not be reached during the survey period. However, as determined by Cohen (1992), a total amount of 45 participants in each condition is sufficient if a medium effect size is anticipated. With a minimum of 36 and a maximum of 42 participants in the conditions, this requirement was approximated sufficiently in regard to the scope of this study.

For the present study, a true-experimental design with independent measures was used to examine the effects of gender stereotype consistent vs. inconsistent information presented about an applicant (independent variable) on memory, as measured by the recognition of gender stereotype consistent information about the candidate (dependent variable). In accordance with an independent measure design, participants were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions in a hiring scenario. The conditions were delivered through the setup of four different questionnaires, which differed only by the CV of the fictitious applicant that participants assessed with regard to a male gender-typed job position. The manipulation consistency vs. inconsistency of information about an applicant with gender stereotypes was represented as follows (see Table 1 below): Participants either evaluated a female applicant with only agentic attributes in her CV, accordingly presenting gender stereotype inconsistent information (experimental group A); a female applicant with only communal attributes in her CV, accordingly presenting gender stereotype consistent information (control group A); or respectively a male applicant with only communal
attributes in his CV providing gender stereotype inconsistent information (experimental group B); or a male participant with only agentic attributes in his CV presenting gender stereotype consistent information to the participant (control group B). All further qualifications and professional experience of the fictitious applicants remained identical for all conditions to increase internal validity. This information presented on the CV objectively qualified all applicants as suitable candidates for the open job position in the fictitious hiring scenario.

Table 1

*Overview Experimental Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Stereotype Consistent Information (Control)</th>
<th>Gender Stereotype Inconsistent Information (Experimental)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Applicant with Communal Attributes (Control Group A)</td>
<td>Female Applicant with Agentic Attributes (Experimental Group A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Applicant with Agentic Attributes (Control Group B)</td>
<td>Male Applicant with Communal Attributes (Experimental Group B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pretest*

In order to confirm the hierarchical level and gender type of our proposed job position, a first pretest (n=25) was conducted. Participants were presented with the job positions of Financial Advisor, Mental Health Counselor, and Human Resources Specialist, and respective job descriptions. The job positions were rated on their perceived gender type and the perceived hierarchical level of employees working in these positions. The pretest yielded the position of Financial Advisor as predominantly male gender-typed and on a higher organizational level, and it was therefore chosen for the experiment. After the design of the final test materials, they were reviewed by native English speakers. To enhance the quality of measurement, the final version of the questionnaire was then pretested with potential respondents (n=22) and additional changes in the clarity of the instructions were made.
**Procedure**

As described in the posts and the instruction to the experiment, participants were told that they would be reviewing a fictitious applicant in order to examine how recruitment professionals assess applicants based on their CVs. Groups were randomly assigned to evaluate either a male or female applicant with either only agentic or only communal attributes for the position as Financial Advisor. To ensure mutual understanding of the role and help with their decision, participants were provided with a job description of a Financial Advisor along with the CV of the fictitious applicant. Participants then completed a distractor task to enable the ensuing measurement of memory by means of a recognition test. After rating their confidence in having observed certain attributes in the previous CV from a list of both agentic and communal attributes for all participants, they were then asked to indicate the probability to invite the applicant for an interview and to hire the applicant for the job. To ensure the correct operation of the experimental manipulation, a manipulation check was incorporated, followed by a set of socio-demographic questions on the last page of the questionnaire.

**Stimulus Material**

As a measurement instrument, a 9-page questionnaire was set up using the online survey tool SoSci Survey. Upon opening the link to the study, participants first received a brief explanation regarding the background of the study, as well as an instruction to the following procedure (see Appendix A). In order to conceal the true purpose of the experiment, participants were told that they would be reviewing a fictitious applicant in order to examine how CVs are interpreted by selection professionals. On the second page, a job description was provided including the job title, contextual information, the job functions, and the job requirements (see Appendix B). As confirmed by pretests, the job position of the Financial Advisor is perceived as a male gender-typed job as well as positioned on a higher hierarchical level within an organization. In order to ensure a valid and truthful depiction of the aforementioned position, the job description was based on information from the Occupational Information Network (O*net). Following the job description, a CV of a fictitious applicant was presented. For the experimental manipulation, four separate CVs were created using a plain and simple layout, following the basic structure of (1) name, (2) professional summary, (3) core competencies, (4) work experience, (5) education, and (6)
skills (see Appendices C, D, E and F). This structure allowed for incorporating attributes through the use of text fragments. The applicant’s name at the top of the CV was manipulated to represent either a male applicant (David Smith) or a female applicant (Claire Smith). In order to avoid any confounding effects of the candidate’s name, the most average names for the respective year of birth were chosen. Then, a short summary of the candidate’s professional background and personal qualities was provided as well as a list of six core competencies. In order to display the applicant’s consistency or inconsistency with gender stereotypes, twelve (12) attributes were integrated in the text parts and manipulated as either communal or agentic for each gender. The attributes were adopted from research examining gender differences in language (Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008) and had previously been used by other scholars in research on gender stereotypes with regard to job advertisements (Gaucher et al., 2011). Work experience, education, and skills of the candidate were identical in all versions to ensure the same suitability of both, the male and female applicant for the job as Financial Advisor.

