

Running head: DISABILITY, GENDER, AND SUPERVISION

Effects of Disability, Gender, and
Level of Supervision on Ratings of Job Applicants

Bradford S. Bell

Michigan State University

Katherine J. Klein

University of Maryland at College Park

Bell, B. S., & Klein, K. J. (2001). Effects of disability, gender, and job level on ratings of job applicants. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 46*, 229-246.

Contact Information:

Bradford S. Bell
386 Ives Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Phone: 607-254-8054
FAX: 607-255-1836
E-mail: bb92@cornell.edu

Abstract

Using ratings of hypothetical job applicants with and without a disability obtained from both full-time workers (n = 88) and undergraduates (n = 98), we examined the effects of disability (paraplegia, epilepsy, clinical depression, or non-disabled), gender, and nature of the job (supervisory or non-supervisory) on five job-relevant dependent measures. Contrary to our hypothesis, applicants with a disability were rated significantly higher in activity and potency than applicants without a disability. Further, also contrary to our predictions, gender and job type did not moderate the relationship between disability and applicant ratings. Post-hoc analyses revealed a significant gender by job type interaction; female applicants were viewed as more qualified than male applicants for the non-supervisory position, but the male applicants were viewed as more qualified than female applicants for the supervisory position. We use the flexible correction model (Wegener & Petty, 1997) to explicate the findings. Limitations and implications for future research on attitudes toward individuals with disabilities are discussed.

Effects of Disability, Gender, and
Level of Supervision on Ratings of Job Applicants

Although the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) have generally encouraged an increase in the employment of individuals with a disability, research suggests that the employment problems of the disabled persist. Studies have found that persons with a disability are viewed as less favorable employees and experience fewer employment opportunities than persons without a disability (e.g., Fichten & Amsel, 1986; Fuqua, Rathbun, & Gade, 1984; Gouvier, Steiner, Jackson, Schlater, & Rain, 1991; Ravaud, Madiot, & Ville, 1992). However, some earlier studies (e.g., Krefting & Brief, 1976; Rose & Brief, 1979) suggest that raters evaluate job applicants and employees with a disability as favorably as applicants and employees not possessing a disability.

In a recent review designed to integrate and extend past research on job discrimination against the disabled, Stone and Colella (1996) proposed that discrimination against persons with a disability varies as a function of the nature of an individual's handicap, other characteristics of the individual, characteristics of the organization, attributes of observers, and the nature of the job. The present study builds on Stone and Colella's model and the empirical literature, and evaluates three hypotheses concerning several of the predictors just mentioned. We examined whether individuals' evaluations of the likely performance of a job applicant with a disability differs as a function of: (a) the applicant's disability (i.e., paraplegia, epilepsy, depression); (b) the applicant's gender; and (c) the nature of the job for which the applicant is applying

(supervisory or non-supervisory). In the following sections, we explicate the rationale for our hypotheses.

Nature of the Disability

Many of the early studies on discrimination against job applicants with a disability used either paraplegia or epilepsy as the sole indicator of disability (e.g., Bressler & Lacy, 1980; Fichten & Amsel, 1986; Krefting & Brief, 1976). At the time these studies were conducted, these two disabilities comprised a large portion of the disabled workforce (Rose & Brief, 1979). Today, however, a wide range of disabilities is covered under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and there are no two or three disabilities that account for a majority of the disabled workforce. As a result, it is important to examine attitudes toward hiring individuals with different disabilities.

Past disability research suggests that there exists a hierarchy of preference toward different disability groups (e.g., Tringo, 1970). One specific and consistent finding has been that individuals with a physical disability, such as paraplegia, are rated more favorably than individuals with a mental or neurological disability, such as epilepsy or mental illness (e.g., Bowman, 1987; Drehmer and Bordieri, 1985; Grand, Bernier, & Strohmer, 1982; Stone & Colella, 1996; Stone & Sawatzki, 1980; Tringo, 1970). While the factors that underlie these differential preferences are not completely understood, numerous explanations have been offered. Some researchers suggest that people prefer applicants with a visible, or self-evident, disability to applicants with a hidden disability (Bordieri & Drehmer, 1986; Drehmer & Bordieri, 1985; Stone & Sawatzki, 1980). While others suggest that the greatest stigma is attached to conditions,

such as alcoholism or mental illness, that make behavior unpredictable and possess a component that can be described as a “lack of willpower” (Schneider & Anderson, 1980; Tringo, 1970).

