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Abstract

This study sought to determine whether stereotypical gender role behaviour and perceived sexual orientation of a male employment candidate would influence merit-based ratings of the candidate’s employment potential. The study consisted of three phases: 1) a simulated interview phase, 2) a resume phase, and 3) an assessment of attitudes toward gays and lesbians. In the interview phase, participants observed either a stereotypically masculine candidate, or a stereotypically feminine candidate on videotape in a simulated interview situation in order to determine whether this behaviour was stereotypically gender congruent, or gender incongruent. In the resume phase, information designed to influence the participant’s perception of the candidate’s sexual orientation was included in the "volunteer experience” section of the resume. Participants examined the resume of either a candidate who was presented as gay or a candidate who was not presented as gay. Participants in the study consisted of 44 male and 72 female University of Windsor undergraduate psychology students who provided ratings of the employment candidate immediately following both the interview and resume components of the study. Participant attitudes toward lesbians and gays were also assessed in order to determine whether these attitudes would be associated with the employment ratings that were provided.

It was expected that women would maintain more favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gays than would men, and that attitudes toward lesbians and gays would be associated with the ratings of the employment candidate. It was expected that the stereotypically masculine candidate would more likely be chosen for the job than the
stereotypically feminine candidate and that a candidate having volunteered in a gay advocacy group would be less likely chosen for the job than a candidate that had not participated in a gay identified organization. It was expected that a stereotypically feminine candidate having participated in a gay advocacy group would receive the lowest ratings, whereas a stereotypically masculine candidate having participated in a gay advocacy group would receive the highest ratings. Finally, female subjects were expected to rate the stereotypically feminine candidate and the candidate that had participated in a gay advocacy group more favorably than would male subjects.

Results indicated that all participant attitudes toward lesbians and gays were relatively positive in nature and were not associated with the ratings that were provided for employment suitability. There were no differences between the ratings of the stereotypically feminine candidate and the stereotypically masculine candidate, nor between the candidate that participated in a gay advocacy group and the candidate that did not participate in a gay identified organization. In addition, no gender differences were observed overall. As expected, the stereotypically masculine candidate that had not participated in a gay advocacy group did receive the highest ratings, but from the women only.

On the basis of these findings it appears that men and women behave differently when assessing potential employees. This evidence suggests there is potential for discrimination on the basis of the stereotypical gender role behaviour and sexual orientation of male employment candidates. Implications are discussed for workplace environments.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

This study examined the influence of perceived gender role congruence and sexual orientation on the job selection process. This study was based on the premise that gender role and sexual orientation are key features in how men and women are defined within North American society, and ultimately within the workplace. This research further proposed that gender role behaviour which is incongruent with gender, and knowledge of gay sexual orientation are factors that can lead to discriminatory treatment in the workplace.

**Discrimination in the Workplace**

Given the often contentious nature of sexual orientation deliberations in society, the acknowledgment of these issues in the context of the workplace may be problematic. Indeed, issues related to the sexual orientation of employees may have the ability to affect workplace processes in a more salient manner than the issues involving other minorities since negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians are so prevalent. Until now, the issue has been addressed only implicitly in conjunction with various workplace AIDS related policies (see Diamant, 1993). This provides a limited understanding of gay and lesbian identity and workplace concerns. However, as a result of recent and expected changes in Canadian law, sexual orientation issues are likely to become a significant workplace concern in the future. Individuals who are gay or lesbian may no longer be content with subjugating their social, relational and affectional orientation to the reality of an unresponsive, if not discriminatory, workplace. Little research has considered or
examined the effects of this new reality for the workplace.

**Sexual Orientation and the Workplace**

The amount of research conducted that has examined the issue of sexual orientation within the context of the workplace is limited. Ellis (1996) reviewed the current research and literature examining the issue of sexual orientation in the American workplace. Research examining gay and lesbian issues in the workplace has been conducted primarily within the fields of education and civil service employment. Some of this research explicitly examines the issue of employment discrimination for gays and lesbians. Other work-related topics that have been examined involve issues related to career development, career counseling, and job interviews. The findings from all of this research highlight the lack of available information for gays and lesbians making career decisions, as well as the unique concerns with which gays and lesbians must contend in the workplace.

Several articles have reviewed the current state of legal protection for gays and lesbians in the American workforce (Badgett, 1996; Hedgepeth, 1979/1980; Levine, 1979; Savin-Williams, 1993). This protection is limited to employees within a few states, and does not usually provide any protection for employees within the private sector. Public sector employees are better protected, with the possible exception of the FBI, the CIA and general civil service employees. In these settings, gay and lesbian employees are often subject to outdated laws that refuse them entry into their chosen profession, and discriminate against them on the basis of being perceived as a security risk (Anderson & Smith, 1993; Herek, 1991).
Little research, if any, has examined the current status of Canadian workers who are gay or lesbian. Human rights codes across the country are likely to continue to include sexual orientation as a prohibited ground for discrimination (Wilson, 1996). Events related to the employment discrimination of gay people in Alberta and events related to the extension of spousal classification for gays and lesbians in Nova Scotia highlight the need for knowledge on the issue. This is likely to create the need for more discussion and research on the issue of sexual orientation in the Canadian workplace.

The following discussion will briefly summarize some of the issues that have been examined in research regarding gays and lesbians in the workplace. This summary will begin by examining some issues related specifically to the tendency for gays and lesbians to conceal information about their sexual orientation within the context of the workplace. Issues related to how career development concerns affect gay men and lesbians will then be examined. Following this more general discussion regarding workplace concerns, issues related to the employment interview process will be examined and then discussed specifically with regard to the implications for gays and lesbians. Finally, in an attempt to isolate factors that influence the discrimination of gays and lesbians within the workplace, issues related to the presence of heterosexism, homophobia and the attitudes that people maintain with regard to gays and lesbians will be discussed.

**Hiding Sexual Orientation in the Workplace: The Field of Education**

Research on employment in education demonstrates a history of systemically engendered invisibility for gay and lesbian employees. Additionally, gays and lesbians
appear to maintain concerns about the loss of jobs and are regularly subject to the effects of negative and limiting stereotypes from colleagues, parents and students. This underlying tension between the fear of damaged credibility and job loss, together with the desire to integrate one's personal and professional identities, contributes to a level of job stress that characterizes the experiences of many gays and lesbians in the workplace (Gonsiorek, 1993).

Harbeck (1992) examined approximately fifty cases of litigation involving homosexual educators obtained from archives dating back to the 1770's. Harbeck supplemented her archival research by corresponding with several of the attorneys and clients for cases occurring after 1950. This history highlights the discrimination that gay and lesbian educators, or any educator suspected of homosexual behaviour, has experienced. For example, California legislation in the 1950's required that police officials notify local boards of education when teachers were detained or arrested, and permitted the suspension of these teachers if they were convicted of any one of many statutes related to sex or morality. Many homosexual educators lost their jobs as teachers for simply being accused of behaviour that was considered criminal, even when acquitted in the court system. Harbeck's research identifies the reasons that teachers within the educational system decide to keep their sexual orientation hidden, but also challenges the assumption that the history of gays and lesbians is a negative and invisible history. Harbeck emphasizes the need for gay and lesbian educators to reveal their sexual orientation within the context of the workplace and encourages the lobbying of governments and school administrators in order to include sexual orientation as a
prohibited form of discrimination. This, suggests Harbeck, is necessary in order for gay
and lesbian educators, their administrators, and their colleagues to become informed
about their rights and obligations regarding this issue.

Woods and Harbeck (1992) examined the experiences and identity management
strategies of lesbian physical education teachers. These individuals thought that they
would lose their jobs if they were open about their sexuality, and they also believed that
female physical educators were negatively and consistently stereotyped as lesbians. The
majority of these participants tended to favor concealment of their lesbian identities.
Many of the participants actively misled their colleagues and students in order to pass as
heterosexuals. Strategies involved changing the pronouns and names of friends and
partners from female to male and lying about the location of social activities when these
establishments were identifiable as gay or lesbian establishments. Most of the
participants engaged in a process of self-distancing from both people and issues related to
sexual orientation when at school. Many of these educators did not intervene when
homophobic comments or jokes were made by peers or students. As a result, many felt
they were failing to provide effective lesbian role models for their students, especially for
those students who they suspected might be gay or lesbian.

Griffin (1992) conducted research on the experiences of gay and lesbian
elementary and high school teachers. The lives of these educators was described as being
driven by an underlying tension between the fear of accusation and the wish for self
integrity arising from the integration of their lesbian or gay identity and their identity as
teachers. Generally, participants believed that if they were publicly accused of being gay
or lesbian, they would experience either job loss or loss of credibility with their students, colleagues and parents.

It appears then that the issue of sexual orientation is often hidden within the context of the workplace. The field of primary and secondary education has been documented as one of the most discriminatory environments for gay and lesbian workers historically, and as a result, the acknowledgment and discussion of sexual orientation issues within this environment has been limited. It is also this environment that has been one of the most effective in highlighting the discrimination and prejudice that gays and lesbians experience in the workplace in general.

**Discrimination in Career Development**

Research in career development and career counseling indicate that gay and lesbian issues are often avoided within the context of the career counseling process. It seems that there is a lack of awareness and information related to gay and lesbian social environments and culture. Information regarding those occupations and institutions that have (and those which have not) addressed gay and lesbian concerns in the workplace is not readily available.

More specifically, the unique factors that influence the career decisions and career development of gays and lesbians as a group are not addressed in the area of career counseling. Additionally, the differences between gays and lesbians and their experiences as two separate groups are not identified. This knowledge, if readily available, would create a greater opportunity to understand the perceptions that gays and lesbians have with regard to making occupational choices and would ultimately facilitate
the career decision process for both gays and lesbians and career counselors.

Elliot (1993) indicates that many problems arise for gays and lesbians because career counselors are insensitive to the unique culture of gays and lesbians. He suggests that gay and lesbian individuals be characterized and perceived as a nonethnic cultural minority and addressed in much the same manner as racial and ethnic minorities during the career counseling process. As a group, lesbians and gays have their own history, culture, ethics, jargon, and sense of community. Counselors who are dealing with gay and lesbian clients should be familiar with these individual, social and cultural issues.

According to Elliot, little is known about the relative levels of prejudice among different organizations and professions. He suggests that future research examine the current state of affairs for gay and lesbian workers within several different companies, professions, and geographical locations in order to develop a more accurate assessment of the receptivity of organizations to lesbian and gay individuals and their concerns in the workplace. This might also provide valuable new information and opportunities for change in those organizations that wish to address gay and lesbian concerns.

Despite a move to understand a wide range of individual differences in both theory and practice, the issue of sexual or affectional orientation is seldom if ever addressed with regard to career counseling. Hetherington, Hillerbrand and Etringer (1989) describe at least four factors that uniquely affect the gay or lesbian career decision-making process and need to be incorporated or addressed within the career counseling process. This includes an acknowledgment of the widely prevalent and often negative social stereotypes about homosexuals and perceived homosexual occupations.
Gays and lesbians are likely to see few role models if any, since many individuals who are gay or lesbian remain invisible within the context of the work environment for fear of repercussion or job loss. Finally, they indicate that it is important to consider the unique issues that gays and lesbians must face with regard to the management of their relationships, particularly in public, and with regard to the transitional experience from an accepting and relatively open school environment to a less than open workplace.

Research examining the implications of sexual orientation for the career counseling discipline highlights the different issues and experiences that gays and lesbians experience as two separate groups. Etringer, Hillerbrand and Hetherington (1990) examined differences in the career decision-making processes between heterosexuals and homosexuals of both genders. They discovered that gay men have the highest uncertainty about their choice of career and lesbians have the lowest. Gay men and heterosexual women were more likely to be dissatisfied with their career choices when made, whereas lesbians and heterosexual men maintained the lowest level of dissatisfaction. These findings indicate that career counseling issues may be different for gay men and lesbians, and that gay men and lesbians may have different concerns in the workplace.

Additionally, Hetherington and Orzek (1989) examined the psychological development and “coming-out” processes as well as the effects these experiences have on the career choices of lesbian women. They characterize lesbians as having a double disadvantage in that they are subject to the discrimination experienced by women in general, as well as the discrimination experienced as a result of their sexual orientation.
They indicate that career counselors need to be sensitive to the interacting processes of lesbian identity formation and the advancement through the stages of career decision making.