After having screened the CV, participants were confronted with a distractor task in order to shift their focus of attention elsewhere. Particularly, this task was integrated to enable participants to store and maintain the encoded information from the CV in their memory and not just remember attributes through mental rehearsal. While initially we incorporated easy mathematical equations, which participants had to evaluate as either true or false (see Appendix G), this task was changed throughout the survey phase as people seemed reluctant to complete mathematical tasks indicated by high dropout rates. In order to address this problem, a search image was included instead, asking participants to find a number of people within an office scene (see Appendix H). After having ensured the storage of memory through the distractor task, the retrieval of memory was then elicited by a recognition task (see Appendix I). Participants were presented a randomized list of communal and agentic attributes, and were asked to rate their confidence in having observed those attributes in the prior CV using a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (no confidence) to 4 (high confidence), as well as the option “I did not understand this word”.

Another adaptation made in order to prevent participant dropout was to exclude the free recall test (see Appendix J), which was initially part of the study as well. As indicated by the low quality of answers in the pretest and the early study phase, this memory test did not exhibit valuable results and was therefore removed.
Subsequent to the retrieval of memory, participants were asked to indicate whether they would consider the candidate for the further selection process and whether they would hire the applicant on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (I agree) to 4 (I disagree) (see Appendix K). On the following page of the questionnaire, participants were requested to state the applicant’s gender and the hierarchical position of the job similar to our pretest in order to confirm that the experimental manipulation was perceived correctly (see Appendix L). Finally, on the last page various socio-demographic variables were assessed including the participant’s gender, age, nationality, and selection experience (in terms of the approximate number of applications screened per year) (see Appendix M), as these were controlled for as possible confounding variables.

**Results**

Our first hypothesis was that participants remember more information consistent with the descriptive gender stereotype of job applicants from their CV than information inconsistent with this stereotype. We furthermore predicted in the second hypothesis that female candidates applying for an opening for a male gender-typed job position are less likely to be considered for the further selection process than men. Our third hypothesis was that women applying for an opening for a male gender-typed job position are less likely to be hired than men.

**Data Analysis**

Boxplots were used to detect outliers and one case was removed from the data set. The manipulation check showed that seven participants falsely identified the gender of the applicant they had assessed and these cases were therefore removed from the data. To test our hypotheses, two two-way ANOVAs, a one-way MANOVA, and two one-way ANOVAs were conducted. Additionally, correlations of the focal variables, two mixed design ANOVAs, and an ANCOVA were computed to test for any further effects and relationships. Possible confounding variables such as age, gender, and selection experience of the participant were controlled for.
Primary Correlation Analyses

In order to determine any relationships between the focal variables, correlations were computed. There was a significant relationship between the recognition of communal attributes and the intent to hire ($r = -.182$, $p$ (two-tailed) = .023). Upon splitting the sample by male and female applicants, there was a significant relationship between the recognition of communal attributes and the intent to hire ($r = -.347$, $p = .002$), and between the recognition of communal attributes and the intent to invite for an interview ($r = -.256$, $p = .028$), and between the number of CVs screened annually and intent to invite for an interview ($r = .311$, $p = .006$) for the female applicants only.

Recognition of Gender Stereotype Consistent Information

In order to examine whether there are any differences in remembering agentic and communal attributes depending on the presentation of agentic and communal attributes on the CV and on the gender of the applicant, two two-way ANOVAs were conducted. With a significant Levene’s test for the mean recognition of communal attributes ($F(3, 151) = 3.201$, $p = .025$) and agentic attributes ($F(3, 151) = 3.392$, $p = .020$) the homogeneity of variances assumption was violated. Therefore, results need to be interpreted with caution. Analysis of skewness and kurtosis showed results that did not exceeded critical values of ±3.29 for medium-sized samples (50 < n < 300, see Kim, 2013). We can therefore assume normality, which is also supported by the sufficiently large sample and equal group sizes.

