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ABSTRACT

The present study examined the effect of priming with individualistic or communalistic values on the decision to hire a Black or White job candidate. The experimental design was a 3 (value priming group) x 2 (applicant qualifications) x 2 (gender of participant) factorial. Introductory psychology students read and responded to an individualistic, a communalistic, or a neutral values survey. Half the participants then read profiles of two equally qualified job candidates, one Black and one White. Unequal qualifications condition participants read profiles of a Black and a relatively better qualified White candidate. Participants then indicated whom they would hire and responded to a survey of symbolic racism. The significant interaction between priming group and candidate qualifications indicated that, contrary to the hypotheses, participants primed with individualistic values were not more likely than participants primed with communalistic values to hire the White candidate in the equal or unequal qualifications conditions. Instead, participants primed with neutral values demonstrated the most extreme preferences, with those in the equal qualifications condition significantly more likely to hire the Black candidate than those in the unequal qualification condition. Chi-square analysis indicated that participants in the equal qualifications condition were equally likely to hire the Black or White candidate; participants in the unequal qualifications condition had a strong preference for the White candidate. Implications of these findings for the implementation of employment equity policies are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Although Canada has been multicultural and multiracial for hundreds of years, economic and employment opportunities have always been inequitably distributed among the various ethnic groups comprising the Canadian population. The federal government has recently defined visible minorities (e.g., those of African, Asian, Caribbean, and Latin American ancestry and other non-Whites) as one of four designated groups that have suffered from these inequities (Canadian Senate and House of Commons, 1986; Ministry of Citizenship, 1994a). Women, Aboriginal peoples, and individuals with physical and/or mental challenges comprise the other three designated groups (Ministry of Citizenship, 1994b).

Visible minorities have long experienced high and persistent unemployment rates, occupational segregation, and over-representation in low-paying, low-status jobs. When compared to White males, visible minorities tend to have lower incomes, fewer promotional opportunities, less economic and decision-making power, lower ranks in company hierarchies, higher unemployment rates, and lower participation rates in the labour force (Agocs, Burr, & Somerset, 1992). These disparities cannot be attributed to differences in education. In fact, visible minorities as a group tend to be better educated than the general population (Agocs et al., 1992). They are also more likely to live in large cities where average earnings are higher. Nonetheless, when the influence of education and geographic location is held constant, visible minority employees earn less than their non-minority counterparts (Agocs et al.,
Since the early 1970s, representatives from the designated groups, human rights commissions, trade unions, and the legal profession have fought for legislation that would ensure equity in the workplace. Ultimately, these activities led to the development of employment equity policies designed to ensure nondiscriminatory hiring practices and the elimination of barriers to employment (Abella, 1984; Canadian Senate and House of Commons, 1986).

Employment equity policies are a source of contention in part because of confusion regarding the meaning of the term employment equity (or affirmative action, the term used in the United States) (De Angelis, 1995). According to Rosenfeld (1991), affirmative action is the:

preferential hiring [and] promotion . . . of minorities or women . . . for purposes of remedying a wrong or of increasing the proportion of minorities or women in the relevant labour force. . . . Such preferential treatment may be required . . . to achieve a defined goal or to fill a set quota. In the context of job hiring or promotion, preferential treatment . . . include[s] the hiring or promotion of a minority or a female over a more qualified non-minority or male (pp. 47-48).

This definition addresses two issues critical to the employment equity debate -- quotas and preferential hiring. In practice, quotas can be either true quotas or numerical
goals. True quotas are the "stronger" of the two alternatives and can be defined as the allocation of a fixed number (or proportion) of jobs to members of targeted groups. For example, a quota may require that 10 positions (or 10%) of the total places in the first year class at a medical school be set aside for Blacks in order to meet the health care needs of the Black community.

In Canada, employment equity plans typically include numerical goals rather than quotas. Numerical goals and quotas differ primarily in terms of their penalties for non-compliance. To use Akande's analogy (personal communication, July 21, 1994), ambitious students may strive for 100% on a test, but if they do not get a perfect grade, they are not seen as failures. Rather, they are given credit for their efforts and perhaps even congratulated on their progress. Similarly, an organization that fails to reach its numerical goal is not reprimanded for failure but is commended for its effort. A quota is a different matter. Students must reach a "mark quota" (usually 50% or higher) to pass a test or course. Otherwise, they face negative consequences (e.g., failure). Similarly, organizations working toward fixed quotas may face negative sanctions if they fail to hire a specific number of people from designated groups.

The second critical issue included in Rosenfeld's (1991) definition, and the one explored in the present study, is preferential hiring. Although preferential hiring is often defined as the hiring of a designated group member over an equally qualified non-member, Rosenfeld (1991) defines it more strongly, as the hiring of a designated group member over a better qualified non-member. Regardless of which hiring
procedure is followed, opponents argue that consideration of group status is unfair because it violates the equity principle of distributive justice, according to which rewards are distributed among people in proportion to their contributions (Deutsch, 1985). In the context of employment, those who potentially can contribute more (e.g., those with superior qualifications and/or experience) should be rewarded with a job.

The counter-argument is that employment equity policies allow those who were previously eliminated from competition because of personal characteristics unrelated to qualifications and/or experience to compete on the same level as formerly favoured group members. The imposition of quotas and/or preferential hiring compensates for past wrongs by increasing the proportion of targeted group members to more accurately reflect their proportion in the general population (Rosenfeld, 1991). As former United States President Lyndon Johnson stated:

You do not take a person who for years has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say, you’re free to compete with all the others, and still justly believe that you have been completely fair. Thus, it is not enough just to open up the gates of opportunity (Johnson Address to Howard University, 1965).

Employment equity policies utilize preferential treatment in order to remove barriers to the employment of a particular group of people and to improve their chances of obtaining a fair proportion of goods or opportunities (Fauuarez, 1994).
Although the mechanisms and structures that have traditionally given some people an edge remain intact (e.g., various forms of nepotism or membership in informal networks that notify them of available positions) (Turner & Pratkanis, 1994), employment equity gives those without such advantages a comparable edge.

In practice, members of designated groups whose hiring helps to meet a numerical goal or quota are not hired "off the street." Maintenance of a viable organization requires that all employees hired meet at least the minimum requirements of the position. The dual goals of quota fulfilment and adequate qualification can be accomplished by several selection procedures. With the value added approach, job candidates are rated on several criteria, one of which is their membership in one of the designated groups (Crosby, 1994). Points are assigned for ratings on each criterion and the candidates with the highest scores are hired or promoted. Another method involves the use of traditional criteria but requires that if one of the top three (or four or five) candidates for a position is a designated group member, then that candidate will automatically be selected in preference to the other candidates (Crosby, 1994).