To examine attitudes toward hiring applicants with different disabilities, we included three disabilities in the present study, paraplegia, epilepsy, and depression. We chose these three disabilities because they differ on the factors described above. The nature of these three disabilities differ in that paraplegia is a physical disability, epilepsy is a neurological disability, and depression is a mental illness. They also differ in the degree to which they are visible or self-evident. Paraplegia is outwardly visible and self-evident, whereas epilepsy and depression can be more easily concealed. Also, research has suggested that paraplegia is viewed as a more predictable condition than epilepsy or depression (Schneider & Anderson, 1980; Stone & Colella, 1996). Finally, because depression is a mental illness, it may be more likely than paraplegia and epilepsy to be viewed as representing a “lack of willpower” (Schneider & Anderson, 1980). Following Stone & Colella (1996) and past research on the hierarchy of preference, we predicted that these factors would differentially affect participants’ ratings of job applicants with different disabilities. Specifically, we predicted that:

Hypothesis 1: Ratings received by job applicants will differ according to the type of disability. Specifically, individuals without a disability will (a) receive the highest hiring recommendations of the four applicants; (b) be viewed as the most competent applicant; (c) receive the highest ratings on activity and potency; and (d) receive the highest salary of the four applicants. Individuals with paraplegia will receive the next highest ratings,

followed by individuals with epilepsy, and finally individuals with a history of depression.

Stereotyping, Gender, and the Disabled

Stone and Colella (1996) proposed that observers may differ in their assessments of female and male individuals with a disability. Although previous research on the relationship between gender of individuals with a disability and reactions of others has produced mixed results (e.g., Farina, Felner, & Boudreau, 1973; Fichten & Amsel, 1986; Levy et al., 1993), Stone and Colella (1996) and others (e.g., Thomas & Thomas, 1985) suggest that people may view men with a disability as less desirable than women with a disability because the characteristics of disabilities, such as lack of strength or endurance, are more inconsistent with the stereotypical male (i.e. men are strong, powerful, independent) than with the stereotypical female (i.e. women are weak, powerless, dependent). Following Stone and Colella (1996), we predicted that:

Hypothesis 2: Gender will moderate the relationship between disability and observer ratings. Applicants with a disability will receive lower ratings than applicants without a disability, but this difference in ratings will be larger for male than for female applicants.

Nature of the Job

Stone and Colella (1996) proposed that whether people perceive an individual with a disability to be capable of performing a job is dependent on the nature of the job. They believe that the nature of the job moderates the relationship between attributes of individuals with a disability and observers' cognitive and affective reactions to individuals with a disability. This is consistent with Heilman's (1983) lack of fit model, which suggests that the perceived fit between

an individual's personal attributes (e.g., ability) and a job's requirements affects job-performance expectations. Because of the attributes typically ascribed to the disabled (e.g., incompetent, unattractive, helpless), they are often viewed as less desirable employees than individuals without a disability (Stone & Colella, 1996). Further, this situation may be exacerbated by the requirements of a particular job. For example, research suggests that as the social distance of an activity decreases, individuals' willingness to engage in the activity with persons with a disability decreases as well (e.g., Bowman, 1987; Grand, Bernier, & Strohmer, 1982). Thus, individuals may be perceived as less suitable for jobs that involve a great deal of face-to-face or interpersonal contact.

In a recent study designed to examine disability-job fit perceptions, Colella, DeNisi, & Varma (1998) did not find a disability-task interaction on performance ratings or predictions about future performance. However, this research focused on a specific task and the authors suggest that the lack of findings may have been caused by the provision of clear performance information and standards and by participants' belief that performance would remain constant over time (Colella et al., 1998).