No significant main effect was found for gender of applicant in regard to the recognition of communal attributes ($F(1, 151) = 2.614$, $p = .108$, $\eta^2_p = .017$) and in regard to the recognition of agentic attributes ($F(1, 152) = 1.388$, $p = .241$, $\eta^2_p = .009$). There was a significant main effect for presented attributes on CV in regard to the recognition of communal attributes ($F(1, 151) = 91.576; p < .001, \eta^2_p = .378$) (see Table 2) and in regard to the recognition of agentic attributes ($F(1,152) = 59.877; p < .001, \eta^2_p = .283$) (see Table 3). The mean for recognition of communal attributes was significantly higher ($M = 3.029$, $SD = 0.607$) (see Table 4) than the mean for the recognition of agentic attributes ($M = 2.144$, $SD = 0.766$) (see Table 5) when participants were presented with only communal attributes on the CV, a higher value meaning a stronger recognition. The mean for recognition of agentic attributes was significantly higher ($M = 3.010$, $SD = 0.617$) than the mean for the recognition of communal attributes ($M = 2.017$, $SD = 0.707$) when participants were presented with only agentic
attributes on the CV, a higher value meaning a stronger recognition. There was no significant interaction effect between gender of applicant and the presented attributes on the CV in regard to recognition of communal attributes ($F(1, 151) = .086, p = .769, \eta^2_p = .001$) and in regard to recognition of agentic attributes ($F(1, 152) = 2.686, p = .103, \eta^2_p = .017$).

Table 2
Two-way ANOVA with Dependent Variable Remembered Communal Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Applicant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes on CV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.662</td>
<td>39.662</td>
<td>91.576</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Applicant x Attributes on CV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Two-way ANOVA with Dependent Variable Remembered Agentic Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Applicant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes on CV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.401</td>
<td>28.401</td>
<td>59.877</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Applicant x Attributes on CV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>72.098</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1148.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations on the Remembered Communal Attributes as a Function of the Gender of the Applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Applicant</th>
<th>Attributes on CV</th>
<th>Remembered Communal Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.9509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.9328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.4358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.5989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.0183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.0286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2.5136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations on the Remembered Agentic Attributes as a Function of the Gender of the Applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Applicant</th>
<th>Attributes on CV</th>
<th>Remembered Agentic Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.0336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.9978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.5284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.9827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.3090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.0095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.5884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Mean Recognized Communal Attributes by Gender of Applicant (left panel) and Mean Recognized Communal Attributes by Attributes on CV (right panel).

Figure 1 (right panel) demonstrates the significant effect of the presentation of type of attributes (communal and agentic) on the CV in regard to the recognition of communal attributes. When communal attributes were presented on the CV, communal attributes were more strongly recognized than agentic attributes. This effect applies for both male and female applicants and is not dependent on the gender of the applicant.

As visible in Figure 1 (left panel), there is a tendency of communal attributes being recognized more strongly for female applicants than for male applicants overall, regardless of the attributes presented on the CV. However, this difference is not significant.
Figure 2 shows the significant effect of the presentation of type of attributes (communal and agentic) on the CV in regard to the recognition of agentic attributes. Agentic attributes were recognized significantly more strongly than communal attributes when the applicant presented agentic attributes on the CV. This effect occurs regardless of the gender of the applicant. Figure 2 shows two tendencies: When presenting agentic attributes on the CV, agentic attributes were slightly more strongly recognized for male applicants than for female applicants. When presenting communal attributes on the CV, agentic attributes were more strongly recognized for female applicants than for male applicants. However, both these differences are merely tendencies and not significant results. Hence, there is no difference in remembering gender stereotype consistent and inconsistent information regardless of the gender of the applicant stated on the CV. However, agentic and communal attributes were correctly remembered as presented on the CV. Therefore, upon analysis of the results Hypothesis 1 is rejected.