The argument for legislat ing employment equity rather than depending on employers' good will is based on the contention that if the market is left to adjust the workplace, then representation of designated groups will change very slowly (Abella, 1984). For example, "at their current rate of progress, women . . . won't achieve equality [in representation proportionate to their existence in the general population] in the workplace for another 80 years" (Royal Commission on Equality in
Employment, 1993, p.3). Moreover, it could be argued that the best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour, which in the workplace has resulted in gross underrepresentation of designated group members.

An often used argument against employment equity revolves around the extent to which past wrongs should be compensated. Given that we are now committed to equity, opponents of employment equity argue that the imposition of quotas or preferential hiring policies can result in "reverse discrimination" -- discrimination against non-designated group members who should not have to suffer as individuals for the past "sins" of their group. There is little debate over the fact that discrimination based on a "morally irrelevant characteristic of persons - such as sex, religion, or race" is arbitrary and therefore unjust (Faundez, 1994, p.4). The important question is whether it is morally appropriate to consider the same characteristics in order to compensate designated group members for discrimination that occurred in the past. Nickel (1977, cited by Faundez, 1994) argues that:

affirmative action does not involve reverse discrimination because the preferential treatment involved in affirmative action for purposes of reparations is not based on a morally irrelevant characteristic. For example, if it is decided to apply affirmative action measures as a form of reparation to benefit members of a group who have been discriminated [against] on account of their race, the differential treatment is not based on an irrelevant characteristic, but on the fact that members of that group were treated unfairly because of their race
In other words, historically, discrimination has been based on a morally irrelevant characteristic (e.g., race), whereas employment equity and affirmative action are based on a morally relevant characteristic -- having been treated unfairly because of one's race. Nickel (1977, cited by Faundez, 1994) argues that only individuals who have experienced discrimination personally should be compensated, not the entire designated group. He also notes, however, that most group members have been victimized by discrimination. Thus, the only administratively feasible way to compensate individual victims is to implement programs that benefit the entire designated group.

For supporters of employment equity, it would, of course, be ideal if everyone agreed with these arguments. Unfortunately, research suggests that most non-minority group members don't understand employment equity or affirmative action (De Angelis, 1995) and/or oppose these types of policies (Crosby, 1994). One possible explanation for this vehement opposition to employment equity for visible minorities is that the United States and Canada are inherently racist societies. The evidence for this position is unfortunately plentiful (Abella, 1984; Lipset & Schneider, 1978; Sniderman & Hagen, 1985), especially with regard to Black citizens of the United States.

Until the Civil Rights laws were passed in the early 1960s, Blacks were not formally considered equal to Whites by the federal government (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986). In the United States, discrimination was legally sanctioned through
segregation legislation requiring Blacks to use different drinking fountains and restrooms, sit at the back of buses, and attend separate, and unequal, schools (Powledge, 1991). Moreover, although civil rights legislation and affirmative action policies are important steps toward equality, they are incapable of immediately compensating for hundreds of years of mistreatment. More importantly, the implementation of such policies is not capable of changing people's attitudes and values in the near future (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986). With regard to employment equity in particular, Lipset and Schneider (1978) found that 80% of Whites surveyed opposed the promotion of a Black worker over an equally able White worker. Similar results were found in a national survey of employers (Braddock & McPartland, 1987).

Undoubtedly, racism is responsible for much of the opposition to employment equity. A related source of this opposition was explored by Katz and Hass (1988) and provides the basis for the present study. Individualism and communalism have been described as core American values (Williams, 1979) that influence the attitudes and behaviours of the majority of White Americans (Katz & Hass). The individualistic orientation is consistent with the Protestant work ethic, which emphasizes the importance of hard work, individual achievement, self-reliance, and self-discipline (Katz & Hass). The Protestant ethic is strongly implicated in people's judgements and feelings about minorities (Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986), conservatism (Feather, 1984), and attitudes toward public assistance programs (MacDonald, 1972). Furthermore, those with strong individualistic values are likely to believe that people should be self-reliant rather than dependent upon help from
others. Individualism is also closely associated with an internal locus-of-control orientation (Lied & Pritchard, 1976; Mirels & Garrett, 1971; Waters, Baltis, & Waters, 1975). Strongly individualistic people also prefer equity (where each person is rewarded according to what they have contributed) over equality (where each person receives the same reward regardless of their relative contributions) (Greenberg, 1978; 1979).

Communalism, the other core value, incorporates the democratic ideals of equality, social justice, and concern for the well-being of others. This value is expressed in various ways, including the tendency to help others less fortunate than oneself, the belief that one should be kind to all people, and feelings of social responsibility (Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986). This value system is consistent with humanitarianism-egalitarianism. People with this outlook tend to see minority groups in a favourable light, often emphasizing the contributions minority group members could make to society if given the opportunity.

The intriguing aspect of these two value systems is that, according to some researchers (e.g., Katz & Hass, 1988; Katz et al., 1986; Williams, 1979), many people hold both individualistic and communalistic values simultaneously despite the fact that they are in many ways contradictory. As a result, many Americans are ambivalent when faced with issues that bring these two value systems into direct conflict (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Katz et al., 1986; Lipset & Schneider, 1978) such as employment equity. Tetlock (1986) suggests that this ambivalence should lead to attitudinal moderation. Tetlock argues that with reference to particular groups, when
people are faced with issues that make both value systems salient, the conflict leads people to think more carefully about the issue and reach a conclusion less extreme than that suggested by either individualism or communalism alone.

Although Tetlock's (1986) predictions are plausible, much of the empirical evidence to date favours Katz and Hass' (1988) ambivalence amplification hypothesis (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Katz et al., 1986), according to which reactions to members of stigmatized groups will be more extreme than reactions to non-stigmatized groups. Thus the ambivalent person will be more positive than might be expected in some situations and more negative than expected in other situations (McConahay, 1986). McConahay also predicts that those who do not have strong negative feelings toward Blacks will not experience ambivalence. These individuals will be guided primarily by their beliefs in equality and fairness which reinforce their relatively positive feelings about Blacks. Those with extremely negative feelings toward Blacks are not expected to experience ambivalence either because their anti-Black attitudes will overpower their belief in equality.

Regardless, both pro- and anti-Black sentiments are prevalent in the psyche of White Americans suggesting that many people are ambivalent. For example, although White participants surveyed by Lipset and Schneider (1978) endorsed the pro-Black concepts of integration and equality in principle, they did not support proposals forwarded by local governments designed to encourage Black people to buy homes in the suburbs. In addition, opinion polls taken in the 1970s showed that over two thirds of the people surveyed supported anti-discrimination laws. During the same time
period, a large percentage of White Americans surveyed indicated that they believed that Blacks were getting more financial assistance than they deserved or needed and were demanding too much too soon in their push for equality (Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay, 1982).

