Appendix 1 Twenty-seven Reports of Randomized Controlled Trials, Published from 1973 to 2008, Assessing the Impact of an Intervention on Gender Bias in the Evaluation of Job Applicants*

Study, year, reference no.	Intervention	Outcome variable	Study design	Study participants	No. of participants	Construct measured	Results	P value
Biernat and Fuegen, 2001 ¹¹ (Substudy 2)	Presence or absence of requirement to justify hiring decision and sign evaluation form	Gender differences in short-list and hiring selections for applicants with identical resumes	2 x 2 x 2 x 2 Participant gender (M,F) by accountability (Y/N) by resume set (M,F) by decision (short list, hire)	College students told to short-list 3 applicants from 14 resumes (7 M, 7 F); then hire 1 of the 3 for mechanical engineering (male sex- typed) position based on recommendation letter	39 male (M) 25 female (F)	Effect of accountability expectation on choice of M or F candidate for male sex-typed job	 No difference in short-listing M or F F applicants more likely to be short-listed than hired F students less likely to hire a F applicant No effect of accountability on short listing Both M and F chose to hire fewer women when held accountable 	NS P < .05 P < .03 NS P < .06
Brescoll and Uhlmann, 2008 ²¹				Adults with work-place experience randomly assigned to view a videotaped job interview		Effects of anger (a gender- incongruent emotion) on eval- uation of multiple work- related		
	Substudy 1:	Substudy 1:	Substudy 1:		Substudy	attributes	Substudy 1:	
	Expression of anger or sadness	Composite measure of status,	2 x 2 Applicant gender (M E) by amotion		1: 39 M 20 F		Status, salary, and competence greater for angry vs sad M	P <.05
	response to losing	salary,	(anger, sadness)		(85%		 Angry F lowest in status and competence 	P <.05
	an account	competence (1- 11); external or internal attribution of emotion			white)		F anger attributed to internal factors	P < .05
	Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 except no emotion rather than sadness for control and high (CEO) and low (assistant trainee) occupational ranks	Substudy 2: Same as in substudy 1 with measure of being "in control" or "out of control" added	Substudy 2: $2 \times 2 \times 2$ Applicant gender (M,F) by emotion (anger, no emotion) by occupation (high vs low rank)		Substudy 2: 70 M 110 F		 Substudy 2: Status, salary, and competence all lower for angry F regardless of rank Angry high rank F less competent than all other targets Anger in F related to internal attribution of being out of control and this fully mediated relationship between anger and 	P < .05 P < .05
	Substudy 2:	Substudy 2:	Substudy 3:		Substudy		status	۲< .01
	As in substudy 3: As in substudy 2 but with no information on occupational rank and added statement of external attribution for anger or none	Same as in Substudy 1	2 x 3 Applicant gender (M,F) by emotion (unexplained anger, explained anger, no emotion)		3: 3: 51 M 82 F		 Higher status and salary for angry M without external attribution vs M with no emotion or external attribution Higher status and salary but not competence for angry F with vs without external attribution but still lower than F with no emotion 	P < .05 P < .05
							same as angry M in status, salary, and competence	NS