**Intent to Invite for an Interview and to Hire**

In order to explore the differences between male and female applicants regarding their likelihood to be invited for an interview and to be hired, a one-way MANOVA was conducted. Gender of the applicant was used as the independent variable. As dependent
variables, the intent to invite for an interview and the intent to hire were used. Multicollinearity was checked prior to the MANOVA by conducting Pearson’s correlations between the dependent variables, which did not exceed critical values. Given the significant result of the Shapiro-Wilk test ($p < .05$), the assumption of normality was violated. However, due to the sufficiently large sample size and equal group sizes, results are interpreted further. Given the significant result of Box’s M test ($p < .05$), the multivariate homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices cannot be assumed. With a significant Levene’s test for intent to invite for an interview ($F(1, 156) = 15.921, p < .001$) and intent to hire ($F(1, 156) = 10.347, p = .002$) the homogeneity of variances assumption was violated. However, due to equal group sizes and with regard to the robust character of the MANOVA, subsequent tests were computed. Looking at the combined effect of intent to invite for an interview and intent to hire, the MANOVA did not yield significant results using Pillai’s trace ($V = 0.028, F(2, 155) = 2.261, p = .108, \eta_p^2 = .028$) (see Table 6). However, looking at the individual results, a significant effect for intent to invite for an interview was determined with $F(1, 2.555) = 4.482, p = .036, \eta_p^2 = .028$ (see Table 7), while intent to hire did not exhibit a significant effect ($F(1, 1.775) = 2.18, p = .142, \eta_p^2 = .014$) (see Table 8). The mean for female applicants was significantly lower ($M = 1.36, SD = 0.559$) than the mean for male applicants ($M = 1.61, SD = 0.899$), a lower value meaning a larger intent to invite for an interview. With a significant Levene’s test ($F(1, 156) = 15.912, p < .001$) the homogeneity of variances assumption was violated. This was supported by the analysis of skewness and kurtosis, which exceeded critical values of ±3.29 for medium-sized samples ($50 < n < 300$) (see Kim, 2013). Thus, results have to be interpreted with caution. Female applicants were not less likely to be hired and invited for an interview than male applicants. Contradictory to our hypothesis, female applicants were more likely to be invited for an interview than male applicants. Hence, upon analysis of the results Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 are rejected.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANOVA Pillai’s Trace with Dependent Variables Intent to Hire and Intent to Recall for an Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

One-way ANOVA with Dependent Variable Intent to Invite for an Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Applicant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>4.482</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>88,920</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>441,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

One-way ANOVA with Dependent Variable Intent to Hire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Applicant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>126,915</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>789,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to examine whether there are any differences in intent to invite for an interview depending on the presentation of agentic and communal attributes on the CV, the gender of the applicant and the gender of the participant, a mixed design ANOVA was conducted. With a significant Levene’s test for the intent to invite for an interview (F(7, 148) = 3.741, p = .001), the homogeneity of variances assumption was violated. However, due to equal group sizes and with regard to the robust character of the ANOVA, subsequent tests were computed. A significant main effect was found for gender of applicant (F(1, 148) = 4.98, p = .027, ηp² = .033). The mean for female applicants was significantly lower (M = 1.35, SD = 0.557) than the mean for male applicants (M = 1.62, SD = 0.902), a lower value meaning a larger intent to invite for an interview. There was no significant main effect for the presentation of attributes on the CV and gender of participant. There was no significant interaction amongst all variables.
In order to examine whether there are any differences in intent to hire depending on the presentation of agentic and communal attributes on the CV, the gender of the applicant and the gender of the participant, a mixed design ANOVA was conducted. With a significant Levene’s test for the intent to hire \((F(7, 148) = 1.751, p = .101)\), the homogeneity of variances assumption was met. There were no significant main effects for the attributes presented on the CV, gender of applicant and gender of participant. There was no significant interaction amongst all variables.

**Discussion**

Our results suggest that gender stereotype consistent information on the CV of an applicant is not recognized more strongly than stereotype inconsistent information. Instead, communal and agentic attributes were remembered correctly as presented on the CV. Hence, evidence indicates that the potential effects of gender bias are not conveyed through memory processes in the initial screening of CVs, which contradicts prior research on the topic (Cantor & Mischel, 1979; O’Sullivan & Durso, 1984). This result is surprising in regard to the mainly German participants in the sample, as studies show that small to medium-sized companies in Germany are lacking profound knowledge of personnel diagnostics (Stephan & Westhoff, 2002) suggesting that perception errors might play a bigger role under those unstructured circumstances. With regard to leadership positions, evidence from German managers (Sczesny, 2003) and German business students (Schein & Mueller 1992; Sczesny, 2003) indicates that stereotypical beliefs about women in higher positions are still widely spread (Sczesny & Bosak, 2011).