Katz et al. (1986) propose that conflicting racial attitudes are due, in part, to the corresponding individualism-communalism split in values. They suggest that Blacks tend to be perceived in two ways: (1) as a group whose "faulty" traits and "inappropriate" behaviours contribute to its plight, and (2) as a group whose life chances have been, and continue to be, reduced by discrimination and who are deserving of sympathy and support. The former perception is linked to individualistic values, which sensitize majority group members to minority group behaviours that deviate from and threaten majority group members' values. The latter perception is linked to communalistic values, which lead people to identify with the needs and aspirations of visible minorities, to feel sympathy for the injustices they have experienced, and to support efforts to improve their condition. In contrast to those for whom communalistic values are predominant, those with strong individualistic values are likely to attribute high unemployment or low status employment among Blacks to personality shortcomings rather than to situational factors such as few job or promotion opportunities. Lipset and Schneider (1978) saw many inconsistencies in the White majority's reactions to civil rights issues as rooted in a contradiction between individualism and communalism. On every issue that they examined, they found a positive, pro civil rights consensus in public opinion when only egalitarian
questions (e.g., discrimination laws) were at stake. When an issue also challenged basic notions of individualism (e.g., compulsory integration which threatens the concepts of freedom and self-determination) the consensus broke down.

This presumed link between individualistic - communalistic values and the corresponding pro- or anti-Black attitudes was the basis for Katz and Hass' (1988) study. In this experiment, Katz and Hass demonstrated that priming an individualistic or communalistic value orientation or a pro- or anti-Black attitude increased the endorsement of the corresponding attitude or value but not of the theoretically opposite attitude or value. In this context, priming may be defined as the tendency for a recently presented concept (e.g., individualistic or communalistic values) to "prime" or "cue" responses to a subsequent "target" question (e.g., a survey of attitudes about Blacks) (Kassin, 1995). Participants given a social values questionnaire containing only individualistic items subsequently endorsed more anti-Black statements than participants primed with communalistic or neutral items. Similarly, those primed with the communalistic items subsequently expressed stronger pro-Black attitudes than those primed with individualistic or neutral items. An analogous pattern of results was observed when participants were primed with attitudes rather than values. Participants primed with pro-Black attitude statements had significantly higher communalistic scores than those primed with anti-Black or control items. Individuals primed with anti-Black attitude statements had significantly higher individualistic scores than those primed with pro-Black or control items.

Katz and Hass' (1988) study supports the contention that values are
determinants of attitudes (Braithwaite & Scott, 1991; Rokeach, 1973). And, according to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and others (e.g., Eagly & Chaiken, 1993), attitudes influence behavioural intentions and behaviours. Given these links, the issue addressed in the present study was whether value priming could influence behavioural intentions. Theoretically and empirically, the link between values and behaviours is more tenuous than the link between values and attitudes. Therefore, value priming may be less effective in eliciting behavioural intentions than in eliciting attitudes (Braithwaite & Scott, 1991). However, anecdotal evidence suggests that politicians, among others, deliberately prime certain values in order to influence behaviours (Zimbardo & Lieppe, 1991). For example, the successful Bush campaign for the United States presidency featured television commercials that told the story of Willie Horton, a Black convicted murderer from the state where Bush’s opponent was governor. While Horton was out of jail on a state sponsored prison furlough program, he raped a young woman and assaulted her boyfriend. Although Horton’s race was never stated explicitly in the ads, it has been suggested that the racial implications were critical to the campaign’s effectiveness. The ads played on White voter’s fears, linked them to Dukakis’ liberal (i.e., communalistic, egalitarian) perspective and then contrasted them with Bush’s conservative (i.e., individualistic, Protestant ethic) approach.
The present study was designed to determine the extent to which priming individuals with either individualistic or communalistic values would influence their decision to hire either a Black or White applicant for a position. As previously discussed, individualistic values reflect the Protestant work ethic, emphasizing the notion that hard work is an important determinant of success, and that laziness is the main reason for the relative lack of success experienced by certain minorities. Therefore, those primed with individualistic values are likely to believe that people should be self-reliant rather than dependent on help from others. In terms of the values-attitude link demonstrated by Katz and Hass (1988), any latent anti-Black attitudes they have will presumably be activated, leading to a behavioural intention favouring a White over a Black candidate. Thus, the first hypothesis tested in the present study is that participants primed with individualistic values will be significantly more likely than those primed with communalistic values to hire a White applicant rather than a Black applicant.

The second hypothesis is two-fold and involves the interaction between priming condition and candidates’ qualifications. This hypothesis is based on the fact that preferential hiring can take either a weak form (i.e., hiring a Black candidate over an equally qualified White candidate) or a strong form (i.e., hiring a Black candidate over a better qualified White candidate). If priming with individualistic values serves to increase the salience of anti-Black attitudes, then it is reasonable to assume that the strong form of employment equity would be even more vehemently opposed than the weak form by participants in the individualistic priming condition.
Hence, it is hypothesized that participants primed with individualistic values will be significantly more likely to hire a White candidate over a relatively less qualified Black candidate than a White candidate over an equally qualified Black candidate.

Given the high level of ambient racism in our society (e.g., Lipset & Schneider, 1978), it is unlikely that even those primed with communalistic values will favour the hiring of a Black candidate over a relatively more qualified White candidate. However, just as individualistic value priming is predicted to amplify outgroup rejection and ingroup favouritism, communalistic priming may diminish these reactions. Therefore, it is predicted that participants primed with communalistic values in the equal qualifications condition will not differ significantly from those in the unequal qualifications condition in terms of their hiring recommendations.

The third hypothesis is based on the associations between individualistic and communalistic values and symbolic racism, analogous to the association between these values and pro- and anti-Black attitudes reported by Katz and Hass (1988). The term symbolic racism (also referred to as modern racism) refers to a blend of anti-Black affect and the kind of traditional American values embodied in the Protestant ethic (Kinder & Sears, 1981). Symbolic racism includes negative beliefs based on a reaction to certain post civil rights era policies that symbolize to some Whites unfair gains or demands of Blacks (Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay, 1986). These anti-Black feelings are expressed indirectly in terms of resistance to policies like employment equity rather than directly as in support for segregation (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1991). Symbolic racism is hypothesized to underlie opposition to policies
that threaten to challenge the racial status quo. In addition to prejudice, symbolic racism is thought to be based on conservative political and value socialization rather than personal experience or competition with Blacks (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1991; Kinder, 1986; Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay & Hough, 1976). This modern form of racism is marked by a tendency to avoid expressing opinions that are blatantly anti-Black or segregationist (McConahay, 1986). Modern or symbolic racists would rather express relatively ambiguous anti-Black feelings that are amenable to defense on non-racial grounds (Katz et al., 1986). Early studies of this construct demonstrated that many Whites expressed moral outrage at what Blacks were doing and demanding as a group. Two sources of this anger were identified: (1) negative feelings toward Blacks, and (2) the type of conservatism present in the secularized values of the Protestant Ethic (McConahay & Hough, 1976).