In the present study, applicants were seeking either a job as a telephone salesperson (non-supervisory) or as an office manager (supervisory). In contrast to Colella, DeNisi, & Varma (1998), we were interested in examining how the general requirements of these two jobs would influence individuals' ratings of job applicants with a disability. Supervisors would be required to select, train, monitor, and discipline sales associates, whereas salespersons would be required to gather and provide information to customers via telephone. The supervisory job required a

higher level of skill and competence and also involved a great deal more face-to-face and interpersonal contact than did the non-supervisory job. Overall, the attributes stereotypically ascribed to individuals with a disability are more inconsistent with the requirements of the supervisory than the non-supervisory job. Thus, we predicted that:

Hypothesis 3: Disability and job type will interact to affect ratings such that the difference between ratings of applicants with and without a disability will be greater when they are applying for the supervisory job than where they are applying for the non-supervisory job.

Method

Participants and Design

Ninety-eight undergraduates at a large Mid-Atlantic university voluntarily participated in our study as part of their advanced psychology class. These students were randomly assigned to one of 16 experimental conditions in a 4(disability) x 2(gender) x 2(job type) between-subjects factorial design. In addition, 88 employees (from one of three medium-sized manufacturing firms) participated in the study. Access to the manufacturing firms was obtained by contacting the president of each organization. A number of survey packets were left at each location. In addition to the experimental survey, each packet contained a sheet that described the study, explained the confidentiality of responses, and provided instructions on how to complete the survey. If interested, employees were instructed to complete the survey and return it in the postage-paid envelope. Based on the total number of employees in the three organizations and the number of surveys returned, the overall response rate for the work sample was approximately

45 percent. The surveys were arranged in random order, resulting in random assignment of participants to the sixteen experimental conditions. Table 1 describes the sample characteristics.

Measures

Each participant received a packet consisting of: (a) a consent form (given only to students); (b) a job description; (c) a recommendation letter; (d) a completed application blank; and (e) rating forms.

Manipulations. Each of the independent variables was manipulated through the materials in the packet given to the participant. Gender was manipulated through the name on the application blank. The male applicant was named Benjamin Barnes and the female applicant was named Barbara Barnes. Job type was manipulated through a job description included in the packet. As described above, in the supervisory job condition the participant received a job description outlining the job of office supervisor for an insurance company. In the non-supervisory job condition, the participant received a job description describing the position of insurance salesperson. Applicant disability was manipulated using the recommendation letter provided to participants. All information in the recommendation letter was held constant; however, depending on which of the four disability conditions the participant received, the recommendation included only one of four statements describing the applicant's disability status. The statements used to manipulate applicant disability are presented in Table 2.

Measures. Five job-related outcomes were measured using scales developed by Heilman, Block, and Lucas (1992) and Heilman, Kaplow, Amato, and Stathatos (1993). They were ratings of applicants on: hiring recommendation, competence, starting salary, activity, and potency.

Hiring recommendations were made on a 9-point scale, the endpoints of which are *very highly recommended* (9) and *do not recommend at all* (1). Participants answered four items assessing the applicant's competence for the job (coefficient alpha in this study = .93) (e.g., "All in all, how qualified do you think this applicant is for the position?" -- *very qualified, not at all qualified*). Participants were also asked to select a starting salary from a list of seven options ranging from \$16,000 to \$28,000, with \$2,000 intervals. Participants completed two bipolar adjective scales designed to measure respondents' perceptions of each applicant's activity level (e.g., *hardworking-lazy*) and potency (e.g., *strong-weak*). In this study, coefficient alphas were .89 and .80 for the activity and potency scales, respectively.