However, there are various other reasons that could explain the absence of presumed effects in regard to this hypothesis as well. First of all, data might have been distorted by measurement errors or due to an insufficient sample size. In addition to that, the study design and experimental manipulation might not have managed to sufficiently trigger memory storage or retrieval accurately. Alternatively, stereotypical images were possibly not adequately evoked by our experimental manipulation. Since this experiment focused on the mere presentation of a relatively plain CV, this stimulus might not have managed to activate a gender schema about the applicant and make gender stereotype consistent and inconsistent information salient enough to the participants. Nonetheless, our data showed a tendency for
communal attributes to be recognized more strongly for female applicants (stereotype consistent) than for male applicants (stereotype inconsistent) and when presenting agentic attributes on the CV, agentic attributes were more strongly recognized for male applicants (stereotype consistent) than for female applicants (stereotype inconsistent). However, both these differences merely constitute tendencies and are not significant. A larger sample size might yield significant results for these trends.

Furthermore, we found no support for the prediction that female candidates applying for a male gender-typed job position are less likely to be considered for the further selection process than male candidates. However, our results showed a contradictory effect. Female applicants were more likely to be invited for an interview than male applicants. This result might be impacted by a similarity-attraction effect. As established by a large body of research, people tend to prefer others who are similar to themselves in various aspects (Byrne, 1971). With regard to recruitment, a study found that similarity bias is affecting selection processes for management positions as well (Eagleson, Waldersee, & Simmons, 2000). Accordingly, since the majority of participants were female, they might have assessed female applicants more positively due to the same gender. However, according to our results there was no interaction effect of the participant’s gender and the intent to invite for an interview, which could either be attributed to the small sample size or indicate that there are no relationships between those variables.

The absence of any anticipated effects could also be ascribed to response biases. According to Cook and Selltiz (1964), people tend to draw a certain picture of themselves that places them in a favourable light, usually referred to as social desirability bias. Thus, it can be presumed that participants in our study attempted to give particularly unprejudiced responses and hence counteracted unconscious stereotypical answers. Although the true focus of this research was concealed, participants were still aware that they were part of an experiment. This could have led to the favourable assessment of female applicants or, in other terms, a slight disadvantage of male applicants. Emerging evidence of discrimination against male applicants (Williams & Ceci, 2014; Herrmann & Kanning, 2015) usually attributes this phenomenon to media coverage of wage gaps and under-representation of women in leadership positions. Perhaps, the discrimination of men is a result of an overshooting response or spillover effect to counteract the perceived discrimination against women in the
workplace. Actions taken to prevent social desirability as a source of bias in the design of this study included assuring anonymity and emphasizing the importance of honest answers.

Lastly, our results showed no support for the prediction that female applicants are less likely to be hired for a male gender-typed job position. Given the results of the prior hypothesis, this is a plausible outcome since the intent to hire an applicant solely based on the screening of the CV is presumably lower than the intent to invite that applicant for an interview. Interventions providing raters with clear evidence of job-relevant competencies about a female applicant have shown to effectively eliminate the difference in gender stereotyping between male and female applicants, especially for female candidates applying for predominantly male gender-typed job positions (Heilman, 1984). As in this experiment, participants were presented with a job description for the open position focusing on clear job-relevant competencies, the effect of discrimination of female applicants for the male gender-typed job might have been eliminated.

Limitations

The design of the stimulus material in English provided access to participants from various countries. However, it could have led to a deterrent effect to participate in the study for non-native English speakers. Evidence of electrodermal recording indicates that there is a greater emotional reactivity towards words in someone's first language compared to the second language (Harris, Ayiei, & Gleason, 2003). Hence, the manipulation of the stimulus material with agentic and communal attributes was potentially less strong or even unsuccessful for the non-native English speakers in the primarily German-speaking sample. This could explain the non-significant relationship between the gender of the applicant and recognition of stereotype consistent information.

As the study was mainly published through a professional social network site primarily used in Germany, Switzerland and Austria, the sample consists of a large fraction of German speaking participants. As cultural and societal factors can influence gender stereotypes, this research has a higher external validity in these countries. The target population of this study included individuals with and without experience in personnel selection. However, participants were recruited in professional social network groups specifically for members with an interested in HR and personnel selection, and over half of the participants stated
having experience in personnel selection. Although experience was controlled for as a possible confound, it did not yield a difference in the results.