Research in the area of career development provides some understanding as to why gays and lesbians tend to conceal their identities in the context of the workplace. There is evidence of differential treatment when considering the lack of awareness and available information about gay and lesbian concerns in the workplace. Furthermore, as a result of the tendency to conceal, there is also a lack of gay or lesbian role models and the advocates necessary to influence a change in the differential treatment of gays and lesbians within the workplace. This only compounds the issue of career development for gays and lesbians entering and currently within the workforce.

**Sexual Orientation and the Job Interview**

This lack of understanding with regard to gay and lesbian culture and issues, which encourages gays and lesbians to disguise their full identity in the workplace, is perhaps most likely to influence the behaviour of gays and lesbians when they are being interviewed for employment. Most candidates want to be perceived positively by their prospective employer and therefore attempt to highlight the most relevant characteristics they perceive as helpful in their prospects for the job. They will also likely downplay those characteristics that are irrelevant or have the potential to restrict job options. If information related to one's sexual orientation is perceived as limiting, it too is likely to be hidden, to the degree that this is possible, within the context of the interviewing process.
Researchers have attempted to examine the effect that knowledge of sexual orientation places upon the interview process. Ellis and Vasseur (1993) examined how previous experiences with homosexuals and attitudes toward homosexuals in general affected the interview process for gays and lesbians who were applying for a sixth grade teaching position. They examined the effect of gender and the interaction of gender of subject and gender of target on the number of negative questions that were chosen for the interview process. They discovered that men rated gay men more negatively than they did lesbians, and that men and women did not differ in their ratings of lesbians. Prior exposure to homosexuals was associated with a reduction in the number of negative questions that heterosexual interviewers asked gay men, but with lesbians, previous exposure to homosexuals was associated with a greater number of negative questions that were used in the interview. Further research is needed in order to examine the effects of sexual orientation on the interview process with other types of occupations.

Heterosexism, Homophobia, and Attitudes

As Ellis and Vasseur (1993) discovered, prior exposure to gay or lesbian individuals reduces the negativity of attitudes toward this group. Since most individuals in our society have been raised in an environment that suppresses even the very idea of homosexuality and same gender sexual orientation as a viable identity (Herek, 1984), it is perhaps not surprising that there are negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians as well as fear regarding gays and lesbians in the workplace. Heterosexist attitudes and homophobia are two factors that contribute to the discrimination of gay men and lesbian women, which though sometimes intentional can also be inadvertent.
Heterosexism is an attitude or belief that places heterosexuality in the privileged position of being the only normal mode of romantic and sexual expression. In addition, homosexuality and same-sex romantic involvement are viewed as immoral, inferior, sinful, or perverted (Elliot 1993). Homophobia, on the other hand, is defined as the irrational fear and/or intolerance of homosexuality and of individuals that are gay, lesbian or bisexual (Herek, 1984), and is sometimes used in a more generic sense to refer to all forms of lesbian, gay and bisexual oppression (Elliot, 1993).

Since attitudes toward gays and lesbians are associated with the discrimination that gays and lesbians experience in the workplace (Ellis and Vasseur, 1993), then efforts to reduce heterosexism and homophobia as well as its effects, may lie with research regarding attitudes. Proactive solutions to the negative experiences of gays and lesbians in the workplace may come from attempts to modify these negative attitudes to more positive attitudes regarding gays and lesbians.

Herek (1984) indicates that the current definition of homophobia (as an irrational fear of homosexuals and homosexuality) is too restrictive. Much of the research emanating from this perspective restricts the discussion of homophobia to the negative attitudes that individuals maintain about gays and lesbians. Research on homophobia needs to develop a more complex model of positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals. Many people are not fearful of gays and lesbians and are likely to accept and support their concerns. This restricted model does not allow researchers to examine the nature of positive attitudes toward gays and lesbians and it does not allow us to identify proactive solutions to gay/lesbian discrimination that might arise from
understanding the nature of these positive attitudes. Herek indicates that there is a need not only to examine the reasons why certain individuals physically brutalize gay men and lesbian women or seek to deprive them of equal opportunity, but also to examine why, given the strong social pressures to the contrary, some people develop positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian individuals.

In an attempt to examine the nature of positive and negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians, Herek and Capitanio (1996) examined the relationship between majority group attitudes and intergroup contact with members of a homosexual minority group characterized by a concealable stigma. They discovered that the relationship between previous contact with homosexuals and more positive attitudes was stronger as a function of increased number of contacts, more intimate contacts, and contacts that included self-initiated disclosure of sexual orientation (as opposed to third party disclosure). The reciprocal nature of the results indicated that heterosexuals are more likely to undergo attitude modification in favor of gays and lesbians as a result of increased contact with homosexuals. In addition, having a positive attitude toward homosexuals means that heterosexual individuals are also more likely to experience social contact with homosexuals as a result of the increased tendency of homosexuals to reveal their sexual orientation to people holding this attitude.

These findings suggest that direct contact between minority and majority group members is likely to engender a positive change in attitudes by the majority group member toward the minority group. Interpreted with regard to the workplace, Herek & Capitanio suggest that institutional policies encouraging homosexual individuals to
disclose their sexual orientation to heterosexual peers are more likely to facilitate more favorable views of gay and lesbian people than they are likely to create social or organizational strife.

**Gender Differences in Attitudes and Discriminatory Behaviour**

Some research has examined the differences that heterosexual men and women maintain in their attitudes toward gay people, with some research indicating that women maintain more positive attitudes toward gays and lesbians than do men (Oliver & Hyde, 1995; Whitley & Kite, 1995). Herek (1988) also examined the basis of these differences in heterosexual attitudes towards gay people. Male heterosexuals consistently expressed a greater number of negative attitudes toward gay people than did the heterosexual females. In addition, male heterosexuals held a greater number of negative attitudes toward gay men than they did toward lesbians. Herek examined several correlates of attitudes toward gays and lesbians including religious and family ideology, previous type and amount of social contact with gays and lesbians, sex role attitudes, as well as defence mechanisms. There were more correlates that were associated with attitudes toward gay men than were associated with attitudes regarding lesbians. This, suggests Herek, may reflect a tendency for heterosexual men and women to have a more highly developed and articulated social stereotype of gay men than of lesbians.

Based on the research regarding attitudes, it is proposed that work environments with a greater proportion of women influencing decisions will be more likely to support the acceptance and inclusion of gays and lesbians in the workplace. Since gay men and lesbians appear to be more likely to reveal their sexual orientation to persons that have
positive attitudes toward gays and lesbians, as indicated in Herek's study, then perhaps gays and lesbians will be more likely to disclose their sexual orientation within work environments that have a smaller overall proportion of men. As more women enter the workforce (Johnston and Packer, 1987), it might be expected that work environments of the twenty-first century will have a greater number of self-identifying gays and lesbians in their midst.

**Purpose and Hypotheses**

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the perception of gender role incongruence and knowledge of gay sexual orientation would limit the ability of a male candidate to obtain employment. In order to determine this, participants rated the candidate's suitability for a management level engineering position after viewing the candidate in a mock interview on videotape and then analyzing this candidate's resume.

On the basis of current human rights regulations (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 1981), questions intended to expose the candidate's sexual orientation are not allowed within the selection interview. It remains to be determined empirically whether suspicion of the interviewee's sexual orientation influences the decisions that are made, perhaps at the expense of merit-based interview candidate characteristics. In addition, since gender role and sexual orientation are closely related in our societal concept of gender, perceived gender role incongruency may influence assumptions about sexual orientation and therefore influence the selection procedure adversely.

**Employment interviews**

It appears that the interview selection process is uniquely susceptible to biases and
prejudicial influences. Previous literature has consistently identified a lack in validity when examining the selection interview process (Wiesner and Cronshaw, 1988; Motwidlo et al., 1992). The interview as a selection technique shows surprisingly little predictive validity for the incumbent's future performance. This pattern is evident for both structured, and unstructured interview methods (McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt & Maurer, 1994). This is problematic when one considers that the selection interview is widely used and not likely to be abandoned as an employee selection technique (Orpen, 1985). Potential employers rely on the information acquired in the selection interview to make decisions about potential employees.

Recently, several meta-analytic studies have been successful at securing more acceptable levels of internal validity by using data from several studies (see McDaniel et al. 1994; Wiesner and Cronshaw, 1988), yet meta-analytic studies have been criticized with regard to the meaning of these findings. Though useful as a statistical technique this information may not be useful when applying the findings to the actual workplace setting.

Advances in research methodologies, and modifications in traditional interview techniques like the more qualitative behavioural-based interview technique (Janz, 1982; Janz, 1989; Orpen, 1985; Motwidlo et al., 1992), may well improve validity measures in the future. One approach that may prove helpful in the effort to increase the validity rates of selection interview studies is the continued examination of the influence of predetermined perceptual sets, stereotypes and the associated attitudes on the outcome of selection interview procedures. An analysis of these issues will help to determine
whether selection interview procedures are susceptible to factors other than merit at the expense of predictive validity. Further research will help to determine whether the components of selection criteria are related to actual job performance or if these criteria reflect predetermined bias unrelated to future performance.

Some studies have examined how the candidate's racial characteristics (Huffcut and Roth, 1998) and gender issues (Graves and Powell, 1996) influence the decisions that are made in the employment interview. Other studies have examined how being overweight (Pingitore, Bernard, Dugoni, Tindale and Spring, 1994), and having a visible disability (Nordstrom, Huffaker and Williams, 1998), affect the employment interview process. Some research has discussed the unique restrictions that gay men (Woods, 1993) and lesbians (Winfield and Spielman, 1995) encounter in the workplace, but no research has investigated the effects of sexual orientation on the interview process outside of the field of education (Ellis and Vasseur, 1993).

**Gender differences in attitudes toward lesbians and gays.**

Since male heterosexuals tend to express a greater number of negative attitudes toward gay people than do heterosexual females (Herek, 1988; Oliver & Hyde, 1995; Whitley & Kite, 1995), and since men tend to hold a greater number of negative attitudes toward gay men than they do toward lesbians (Herek, 1988), it was expected that:

Hypothesis 1) women will maintain more favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gays than will men.

**The relation of attitudes to employment candidate ratings**

Finally, since attitudes toward gays and lesbians are associated with the discrimination
that gays and lesbians experience in the workplace (Ellis and Vasseur, 1993; Herek and Capitanio, 1996), it was expected that:

Hypothesis 2) more favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gays will be associated with more favorable ratings of the employment candidate.

The effect of perceived gender role congruency on employment candidate ratings

Etringer, Hillerbrand and Hetherington (1990) indicate that gay men and heterosexual women were more likely to be dissatisfied with their career choices than lesbians and heterosexual men. Perhaps this is because gay men and heterosexual women are more likely than lesbians or heterosexual men to be discriminated on the basis of their femininity or perceived femininity. If both lesbians and heterosexual men are perceived to be more masculine than gay men and women, then it is expected that:

Hypothesis 3) an employment candidate who presents a stereotypical masculine behaviour pattern will be more favourably rated than a candidate who presents a stereotypical feminine behaviour pattern.

The effect of perceived sexual orientation on employment candidate ratings

Ellis and Vasseur (1993) indicate that employment interviewers' pre-interview attitudes may affect the success of the gay or lesbian employment applicant. Further research indicates that knowledge of gay or lesbian sexual orientation by employers may reduce the employment credibility of gays and lesbians (Griffin, 1992) and that gays and lesbians may even be perceived as a security risk (Anderson & Smith, 1993; Herek, 1991). Hetherington, Hillerbrand and Etringer (1989) indicate that there are widely prevalent and often negative social stereotypes about homosexuals and perceived
homosexual occupations and that there are few gay or lesbian role models within the workplace to alter these stereotypes. The very idea of same-gender sexual orientation is not considered viable as a component of one's identity (Herek, 1984), and if homosexuality and same-sex romantic involvement are often viewed as immoral, inferior, sinful, or perverted (Elliot, 1993), then it is expected that:

Hypothesis 4) a male candidate who volunteers in a gay advocacy group will be less favorably rated than a candidate who has not participated in a gay identified organization and will therefore more likely be chosen for the job.