Applicant characteristics. Each applicant was described as 23 years old, an age that allows time for the completion of an undergraduate degree and one year of work experience. Each applicant was described as a graduate of the University of Maryland at College Park who had received an undergraduate degree in business, with an overall GPA of 2.8. The recommendation letter described the applicant as warm, friendly, and competent, and all of the applicants had good health records (few absences or sick leaves) and their conditions were stable

Results

Of the 186 participants in this study, 98 were students and 88 were workers. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that students and workers differed significantly on several demographic variables (See Table 1). Although the student and worker samples differed on several demographic variables, there were no significant differences between student and workers' evaluations of the job applicants with and without a disability. The mean ratings for

both groups are presented in Table 3. Because students and workers did not differ in their evaluations, we combined their data in all of the analyses reported below.

The intercorrelations between the dependent variables are shown in Table 4. Because several of the dependent variables were moderately to highly intercorrelated, we used multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to test our hypotheses. MANOVA tests for overall effects of independent variables on a linear combination of the dependent variables. In addition to testing for overall effects, MANOVA provides control over inflated familywise Type I error rates that can result from multiple univariate tests (e.g., Haase & Ellis, 1987; Leary & Altmaier, 1980; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). If the overall test was significant, we performed follow-up univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post-hoc tests to examine specific effects.

In Hypothesis 1, we predicted differential ratings based on applicant disability. Using Wilk's criterion, we found that applicant disability had a significant effect on the combined DVs, $F(15, 458.65) = 1.95, p < .05, \eta^2 = .06$. Follow-up univariate tests revealed that disability had a significant affect on potency ratings, $F(3, 170) = 5.38, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09$, , and on activity ratings, $F(3, 170) = 10.35, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08$. Contrary to our prediction, however, a Tukey honestly significant difference (HSD) test revealed that the applicant with paraplegia received significantly higher ratings on both activity and potency than applicant without a disability and the applicant with a history of depression. The potency and activity ratings for the job applicants with paraplegia and epilepsy were not significantly different, and participants' ratings of the applicant without a disability, the applicant with a history of depression, and the applicant with

epilepsy did not significantly differ from one another. The mean activity and potency ratings for each disability are shown in Table 5.

Hypothesis 2 stated that gender would interact with disability to affect the dependent measures. The results showed that gender did not have a significant main effect on the dependent measures, nor did it moderate the relationship between disability and the dependent variables. However, females received higher ratings than males on every variable except potency.

Hypothesis 3 stated that job type and disability type would interact to affect ratings such that the difference between ratings for job applicants with and without a disability would be larger when they were applying for the supervisory rather than non-supervisory position. The MANOVA showed that nature of the job had a significant overall effect on the combined DVs, $F(5, 166) = 7.83, p < .001, \eta^2 = .19$. Additional univariate tests showed that nature of the job had a significant effect on perceived competence, $F(1, 170) = 15.40, p < .001, \eta^2 = .08$, and hiring recommendations, $F(1, 170) = 10.56, p < .01, \eta^2 = .06$. As expected, applicants received more favorable hiring recommendations and competency ratings when they were applying for the non-supervisory rather than the supervisory position. Contrary to our prediction, however, the interaction of job type and disability was not significant.

Post-hoc Analyses

In a series of post-hoc analyses, we explored the influence of gender and job type on ratings of the applicants. Multivariate analysis of variance revealed that the interaction between applicant gender and nature of the job was marginally significant, $F(5, 166) = 1.94, p = .091, \eta^2 =$

.06. Univariate tests revealed a significant interaction between gender and job type in predicting hiring recommendations, $F(1, 170) = 7.62, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$, perceived competence, $F(1, 170) = 6.37, p < .05, \eta^2 = .04$, potency, $F(1, 170) = 6.66, p < .05, \eta^2 = .04$, and activity, $F(1, 170) = 5.20, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$. The means for both males and females are presented in Table 6. Both male and female applicants received more favorable hiring recommendations and competency ratings when applying for the non-supervisory rather than the supervisory position. However, this difference was significantly larger for females than it was for males. The interaction for hiring recommendations is presented graphically in Figure 1. Further, in the supervisory job condition, males received higher scores than females on perceived competence, hiring recommendations, activity, and potency. In the non-supervisory job condition, however, females received higher scores than males on the four dependent measures.