The aim of the experiment was to be designed close to a real selection scenario, providing a job description for the position and CV of the applicant. However, recruiters usually review applications from several candidates and compare applicants before making a hiring decision. Additionally, it is common to attach an application photo to a CV in German speaking countries. As this can activate other stereotypes for example due to facial stigma (Madera & Hebl, 2012) or obesity (Agerström & Rooth, 2011) and could be a possible confound, application photos were refrained from in the design of this study. The implementation of this research through an online experiment allowed to reach participants from the target population and to study the variables under laboratory conditions limiting possible confounds. This could in turn negatively affect external validity of the results. Another problem in experimental research is that the social psychology component usually makes this design vulnerable to the impact of demand characteristics and social desirability bias since participants are aware that they are subject in an experiment. Hence, participants might have been particularly cautious in regard to gender due to the prevalence of the topic in the media. The rather small sample size in the four different experimental conditions and the unequal distribution of male and female participants pose an additional threat to the generalizability of the results.

Implications

To begin with, future research on the effect of gender stereotypes on recruiters’ memory in the personnel selection context should be based on a larger and more balanced sample with regard to gender distribution. In order to mitigate possible effects of culture, research should be limited to examining participants of one nationality or cultural background only. Stimulus material should be designed in the native language of the participants in the sample to ensure a strong manipulation, especially when no additional cues increasing the saliency of the gender are presented, such as application pictures. In the present study, selection experience of the participants did not yield significant effects as a covariate, which could be explained by errors through biased memory of the participants who were not able to estimate the total number of CVs screened per year. Consequently, the selection experience should be assessed more adequately in subsequent research.
Apart from that, measures of memory could be enhanced and expanded, for example by implementing more effective tests of recall or using more indirect tests of memory like the word stem completion task. Moreover, the design could be modified in order to attain greater ecological validity. Since recruiters rarely only ever screen one application at a time, the study could be replicated with a repeated measure design. In addition to that, replicating research should consider removing the job description in order to match the real-world setting more accurately, which is rarely as structured and evidence-based.

Our results suggest that male applicants might be put at a disadvantage due to a spillover effect induced by the intent to prevent discrimination against women. First indications of this phenomenon need to be investigated further in order to fully comprehend the different mechanisms of gender bias in the workplace.

Generally, issues of gender stereotypes in recruitment and the impact of biases in decision-making should be further investigated in order to raise awareness of practitioners and substantiate and expand the current state of knowledge. As the recruitment setting requires fast decision-making under ambiguity or with only limited information, this environment is likely to exacerbate gender biases.

As a newly emerging field, evidence-based Human Resource Management is concerned with making decisions based on valid selecting methods, hard facts, and evidence rather than guesswork (Lange, 2013). By making recruitment professionals aware of evidence-based practices, steps against discrimination can be taken. As an example, anonymization of applications has been put into practice through pilot projects already and shown to significantly reduce the impact of selection biases (Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen, 2014). The effect of gender stereotypes can be eliminated by providing clear information about job-relevant competencies (Heilman, 1984) and committing to hiring criteria prior to disclosure of the applicant’s gender (Uhlmann & Cohen, 2005). Evidence-based practices such as job analysis can yield clearly defined job-relevant competencies and weighting schemes for decision-making, which can help standardize hiring procedures and reduce bias. Applicants should be selected less due to gender stereotypes, but to performance, skill, and objective qualities necessary to perform in a specifically defined job role.
References


Dear participants,

The CV (curriculum vitae) is an essential part of any application and contains important facts and information. As part of our master's thesis in the field of Work and Organizational Psychology, we would like to examine how people interpret CVs. We are Annika Herrmann and Meike Petermann, two master's students at Linnaeus University in Växjö, Sweden.

In this study, you will receive a job description for an open position that you will be in charge of filling and the CV of only one fictional applicant, which you are supposed to read carefully. After screening the CV, you will be asked a few questions. Overall, this study will take about 15 minutes. However, this is not about speed, so take your time, and possibly also look up words if you don't understand them. It is recommended to find a quiet spot and moment, so you will not be disturbed while filling out the questionnaire.

Your details will be processed anonymously and can not be traced back to you later on (disclosure to third parties is excluded). Please answer spontaneously and honestly.

Thank you for your participation!

Annika Herrmann & Meike Petermann
Appendix B

Job Description Male Gender-typed Job

Financial Advisor

Contextual Information:

Advise clients on financial plans using knowledge of tax and investment strategies, securities, insurance, pension plans, and real estate. Duties include assessing clients’ assets, liabilities, cash flow, insurance coverage, tax status, and financial objectives.