Behaviorally, symbolic racism is manifested in actions that are justified on a nonracial basis (e.g., conservative politics and values) but operates to maintain the racial status quo with its discrimination against the welfare, status, and symbolic needs of Blacks (McConahay & Hough, 1976). Based on the empirically determined correlation between individualistic and anti-Black attitudes (Katz & Hass, 1988) and the correspondence between anti-Black attitudes and symbolic racism, it is predicted that participants primed with individualistic values will demonstrate stronger symbolically racist attitudes than participants primed with communalistic or neutral values.
CHAPTER 2

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from introductory psychology classes at the University of Windsor. One hundred and ninety five students participated in this study, 56 men and 139 women. Of these, 40 were non-White and were excluded from the final sample. This group of 40 included 13 African Canadians, 20 Asians, 3 Hispanics, 2 Middle Eastern, 1 Aboriginal/Native, and 1 person who self-identified as "Other." An additional four White participants did not indicate which candidate they would hire (or indicated both candidates, see Procedure) and were also dropped from subsequent analyses. The average age of the 155 participants in the final sample (43 men and 112 women) was 20.5 years (SD=3.8). Of these, 115 were in first year, 19 in second, 17 in third, 3 in fourth, and 1 in year 5 (presumably this person was completing an undergraduate degree since they were enrolled in an introductory psychology class). Many were in the faculty of social sciences (n=58); smaller numbers were in the faculties of business (n=21), the school of social work (n=11), science (n=9), or had not declared a major (n=30).

Experimental Design

The study was a 3 (priming stimulus) x 2 (target candidate qualifications) x 2 (gender) between-subjects factorial design. Gender was included in the analysis to determine whether White men are more averse to employment equity-consistent hiring decisions than White women who are likely beneficiaries of the policy.
Procedure

Participants completed the experiment in groups ranging in size from 20 to 100. They received a package including an informed consent form (Appendix A), a description of the study, the priming stimulus (Appendix B), the experimental manipulation (Appendix C), and the dependent measures (Appendix D) from a White female experimenter. According to the study description, its goal was to investigate organizational decision making processes as a function of participants’ personalities, their personal values, and the quantity of information made available to them.

An equal number of participants were randomly assigned to individualistic (IND), communalistic (COMM), and control (CONT) conditions. Participants first read and responded to either the IND, COMM, or CONT scale. Participants then read the summarized dossiers of two graduate students, one Black and one White, applying for a position as a research project coordinator. Each dossier contained a personal profile including the applicant’s racial/ethnic background, grade point average (GPA), academic program, research and work experience, publications/conference presentations, scholarships, and awards received.

Half the participants received information about two equally qualified candidates (equal qualifications condition); the other half received information revealing that the White candidate was relatively more qualified than the Black candidate (unequal condition). Although the White candidate had better qualifications, both were sufficiently qualified for the position. Profiles of the candidates in the equal qualifications condition were counterbalanced to control for
any perceived differences between the candidates (Appendix B). For half the
participants, the Black candidate was matched with "Greg's" profile; for the other
half, the Black candidate was matched with "Derek's" profile. Similarly, the profile
of the White candidate was "Greg's" 50% of the time and "Derek's" 50% of the
time.

Respondents then completed the symbolic racism scale, a manipulation check,
and some demographic information. Finally, they met with the experimenter in a
separate room for debriefing. During the debriefing, all of the priming stimuli were
available for examination by interested participants and the purpose of the study was
explained in detail (Appendix E).

**Measures**

**Priming Stimuli**

The individualistic priming stimulus consisted of the Protestant Ethic (PE)
scale (Katz & Hass, 1988; derived from Mirels & Garrett, 1971). With respect to
individualism, the focus of this scale is on those components embodied in the
Protestant ethic that emphasize the importance of hard work, individual achievement,
conservatism, and attitudes toward public assistance programs. Although Mirels and
Garrett's (1971) Protestant work ethic (PWE) scale has been cited more frequently in
the research literature (Furnham et al., 1993), the Katz and Hass (1988) scale was
selected because it contains fewer items, is highly correlated with the original scale (r
= .93), and is adequately reliable (Cronbach's alpha = .76). Examples of PE items
are as follows: "Most people who don't succeed in life are just plain lazy," and
"Anyone who is willing and able to work hard has a good chance of succeeding."

The communalistic priming stimulus consisted of the 11-item Humanitarian-
Egalitarian (HE) scale (Katz & Hass, 1988), which emphasizes the notions of equality
and concern for the well-being of others. The HE scale is not correlated with the
PWE scale ($r = .09$) or with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($r = .13$)
and is adequately reliable (Cronbach's alpha = .84). Examples of HE items include:
"One should find ways to help others less fortunate than oneself," and "There should
be equality for everyone -- because we are all human beings."

The control condition priming stimulus consisted of a neutral scale (G. Hass,
personal communication, November 7, 1994) that was uncorrelated with the PE or the
HE scales. This scale consists of 11 items that are very general in nature (e.g.,
"One-way streets help make traffic move more smoothly"). The items on all three
scales were answered on a six point Likert type scale such that strong agreement with
an item was indicated by a score of +3 and strong disagreement with an item was
indicated by a score of -3 (there was no neutral or zero point on the scale and all
scales are included in Appendix A).

**Dependent Measures**

After reading the dossiers of the two job applicants, participants were asked to
indicate on a six point scale which of the two candidates they believed should be
offered the position. This scale was anchored at one end by "Absolutely sure White
candidate's name" and was coded as a 1. The other end of the scale was "Absolutely sure Black candidate's name" and was coded as a 6. There was no neutral point on this scale so participants were forced to choose one candidate or the other (Appendix A). The use of this scale makes it possible to determine the strength of the respondents’ choice in addition to looking at which candidate they chose.

Symbolic racism was measured using Kinder and Sears’ 8-item (1981) expressive racism sub-scale (Appendix A). The entire scale consists of two sub-scales: the expressive racism scale, and a scale measuring opposition to busing (which was inappropriate for the present study). Items on the expressive racism sub-scale were answered in a forced-choice format (e.g., yes/no).

Manipulation Check

Before answering the demographic questions, participants were asked "Did the candidates differ on any noteworthy characteristics (e.g., qualifications, experience, gender, ethnicity)?" in an open-ended response format. Any responses that indicated that a respondent did not understand their task or that they were not paying attention would have necessitated the elimination of that respondent’s questionnaire from further analysis. No participants were dropped from the analysis for this reason.