In further exploratory analyses, we re-coded the disability variable to form a dichotomous disability (paraplegia, epilepsy, and depression) versus no disability variable. Multivariate analysis of variance showed that the three-way interaction of disability, gender, and job type had a significant overall effect on the combined DVs, $F(5, 174) = 3.71, p < .01, \eta^2 = .10$. Follow-up univariate tests revealed a significant three-way interaction of disability, gender, and job type in predicting potency $F(1, 178) = 4.62, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$, activity $F(1, 178) = 7.53, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$, and salary $F(1, 178) = 3.92, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$. For example, the mean potency ratings, presented in Table 7, indicate that only the ratings of disabled applicants showed the interaction of gender and job type, described above. That is, male applicants with a disability were rated more favorably than female applicants with a disability in the supervisory job condition. Conversely,

female applicants with a disability were rated more favorably than male applicants with a disability in the non-supervisory job condition. This pattern was not apparent within the no disability condition. The gender by job type interaction for the no disability condition is presented in Figure 2 and the gender by job type interaction for the disability condition is presented in Figure 3. The pattern of results was very similar for the significant three-way interaction of disability, gender, and job type in predicting activity and salary.

Discussion

Building on Stone and Colella's (1996) model, we studied individuals' attitudes toward hiring persons with a disability. While the results did not support our hypotheses, we found several unexpected, significant, and intriguing results. Below, we discuss our findings, implications for future research, and the limitations of our research.

Contrary to Hypothesis 1, the applicant with paraplegia received significantly higher activity and potency ratings than the applicant without a disability and the applicant with a history of depression. In addition, all three of the applicants with a disability were rated higher than the applicant without a disability on activity, and the applicants with paraplegia and epilepsy were rated higher than the applicant without a disability on potency. These results suggest that raters displayed biases in favor of, instead of against, the applicants with a disability.

One explanation for this finding is what is referred to as the "norm to be kind" (e.g., Hastorf, Northcraft, & Picciotto, 1979). This norm suggests that one should never do anything that would be unpleasant to persons with a disability. This would include providing negative feedback and giving poor evaluations. The norm to be kind, therefore, suggests that persons with

a disability should always receive higher appraisals than persons without a disability, and might explain why in the present study the applicants with a disability received higher ratings than the applicant without a disability on several of the dependent measures. Another plausible explanation of this finding and many of our other findings as well is Wegener and Petty's (1997) Flexible Correction Model (FCM). The model suggests that when people assess the qualities of a person or object, they attempt to take into consideration any biasing factors that they believe may influence their perceptions of the target. To account for perceived biasing factors, individuals may adjust or correct their initial reactions (Wegener & Petty, 1997). Also, the model suggests people may overcorrect. That is, people may overestimate the extent to which a biasing agent influenced their original assessments, leading to a subsequent bias in judgement opposite to the uncorrected bias. In reading descriptions of applicants with a disability, raters may have attempted to overcome perceived biases and respond in a socially desirable fashion. In doing so, they may have overcorrected, displaying biases in favor of the applicants with a disability.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that gender would interact with disability to affect the dependent measures. However, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Gender had neither a moderating effect nor a main effect on the dependent measures. However, female applicants received higher ratings than male applicants on every variable except potency. These results are also consistent with the FCM (Wegener & Petty, 1997). In rating female applicants, participants may have overcorrected for the perceived bias (here negative stereotypes of women), yielding more positive ratings of female than male applicants on all the scales except potency.