Job functions:

- Interview clients to gather financial information
- Recommend investments to clients
- Correspond with customers to answer questions or resolve complaints
- Educate clients on financial planning topics
- Prepare financial documents, reports, or budgets
- Identify strategic business investment opportunities
- Analyze market conditions or trends

Job requirements:

- BAVBS degree, preferably in a related field such as finance, business, marketing, etc.
- Minimum of 3-5 years of experience as an advisor
- Solid knowledge of financial planning process and financial planning software programs (e.g. Sage 50 Accounting)
- Goldmine, Certified Financial Planner®, LPL BranchNet preferred
- Possesses strong knowledge of financial products and services
- Demonstrates strong knowledge of brokerage and investment products
- Ability to provide exceptional customer service and support to field sales force in a professional and timely manner
- Excellent verbal and written communication skills
Appendix C
Female Applicant with Communal Attributes

Claire Smith

PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY
Compassionate, empathetic and supportive Finance Specialist with profound expertise in investment strategies. More than 5 years of experience in financial planning with special focus on real estate, insurance, and tax status. On a personal level I am caring and have a genuine desire to help others and the innate ability to connect with people. Combining strong knowledge of investment products and services with the determination to provide the highest level of customer service. Excellent written and verbal communication skills.

CORE COMPETENCIES
- Highly cooperative
- Considerate
- Responsible
- Sensitive
- Understanding
- Honest

WORK EXPERIENCE
Jul 2014 – present
Personal Financial Advisor
Timber Financial Group
London
- Consult with clients to determine financial needs and goals, and develop growth plans
- Offer detailed, research-based advice on strategies to meet clients’ needs
- Analyze and utilize market data to reinforce recommendations

Dec 2011 – Jun 2014
Junior Consultant
Spectrum Bank
London
- Develop and cultivate client base
- Customize financial plans to fit the needs of each client group
- Analyze investment opportunities and client needs, and recommend appropriate strategies

EDUCATION
Sep 2006 – Jun 2011
B. Sc, International Economics and Finance (Hons)
Majr in Finance
University of Huddersfield, UK

Apr 2008 – Jun 2008
A-Levels, (Mathematics; A; History; B, Biology; B)
East Goldman College, Manchester, UK

SKILLS
Languages
- English: Native speaker
- French: Fluent (B2)

Programs
- MS Office: Highly proficient
- Sage 50 Accounting: Highly proficient
- Goldmine (Certified Financial Planner)
Appendix D
Male Applicant with Agentic Attributes

David Smith

PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY
Ambitious, determined and assertive Finance Specialist with profound expertise in investment strategies. More than 5 years of experience in financial planning with special focus on real estate, insurance, and tax status. On a personal level I am active and have a genuine desire to challenge others and the innate ability to lead others. Combining strong knowledge of investment products and services with the determination to provide the highest level of customer service. Excellent written and verbal communication skills.

CORE COMPETENCIES
- Autonomous work style
- Confidence
- Analytical approach
- Competitive
- Self-reliant
- Decisiveness

WORK EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jul 2014 – Present</th>
<th>Personal Financial Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber Financial Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Consult with clients to determine financial needs and goals, and develop growth plans |
- Offer detailed, research-based advice on strategies to meet clients' needs |
- Analyze and utilize market data to reinforce recommendations |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec 2011 – Jun 2014</th>
<th>Junior Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Develop and cultivate client base |
- Customize financial plans to fit the needs of each client group |
- Analyze investment opportunities and client needs, and recommend appropriate strategies |

EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Huddersfield, UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Goldman College, Manchester, UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SKILLS

Languages
- English: Native speaker
- French: Fluent (B2)

Programs
- MS Office: Highly proficient
- Sage 50 Accounting: Highly proficient
- Goldmine (Certified Financial Planner)
Appendix E
Female Applicant with Agentic Attributes

Claire Smith

PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY
Ambitious, determined and assertive Finance Specialist with profound expertise in investment strategies. More than 5 years of experience in financial planning with special focus on real estate, insurance, and tax status. On a personal level I am active and have a genuine desire to challenge others and the innate ability to lead others. Combining strong knowledge of investment products and services with the determination to provide the highest level of customer service. Excellent written and verbal communication skills.