Demographic Questions

Participants were asked their age, sex, year in university, program, and racial/ethnic background.
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Results

Preliminary Analyses

Fifteen participants did not respond to the question "Did the candidates differ on any noteworthy characteristics (e.g., qualifications, experience, gender, ethnicity)." Nine of these were in the equal qualifications condition, in which the appropriate answer was "ethnicity" (the candidates were virtually indistinguishable except for their race). These participants may have noticed the racial difference but felt uncomfortable mentioning it. This possibility is supported by the fact that some of the participants who did mention race made a point of stating that they did not think that race was relevant, nor did they base their decision on race alone. In the unequal qualifications condition, the appropriate answer was "qualifications and/or ethnicity." As in the equal qualifications condition, the six participants in the unequal qualifications condition who did not mention race or qualifications may simply not have wanted to mention these differences even though they noticed them. Primary analyses conducted with and without these 15 participants were identical. Therefore, these participants were included in all analyses reported here.

Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure that the two equally qualified candidates were actually perceived as equal. An independent samples t-test examined differences in hiring decisions between participants based on ethnicity/profile combinations (White Greg/Black Derek or Black Greg/White Derek). There was no significant difference, $t(78) = .26$, n.s.
Scores on all of the individual priming scale items were moderately to highly correlated with total priming scale scores. These item-total correlations ranged between .36 and .80, ps < .01, which is within an acceptable range (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989). These correlations suggest that most of the individual priming scale items were significantly correlated with the value that the scale was designed to measure. Cronbach's alpha was .71 and .76 for the individualistic and communalistic scales, indicating that these scales are moderately reliable (these alpha values are similar to those reported by Katz and Hass, 1988; .76 and .84 for the individualistic and communalistic scales respectively).

With respect to reliability, the symbolic racism scale did not fare as well as the priming measures did. In order to assess the reliability of these nominal forced-choice items, the frequency with which a given item was endorsed by all participants and by each of the value priming groups was examined. Four of the eight symbolic racism items (2, 4, 6, and 7) were answered in the same direction by at least 80% of the respondents (see Table 1). For example, item 7, "Over the past few years, Blacks have got more than they deserve," was endorsed by an average of only 12.3% of the participants. Chi-square goodness of fit analyses of the differences between endorsement frequencies for the three priming groups yielded only one significant difference. On item 4, "Do you think city officials pay more, less, or the same attention to a request or complaint from a Black person as from a White person?" more individualistic (20%) and fewer communalistic (6%) primed participants gave the symbolically racist response "more" than predicted by the underlying model.
Table 1. Endorsement Rates of Symbolic Racism Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Individualistic</th>
<th>Communalistic</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>$X^2(2)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45% (43.3)</td>
<td>50% (43.3)</td>
<td>35% (43.3)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 (10.7)</td>
<td>8 (10.7)</td>
<td>10 (10.7)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61 (61.7)</td>
<td>67 (61.7)</td>
<td>57 (61.7)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 (13.3)</td>
<td>6 (13.3)</td>
<td>14 (13.3)</td>
<td>7.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32 (30.0)</td>
<td>27 (30.0)</td>
<td>31 (30.0)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>86 (88.7)</td>
<td>92 (88.7)</td>
<td>88 (88.7)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 (12.3)</td>
<td>13 (12.3)</td>
<td>10 (12.3)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46 (43.0)</td>
<td>46 (43.0)</td>
<td>37 (43.0)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Expected values appear in parentheses; * $p < .05$

Primary Analyses

A 3 x 2 x 2 between-subjects ANOVA examined participants' hiring tendencies as a function of priming condition (individualistic, communalistic, or control), applicant qualifications (equal or unequal), and gender of participant. As indicated in Table 2, the main effects of priming condition and gender were not significant. Hence, there was no support for the hypothesis that individuals primed with individualistic values would be significantly more likely than those primed with communalistic values to hire the White applicant. There was, however, a significant main effect of the job candidates' qualifications, $F(1, 143) = 21.25, p < .001$.

Participants who evaluated two equally qualified job candidates were more likely to hire the Black person ($M = 3.44$) than participants who evaluated a Black candidate and a relatively better qualified White candidate ($M = 2.56$).
The significant interaction between priming group and qualifications, $F(2, 143) = 3.69$, $p < .05$, indicated that the propensity to hire the equally qualified Black applicant was different across the three priming groups. Contrary to the hypotheses, the effect of the qualifications manipulation was strongest for the control group, intermediate for the communalistic values group, and weakest for the individualistic values group (see Figure 1).

Table 2. The Effects of Priming, Qualifications, and Gender on Hiring Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>21.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual. x Priming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>3.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual. x Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priming x Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual. x Priming x Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>200.55</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>250.97</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .10$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .001$
Although it was predicted that individuals primed with individualistic values would be significantly more likely to hire a White candidate in the unequal qualifications condition than in the equal qualifications condition (hypothesis 2), no difference was observed, $F(1, 143) = 1.84$, n.s. Similarly, the difference between the two communalistic value groups did not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 143) = 3.30$, n.s. (see Figure 1). No specific predictions were made about control group participants, the assumption being that they would occupy a position between the individualistic and communalistic values priming groups. Instead, participants in the two control groups were the most extreme, with the equal qualifications condition controls being significantly more likely to hire the Black candidate than their colleagues in the unequal qualifications condition, $F(1, 143) = 23.57$, $p < .001$. In fact, these participants were the only ones to actually show an intention to hire the Black candidate.

The ANOVA data are based on an analysis of hiring preferences as a continuous variable. Had the participants' hypothetical behavioural intentions resulted in actual hiring decisions, these decisions would have been dichotomous; in other words, only one of the two candidates would have been given the position. It is therefore informative to examine the results of the chi-square goodness of fit analyses of the data. Overall, participants indicated an intention to hire the White candidate rather than the Black candidate, $X^2(5) = 17.22$, $p < .01$, a finding that is consistent with the results of previous studies (e.g., Lipset & Schneider, 1978). Although this bias in favour of the White applicant was not significant in the equal qualifications condition,
\(X^2(5) = 3.66, \text{n.s.},\) it was significant in the unequal qualifications condition

\(X^2(5) = 35.68, p < .005\) (see Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Group</th>
<th>Hiring Preference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Applicant</td>
<td>White Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>12 (14)</td>
<td>16 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>11 (13)</td>
<td>15 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>17 (13)</td>
<td>9 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Group</th>
<th>Hiring Preference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>6 (14.0)</td>
<td>22 (14.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>4 (11.0)</td>
<td>18 (11.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>23 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Expected values appear in parentheses
Examination of the frequencies (see Table 3) reveals that control group members in the equal qualifications condition were almost twice as likely to hire the Black candidate over the White candidate. In the unequal qualifications control condition, however, the White candidate was over 10 times more likely to be hired than the Black candidate.

As indicated in Table 2, there was an unexpected marginally significant interaction between gender and qualifications, \( F(1, 143)=3.35, p=.10 \). Simple effects F-tests revealed that women were significantly more likely to hire the Black candidate in the equal than in the unequal condition, \( F(1, 143)=25.5, p<.001 \), but not men, for whom the qualification manipulation had no effect \( F(1, 143)=.36, \) n.s. (see Figure 2).