Our results did not support Hypothesis 3. Instead, the applicants with and without a disability received similar ratings when applying for the supervisory as compared to the non-supervisory position. However, our post-hoc exploratory analyses revealed that job type moderated the effects of gender on perceived competence, hiring recommendations, activity, and potency. Female applicants received significantly higher ratings when applying for the non-supervisory as compared to the supervisory job. Male applicants also received higher ratings when applying for the non-supervisory job; however, the difference was not as large as it was for the females. While, female applicants received higher scores than male applicants on hiring recommendations, potency, activity, and perceived competence in the non-supervisory job condition, the pattern was reversed in the supervisory job condition. In short, participants rated male applicants a better fit than female applicants for the supervisory job and female applicants a better fit than the male applicants for the non-supervisory position. If put into practice in an organization, these ratings would of course create a glass ceiling for women.

Participants revealed no bias against applicants with a disability, but a bias against women. Why? Again, the flexible correction model provides a plausible explanation. Respondents may well have determined, from our scenarios, that we were investigating attitudes toward workers with a disability. If so, participants may have focused on the disability information, as they endeavored to correct for perceived disability biases. In attending to the disability information, participants may have left gender bias uncorrected, producing the glass ceiling effect observed above.

The results of our tests of the three-way interactions of gender, job type, and disability support this interpretation. If the disability information distracted the participants, then gender biases should have appeared only when disability information was present. This is what we found. In the disability condition, male applicants for the supervisory job were rated higher than female applicants for the supervisory job, whereas female applicants for the non-supervisory job were rated higher than male applicants for the non-supervisory job. In the no disability condition, however, ratings of the male applicants did not differ significantly from ratings of the female applicants. In short, participants revealed gender biases only when they experienced, and presumably were distracted by, the disability information in our scenarios. When disability was not a factor, participants appeared to correct for gender bias.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

In this study, we tested three hypotheses suggested by Stone and Colella's (1996) model. The hypotheses were not supported. One possible explanation for the lack of findings may be that we used relatively obtrusive, paper people manipulations of disability, gender, and individual background. As Stone and Colella (1996, p.393) stated, "the use of these methods places subjects in situations where they are motivated to respond in socially desirable ways or manage the impression that they are not unfairly discriminating against disabled individuals."

More revealing than our tests of the hypotheses, however, were our post-hoc analyses. Consistent with the flexible correction model, the results suggest that raters recognized and corrected for gender bias only when rating applicants with a disability. In rating applicants with a disability, raters apparently sought to correct for disability bias and may have over-corrected for

this bias. In rating applicants with a disability, however, raters apparently overlooked the potential for gender bias. These results raise important questions for research on sensitive subjects such as gender and disability bias. Does the presence of distracting information (e.g., regarding disability), allow researchers to capture biases that respondents might, in the absence of distracting information, attempt to hide? Are respondents' ratings in the presence of distracting information hence more valid than respondents' ratings in the absence of such information? Stereotypes are a strategy used to preserve valuable cognitive resources; therefore, it seems logical that bias against applicants with a disability may only emerge when raters are distracted or are under a high level of cognitive load. Future research should address these questions, we believe. The results of such research may provide new insights into the best ways to assess the nature and determinants of individuals' perceptions of minority groups, including women, racial minorities, and individuals with a disability.

References

- Bordieri, J. E., & Drehmer, D. E. (1986). Hiring decisions for disabled workers: Looking at the cause. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *16*, 197-208.
- Bowman, J. T. (1987). Attitudes toward disabled persons: Social distance and work competence. Journal of Rehabilitation, *53*, 41-44.
- Bressler, R. B., & Lacy, A. W. (1980). An analysis of the relative job progression of the perceptibly physically handicapped. Academy of Management Journal, *23*, 132-143.
- Colella, A., DeNisi, A. S., & Varma, A. (1998). The impact of ratee's disability on performance judgments and choice as a partner: The role of disability-job fit stereotypes and interdependence of rewards. Journal of Applied Psychology, *83*, 102-111.
- Drehmer, D. E., & Bordieri, J. E. (1985). Hiring decisions for disabled workers: The hidden bias. Rehabilitation Psychology, *30*, 157-164.
- Farina, A., Felner, R. D., & Boudreau, L. A. (1973). Reactions of workers to male and female mental patient job applicants. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, *41*, 363-372.
- Fichten, C. S., & Amsel, R. (1986). Trait attributions about college students with a physical disability: Circumplex analyses and methodological issues. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *16*, 410-427.
- Fuqua, D. R., Rathbun, M., & Gade, E. M. (1984). A comparison of employer attitudes toward the worker problems of eight types of disabled workers. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, *15*, 40-43.