CORE COMPETENCIES
- Autonomous work style
- Confidence
- Analytical approach
- Competitive
- Self-reliant
- Decisiveness

WORK EXPERIENCE
Jul 2014 – present  Personal Financial Advisor
Timber Financial Group
London
- Consult with clients to determine financial needs and goals, and develop growth plans
- Offer detailed, research-based advice on strategies to meet clients' needs
- Analyze and utilize market data to reinforce recommendations

Dec 2011 – Jun 2014  Junior Consultant
Spectrum Bank
London
- Develop and cultivate client base
- Customize financial plans to fit the needs of each client group
- Analyze investment opportunities and client needs, and recommend appropriate strategies

EDUCATION
University of Huddersfield, UK

East Goldman College, Manchester, UK

SKILLS
Languages: English: Native speaker
French: Fluent (B2)

Programs: MS Office: Highly proficient
Sage 50 Accounting: Highly proficient
Goldmine (Certified Financial Planner)
Appendix F
Male Applicant with Communal Attributes

David Smith

PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY
Compassionate, empathetic and supportive Finance Specialist with profound expertise in investment strategies. More than 5 years of experience in financial planning with special focus on real estate, insurance, and tax status. On a personal level I am caring and have a genuine desire to help others and the innate ability to connect with people. Combining strong knowledge of investment products and services with the determination to provide the highest level of customer service. Excellent written and verbal communication skills.

CORE COMPETENCIES
• Highly cooperative  • Responsible  • Understanding
• Considerate  • Sensitive  • Honest

WORK EXPERIENCE
Jul 2014 – present  Personal Financial Advisor
Timber Financial Group
London
• Consult with clients to determine financial needs and goals, and develop growth plans
• Offer detailed, research-based advice on strategies to meet clients' needs
• Analyze and utilize market data to reinforce recommendations

Dec 2011 – Jun 2014  Junior Consultant
Spectrum Bank
London
• Develop and cultivate client base
• Customize financial plans to fit the needs of each client group
• Analyze investment opportunities and client needs, and recommend appropriate strategies

EDUCATION
University of Huddersfield, UK

East Greenwich College, Manchester, UK

SKILLS
Languages  English: Native speaker
            French: Fluent (B2)
Programs  MS Office: Highly proficient
            Sage 50 Accounting: Highly proficient
            Goldmine (Certified Financial Planner)
## Appendix G

### Mathematical Distractor Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$14 - 5 = 18$</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49 ÷ 7 = 7$</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 - 39 - 5 = 47$</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 - 13 + 88 = 90$</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9 + 3 \times 3 = 36$</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$27 - 13 + 4 = 19$</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$111 ÷ 11 = 10$</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H
Search Image Distractor Task
Appendix I  
Recognition Test Confidence Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Confidence</th>
<th>Slight Confidence</th>
<th>Moderate Confidence</th>
<th>High Confidence</th>
<th>I Don't Understand This Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting with people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J
Free Recall Test

List all the attributes you can recall from David Smith’s CV.
You can enter a maximum of 20 attributes. Please use only adjectives (e.g. clever, boring, enthusiastic) and no hard facts (e.g. Bachelor’s degree, language skills).

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 01 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 02 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 03 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 04 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 05 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 06 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 07 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 08 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 09 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 19 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 20 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
Appendix K
Intent to Hire and Intent to Recall

Based on her CV, I would consider Claire Smith for the further selection process.
(Please choose the response that is most applicable.)

- I agree
- I slightly agree
- I slightly disagree
- I disagree

Based on her CV, I would hire Claire Smith for the job position as Financial Advisor.
(Please choose the response that is most applicable.)

- I agree
- I slightly agree
- I slightly disagree
- I disagree
Appendix L

Manipulation Check

Please state the gender of the applicant whose CV you just screened.

- Male
- Female

In my opinion, in the job as Financial Advisor the percentage of...

- men working in this job is higher than women.
- women working in this job is higher than men.
- men and women working in this job is balanced.

In my opinion, In the job as Financial Advisor employees operate at a...

- high hierarchical level in an organization.
- medium hierarchical level in an organization.
- low hierarchical level in an organization.
Appendix M

Socio-demographic Questions

Please state your year of birth.

[Please choose]

Please state your gender.

- Male
- Female
- Other

Please state your nationality.

[Please choose]

Does your job (occasionally) require you to screen application documents?

- Yes
- No

How many CVs do you screen on average per year?
(Please state number in digits, e.g. 200)

On average ___ / CVs
Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

We would like to thank you very much for helping us.

For more information on the study and the results please contact us via Email (wop.psychology.lnu@gmail.com) or feel free to connect with us through Xing.

Your answers were transmitted, so you may close the browser window or tab now.

For further questions please contact: wop.psychology.lnu@gmail.com, Linnaeus University
Växjö (Sweden) – 2018