The combined effect of perceived gender role and perceived sexual orientation on employment candidate ratings

Hetherington and Orzek (1989) characterize lesbians as having a double disadvantage in the workplace because they are subject to the discrimination experienced by women in general as well as the discrimination experienced as a result of their sexual orientation. Perhaps at least some gay men have a double disadvantage in that they are discriminated on the basis of being feminine as well as being gay. Furthermore, research on attitudes toward gays and lesbians (Herek, 1988) suggest that there may be more agreement regarding the common stereotypes of gay men than of lesbians, and that attitudes toward gay men are generally more negative than attitudes toward lesbians.

If the stereotypes of the participants in this research consist of gay men acting in a stereotypical feminine manner and lesbians acting in a stereotypical masculine manner, then perhaps it is this combined perception of gender role incongruency as well as knowledge about sexual orientation that is affecting the ratings. It is therefore expected
that:

Hypothesis 5) an employment candidate who presents a stereotypical feminine behaviour pattern and has participated in a gay advocacy group will receive the lowest ratings.

and

Hypothesis 6) an employment candidate that presents a stereotypical masculine behaviour pattern and has not participated in a gay advocacy group will receive the highest ratings.

**The effect of gender differences on employment candidate ratings**

Given that female attitudes toward gays and lesbians are generally more favourable than those of men (Herek 1988; Oliver & Hyde, 1995; Whitley & Kite, 1995), it is expected that:

Hypothesis 7) female participants will provide more favorable ratings of the candidate who presents a stereotypical feminine behaviour pattern than will male participants.

and

Hypothesis 8) female participants will provide more favorable ratings of the candidate who has participated in a gay advocacy group than will male participants.

In summary then, it is expected that 1) women will maintain more favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gays than will men. 2) More favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gays will be associated with more favorable ratings of the employment candidate. 3) Those candidates who present a stereotypical masculine behaviour pattern will be more favorably rated and more likely chosen for the job. In addition, 4) those candidates that have volunteered in a gay advocacy group are expected to be less favorably rated than those candidates that have not participated in a gay identified
organization. 5) It is expected that those candidates which present a stereotypical feminine behaviour pattern and have participated in a gay advocacy group will receive the lowest ratings, whereas 6) those candidates that present a stereotypical masculine behaviour pattern and have not participated in a gay advocacy group will receive the highest ratings. Finally, 7) female participants are expected to rate candidates who present a stereotypical feminine behaviour pattern or 8) have participated in a gay advocacy group more favorably than will male participants.
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Method

Preliminary Study

In order to assure that the videotapes reflected the manipulation that was intended, pre-experimental tests were conducted in order to assure the construct validity of the videotaped experimental manipulation. A preliminary analysis was conducted in order to ensure that the two videotapes of the employment candidate differed in the stereotypical gender role behaviour that was observed. Forty-six participants from an introductory sociology class at the University of Windsor viewed the videotape of the feminine behaving candidate as well as the videotape of the masculine behaving candidate. After viewing each of the videotapes, participants completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) in order to determine whether the candidate's gender role behaviour differed (see Appendix A.).

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSR). The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSR) consists of 40 personality characteristics and behaviours which have been previously rated as stereotypically feminine or stereotypically masculine. Twenty additional items are included as neutral filler items. This gender-role measure provides separate measures of typically masculine and typically feminine characteristics.

Masculine and feminine ratings were obtained from each of the participants on both of the two videotapes. Following completion of the BSR, two paired t-tests were conducted using first the feminine ratings and then the masculine ratings from the BSR scale. Differences in the ratings of the two videotapes were observed on the masculine
scale only. Participants rated the feminine behaving candidate significantly less masculine than the masculine behaving candidate with \( t = -2.99, p < .05 \) as expected. Therefore, the videotapes were deemed acceptable for use as an independent variable for the purpose of this study.

**Main Study**

**Participants for the Main Study**

A total of 116 University of Windsor students taking spring and summer psychology courses were recruited from class to participate in the study. Forty four of these participants were men and 72 of the participants were women with ages ranging from 18 to 56. The mean age for women and men was identical at 25 years. One male participant self identified as gay and one female participant self-identified as bisexual. The remaining participants self-identified as heterosexual.

**Measures**

*The rating scales.* In addition to the videotapes and resume, two rating scales were developed for the study (see Appendix B.). The rating scale for the videotape portion of the study was constructed directly from the script used in the interview. Participants were provided with a script that matched the questions asked in the interview. These questions were grouped into five categories labelled, "Category A: Education and Training", "Category B: Work Experience Special Skills", "Category C: Career Interests and Work Goals", "Category D: Interest in Job and Company", "Category E: Self-assessment", and "Category F: Communication Skills". After each category of questions, participants were provided a 5 point Likert rating scale in order to
rate the candidate. Participants rated the extent to which the candidate's responses reflected a good match with the qualifications outlined in the job description. Scores obtained from each of the participants represented the extent to which they believed the candidate would be a suitable choice for the management position in engineering based on the overt behaviour of the candidate.

The rating scale for the resume component was structured in a similar manner. Participants rated the extent to which they believed the candidate was a suitable choice based on the information provided in the resume. Scores obtained from this portion of the study represented the extent to which participants believed that the candidate's resume reflected a good match with the qualifications outlined in the job description for "Category A: Education and Training", "Category B: Experience and Special Skills", and "Category C: Additional Experience".

Since both of these rating scales were created for the purposes of this study, no reliability tests were available. Chronbach's alpha was used to determine inter-item reliability prior to analysis of the data.

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (ATLG). In order to account for participant attitudes toward gays and lesbians with participant ratings of the candidate in the interview and resume sections, Herek's (1988) Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale was administered to all of the participants. The ATLG provides a measure of attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. It is a twenty item scale in Likert format with two 10-item subscales. The subscales consist of the attitudes toward gay men scale (ATG), and the attitudes toward lesbians scale (ATL). Internal consistency for the overall and
subscales are as follows (alpha = .90 for the ATLG, alpha = .89 for the ATG, and aplha = .77 for the ATL).

After completing the questionnaire, participants were provided with written debriefing as they exited the classroom in which the study was conducted.

Research Design

There were two independent variables in the study with four possible conditions. The first independent variable was established by manipulating the participant's perception of the candidate's gender role. The second independent variable was established by manipulating the participant's perception of the candidates's sexual orientation. Participants in condition 1 observed a stereotypically masculine gay male, participants in condition 2 observed a stereotypically masculine non-gay male. Participants in condition 3 evaluated a stereotypically feminine gay male, and participants in condition 4 evaluated a stereotypically feminine non-gay candidate. The dependent variable consisted of the ratings that participants provided regarding the candidate's suitability for hire in the interview and resume portions of the study. Ratings from the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gays were used as the covariate.

Procedures

The study consisted of three phases: 1) a simulated interview phase, 2) a resume phase, and 3) an assessment of participants' attitudes toward gays and lesbians. Participants also indicated their gender, their age, their major of study, and their sexual orientation. Prior to observing the videotapes and completing the questionnaire, all participants were provided with a job description in order to establish the context by
which to evaluate the credentials of the candidate.

The purpose of the interview phase was to introduce the first independent variable. This first independent variable involved the manipulation of the perceived gender role behaviour of the male employment candidate. The interview component required that participants observe a videotape of the candidate in a simulated selection interview. Participants observed either a stereotypically masculine candidate, or a stereotypically feminine candidate on videotape in a mock interview (see Appendix C. for script). After viewing the videotape, participants rated the candidate's suitability for the hire. These ratings were used as the dependent measure in the first analysis.

The purpose of the resume phase was to introduce the second independent variable. This second independent variable involved the manipulation of the perceived sexual orientation of the employment candidate. Participants analyzed a resume detailing the candidate's education, work experience, volunteer experience and interests. Participants examined the resumes of either a candidate who was presented as gay or a candidate that was not presented as gay. In order to present the candidate as gay, information was included in the "volunteer experience" section of the resume indicating he was a member of a gay and lesbian organization. For the candidate that was not presented as gay, information in the volunteer experience section indicated that he was a member of Green Peace. This information was included in order ensure that identification with a gay and lesbian organization was the only factor influencing the results, as opposed to involvement in a political or activist organization (see Appendix C. for resume). After analyzing the resume, participants rated the candidate's suitability for
the hire. These ratings were used as the dependent measure in the second analysis.

The purpose of the third phase of the experiment was to determine whether participant attitudes toward lesbians and gay men would co-vary with the ratings provided in the interview and resume phases of the study. Following the videotape and resume portions of the study, participants completed the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale in order to determine whether participant attitudes toward homosexuals were related to the outcome of the selection interview process.

Several additional questions were asked. Participants were asked to indicate their gender in order to determine whether there were differences between the attitudes of men and women. Finally, participants were asked to indicate their sexual orientation and their age. Information related to sexual orientation was obtained in order to control for this potential bias when analyzing the interview ratings and participant attitudes toward gays and lesbians.
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Results

Prior to analysis, one case was removed due to missing data on all of the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale, and two additional cases were removed due to outlying data on several of the dependent variables. These two cases exhibited extremely and consistently low ratings on all of the scales. No multivariate outliers were detected. Means from the one gay and one bisexual participant did not differ significantly from the overall means, and were therefore included in the analysis. Data from 113 participants were included in the final analyses.

Initial examination of the data revealed a strong positive skew for the ATLG scale. In order to assure that the variance was not underestimated, data from the ATLG scale was transformed by calculating the logarithm of the raw data in order to create a new variable that more closely resembled a normal distribution. The normality of the remaining dependent variables was deemed acceptable for analysis.

Two of the three resume sub-scales exhibited a high bivariate correlation (\( r > .80 \)) indicating a risk for multicollinearity. Scales from the "Previous Work Experience" and "Additional Experience" sections of the resume were therefore collapsed into one "Experience" rating scale in order to ensure that none of the dependent variables were linear combinations of another variable.

All of the scales used in the study exhibited high levels of internal reliability with alpha = .81 for the interview scale, alpha = .76 for the resume education scale and alpha = .91 for the resume experience scale. Reliability for the ATLG was also acceptable with
alpha = .96, with alpha = .94 for the ATG and alpha = .91 for the ATL.

Three main analyses were conducted in order to address the hypotheses of the study. Initially a t-test was conducted in order to determine gender differences on the attitudes toward lesbians and gays scale. Next, an analysis of covariances was conducted using the interview ratings as the dependent variable. Finally, a multivariate analysis of variance was conducted using the ratings provided after the resume component of the study as the dependent variable.

**Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men**

The first analysis was conducted in order to determine whether men and women differed in their attitudes toward gays and lesbians as hypothesized (Hypothesis 1). A two-tailed t-test was conducted in order to compare the scores of men and women. With the ATLG, lower scores indicate more favourable attitudes, and higher scores indicate less favourable attitudes toward gays and lesbians. Contrary to expectations, women did not exhibit significantly lower scores (M = 61.36) on the ATLG than the men (M = 60.33), t = .15, p > .80. Since the employment interview candidate was male, an additional test was conducted in order to test the hypothesis that attitudes toward gay men only would differ between men and women. Scores on the ATG also did not differ between women (M = 34.00) and men (M = 36.73), t = .64. Finally, a two-tailed t-test was conducted in order to determine whether attitudes toward gay men would be more positive than attitudes toward lesbians. This analysis was conducted in order to determine whether scores from the ATG would be more appropriate for the analysis as opposed to the complete ATLG. Scores on the ATL differed significantly from scores on the ATG with t = 8.7, p < .01
indicating that participants maintained less favorable attitudes regarding gay men than attitudes regarding lesbians. Since this difference was significant, the ATG was used as the covariate rather than the ATLG.

**Interview Ratings**

The next analysis was performed using the interview ratings only in order to test the hypothesis that a stereotypical masculine behaving employment candidate would be rated more favorably than a stereotypical feminine behaving employment candidate (Hypothesis 3), and in order to test the hypothesis that men would rate the feminine behaving candidate less favorably than would women (Hypothesis 7).

A 2 x 2 factorial ANCOVA was performed using the Interview ratings as the dependent variable, Candidate Gender Role (masculine and feminine) and Gender of Participant (men and women) as the independent variables, and Attitudes Toward Gay Men as the covariate. Homogeneity of variance-covariance was confirmed with \( F(9, 59122) = 1.16, p > .31 \) assuring that the discrepancy in sample sizes amongst the cells would not invalidate the use of ANCOVA. Homogeneity of regression was assured with \( F(3, 105) = 1.42, p > .23 \) indicting that there was no significant difference in the amount of variability that was accounted for in the dependent variable by the covariate, amongst all levels of the independent variables.