Gouvier, W. D., Steiner, D. D., Jackson, W. T., Schlater, D., & Rain, J. S. (1991). Employment discrimination against handicapped job candidates: An analog study of the effects of neurological causation, visibility of handicap, and public contact. Rehabilitation Psychology, 36, 121-129.

Grand, S. A., Bernier, J. E., & Strohmer, D. C. (1982). Attitudes toward disabled persons as a function of social context and specific disability. Rehabilitation Psychology, 27, 165-173.

Haase, R. F., & Ellis, M. V. (1987). Multivariate analysis of variance. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 404-413.

Hastorf, A. H., Northcraft, G. B., & Picciotto, S. R. (1979). Helping the handicapped: How realistic is the feedback received by the physically handicapped? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 373-376.

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, vol. 5: 269-298. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., & Lucas, J. A. (1992). Presumed incompetent? Stigmatization and affirmative action efforts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 536-544.

Heilman, M. E., Kaplow, S. R., Amato, M. A. G., & Stathatos, P. (1993). When similarity is a liability: Effects of sex-based preferential selection on reactions to like-sex and different-sex others. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 917-927.

Krefting, L. A., & Brief, A. P. (1976). The impact of applicant disability on evaluation judgements in the selection process. Academy of Management Journal, *19*, 675-680.

Leary, M. R., & Altmaier, E. M. (1980). Type I error in counseling research: A plea for multivariate analyses. Journal of Counseling Psychology, *27*, 611-615.

Levy, J. M., Murphy, B. S., Levy, P. H., Kramer, M. E., Rimmerman, A., & Botuck, S. (1993). Monitoring process and employment outcomes over time: The YAI employment project. Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, *5*, 167-179.

Ravaud, J. F., Madiot, B., & Ville, I. (1992). Discrimination towards disabled people seeking employment. Social Science and Medicine, *35*, 951-958.

Rose, G. L., & Brief, A. P. (1979). Effects of handicap and job characteristics on selection evaluations. Personnel Psychology, *32*, 385-392.

Schneider, C. R., & Anderson. (1980). Attitudes toward the stigmatized: Some insights for recent research. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, *23*, 299-313.

Stone, C. I., & Sawatzki, B. (1980). Hiring bias and the disabled interviewee: Effects of manipulating work history and disability information of the disabled job applicant. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *16*, 96-104.

Stone, D. L., & Colella, A. (1996). A model of factors affecting the treatment of disabled individuals in organizations. Academy of Management Review, *21*, 352-401.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). Using Multivariate Statistics (3rd ed.). New York: HaperCollins.

Thomas, L. T., & Thomas, J. E. (1985). The effects of handicap, sex and competence on expected performance hiring & salary recommendations. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 16, 19-23.

Tringo, J. L. (1970). The hierarchy of preference toward disability groups. The Journal of Special Education, 4, 295-306.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1997). The flexible correction model: The role of naive theories of bias in bias correction. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 29, 141-208.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics

| Subsample | Sample Characteristics | | |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| | Mean Age** | % Female* | % Hiring Experience* |
| Students | 22.81 | 74.50 | 45.90 |
| Workers | 44.80 | 54.50 | 63.60 |

** = Difference between groups was significant at $p < .001$

* = Difference between groups was significant at $p < .05$

Table 2

Information used to manipulate disability in the recommendation letter.

Paraplegia: Although Barbara/Benjamin has been a paraplegic since childhood and is unable to use her/his legs, she/he has had very few complications or set-backs in the past several years, is generally healthy, and did not miss a day of work in the last year.