The next analysis examined whether participants primed with individualistic values would subsequently endorse stronger symbolically racist attitudes (hypothesis 4) than those primed with communalistic values. A 3 (values priming) x 2 (qualifications) x 2 (gender) ANOVA of symbolic racism scores failed to confirm this hypothesis. As indicated in Table 4, there were no main effects of priming or qualifications. The main effect of gender was marginally significant, \( F(1, 143)=2.71, p=.10 \); men had somewhat higher scores \((M=3.40)\) than women \((M=2.89)\) on the symbolic racism measure.
Figure 2. Hiring Tendencies by Gender and Applicant Qualifications.
As was the case in previous analyses, there was a significant interaction between the job candidates' qualifications and priming condition \( F(2, 143)=3.34, \ p < .05 \). Although individualistic and control priming group members assigned to the equal condition did not differ significantly from their counterparts in the unequal condition, \( F(1, 143)=.22 \) and \( F(1, 143)=2.59 \), respectively, the same was not true in the communalistic priming groups. Participants in the communalistic group unequal qualifications condition had significantly lower scores on the symbolic racism scale than their counterparts in the equal qualifications condition, \( F(1, 143)=4.36, \ p < .05 \) (see Figure 3).

Table 4. The Effects of Priming, Qualifications, and Gender on Symbolic Racism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual. x Priming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>3.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual. x Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priming x Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qual. x Priming x Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>380.48</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>416.84</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .10 \)
** \( p < .05 \)
As expected, participants who indicated an intention to hire the Black applicant had significantly lower symbolic racism scale scores ($M = 2.56$) than those who indicated that they would hire the White applicant ($M = 3.27$), $t(153) = 2.56$, $p < .01$.

Symbolic racism is conceptualized as a combination of conservative political and value socialization (both of which are consistent with the Protestant ethic), and prejudice. As a result, it is reasonable to assume that there should be a moderate positive correlation between scores on the symbolic racism and individualism scales. Overall there was a non-significant correlation between the individualistic values scale scores and symbolic racism scores. When the equal and unequal subgroups of the individualistic values priming group were examined separately it became evident that although there was a non-significant correlation for participants in the equal condition, $r = .19$, $p = .34$, there was a marginally significant correlation in the predicted direction for participants in the unequal condition, $r = .35$, $p = .07$. Communalistic values are theoretically negatively related to symbolic racism and the correlation between communalistic values scale scores and symbolic racism scale scores was $- .40$, $p < .05$ for participants in the equal qualifications condition. The analogous correlation for communalistic values group respondents in the unequal qualifications and both control groups did not reach significance.
Figure 3. Symbolic Racism Scores by Priming Group

and Applicant Qualifications
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Discussion

The present study evaluated support for employment equity by examining undergraduate university students' decisions to hire either a Black or a White applicant for a job. Evidence from the equal qualifications condition is encouraging. Half the participants in the equal qualifications condition indicated that they would hire the Black candidate. Although less than half of the value primed participants demonstrated this preference, almost two-thirds of the control group participants chose the Black candidate.

In the unequal qualifications condition, however, the hiring decisions were quite different; only 16% of these participants indicated an intention to hire the Black candidate. Participants primed with individualistic or communalistic values were over three times more likely to hire the White candidate. Those in the control group were by far the most extreme; they were over ten times more likely to hire the White candidate instead of the Black candidate. Contrary to the predictions, control group participants demonstrated the most extreme hiring preferences, demonstrating the strongest pro-Black bias in the equal qualifications condition, and the strongest pro-White bias in the unequal qualification condition.

The decisions made by the control group are important because these participants are the ones who resemble "real-world" employers most closely. Although these participants completed a "values" scale, it is crucial to note that this scale was unrelated to hiring decisions or racial issues. Moreover, their behaviour is
not inconsistent with that displayed by participants in previous studies examining symbolic racism or hiring decisions (e.g., Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Lipset & Schneider, 1978; McConahay, 1986).

In a situation in which ethnicity was the only difference between job candidates, a strong tendency to demonstrate non-prejudiced hiring practices by choosing the Black candidate was not surprising (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; McConahay & Hough, 1976). In the equal qualifications condition, where participants had no nonracial attributions available for use to justify a decision to hire a White person over an equally qualified Black person, they may have felt it was necessary to choose the Black applicant to avoid looking as though they had an anti-Black bias. However, when the White candidate had superior qualifications to the sufficiently, yet less qualified Black candidate, control group participants were the least likely to choose the Black person. Of course, this reaction (and those of the value primed groups) probably reflects the rejection of the strong form of employment equity (Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay & Hough, 1976). It is possible, however, that at least some of the anti-Black preference stems from the same rationale as that apparent in Dovidio and Gaertner (1991). These researchers, on the basis of their findings, argue that if some non-racial justification exists for discriminating against a Black person, then some (White) people who would never display overt racism will make use of the opportunity to discriminate when there is no chance of proving that their decision is racially motivated.

Based on the ambivalence amplification hypothesis supported by Katz and Hass
(1988), it was predicted that value priming would serve to amplify participants’ responses so that individualistic value primed participants would be significantly more anti-Black and communalistic value primed participants would be more pro-Black than control group members. Instead, value priming effectively moderated responses so that in both the equal and unequal qualification conditions, the most extreme pro- and anti-Black hiring tendencies were those of the control group. This finding is consistent with Tetlock (1986). Tetlock suggests that ambivalence may develop when people are faced with issues that bring contradictory values together. He argues that when these issues make contradictory value systems salient, the conflict leads people to think more carefully about the issue and reach a conclusion that is more moderate than that suggested by either value alone.

For example, individualistic and communalistic group participants in the equal qualifications condition made responses that were moderate in comparison to the responses of participants in the control group. Equal qualifications condition group members primed with individualistic values may have considered a number of factors carefully. These factors likely included (but are not limited to): (1) the idea that neither candidate was more deserving of the job than the other because of their equivalent credentials, (2) the idea that showing a strong preference for the White candidate may make them appear racist, and (3) Protestant work ethic values that primed anti-Black attitudes, and influenced their decision in favour of the White candidate. Thinking about the combination of these (and possibly other) factors, or to use Tetlock’s (1986) terminology, "integrating the complexities" of the issues may
have been the reason for a relatively moderate, rather than a strong preference for the White candidate.

The results of this study suggest that young White Canadians are not ready to endorse a strong form of employment equity. Moreover, these findings imply that if job candidates are equally qualified, then priming with individualistic or communalistic values is not advised if one's goal is to increase the proportion of Black employees to better represent the proportion of Blacks in the general population. However, in the "real world", how often are two job candidates absolutely equally qualified? Subjective judgements and/or interpretations of equal qualifications are an easy way to conceal race-based hiring decisions and discriminate against qualified Black applicants. In most real employment settings, candidates will not be as indistinguishable as they were in the present study; thus there will likely be more room for perceived inequality to influence hiring decisions. In these instances, value priming might make a difference favouring Black applicants because it would promote consideration of the larger issues upon which employment equity is based.