It was hypothesized that the candidate who presented a stereotypical masculine behaviour pattern would be more favorably rated than the candidate who presented a stereotypical feminine behaviour pattern, and that women would provide more favorable ratings than men. The predicted pattern of results did not emerge since none of the main
Table 1.

**Analysis of Variance for Employment Interview Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender Role</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Participant</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Participant X Candidate Gender Role</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG (Covariate)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>48.26</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table 2.

**Means and Standard Deviations for Interview Ratings as a Function of Candidate Gender Role and Gender of Participant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Participant</th>
<th>Candidate Gender Role</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.31 (.66)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.13 (.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.31 (.70)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.38 (.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effects or the two way interaction reached significance (see Table 1.). Thus, the
candidate who presented a stereotypical masculine behaviour pattern was not more
favorably rated than the feminine behaving candidate and female participants did not rate
the stereotypical feminine behaving candidate more favorably than did the men.
Additionally, the Attitudes Toward Gay Men scale provided no adjustment to the
dependent variable due to a lack of variance. Most participants provided fairly positive
ratings with regard to their attitudes toward gays (see Table 2.).

Resume Ratings

The next analysis was conducted using the two resume sub-scales, Education and
Experience as the dependent variables. This analysis was conducted in order to test the
hypothesis that more favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gays will be associated with
more favorable ratings of the employment candidate (Hypothesis 2), that stereotypically
masculine candidates will be rated higher than stereotypically feminine candidates
(Hypothesis 3), whether candidates who were perceived as gay would be rated lower
than candidates who were not perceived as gay (Hypothesis 4), whether stereotypically
feminine behaving men who were perceived to be gay would be rated lowest of all
(Hypothesis 5), whether stereotypically masculine men who were not perceived to be gay
would be rated highest of all (Hypothesis 6), and finally, whether women would rate the
stereotypically feminine candidate (Hypothesis 7) or the candidate that was perceived to
be gay (Hypothesis 8) more favorably than would the men.

A 2 X 2 X 2 between subjects MANCOVA was conducted using the two resume
sub-scales, Education and Experience, as the dependent variables. Candidate Gender Role
### Table 3.

**Means and Standard Deviations for Resume Education Ratings as a Function of Candidate Gender Role, Perceived Sexual Orientation and Gender of Participant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay (Congruent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Raters</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Raters</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>(.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Gay (Not Congruent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Raters</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Raters</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(masculine and feminine), Perceived Sexual Orientation (gay and not-gay) and Gender of Participant (men and women) were entered as the independent variables, and ratings from the Attitudes Toward Gay Men scale were used as the covariate. The correlation between the two dependent variables was low enough to be acceptable for use in the analysis with \( r < .68 \). Homogeneity of variance-covariance was confirmed with \( F(42, 11215) = 1.05, p > .39 \) therefore assuring that the discrepancy in sample sizes amongst
Table 4.

**Means and Standard Deviations for Resume Experience Ratings as a Function of Candidate Gender Role, Perceived Sexual Orientation and Gender of Participant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Candidate Gender role</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>(Congruent)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Not Congruent)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the cells would not invalidate the use of MANCOVA. Homogeneity of regression was assured with $F(14, 192) = 1.24$, $p > .24$ indicating that there was no significant difference in the amount of variability that was accounted for in the dependent variable by the covariate, amongst all levels of the independent variables.

The Attitudes Toward Gay Men scale provided no adjustment to either of the dependent variables due to a lack of variance with $F(1, 104) = .02$, $p > .90$ for the
Table 5.

Univariate Results for the Resume Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Role</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (1, 105)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender Role</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>&lt;.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>&lt;.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Participant</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>&lt;.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender Role X Perceived Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>&lt;.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Participant</td>
<td>&lt;.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender Role X Gender of Participant</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>&lt;.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Sexual Orientation X Gender of Participant</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>&lt;.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Gender Role X Perceived Sexual Orientation X Gender of Participant</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>&lt;.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Education variable, and $F (1, 104) = .80, p > .37$ for the Experience variable. The three-way interaction of Candidate Gender Role X Perceived Sexual Orientation X Gender of Participant was the only effect that reached significance with multivariate $F (2, 103) =$
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**Mean Previous Education Resume Ratings as a Function of Candidate Gender Role and Gender of Participant for the Gay Identified Candidate**
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Mean Previous Education Resume Ratings as a Function of Perceived Sexual Orientation and Gender of Participant

Legend

▲ Gay
● Not Gay
Figure 6.

Mean Previous Education Resume Ratings as a Function of Candidate Gender Role and Gender of Participant

Legend

○... Masculine
△... Feminine
.379, p < .05. None of the main effects reached significance with multivariate $F(2, 103) = .35$, $p > .70$ for Candidate Gender Role multivariate $F(2, 103) = .08$, $p > .92$ for the main effect of Perceived Sexual Orientation, multivariate $F(2, 103) = .36$, $p > .69$ for the main effect of Candidate Gender Role and multivariate $F(2, 103) = 1.34$, $p > .26$ for the main effect of Gender of Participant. None of the two way interactions reached significance, with multivariate $F(2, 103) = .68$, $p > .50$ for the Candidate Gender Role X Perceived Sexual Orientation interaction, (Multivariate $F(2, 103) = .003$, $p > .90$ for the Candidate Gender Role X Gender of Participant interaction, and (Multivariate $F(2, 103) = .56$, $p > .57$ for the Perceived Sexual Orientation X Gender of Participant interaction.

Further examination of the means for the education ratings revealed that the lowest overall ratings were made by women when rating the identified gay candidate that behaved in a stereotypical masculine manner ($M = 3.35$). The highest overall ratings were made by women viewing the stereotypical masculine behaving candidate that had not participated in a gay identified organization ($M = 3.91$) (see Table 3).

Several additional post-hoc analyses were conducted in order to better identify the source of the significant difference observed in the three-way interaction for the Resume Education subscale ratings. Two 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA's were performed using the Resume Education subscale ratings as the dependent variable, Candidate Gender Role (masculine and feminine) and Perceived Sexual Orientation (gay and not-gay) as the independent variables.

The first 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA was conducted using only data from those participants that were men. The two way interaction of Candidate Gender Role X
Perceived Sexual Orientation did not reach significance with $F(1, 39) = 1.52, p > .23$, and neither of the main effects reached significance with $F(1, 39) = .21, p > .65$ for Candidate Gender Role and $F(1, 39) = .27, p > .60$ for the main effect of Perceived Sexual Orientation.

An identical $2 \times 2$ factorial ANOVA was performed using only data from those participants that were female. The two way interaction of Candidate Gender Role $\times$ Perceived Sexual Orientation was the only effect that reached significance with $F(1, 66) = 7.0, p < .05$. Neither of the main effects reached significance with $F(1, 66) = .48, p > .49$ for Candidate Gender Role and $F(1, 66) = 3.06, p > .09$ for the main effect of Perceived Sexual Orientation.

Finally, four additional post-hoc one-way ANOVA's were conducted using only the data from those participants that were women. The first two ANOVA's were conducted using the Resume Education subscale ratings as the dependent variable and Candidate Gender Role (masculine and feminine) as the independent variable. The first ANOVA was conducted using only the data from those women that had observed an identified gay candidate. This analysis reached significance with $F(1, 33) = 6.78, p < .02$ for the main effect of Candidate Gender Role. Women rated the feminine presenting gay candidate significantly higher than the masculine presenting gay candidate (see Figure 1.). The second analysis was identical to the first, but was performed using only the data from those women that had observed a candidate that was not identified as gay. This analysis did not reach significance, with $F(1, 33) = 1.59, p > .22$ for the main effect of Candidate Gender Role.
Figure 7.
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The last two one-way ANOVA's were conducted using the Resume Education subscale ratings as the dependent variable and Perceived Sexual Orientation (gay and not gay) as the independent variable.

The third ANOVA was conducted using only the data from those women that had observed a stereotypical feminine behaving candidate. This analysis did not reach significance with $F(1,25) = .92, p > .35$ for the main effect of Perceived Sexual Orientation. The fourth one-way ANOVA was identical to the third, but was performed using only the data from those women that had observed a stereotypical masculine behaving candidate. This analysis did reach significance, with $F(1,41) = 9.41, p < .01$ for the main effect of Perceived Sexual Orientation. Women participants rated the stereotypical masculine behaving gay candidate lower than the stereotypical masculine behaving candidate that was not gay (see Figure 1. and Figure 2.).

**Gender differences in attitudes, and the relation of attitudes to employment candidate ratings**

Contrary to expectation, men did not hold less favourable attitudes toward lesbians and gays than did women (Hypothesis 1). Relatively positive ratings were provided by all of the participants with regard to their attitudes toward gays and lesbians. These attitudes were not related to the employment ratings that were provided in the interview or resume phases of the study (Hypothesis 2). The ATG scale did not provide any adjustment to the ratings due to a lack in variance. This lack of variance may be due to the fact that the sample of students within this study maintained particularly positive attitudes toward gays and lesbians but may also be due to social desirability, since
participants completed the ATLG following completion of the interview component of the study. This may have influenced their responses on the ATLG, thereby reducing the expected variance. Participants may have guessed the premise of the study and attempted to compensate by presenting fairly positive attitudes regarding gays and lesbians.

The separate effects of perceived gender role congruency and perceived sexual orientation on employment candidate ratings

Given that the participant attitudes toward gay men were not related to the ratings that were made, feminine candidates were not rated less favourably than were masculine behaving candidates (Hypothesis 3), and candidates that participated in a gay advocacy group were not rated less favourably than candidates that did not participate in a gay identified organization (Hypothesis 4). Further examination of the means revealed that in fact men slightly preferred gay identified candidates. Women slightly preferred candidates that were not identified as gay, though the difference was not significant. This may have been due to the fact that women preferred the employment candidate that had been involved with Green Peace.

The combined effect of perceived gender role and perceived sexual orientation on employment candidate ratings

Contrary to expectations, the stereotypically feminine behaving candidate that was perceived to be gay was not rated lowest (Hypothesis 5). Overall, participants did not differentiate between feminine and masculine presenting candidates. Students in this sample were not particularly biased in favour of the masculine candidate as expected. The only difference observed was when the candidate was gay and the participant was
female. It is possible that participants interpreted the behaviour of the stereotypical feminine candidate as stereotypically expressive or social in nature rather than feminine. Participants may consider expressive characteristics as essential, particularly within the context of an interview setting. People skills may also be an expectation given that the candidate was interviewing for a management level position.

Stereotypical masculine behaving candidates who did not participate in a gay identified organization did receive the highest ratings as expected (Hypothesis 6), but from the women only. Stereotypical masculine behaving candidates that were perceived to be gay were not expected to be rated lowest.

The effect of gender differences on employment candidate ratings

Contrary to expectations, men did not provide lower ratings of the feminine behaving candidate (Hypothesis 7) or gay candidate (Hypothesis 8) than did women. Furthermore, ratings by the women were not expected to be the lowest ratings provided, and women were not expected to rate the masculine gay candidate lower than the feminine gay candidate.
Chapter 4

Discussion

Responses on the attitudes toward lesbians and gays scale were relatively and consistently positive in comparison to many previous studies. These ratings were not related to the ratings that were made regarding the employment candidate. As indicated in the results section, this may have been due to social desirability since the ATLG scale immediately followed the employment interview component of the study. Participants may have guessed the premise of the study and therefore responded in a more favorable manner than they would have if they had completed the ATLG in another setting.

It is also possible that attitudes toward gays and lesbians are more favorable amongst Canadian university social science students than previous studies have indicated. This study was initially designed to be conducted with business administration students who might be expected to maintain relatively less favourable attitudes toward gays and lesbians than would social science students. The results of this study are likely to have been different if the study was conducted only with students of business administration or if it had been conducted within a workplace setting.

The relatively positive ratings in this study seem to indicate that this sample was relatively gay-positive. Many of the hypotheses in this study were developed with the expectation that the sample would maintain relatively unfavourable attitudes toward gays and lesbians, as exhibited in previous studies. Given that the sample appears to be relatively gay-positive, any conclusions regarding interviewers with unfavourable attitudes toward gays and lesbians are not likely to be determined from this data.
Therefore conclusions from this study are made under the assumption that participants of this study are a relatively gay-positive group of people.