Epilepsy: Although Barbara/Benjamin has been an epileptic since childhood, she/he has had very few complications or setbacks in the past several years, is generally healthy, and did not miss a day of work in the last year.

Depression: Barbara/Benjamin suffered a bout of clinical depression toward the end of high school, but is currently on medication and has had very few complications or setbacks in the past several years, is generally healthy, and did not miss a day of work in the last year.

No disability: Two years ago Barbara/Benjamin suffered a broken leg from a car accident. The accident was not her/his fault. Barbara/Benjamin is generally healthy and did not miss a day of work in the last year.

Table 3

Mean ratings given by students and workers

| Dependent Measure | Students | | Workers | |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| 1. Hiring Recommendation | 5.77 | 1.96 | 5.66 | 2.19 |
| 2. Competency | 6.08 | 1.61 | 5.87 | 2.01 |
| 3. Activity | 6.66 | 1.42 | 6.70 | 1.59 |
| 4. Potency | 5.51 | 1.22 | 5.52 | 1.49 |
| 5. Salary | 4.17 | 1.46 | 3.82 | 1.63 |

Note: Higher scores indicate more favorable ratings. Differences between students' and workers' ratings were not significant.

Table 4

Correlations among dependent variables

| Dependent Variables | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|------|------|------|------|---|
| 1. Competence | 5.98 | 1.81 | - | | | | |
| 2. Activity | 6.68 | 1.50 | .62* | - | | | |
| 3. Potency | 5.51 | 1.35 | .46* | .67* | - | | |
| 4. Recommend | 5.72 | 2.07 | .90* | .58* | .48* | - | |
| 5. Salary | 4.01 | 1.55 | .48* | .29* | .23* | .44* | - |

*p < .01 (2-tailed)

Table 5

Mean activity and potency ratings by disability

| Disability Condition | Activity | | Potency | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| 1. Paraplegic | 7.33 _a | 1.18 | 6.13 _a | 1.38 |
| 2. Epileptic | 6.71 _{a, b} | 1.60 | 5.47 _{a, b} | 1.26 |
| 3. Clinically Depressed | 6.32 _b | 1.57 | 5.07 _b | 1.22 |
| 4. Non-disabled | 6.33 _b | 1.44 | 5.33 _b | 1.32 |

Note: Higher scores indicate more favorable ratings. Significant differences between groups are represented by different subscripts.

Table 6

Mean perceived competence, hiring recommendations, activity, and potency ratings for males and females applying for supervisory and non-supervisory positions.

| Gender | Nature of the Job | Competence | | Hiring | | Activity | | Potency | |
|--------|-------------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| Female | Supervisory | 5.31 | 1.97 | 5.04 | 2.18 | 6.51 | 1.35 | 5.18 | 1.37 |
| Female | Non-supervisory | 6.87 | 1.39 | 6.73 | 1.40 | 6.94 | 1.25 | 5.65 | 1.29 |
| Male | Supervisory | 5.73 | 1.81 | 5.51 | 2.11 | 6.87 | 1.48 | 5.85 | 1.33 |
| Male | Non-supervisory | 6.08 | 1.67 | 5.63 | 2.12 | 6.41 | 1.84 | 5.38 | 1.34 |

Note: Higher mean scores indicate more favorable ratings.

Table 7

Mean potency ratings for the three-way interaction between disability, job type, and gender.

| | Disability | | | | No Disability | | | |
|--------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | Non-supervisory | | Supervisory | | Non-supervisory | | Supervisory | |
| | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| Male | 5.39 | 1.35 | 5.98 | 1.41 | 5.33 | 1.36 | 5.42 | 1.00 |
| Female | 5.89 | 1.18 | 5.04 | 1.31 | 5.00 | 1.41 | 5.56 | 1.53 |

Note: Higher scores indicate more favorable ratings.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Mean hiring recommendations for male and female applicants applying for the supervisory and non-supervisory positions.

Figure 2. Three-way interaction for potency in the no disability condition.

Figure 3. Three-way interaction for potency in the disability condition.