It is possible that the value priming manipulation proved somewhat ineffective because the relationship between values and behavioural intentions may be mediated by attitudes. Katz and Hass (1988) primed values or attitudes and assessed subsequent attitudes or values. In the present study, attitudes were neither primed nor measured. Thus it is not possible to determine whether or in what ways attitudes, as the presumed intervening step between values and behavioural intentions, were affected by the manipulation. Future research could include an explicit measure of
anti- and pro-Black attitudes to determine the effectiveness of individualistic and communalistic value priming on these racial attitudes.

In this study, women expressed less symbolic racism than men. In addition, women in the equal qualifications condition were more likely than women in the unequal qualifications condition and more likely than men to hire the Black applicant. Given that the candidates were male, this latter result is not surprising. White men may have felt a certain ingroup loyalty to the White male candidate. This explanation is supported by the fact that men were unlikely to hire the Black candidate whether he was equally or less qualified than the White candidate but that women only demonstrated a strong preference for the White candidate when he was better qualified.

Analysis of responses associated with the symbolic racism scale are highly speculative, however, given the evidence regarding this scale’s relatively low reliability. Future studies could benefit from the use of an alternative, more subtle measure of symbolic racism. Another flaw of the current study is that without the inclusion of an additional group who had to evaluate a relatively superior Black candidate and a relatively inferior White candidate it is difficult to determine whether hiring decisions were based on a strong White preference that made qualifications irrelevant. If the White preference was evident in a scenario in which the Black applicant was superior then it would be easier to conclude that racial issues were a major factor in participants’ hiring decisions. In addition, as is typical of many studies in social psychology, this one was based on the responses of relatively young
introductory psychology students. Participants of this age may not have had much exposure to or experience in the work world and as a result they may not be familiar with hiring practices that are consistent with employment equity. In any case, these findings are potentially very useful because it is inevitable that at least some of these participants will be employers making these types of decisions in the future.
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APPENDIX A: Informed Consent Form

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. I am interested in determining how much information about job candidates is required to make accurate hiring decisions and how personal values/personality influence these decisions. Participants in this study will be assigned to one of three conditions: (1) summarized information, (2) complete written information, and (3) complete written information plus interview.

You have been assigned to the ______________________________ condition.

All participants will be given a brief questionnaire on personal values associated with personality.

Those assigned to the "summarized information condition" will receive summarized information about two graduate students applying for a job. The information about the student applicants is based on information contained in their academic files.

Those assigned to the "complete written information" condition will read all the material in the students’ files, not just a summary of the file.

Those assigned to the "complete written information plus interview" condition will read the complete files and watch a videotape of both candidate’s employment interviews.

Please try to respond as honestly as possible, and please do not put your name or any identifying information on the study materials. This study is completely anonymous.

Your participation in this experiment is completely voluntary and you can choose to withdraw at any time without any consequences. This experiment will take approximately 20-30 minutes.

If you wish to see a copy of the final results, a copy will be available in the Psychology Department Head’s Office by September, 1995.

This experiment has been approved by the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology, University of Windsor. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact:

Helen Ofosu (Principal Investigator)  253-4232, ext. 2218
Dr. Shelagh Tuason (Research Advisor)  253-4232, ext. 2250
Dr. Roland Englehart (Ethics Committee)  253-4232, ext. 2218

Please read the following paragraph, and, if you agree to participate, please sign below.

I understand that any information about me obtained from this research will be kept confidential. My participation in this experiment is voluntary.

Signature ___________________________  Date ___________________________
APPENDIX B: Value Priming Scales

A SURVEY OF PERSONAL VALUES (PE Scale)

The following are statements about which we all have beliefs and opinions. We all think differently about such matters, and this scale is an attempt to let you express your viewpoint. There are no right or wrong answers. Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with a statement by selecting one of the following.

Agree Strongly +3
Agree +2
Agree Slightly +1
Disagree Slightly -1
Disagree -2
Disagree Strongly -3

For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1.

1. Most people spend too much time in unprofitable amusements.
2. Our society would have fewer problems if people had less leisure time.
3. Money acquired easily is usually spent unwisely.
4. Most people who don't succeed in life are just plain lazy.
5. Anyone who is willing and able to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.
6. People who fail at a job have usually not tried hard enough.
7. Life would have very little meaning if we never had to suffer.
8. The person who can approach an unpleasant task with enthusiasm is the person who gets ahead.
9. If people work hard enough they are likely to make a good life for themselves.
10. I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do.
11. A distaste for hard work usually reflects a weakness of character.
A SURVEY OF PERSONAL VALUES (HE Scale)

The following are statements about which we all have beliefs and opinions. We all think differently about such matters, and this scale is an attempt to let you express your viewpoint. There are no right or wrong answers. Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with a statement by selecting one of the following.

Agree Strongly +3  
Agree +2  
Agree Slightly +1  
Disagree Slightly -1  
Disagree -2  
Disagree Strongly -3  

For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1.

1. One should be kind to all people.
2. One should find ways to help others less fortunate than oneself.
3. A person should be concerned about the well-being of others.
4. There should be equality for everyone -- because we are all human beings.
5. Those who are unable to provide for their basic needs should be helped by others.
6. A good society is one in which people feel responsible for one another.
7. Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things.
8. Acting to protect the rights and interests of other members of the community is a major obligation for all persons.
9. In dealing with criminals the courts should recognize that many are victims of circumstance.
10. Prosperous nations have a moral obligation to share some of their wealth with poor nations.
A SURVEY OF PERSONAL VALUES (Neutral Scale)

The following are statements about which we all have beliefs and opinions. We all think differently about such matters, and this scale is an attempt to let you express your viewpoint. There are no right or wrong answers. Please read each statement and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with a statement by selecting one of the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Slightly</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Slightly</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, if you agree strongly, you would write +3 in the margin to the left of the statement, but if you disagree with it a little, you would put -1.

___ 1. I would rather watch a news or current events program on television than watch a situation comedy show.

___ 2. My parents had a large influence in shaping my value system.

___ 3. When choosing a book to read I prefer one that takes place now rather than one that takes place in the past.

___ 4. I am frequently disappointed with movies I see because they do not live up to the expectations I have before seeing them.

___ 5. One-way streets help make traffic move more smoothly.

___ 6. In general, I prefer the color blue to the color green.

___ 7. I am more of a "day person" than a "night person".

___ 8. Smoking should be prohibited in public areas.

___ 9. There is never a good enough reason to get a divorce.

___ 10. The food we eat has a big effect on the state of our health.

___ 11. War is sometimes necessary to solve world problems.
APPENDIX C: Applicant Profiles

SUMMARY APPLICANT PROFILE

Personal Information
Name Greg Brooks
Program Applied Social Psychology
Highest Degree M.A. (1993)
Grade Point Average (G.P.A.) 86%

Racial/Ethnic Background
(check all that apply)
- White/European descent
- Black/African descent
- Asian
- Aboriginal/Native
- Other

Physical/Mental Challenge

Awards/Scholarships Received
2. Ontario Graduate Scholarship ($11,859) - September, 1991.