Given that the sample appeared to be relatively "liberal" in their attitudes or at least gay-positive, the only hypothesis that was confirmed was hypothesis six in which the employment candidate that presented a stereotypical masculine behaviour pattern and had not participated in a gay advocacy group was expected to receive the highest ratings overall. This was true with the women only. Consideration of both gender role and sexual orientation did influence the employment ratings that were made by the women only, but in this case gay men that were masculine received the lowest ratings and it was expected that gay men that were feminine would receive the lowest ratings.

Women were not expected to rate the candidates in the pattern indicated. There is the possibility that women who are not biased against gays and lesbian are more likely to expect that masculine gay males are attempting to hide or falsify their sexual orientation if they do not meet up to stereotypical expectations of feminine behaviour. In this case, even when people have relatively positive attitudes toward lesbians and gays, expectations regarding their behaviour may be limited. They may be expected to act in a stereotypical manner and any deviations from this stereotype may be perceived as insincere or an attempt to mislead. Alternatively, women may perceived feminine gay men as an "ally" with regard to feminine gender related issues in society in general. Gay men that are feminine may be perceived as supportive of womens concerns, whereas masculine gay men may be held circumspect.

The ratings provided by the men, contrary to expectation, did not reveal a
tendency to discriminate inappropriately when observing candidates that were perceived to be gay, or when candidates were perceived to be stereotypically feminine. Male participants did not rate the perceived gay candidate less favourably than the candidate that was not perceived to be gay, and they did not rate the stereotypically feminine candidate less favourably than the stereotypically masculine candidate. It appears that the men may not have been affected by knowledge of the candidate's participation in a gay organization as much as were women. This may be due to the fact that they maintain less bias, or they may simply be less attuned to the cues of sexual orientation when rating objective criteria like previous education and experience. Future studies might attempt to determine whether men would show differences in their ratings if they were asked to make more global attitudinal judgements, such as whether they would sincerely desire to have a gay man or a stereotypically feminine man as a colleague.

Attitudes toward lesbians and gays did not differ between men and women as expected. Additionally, more favorable attitudes toward lesbians and gays were not associated with more favorable ratings of the employment candidate. Previous research suggests that male attitudes toward gays and lesbians tend to be more negative than the attitudes that women maintain toward gays and lesbians. Several studies have discovered that male heterosexuals consistently expressed a greater number of negative attitudes toward gay people than did heterosexual females (Herek, 1988; Oliver & Hyde, 1995; Whitley & Kite, 1995). In addition, male heterosexuals held a greater number of negative attitudes toward gay men than they did toward lesbian women (Herek, 1988). In this study, the mean responses that were observed on the ATLG scale did not indicate
that men held more negative attitudes toward lesbians and gays than did women. Again, this may have been due to the fact that participants were generally gay-positive and therefore less likely to exhibit any negative attitudes toward lesbians and gays, regardless of their gender.

There was partial confirmation of hypothesis three in which the stereotypically masculine candidate was expected to be more favorably rated than the stereotypically feminine behaving candidate, but only for women as indicated. The male candidate who volunteered in a gay advocacy group was not less favorably rated than the candidate who had not participated in a gay identified organization and female raters did not provide more favorable ratings of the candidate who presented a stereotypical feminine behaviour pattern or had participated in a gay advocacy group than did male interviewers.

There is perhaps a tendency for people to have a more restricted stereotype of gay men than of men that are not gay. Of the several correlates that Herek (1988) examined in association with attitudes toward gays and lesbians, independent variables that were associated with attitudes toward gay men reached significance more frequently than those attitudes that were related to lesbians, suggesting that heterosexual men have a more highly developed and articulated social stereotype of gay men than of lesbians. The fact that some of the participants in this study rated stereotypically masculine gay men lower and stereotypically masculine men that were not gay higher does suggest that people have fairly clear stereotypes with regard to both the gender role behaviour and the sexual orientation of men even when their attitudes are relatively favourable toward gays and lesbians. In addition, the fact that participants maintained more negative attitudes
regarding gay men than regarding lesbians suggest that people, in general, maintain more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians.

Though it was not intended as part of the research, evidence in this study suggests that there may be more agreement about what constitutes a stereotype of a man that is perceived to be gay than a stereotype regarding a man that is not perceived to be gay. Standard deviations in both of the gay conditions were smaller than the standard deviations for the employment candidate that was not perceived to be gay. Given that the ratings were provided in response to the employment suitability of the candidate, it remains to be determined whether this limited variability or "agreement" amongst the population might restrict candidates that are gay from being hired for certain types of employment.

Overall, the implication for the workforce is that feminine behaving candidates are not less likely to be hired for a management level engineering position amongst relatively liberal or gay positive interviewers. For gay identified interviewees specifically, candidates that behave in a stereotypical feminine manner may actually be more likely to be hired than those gay identified candidates that behave in a manner that is viewed as stereotypically masculine, particularly if women are likely to be the persons that are hiring in the workplace. Stereotypically masculine male candidates that are gay, it appears, are more likely to experience discrimination amongst relatively pro-gay interviewers.

Future Research

Future research could examine several aspects of these findings. An additional
study that examines the ratings that both men and women provide when observing a female employment candidate would provide the opportunity to further determine whether men exhibit the same pattern of response as the women in this study. Additional research might also examine the ratings of gay men and lesbian women regarding both male and female employment candidates in order to determine whether cognitive dissonance is at the source of the patterns observed. Gays and lesbians would not be expected to have as restricted a stereotype as those candidates that participated in this study, and would therefore be expected to behave differently.

Given that women rated the candidate who ostensibly participated in Green Peace (the not-gay candidate control information) highest, an additional level of the sexual orientation variable might be included. This level of the variable would not include any information related to previous experience in a gay identified organization or with Green Peace, in order to determine whether the Green Peace information was confounding the results.

Future studies might also include questions asking about the participant's previous contact with gays and lesbians in order to determine whether previous exposure to gays and lesbians affect subsequent ratings for employment. An additional manipulation check could be included asking the participants whether they thought the candidate was gay and whether they thought the candidate was feminine in order to determine whether the conclusions regarding gay men and stereotypically masculine men are warranted. A manipulation check of this type would also help to determine whether inclusion of "Green Peace" in the volunteer experience section was effective as a control.
Attitudes and Behaviour

It is difficult to determine whether this research provides evidence that attitudes and behaviour are related within the context of the employment interview. Evidence from Ellis and Vasseur (1993) suggests that interviewer's pre-interview attitudes toward gays and lesbians may be critical in predicting the gay or lesbian candidate's success or failure in an interview. The attitudes prevalent in this research appeared to be fairly positive but were restricted in variability. Even with the fairly positive attitudes on the ATLG, female participants provided less favorable ratings of stereotypical masculine behaving men that were perceived to be gay. This seems to indicate that other factors, perhaps stereotypes, are more likely to influence the decisions that are made within the interview process.

In an attempt to gain some understanding as to how and why people discriminate employment candidates on the basis of information that is for the most part irrelevant, theory on attitudes does not appear to be the best at accounting for behaviour, particularly in this study. Participants in this study did not behave in a manner one might expect given their attitudes toward gays and lesbians. Women were more likely to rate candidates that were perceived to be gay and behaved stereotypically masculine lower than they rated other candidates whereas men were not. This occurred even though women and men maintained relatively favorable attitudes toward gays and lesbians.

Some studies have found that an increase in contact between majority group members with an outgroup, such as gays and lesbians, improve the attitudes that the majority group members maintain in regard to minority group members. Herek and
Capitano (1996) found the relationship between previous contact with homosexuals and more positive attitudes to be stronger as a function of increased number of contacts, more intimate contacts, and contacts that included self-initiated disclosure of sexual orientation (as opposed to third party disclosure). Herek and Capitano's results indicate that heterosexuals are more likely to undergo attitude modification in favor of gays and lesbians as a result of increased contact with homosexuals.

It is difficult to tell from this research whether previous contact moderated the attitudes or the employment ratings that were provided because there were no questions about previous contact. Since the sample in this study appears to be relatively gay-positive, it would be of interest to examine the relationship of relative previous contact with gays and lesbians amongst relatively gay-positive interviewers. Future studies might examine whether the differences between ratings of masculine-gay and feminine-gay candidates are moderated by previous participant exposure to individuals that are identified as gay or lesbian. For example, are women that have had multiple contacts with gays and lesbians more or less likely to rate gay-masculine candidates lower than gay-female candidates when hiring?

Herek and Capitano further suggest that institutional policies encouraging homosexual individuals to disclose their sexual orientation to heterosexual peers are more likely to facilitate the development of positive attitudes toward gays and lesbians in the workplace. These policies, it appears, are not likely to create social or organizational strife as some have suggested. Based on Hereks' study, it appears that an increased level of contact or perhaps familiarity with a minority may be more likely to influence
behaviour than will a change in attitudes. Given the behaviour of the women in this study, the findings do not provide evidence that the actual behaviour of individuals toward gays and lesbians in an employment interview will indeed reflect their stated attitudes toward gays and/or lesbians. Given this, it is debatable whether institutional policies that encourage gays and lesbians to disclose their sexual orientation would create organizational strife in the first place, regardless of employee attitudes.

This research suggests that the relationship between attitudes and behaviour is more complex than previous discussions have identified regarding attitudes toward gays and lesbians. Herek (1984) indicates that the definition of homophobia (an irrational fear of homosexuals and homosexuality) is too restrictive and that much of the discussion regarding homophobia has examined only the negative attitudes that individuals maintain about gays and lesbians. Research on homophobia, suggests Herek, would benefit from a more complex model of positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals.

Social Cognition, Stereotypes and Cognitive Dissonance

Cognitive dissonance theory perhaps better accounts for the pattern observed in at least the women participants of this study. These participants may maintain a stereotype that equates stereotypical feminine behaviour with the gay sexual orientation of men. If male candidates are perceived to be gay and behave in a stereotypical masculine manner then ratings are low, perhaps because the expectations or stereotypes of the rater are disconfirmed. For those candidates that do not behave in a stereotypical manner as expected, dissonance is aroused.

Cognitive dissonance theory asserts that experiences such as this that contradict
the beliefs that a person maintains will place them in an uncomfortable state. Dissonance
theory further states that humans are motivated to ensure that this uncomfortable state is
altered and the dissonance is resolved. In most cases there are at least two ways in which
the person confronted with an unexpected reality can resolve the dissonance. One option
is to change the beliefs that are dissonant with what is observed. In the case of this study,
participants would have perhaps altered their belief that gay men typically behave in a
stereotypical feminine manner, or that stereotypical masculine behaving men are not gay.
The other is to deny or devalue the reality that is dissonant with what is believed. In this
case what would be observed would be similar to what the results of this study revealed.
Participants would rate the candidate that disconfirms the participants stereotypes lower
than the candidate that confirms one's expectations.

Based on the information gathered in this study it is impossible to determine
whether the participants altered their stereotypes in any manner, but what can be
postulated based on the evidence is that women participants may have retained a
stereotype of either gay men or masculine men that was disconfirmed by the information
provided to them in at least one condition within this study. Stereotypically masculine
behaving men are not supposed to be gay.

One of the most interesting findings of this study is the discrepancy between the
patterns of behaviour when comparing men and women. Though it is difficult to
determine from the evidence in this study, perhaps the behaviour of men, when
confronted with the presence of gays and lesbians, is influenced by the attitudes that
these men maintain toward gays and lesbians whereas women may be more be governed
by their stereotypes or beliefs about gays and lesbians. Perhaps this is why women appeared to rate masculine men that were perceived to be gay less favourably.

The other possibility is that the different pattern of behaviour that was observed in women is due to a confound of the study itself. The only employment candidate that was observed in this study was male. Perhaps if a female employment candidate was presented to the men, they might exhibit a similar pattern in ratings as did the women.

**Familiarity to Self**

Another theory that may account for the behaviour of the women observed in this study, is one that better accounts for the relational dimension of the persons concept of "self" and "self-to-other" in the human social environment. Interpreted from this perspective, at least two dimensions of familiar human "reality" could be postulated in order to explain the results of this study, that of the feminine reality and that of the heterosexual reality. Assuming that women in this study tend to behave in a more stereotypically feminine manner and that the gay men in question are behaving in a stereotypically feminine manner, both these women and men are familiar with what the experience of behaving in a stereotypical feminine manner entails for one's self, one's perceptions of reality, the social environment etc. Femininity is familiar, therefore these women may be more likely to feel as if they can better relate to or understand those individuals that display stereotypically feminine behaviours and as a result might rate them more favourably.

On the other hand, ample opportunity to relate to heterosexual men in a culture that is, for the most part heterosexual, entails that these women would be quite familiar
with men that are heterosexual and what heterosexuality means for one's concept of self, one's perception of reality, one's experiences in the social realm etc. Heterosexuality is also familiar.

For those individuals that display stereotypically masculine characteristics, and are perceived to be gay, there may be no opportunity for these women to access previous experience and understanding related to both the dimensions of masculinity and homosexuality. This combination of realities is least familiar to heterosexual women, at least when the subject in question is male, such as in this study. These women may have no expectations of what to expect from individuals exhibiting these characteristics, and therefore might rate them lower in acceptability for say, employment.

Employment Selection Interviews

Based on the findings in this research then, there appears to be some evidence of discrimination in the employment interview, particularly for men who are perceived to be gay but do not act in a stereotypically feminine manner. This pattern is perhaps most evident when raters are women, and occurs even when these women have relatively positive attitudes toward gays and lesbians in general.

It appears that the combined influence of the knowledge of sexual orientation and gender role behaviour can influence interview outcomes even amongst relatively pro-gay populations. As discussed in the introduction, current Human rights regulations (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 1981), prohibit questions in the selection interview that are intended to expose the interview candidate's sexual orientation. Given the results of this study, it appears that even though questions of sexual orientation are not allowed in the
employment interview, the mere suspicion of the interviewee's sexual orientation may influence the decisions that are made. This may occur at the expense of merit based interview candidate characteristics.

This study further raises question about the validity of employment selection interviews. Previous literature examining the selection interview process has consistently identified a lack in validity (Wiesner and Cronshaw, 1988; Motwidlo et al., 1992). The interview as a selection technique shows surprisingly little predictive validity for the incumbent's future performance. The results from this current analysis suggest that other factors, such as sexual orientation, gender role behaviour and the gender of the interviewer do have the capability of influencing the decisions that are made within the employment selection interview process. As a result, the candidate with the best qualifications and performance record may not be hired, and the employment interview process will have been compromised as a result of extraneous factors unrelated to the performance criteria of the position.

Additionally, this study suggests that employment candidates may not fare well if information within the interview causes the interviewer to perceive that the candidate is gay. Indeed most candidates want to be perceived positively by their prospective employer and therefore attempt to hide this types of information, to the degree that this is possible, within the context of the interviewing process. Evidence from this study suggests that information related to sexual orientation may indeed limit the success of candidates that make this information known, but for candidates that do not exhibit stereotypical feminine behaviours only. Male candidates that are known to be gay and
appear to behave in a stereotypical feminine manner may not experience adverse responses as a result of these qualities within the context of the employment interview. Given this research, these individuals may indeed benefit from an opportunity to reveal their sexual orientation within the context of the employment interview.

This study further extends our knowledge about the experience of gays and lesbians with employment interviews. Ellis and Vasseur (1993) indicate that more research is needed in order to examine the effects of sexual orientation on the interview process within the context of different employment environments. No research at present has investigated the effects of sexual orientation on the interview process outside of the field of education. This current research provides information about the employment interview within the context of the field of engineering at a management level, and suggests that there is potential for discrimination within the field of engineering for men that are perceived to be gay and behave in stereotypical masculine manner.

Sexual Orientation and the Workplace

It appears then that there is additional evidence of concerns that are unique to gays and lesbians within the context of the workplace. For example, Hetherington, Hillerbrand and Etringer (1989) indicate that there are at least four factors that uniquely affect persons that are gay or lesbian during the career decision-making process. There are widely held stereotypes about homosexuals and perceived homosexual occupations, there are few role models, there are concerns about the visibility of same gender relationships in public, and in addition there is often no context within the workplace for which gays and lesbians can gather for support and/or discuss their unique concerns. Additionally, this study
highlights the potential for an increased risk of discrimination in the employment interview.

It appears as well that the issues in the workplace may be different for gay men than they are for lesbian women. For instance, Etringer, Hillerbrand and Hetherington (1990) indicate that gay men and heterosexual women were more likely to be dissatisfied with their career choices when made, whereas lesbians and heterosexual men maintained the lowest level of dissatisfaction.

Other researchers (Hetherington and Orzek, 1989) characterize lesbians as having a double disadvantage in the workplace because they are subject to the discrimination experienced by women in general, as well as the discrimination experienced as a result of their sexual orientation. In this study, it was expected that the discriminatory responses related to the appearance of femininity, together with the discriminatory responses related to the label of being gay, would be an example of how gay men might also experience "double" discrimination in the workplace. It was expected that this might account for why gay men and heterosexual women appeared to be less pleased with their career decisions than were lesbians and heterosexual men.

The results of this study do not suggest that gay men are discriminated on the basis of femininity and their sexual orientation, but do suggest that both the consideration of sexual orientation and stereotypical gender role behaviours might place the gay man and the stereotypical masculine man at a disadvantage in the workplace. In fact, in this study, it appears that masculine men that are perceived to be gay are most at risk of discrimination in the selection interview, and perhaps the workplace. Men that are
perceived to be gay, but behave in a stereotypical feminine manner may be less at risk of discrimination when being interviewed for a job.

It appears then that gay men are indeed discriminated on the basis of at least two factors as well. Being gay only, particularly if behaving in a stereotypically feminine manner, may not be enough to incite discrimination. When both the congruency of the gender role behaviour and the sexual orientation of the employee are considered it appears to place some gay men at a disadvantage.

Given that cognitive dissonance may be at the basis of the findings within this study it appears that interviewers, within workplaces that do not address gay and lesbian concerns, may maintain a relatively restricted understanding of gay and lesbian realities. Elliot (1993) indicates that many problems arise for gays and lesbians because career counselors are insensitive to the unique culture of gays and lesbians. The current research suggests that general knowledge of gay and lesbian realities may indeed be limited. Participants may not have had a particularly extensive cognitive schema of gay men given that they favoured the stereotypical feminine behaving candidate rather than the stereotypical masculine behaving candidate.

As a result, it appears that there is a need to expand current knowledge with regard to gay and lesbian concerns within a variety of workplaces. This research provides evidence that there is potential for discrimination within the field of engineering, and perhaps at management levels. Perhaps this knowledge will create a greater understanding of the perceptions that gays and lesbians have with regard to making occupational choices and ultimately facilitate the career decision process for gays and
lesbians.

Greater Acceptability and Presence of Gays and Lesbians in the Workplace?

In the introduction, it was suggested that work environments having a greater proportion of women influencing decisions might be more likely to support the acceptance and inclusion of gays and lesbians in the workplace. The reciprocal nature of Herek's (1988) study, in which women had more favourable attitudes toward gays and lesbians and improved attitudes toward gays and lesbians as a function of increased level of contact, suggests that gays and lesbians would be more likely to disclose their sexual orientation within work environments that have a smaller overall proportion of men.

Given the results of this current research, a greater proportion of women in the workforce may facilitate a greater acceptance of sexual orientation issues for gays and lesbians in general, but for those gay men that do not exhibit a stereotypically feminine gender role, evidence would suggest that these individuals may not benefit in terms of reduced discrimination. There was no evidence that men would be more likely to discriminate, although, given their attitudes, it might be a common expectation.

In conclusion, it appears that there may not be enough incentive for gays and lesbians that conceal their sexual orientation to cease hiding this aspect of their identity within the context of the current Canadian workplace. This type of behaviour is likely to continue at some level, preventing the needed visibility of effective gay and lesbian role models within the Canadian workplace. The lack of general understanding and discussion with regard to gay and lesbian culture and issues may only encourage gays and lesbians to disguise their full identity in the workplace. Evidence from this research
indicates that there are indeed rewards for maintaining silence (don't ask don't tell) and punishments for having revealed. As indicated by Gonsiorek (1993), the underlying tension between the fear of damaged credibility and job loss, together with the desire to integrate one's personal and professional identities, contribute to a high level of job stress that may continue to characterize the experiences of many gays and lesbians in the workplace.
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Appendix A.

Preliminary Study Materials
Instructions to Participants

In order to conduct a study for completion of my Master's Thesis, I need you to rate two videotapes. In each videotape you will observe an employment interview in process. Each of these interviews last approximately fifteen minutes. Please complete the first questionnaire immediately after you view the first videotape. After viewing the second videotape, please complete the second questionnaire.
Questionnaire for Videotapes (Bem Sex Role Inventory)

The following is a list of traits and behaviours that can be used to describe aspects of a person. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following best describe the interview candidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Does not describe</th>
<th>Describes the candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the candidate</td>
<td>very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self reliant</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yielding</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Helpful</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Defends own beliefs</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cheerful</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Moody</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Independent</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shy</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conscientious</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Athletic</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affectionate</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Theatrical</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assertive</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Flatterable</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Happy</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Strong personality</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Loyal</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Unpredictable</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Forceful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feminine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Reliable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Analytical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Sympathetic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Jealous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Has leadership abilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Truthful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Willing to take risks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Understanding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Secretive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Makes decisions easily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Compassionate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Sincere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Self-sufficient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Conceited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dominant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Soft spoken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Likeable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Masculine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Warm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Solemn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Willing to take a stand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Friendly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Aggressive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Gullible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Inefficient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Acts as leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Childlike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Adaptable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Individualistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Does not use harsh language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Unsystematic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Competitive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Loves children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Tactful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Ambitious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Gentle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Conventional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback Sheet

The study in which you just participated was a pre-test to determine whether the videotaped interviews you observed will be effective as a measure in the study I will be conducting for completion of my Master's Thesis. This study will attempt to examine how the perception of gender role congruence, and suspicion of interview candidate sexual orientation affect the selection interview process.

In this study, participants will view a videotaped interview of an interview candidate and will be asked to rate the individual on a number of predetermined selection criteria. In addition, all participants will be provided with a resume for this same individual and asked to rate this individual on the basis of the information provided in the resume.

In the interview stage, participants will observe either a stereotypical masculine behaving candidate, or a stereotypical feminine behaving candidate on videotape in a mock interview. In the resume stage of the study, participants will examine the resumes of either a candidate who is most likely gay or a candidate that is not gay. Suspicion of sexual orientation will be created by including documentation of the candidates participation in a gay advocacy group in the "volunteer experience" section of the resume. Participants could therefore be placed into one of four possible conditions. Participants in condition 1 will observe a stereotypical masculine gay male, condition 2 will observe a stereotypical masculine non-gay male. Participants in condition 3 will evaluate a stereotypical feminine gay male, and participants in condition 4 will evaluate a stereotypical feminine non-gay candidate (see Figure 1.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Condition 1: stereotypical masculine gay male</td>
<td>Condition 3: stereotypical feminine gay male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.

It is expected that male candidates who present a stereotypical masculine behavioural pattern will be evaluated more positively and more likely be selected for the job (Conditions 1 and 2). In addition, those candidates that have volunteered in a gay advocacy group are expected to be labelled as gay and be less favourably rated than those candidates that have not participated in a gay identified organization (Conditions 1 and 3). In addition, given previous research, it is expected that female interviewers will rate both stereotypical feminine and gay labelled candidates more favourably than will male interviewers.

In order to assure that the videotapes reflect the manipulation that is intended, this pre-experimental test is needed in order to assure the construct validity of the videotaped experimental manipulation. The questionnaire you completed was the Bern Sex Role Inventory (1974), designed to measure gender role characteristics. Your ratings will be used in order to determine whether the two videotaped candidates differ significantly with regard to their gender role behaviours. In short, to determine whether the stereotypical feminine behaving candidate appears to act in a feminine manner, and to determine whether the stereotypical masculine behaving candidate appears to act in a masculine manner.

If you would like a copy of the results, please send your request to fehr1@uwindsor.ca. Thank you for your time and effort.

Reference


Suggested Readings


Appendix B.