Publications/Conference Presentations


Research Experience
Recruited youth in Windsor for a study on high school dropouts conducted in Windsor, Toronto, Hamilton, and Ottawa by the Canadian Alliance of Educators. M.A. Thesis research on "Alcoholism and procrastination in a sample of health sciences students."

Work/Professional Experience
Practicum Placement: Department of Human Resources, City Hall - Windsor.
Other: Private tutor for students taking statistics, methodology, and experimental psychology courses.
SUMMARY APPLICANT PROFILE

Personal Information
Name: Darrell Cole
Highest Degree: M.A. (1992)
Grade Point Average (G.P.A.): 35%

Racial/Ethnic Background
(check all that apply)
- White/European descent
- Black/African descent
- Asian
- Aboriginal/Native
- Other

Physical/Mental Challenges

Awards/Scholarships Received
1. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada Fellowships ($14,016).

Publications/Conference Presentations

Research Experience
Worked with a team of cognitive psychologists at an Ontario University on a study comparing the effectiveness of problem-based learning with traditional learning for the education of health sciences students (medical nursing, physiotherapy, and occupational therapy). M.A. thesis research investigated “Personality and Situational Determinants of Leadership Effectiveness.”

Work/Professional Experience
Practicum Placement: Windsor Board of Education, Department of Human Resources.

Other: Private tutor for introductory, intermediate, and advanced statistics.
SUMMARY APPLICANT PROFILE

Personal Information
Name: Derek Jones
Highest Degree: M.A. (1992)
Grade Point Average (G.P.A.): 91%

Racial/Ethnic Background
(check all that apply)
- [ ] White/European descent
- [ ] Black/African descent
- [ ] Asian
- [ ] Aboriginal/Native
- [ ] Other

Physical/Mental Challenge

Awards/Scholarships Received
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada Fellowship ($14,014)
Queen Elizabeth II Ontario Scholarship ($13,500) - September, 1994
University of Windsor Tuition Scholarship (1992-93)

Publications/Conference Presentations

Research Experience
Conducted a needs assessment for the Windsor Gambler’s Anonymous to estimate the increased demand for their services after the opening of Casino Windsor.

Completed an M.A. thesis on “Behavior as seen by the actor and by the observer.”

Design and implemented an evaluation study of the effectiveness of a peer counseling and tutoring program at the Windsor Youth Association.

Work/Professional Experience
Placement: Department of Human Resources, Ford Canada - helped revise their employee bonus/incentive program.

Other: Helped develop an Employee Assistance Program for a local TV station; Statistics tutor.
SUMMARY APPLICANT PROFILE

Personal Information
Name: Richard Brooks
Grade Point Average (G.P.A.): 86%

Racial/Ethnic Background
(check all that apply)
- White/European descent
- Black/African descent
- Asian
- Aboriginal/Native
- Other

Physical/Mental Challenge

Awards/Scholarships Received
University of Windsor Tuition Scholarship (1992-93).

Publications/Conference Presentations

Research Experience
Recruited youth in Windsor for a study on high school dropouts conducted by the Canadian Alliance of Educators in Windsor, Toronto, Hamilton, and Ottawa. Completed an M.A. thesis on "Alcoholism and procrastination in a sample of health sciences students."

Work/Professional Experience
Practicum Placement: Department of Human Resources, City Hall - Windsor.
Other: Private tutor for students taking intro, intermediate, and advanced statistics.
APPENDIX D: Dependent Measures

Based on the summarized information, which candidate would you hire/recommend for a job as a Research Project Co-Ordinator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>Pretty</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Pretty</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>Bit Sure</td>
<td>Bit Sure</td>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Darryl</td>
<td>Darryl</td>
<td>Darryl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the candidates differ on any noteworthy characteristics? (e.g., qualifications, experience, gender, ethnicity)
SYMBOLIC RACISM SCALE

1. Do you think that most Blacks who receive money from welfare programs could get along without it if they tried, or do they really need help? Need Help ___  Don't Need Help ___

2. Blacks shouldn't push themselves where they're not wanted. Yes ___  No ___

3. Because of past discrimination, it is sometimes necessary to set up quotas for admission to university of minority students. Yes ___  No ___

4. Do you think city officials pay more, less, or the same attention to a request or complaint from a Black person as from a white person? Less ___  More ___  Same ___

5. Do you think that minority groups have gained more than they are entitled to? Yes ___  No ___

6. Is it wrong to set up quotas to admit Black students to college who don't meet the usual standards? Yes ___  No ___

7. Over the past few years, blacks have got more than they deserve. Yes ___  No ___

8. In this city, would you say many, some, or only a few blacks miss out on jobs or promotions because of racial discrimination? Many ___  Some ___  Only a Few ___
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Age ______ Sex ______

Year in University ______

Program/Major Subject

Your ethnic background (check all that apply)

___ White or of European descent

___ Black or of African descent

___ Asian

___ Aboriginal/Native

___ Hispanic

___ Other (write in) ____________________________
APPENDIX E: Debriefing Information

Individualism and communalism are very common values in the American psyche, and because Canadians are (at least in some ways) similar to Americans one would expect Canadians to hold these values. Individualism is consistent with the Protestant Work Ethic which emphasizes the importance of hard work, individual achievement, and self-discipline. Communalism incorporates the ideals of equality, social justice, and concern for the well-being of others. These values are important determinants of attitudes and behaviour.

Although these values are very common, they can be contradictory and may help to explain conflicting racial attitudes. Previous research suggests that priming people with individualistic values makes them feel more anti-Black (exposing them to PWE ideas makes them feel more anti-Black) and priming people with communalistic values makes them feel more pro-Black. The main purpose of this experiment was to see whether or not this effect influences people's tendency to hire a Black job candidate for a job.

As you were told, this study did concern the effects of personal values on hiring decisions. You were also told that we were concerned with the effect of the quantity of information available for making hiring decisions. This was done so that you would not be tempted to answer questions in a biased or unnatural way just to help prove or disprove the hypothesis.

You are welcome to view the individualism, communalism, and control/filler questionnaires and once the results have been tabulated and the final report written, they will be available in the Department Head's Office, Psychology Department, University of Windsor.

Thank you for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Helen Ofosu
VITA AUCTORIS

Helen Ofosu was born on June 26, 1969 in Toronto, Canada. She graduated from Lester B. Pearson High School in 1988 and went on to McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. While at McMaster, Helen completed a B.Sc. in Psychology with First Class Honours. She is currently a candidate for the Master's degree in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor and hopes to graduate in Fall 1995.