Development of the Interview and Resume Measures
In order to develop both the interview and the resume, a job description was constructed. The job description was needed in order to determine the position for which the candidate was being considered, as well as the desired knowledge, skills and abilities that the ideal candidate would require for this position. In addition, this job description was used as a guideline for developing the interview questions and corresponding rating scales that were used in the videotape and resume phases of the experiment. A management level engineering position and corresponding job description was chosen for the study. It was expected that the field of engineering might be one of the most likely areas for discrimination against employees that are gay given the lower numbers of female engineers. The job description used for this study was based on a job description obtained from the University of Windsor Human Resources department in an attempt to make the job position, the necessary qualifications and ultimately the interview and resume components as realistic as possible.

The applicants' necessary qualifications were determined from the completed job description, in a manner suggested by Zima (1983). Job requirements were grouped into basic competencies. These competencies were further grouped into education-based competencies or experiential-based competencies. These basic requirements were then used to construct the interview script and candidate resume that reflected the necessary education and work experience needed to fulfill the requirements of the job.

The Interview Videotapes. The interview component of the experiment was videotaped in order to assure that all participants received the same interview information, yet maintain as much realism as possible. Two videotapes were developed
for the interview component. In both videotapes, participants observed an actor responding to questions from a male interviewer off-screen. All participants were provided with a written copy of the interview questions in order to rate the responses. One videotape consisted of a male candidate exhibiting typically masculine behavioural characteristics, the other consisted of a male candidate exhibiting typically feminine behavioural characteristics.

The actor for this interview scenario was recruited from the University of Windsor Theater Department. In order to assure that only the variable of interest was different between the two conditions, the same actor portrayed the masculine as well as the feminine candidate. All participants viewed only one candidate. The behavioural characteristics for both the masculine and feminine candidates were obtained from Bern's (1974) Bern Sex Role Inventory. The author of this research was the off-screen interviewer for both interviews.

The Interview Script. The interview script for this study was developed on the basis of Zima's (1983) interview guidelines and structure and elaborated on the basis of the qualifications that were identified in the resume construction phase. The interview script contained a number of predetermined questions and responses designed to highlight the qualities of the candidate that were most relevant to the qualifications deemed necessary in the job description. This interview script was also used to construct the interview rating scale.

The Resume. The resume component of the study required that two resumes be developed. One resume contained information that portrayed the candidate as being gay,
the other did not.

In order for the resume to be as realistic as possible, an actual example resume was obtained from the University of Windsor, Academic Advisory Center. This resume was modified in order to closely match the job description and qualifications that were determined for the purpose of this research. The two resumes that were developed for this study differed only on the basis of the information listed in the volunteer experience section of the resume.

Participants in the gay conditions received a resume indicating that the interview candidate was a volunteer in the local chapter of EGAL (Equality for Gay’s and Lesbian's Everywhere), a lobby group for gay and lesbian rights. Participants in the non-gay conditions received a resume indicating that the interview candidate was a volunteer in a local chapter of Green Peace, a lobby group for environmental and animal rights concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape Location</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Tape Location: Masculine Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Feminine Interview | **Category A: Education and Training** | 1. What subjects did you enjoy the most when in University? | -math  
-sciences | 16.16 |
| 1:00          | **Why?** | -like these subjects because they were systematic and ordered | 16.45 |
| 1.14          | **2. What prompted you to choose engineering as your major?** | -enjoy building things  
-enjoy mechanics | 17.06 |
| 1.36          | **Category B: Work Experience and Special Skills** | 5. Tell me about your work history as an engineer | -worked most recently with City of Metropolitan Toronto as a field engineer supervisor  
-worked in 1994 with the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton in their Transportation Planning Division in Ottawa  
-worked the Summer of 1994 as an Engineering Assistant at Unitel Communications Inc. in Toronto, ON | 17.38 |
| 2.22          |          |          | 17.45 |
| 3.1 | What sort of activities did you perform in that position | -assisted the engineering manager with various administrative duties | 18.26 |
| 3.26 | 6. What are your special job strengths? | -good people skills  
- good supervisory skills  
- have experience in training and development of employees (ie: implemented several transport planning and graphics packages and trained staff to use this software.)  
- ability to develop cost saving methods | 18.5 |
| 3.5 | 7. What did you enjoy least about your last job? | - lack of policies issuing from the Regional Official (ie a need to develop a more comprehensive transportation policy to guide engineering efforts more efficiently) | 19.14 |
| 4.23 | 10. How did you motivate your employees? | - bonuses if job completed before date-(usually negotiated with the contractor prior to start of project)  
- also regular person to person acknowledgment of work related accomplishments and progress | 19.53 |
| 5.09 | Was this approach effective? | - difficult to compare, but received good feedback  
- little conflict amongst workers | 20.37 |
<p>| 5.24 | 12. Describe an instance in which an employee was performing below expectation. How did you address this situation? | Initially attempted to set an example, work more closely with the individual and generally be more directive. -attitude was a major problem, and began to cause resentment amongst the other workers. -employee was clearly not meeting standards that were established at the start of the project and which had been addressed on more than one occasion as a problem. -warning was given, but employee terminated soon after | 20.51 |
| 6.27 | 14. Describe an instance in which you were required to enforce unpopular restrictions or requirements in the workplace. | -smoking/breaks became a concern with one-indoor facility in which we were completing a project -this institution had a smoking policy and the engineers were smoking within the building -employee complaints were received about the smoking as well as the dust being generated -eventually needed to go outside for breaks, or to coffee shop across the street since it was quite cold outside -the length of breaks then became an issue | 21.51 |
| 7.28 | How did the staff respond? | Eventually erected a supply tent outside to break the wind and house a ventilating device for fumes at the project site | 22.51 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.03</th>
<th><strong>Category C: Career Interests and Work Goals</strong></th>
<th>23.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>17. What are your short or long term goals?</td>
<td>23.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-would like to be the head of an engineering department (private or public)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-have also considered involvement as a partner in an engineering firm, or starting own business providing services to engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>18. What other types of jobs have you considered?</td>
<td>24.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25</td>
<td><strong>Category D: Interest in Job and Company</strong></td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>19. What is it about this job that appeals to you?</td>
<td>24.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-the experience would be beneficial (ie: a large organization-well established)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-also I know people in the area and in the organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>20. What do you know about this job?</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-that it is quite a bit of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-that the people/organization are generally supportive of engineering related decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-a history of good decisions made regarding facilities (ie facilities in good shape)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>21. What do you know about our University and the services provided?</td>
<td>26.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-own school experience (attended University of Windsor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-some experience dealing with other University projects in City of Toronto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td><strong>Category E: Self-assessment</strong></td>
<td>27.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11.49 | 22. What would you say are some of the basic factors that motivate you in your work? | - the final accomplishment  
- an effectively completed project  
- people that are agreeable and responsible  
- the process of planning and successfully implementing these plans | 27.23 |
| 12.44 | 23. How would you describe your management style? | - supportive and involved  
- not removed from the worksite  
- fair but decisive | 28.14 |
| 13.27 | 24. What kinds of things frustrate you most on a job? | - electrical tools breaking down, suppliers held up, contracts with suppliers breakdown—generally the little daily stuff has its greatest effect. | 28.47 |
| 13.58 | How do you cope with them? | - workout and exercise regularly—eat well  
- play golf | 29.26 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.24</th>
<th><strong>Category F: Communication Skills</strong></th>
<th>29.52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14.3  | 26. What types of changes would you make in order to optimize the use of communication technology in the division? | - make use of computer programs in both engineering projects and all aspects of administration  
- use of email for internal and external orders and communication  
- advantage of record keeping when systems are used  
- encourage the use of software programs to facilitate the planning and implementation of projects  
- provide training/workshops for employees that need support  
- include aspects of technology and its use in the performance evaluation requirements for employees  
- obtain updated programs when possible | 29.59 |
| 15.55 |                                      | 31.04 |
Appendix C.

Materials for the Study
JOB REQUIREMENTS FOR THE POSITION OF:
"MANAGER OF FACILITIES PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND
CONSTRUCTION"

Department: Physical Plant
Organization: The University of Windsor

Management & Supervisory Experience
- proven management or supervisory skill.
- minimum of 3 years experience at a management or supervisory level.
- basic knowledge of human resources and the implications these resources will
  have for the completion of projects and the provision of services.
- ability to monitor and motivate staff.
- experience with planning and procedure development.
- ability to critically evaluate systems and distinguish and demonstrate short and
  long term implications.
- ability to identify and summarize expected costs.

Industry Knowledge
- experience with projects of similar or equivalent magnitude.
- awareness of what products and services are available and how to obtain these
  products and services.
- knowledge of industry competitors.

Communication and Facilitation
- ability to negotiate and clarify client needs.
- working familiarity with new communication technology.
- ability to demonstrate flexibility in the planning and implementation of work
  requirements.
- ability to demonstrate sensitivity to the many vested interests.
- ability to effectively plan, define and market the organizational structure both
  internal to the division and externally.
Instructions to Participants

The following study is an examination of the employment selection process. Employment selection processes have a history of being unreliable. This means that it is often very difficult to accurately determine future job performance of candidates on the basis of these procedures. The employment selection package you will be using today was carefully constructed in an attempt to improve the predictability of employment selection procedures. The current study is being conducted in order to assess this package. Your responses will be used to determine the effectiveness of this package and ultimately to improve the predictability of employment selection procedures.

The study consists of three parts. An interview portion, a resume portion and some additional questions. You will be asked to provide ratings of an employment candidate in order to assess the suitability of this candidate for hire. These ratings will be used to determine whether this candidate will be considered for the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction" at the University of Windsor.

Please check to ensure that you have the following four items in your interview package:

I. Job Requirements for the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".
II. Interview Rating Scale
III. Resume
IV. Resume Rating Scale

Please take some time right now to examine the job requirements. You will need to be familiar with the criteria in this job description in order to assess the candidate's interview responses as well as the candidate's resume. Please use these criteria to guide you in your decisions.
Videotaped Interview

In the interview section of the study you will observe an interview in process. The interview will last approximately fifteen minutes. You will be provided with a script of the questions asked in this interview together with a rating scale for each of the following categories:

Category A: Education and Training,
Category B: Work Experience and Special Skills,
Category C: Career Interests and Work Goals,
Category D: Interest in Job and Company,
Category E: Self-assessment.
Category F: Communication Skills

Based on the candidates responses to the questions in each of these categories, please rate the suitability of the candidate for placement in a management level engineering position. You may include additional comments in the spaces provided if you wish.
Resume

In the resume section of the study you will examine the candidate’s resume. You will be provided with a list of questions and associated rating scales. Please evaluate the candidate's resume on the basis of the following categories:

Category A: Education and Training,
Category B: Work Experience and Special Skills,
Category C: Additional Experience.

Please rate the suitability of the candidate for placement in a management level engineering position by completing the rating scales for each question in each of these categories. You may include additional comments in the space provided if you wish.

Additional Questions

In order to determine the effectiveness of your ratings of the candidate, some additional information is required. Please respond to these additional questions as accurately as possible. When complete, please return the complete interview package to the front desk before leaving the room. Thank you for your time and effort!
**INTERVIEW RATING SHEET**

*Based on the responses provided in this interview, please rate the suitability of the candidate for placement in the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction" at the end of each of the following categories.*

**Category A: Education and Training**

*Question in Interview*

1. What subjects did you enjoy the most when in University?

2. Why?

3. What prompted you to choose engineering as your major?

*Based on the responses provided in the category of Education and Training, please rate the suitability of the candidate for placement in the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".*

| A. Is the applicant’s education and training job-related, and does it match the qualifications for this position? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Do not hire | Improvement | Acceptable Candidate | Good Candidate | Excellent Candidate |

*Comments:*
## Category B: Work Experience and Special Skills

### Question in Interview

| 4. Tell me about your work history as an engineer |
| 5. What sort of activities did you perform in this position? |
| 6. What are your special job strengths? |
| 7. What did you enjoy least about your last job? |
| 8. How did you motivate your employees? |
| 9. Was this approach effective? |
| 10. Describe an instance of in which an employee was performing below expectation. How did you address this situation? |
| 11. Describe an instance in which you were required to enforce unpopular restrictions or requirements in the workplace. |
| 12. How did the staff respond? |

*Based on the responses provided in the category of Work Experience and Special Skills, please rate the suitability of the candidate for placement in the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".*

| B. Do the applicant's work-experience and special skills relate to the work involved in this position? |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Do not hire | Needs Improvement | Acceptable Candidate | Good Candidate | Excellent Candidate |

*Comments:*
### Category C: Career Interests and Work Goals

*Question in Interview*

13. What are your short or long term goals?

14. What other types of jobs have you considered?

*Based on the responses provided in the category of Career Interests and Work Goals, please rate the suitability of the candidate for placement in the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not hire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

### Category D: Interest in Job and Company

*Question in Interview*

15. What is it about this job that appeals to you?

16. What do you know about this job?

17. What do you know about our University and the services provided?

*Based on the responses provided in the category of Interest in Job and Company, please rate the suitability of the candidate for the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".*

D. Are the applicant’s interests in the specific position consistent with the opportunities in that position? Is the applicant’s interest in the organization consistent with what the organization can offer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not hire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category E: Self-assessment

Question in Interview

18. What would you say are some of the basic factors that motivate you at work?

19. How would you describe your management style?

20. What kinds of things frustrate you most on a job?

21. How do you cope with them?

Based on the responses provided in the category of Self-assessment, please rate the suitability of the candidate for the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".

E. Is the applicant’s self-assessment compatible with the position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Category F: Communication Skills

Question in Interview

22. What types of changes would you make in order to optimize the use of communication technology in the division?

Based on the responses provided in the category of Communication Skills, and the candidate's communication within the interview itself, please rate the suitability of the candidate for the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".
F. Are the applicants communication style and habits appropriate for the job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

*Summarize any other factors brought out in the interview which have a bearing on the applicant's suitability for the position.*
# RESUME RATING SHEET

*Based on the information provided in the resume, please rate the suitability of the candidate for placement in the position of "Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction".*

## Category A: Education and Training

1. To what extent do you believe that the candidate's *amount* of education prepare him for this position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent do you think that the *range* of education and training prepare this candidate for the position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent do you believe that the certificates or awards received by the candidate prepare this candidate for the position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Is there any additional training that makes this candidate appropriate for the position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category B: Work Experience and Special Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.. To what extent do you believe that the candidate's work history have provided the candidate an opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills appropriate for the position of &quot;Manager of Facilities Planning, Engineering and Construction&quot;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Are there any extended gaps in the candidates career history that might indicate a prolonged and unaccounted absence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. To what extent do the previous job duties and responsibilities of this candidate prepare this candidate for a management level engineering position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. To what extent have the previous work environments of this candidate prepared him for a position with the University of Windsor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Does the candidate have sufficient supervisory experience for someone in a management level engineering position as described?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. To what extent has the candidates experience with company accounts and financial responsibilities prepared this candidate for the position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Based on the previous work history of this candidate, do you believe this candidate is likely to stay in this organization for an extended period of time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Acceptable Candidate</td>
<td>Good Candidate</td>
<td>Excellent Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category C: Additional Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent do you believe that the candidate's <em>amount</em> of additional experience prepare him for this position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent do you think that the <em>range</em> of additional experience prepare this candidate for the position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent do the candidates non-career related interests make him a suitable candidate for a management level engineering position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not hire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*
RESUME OF GARY THOMPSON (not gay)

Permanent Residence
113 Royal Crescent
Toronto, ON
(416) 432-4568

Education/Training

April 1994  University of Windsor,
            Windsor, ON
            Bachelor of Applied Science
            Civil Engineering

October 1997  Ryerson Polytechnical Institute,
              Adult Education Department,
              Toronto, ON
              Management Studies Certificate

April 1995  Canadian Drafting Institute
            *Drafting and Surveying certificate

Employment Experience

1995-present  City of Metropolitan Toronto, Toronto, ON
              Field Engineer Supervisor
              * Supervised survey crews and performed direct engineering support for crews
              explaining work assignments and methodology.
              * Analysed work flow to develop cost saving methods
              * Anticipated need and arranged for tools, equipment and materials
              * Supervised activities of subcontractors and suppliers
              * Verified that construction quality met government standards
              * Located and tested materials including sand and gravel

1994 - 1995  Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Transportation Planning Division,
              Strategic Branch, Ottawa, ON
              Transportation Analyst
              * Developed a transportation modelling software application
              * Analysed traffic movement trends and developed a proposal for long term

traffic

management

* Implemented several transport planning and graphics packages and trained

staff.

* Developed regional transportation policies issuing from the Regional Official

plan

Summer 1994  Unitel Communications Inc. Toronto, ON
Engineering Assistant
* Assisted engineering manager with administrative duties
* Input data into various analysis software
* Reviewed and summarized tower inspection reports
* Assisted in the development of the tower inspection program
* Designed structures

Student Employment Experience

1991 & 1992  Chrysler Canada Limited, Windsor, ON
Occasional Weekends and Summers

1991 -1994  Waiter
* Waited on tables in a fine dining atmosphere and managed a cash float
* Learned to respond to and rectify customer complaints in a professional manner

Computer Skills

Languages: FORTRAN, BASIC, Turing, Pascal
Systems: DOS, UNIX
Software: WordPerfect, AutoCAD, EMME/2, Lotus, Harvard Graphics

Volunteer Activities

1996 - present  Green peace
Toronto, ON
Vice-President/Treasurer
* Organized and planned weekly meetings for advisory board and members
* Developed and Co-ordinated environmental concerns information line
* Projected budget and determined pricing, developed promotional flyers and correspondence, secured donations from various local businesses
* Increased profits 17% above preceding year

Treasurer 1996 /1997
* Processed and recorded payments and income; reconciled bank statements
* Automated financial and membership records
* Prepared detailed reports for meetings and year end statement

1995 - present  Extend- A- Family, Toronto, ON
Volunteer, Circle of Friends Program
* Participate in recreational and leisure activities with a teenager with a developmental disability

* Play on local community baseball and volleyball teams (19xx-present)

REFERENCES AVAILABLE ON REQUEST
RESUME OF GARY THOMPSON (Gay)

Permanent Residence
113 Royal Crescent
Toronto, ON
(416) 432-4568

Education/Training

April 1994 University of Windsor,
Windsor, ON
Bachelor of Applied Science
Civil Engineering

October 1997 Ryerson Polytechnical Institute,
Adult Education Department,
Toronto, ON
Management Studies Certificate

April 1995 Canadian Drafting Institute
*Drafting and Surveying certificate

Employment Experience

1995-present City of Metropolitan Toronto, Toronto, ON
Field Engineer Supervisor
* Supervised survey crews and performed direct engineering support for crews
  explaining work assignments and methodology.
* Analyzed work flow to develop cost saving methods
* Anticipated need and arranged for tools, equipment and materials
* Supervised activities of subcontractors and suppliers
* Verified that construction quality met government standards
* Located and tested materials including sand and gravel

1994 - 1995 Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Transportation Planning Division,
Strategic Branch, Ottawa, ON
Transportation Analyst
* Developed a transportation modeling software application
* Analyzed traffic movement trends and developed a proposal for long term
  traffic
  management
* Implemented several transport planning and graphics packages and trained
  staff.
* Developed regional transportation policies issuing from the Regional Official
  plan

Summer 1994 Unitel Communications Inc. Toronto, ON
Engineering Assistant
* Assisted engineering manager with administrative duties
* Input data into various analysis software
* Reviewed and summarized tower inspection reports
* Assisted in the development of the tower inspection program
* Designed structures

Student Employment Experience

1991 & 1992  Chrysler Canada Limited, Windsor, ON
Occasional Weekends and Summers

1991 -1994  Waiter
* Waited on tables in a fine dining atmosphere and managed a cash float
* Learned to respond to and rectify customer complaints in a professional manner

Computer Skills

Languages:  FORTRAN, BASIC, Turing, Pascal
Systems:  DOS, UNIX
Software:  WordPerfect, AutoCAD, EMME/2, Lotus, Harvard Graphics

Volunteer Activities

1996 - present  EGAL (Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere)
Toronto, ON
Vice-President/Treasurer
* Organized and planned weekly meetings for advisory board and members
* Developed and Co-ordinated AIDS information line
* Projected budget and determined pricing, developed promotional flyers and correspondence, secured donations from various local businesses
* Increased profits 17% above preceding year

Treasurer 1996 /1997
* Processed and recorded payments and income; reconciled bank statements
* Automated financial and membership records
* Prepared detailed reports for meetings and year end statement

1995 - present  Extend- A- Family, Toronto, ON
Volunteer, Circle of Friends Program
* Participate in recreational and leisure activities with a teenager with a developmental disability

* Play on local community baseball and volleyball teams (19xx-present)

REFERENCES AVAILABLE OF REQUEST
Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gays scale
Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If a women were put in charge of me, I would not mind taking advice and direction from her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I had a chance to introduce a disabled visitor to my friends and neighbours, I would be pleased to do so.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lesbian just can't fit into our society.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would rather not have blacks live in the same apartment I live in.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I enjoy a funny racial joke, even if some people might find it offensive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A woman's homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It would not bother me if my new roommate was disabled.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is likely that aboriginals will bring violence to neighbourhoods when they move in.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Over the past few years, women have received more economically than they deserve.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I get very upset when I hear a prejudicial remark about disabled people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would accept an invitation to a New Year's Eve party given by an aboriginal couple in their own home.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 4. Provincial laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behaviour should be loosened.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Female homosexuality is a sin.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I would probably feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with an aboriginal in a public space.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in Canadian morals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. If I had a chance to introduce a disabled visitor to my friends and neighbours, I would be pleased to do so.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Female homosexuality in itself is no problem, but what society makes of it can be a problem.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I would not mind it at all if an aboriginal family with about the same income and education as me moved in next door.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Interracial marriage should be discouraged to avoid the &quot;who-am-I?&quot; confusion which the children feel.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I think that black people look more similar to each other than white people do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I get very upset when I hear a prejudicial remark about aboriginal people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Male homosexuality is a perversion.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Women are demanding too much too fast in their push for equal rights.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Lesbians are sick.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The disabled should be supported in their struggle against discrimination and segregation.</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I would <em>not</em> be too upset if I learned that my son were a homosexual.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Generally, aboriginals are not as smart as whites.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I worry that in the next few years I may be denied my application for a job or a promotion because of preferential treatment given to minority group members.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Homosexual behaviour between two men is just plain wrong.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Some aboriginals are so touchy about race that it is difficult to get along with them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Women and men are inherently equal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should <em>not</em> be condemned.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It would not bother me if my new roommate was aboriginal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Questions

43. Please indicate your gender.
   ☐ Male ☐ Female

44. Please indicate your sexual orientation.
   ☐ Gay ☐ Lesbian ☐ Heterosexual ☐ Bisexual

45. Please indicate your age ______

46. What is your Major of study? ____________________________

Employment History

47. Please indicate the industry(ies) in which you have worked
   ☐ Manufacturing  ☐ Retail
   ☐ Education  ☐ Agriculture
   ☐ Hospitality/Entertainment  ☐ Transportation
   ☐ Health Care  ☐ Insurance
   ☐ Finance/Banking  ☐ Professional Services (please describe)
   ☐ Other (please describe)

48. Are you currently employed?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes,

a) ☐ Part-time? ☐ Full-time?

b) Briefly describe your current position ____________________________
Debriefing Sheet

The previous study in which you just participated was an examination of the interview selection process. More specifically, it is an examination of the interview process as it pertains to the experiences of both heterosexual and homosexual men.

Researchers have attempted to examine the effect that knowledge of sexual orientation places upon the interview process. Ellis and Vasseur (1993) examined how previous experiences with homosexuals and attitudes toward homosexuals in general affected the interview process for gays and lesbians who were applying for a sixth grade teaching position. They indicate that interviewer's pre-interview attitudes toward gays and lesbians may be critical in predicting the gay or lesbian candidate's success or failure in an interview. Further research is needed in order to examine the effects of sexual orientation on the interview process with other types of occupations.

This study will attempt to examine how the perception of gender role congruence, and suspicion of interview candidate sexual orientation affect the selection interview process. It is expected that male candidates who present a stereotypically masculine behavioural pattern will be evaluated more positively and more likely be selected for the job. In addition, those candidates that have volunteered in a gay advocacy group are expected to be labeled as gay and be less favourably rated than those candidates that have not participated in a gay identified organization. In addition, given previous research, it is expected that female interviewers will rate both stereotypically feminine and gay labeled candidates more favourably than will male interviewers.
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