Cann et al., 1981 ³²	Overall applicant rating or rating of separate	Applicant 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 College students 96 M Impact on of qualifications (1- 10), decision to Applicant gender (M,F) randomly assigned to 148 F summary indications (1- 10), decision to participation to by attractiveness (low, review 1 out of 24 job review 1 out of 24 job gender complexity			•	No effect of applicant gender or attractiveness on overall ratings, but M and attractive applicants	NS (overall); P < .01 (hiring)																								
	varied in order; applicant physical attractiveness (pre- tested) also varied	composite rating of 10 qualifications (each 1-10), self- assessment of	of evaluation by participant gender (M,F)	order of rating separate qualifications either first or second		attend to specific qualifications first	•	more likely to be hired Ratings of individual qualifications higher and more strongly correlated with hiring decision when made prior to overall rating	P < .01 (qualifications) (P value not given for correlation)																						
		applicant attractiveness on decisions					•	Rating order affected hiring only for average attractive applicants:	P < .05																						
							•	niring more likely when overall ratings came first (no gender breakdown) Raters acknowledged influence of attractiveness	<i>P</i> < .0001																						
Dipboye et al., 1977 ³³	Physical attractiveness (pre- tested) and	Willingness to hire (1–7), salary, and top	2 × 3 × 2 × 2 × 3 Rater gender by rater attractiveness (low,	College students reviewed 12 randomly ordered resumes;	110 (white; no gender breakdown)	Impact of attractiveness on bias in hiring	•	Attractive, high qualified M most likely hired, highest salary, selected as top candidate	<i>P</i> < .05																						
	qualifications of applicants varied	candidate; rating of traits on adjectival scales	date; rating its on moderate, high) by applicant qualifications Two other college students viewed raters through a one- trival scales decisions M more likely than F to be hired in all conditions except M raters for low-qualified F applicants 	<i>P</i> < .05																											
			applicant attractiveness (low,	their attractiveness			•	Unattractive M rated higher than unattractive F	<i>P</i> < .05																						
			moderate, high)				•	moderately attractive M and F Attractiveness enhanced hiring	NS P < .05																						
		0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						only for highly qualified	NS																						
							•	Rater attractiveness had no effect	P < .05																						
							•	Adjectival trait differences in M and F applicants aligned with	NS																						
							•	gender stereotypes No difference in competence or intelligence M vs F Attractive applicants more favorable than unattractive on all traits except intelligence	P < .05 (all traits); NS (intelligence)																						
Fuegen et al., 2004 ²³	Parental status of applicant varied	Ratings of applicant competence, job commitment,	$2 \times 2 \times 2$ Applicant gender (M,F) by parental status (Y/N) by participant	Two samples of college students randomly to review resume in 1 of 4	49 M 58 F (Midwestern sample);	The extent to which parenthood impacts employment	•	No difference in competence, performance standards, hiring, promotion for nonparents regardless of gender	NS																						
		availability on job, gender ST behaviors;	gender (M,F)	conditions; Midwest sample was 90% white, 3.8% Asian,	21 M 66 F (Eastern	standards for men and women	•	Availability: parents < nonparents; F parents < M parents	P < .0001; P < .02																						
		"ideal" workers		2.8% African American, 2.8% Hispanic;	Sumple)		•	Masc stereotype: parents < nonparents	<i>P</i> < .02																						
				Eastern sample was			•	Fem. stereotype: no differences	NS																						
				African American, 4.6% Asian. 13.9%			•	Parents of both genders less committed than nonparents;	P < .05																						
				Hispanic, 1.1% West			•	M rated F applicant more committed	P < .03																						
				Indian																									•	F rated M applicant more committed	P = .06
							•	Hiring and promotion lower for F but not M parent	P < .02																						

							Required performance standards and time commitment for hire: nonparents same, but F parent held to higher standards and M parent held to lowest standards	NS (nonparents) P < .01 (F vs M parent)
Futoran and Wyer, 1986 ³⁴	Gender of applicant was explicit or left ambiguous with a nongendered name (Pat, Chris)	Rating (0-5) of applicant suitability of 9 occupations (3 M sex-typed, 3 F sex-typed, 3 neutral)	2 × 2 × 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by stereotype traits (masc, fem) by sex- typed job (M,F) 2 × 2 Stereotypic traits (masc, fem) by sex- typed job (M,F) for gender-ambiguous applicant	College students randomly assigned to 1 of 6 groups: job suitability for M, F, ambiguous applicant when traits match or	134 M 114 F	Separate contribution of stereotypic gender traits and biological sex to ratings of job suitability	 Inference of gender in ambiguous condition no different for applicants with stereotypic M or stereotypic F traits Applicant assumed to be the gender of the sex-typed job 	NS P < .03
				do not match job type			 When gender was explicit, both gender and traits contributed independently to judgment of job suitability When gender was inferred, (ambiguous) it was irrelevant and judgment of job suitability was based solely on applicants' traits 	<i>P</i> < .05
Glick et al., 1988 ¹²	Type of stereotypic or counter- stereotypic gender individuating information (unrelated to job) about applicants varied in otherwise identical resumes	Likelihood of interview for job rated 1-5; Personality trait inferences rated masc or fem 1-5	2 x 3 x 3 Applicant gender (M,F) by individuating Information (masc, fem, neut as indicated by summer job, work- study job, extracurricular activities) by job sex- type (masc, fem, neut)	Upper level managers and business professionals rated 1 of 6 possible resumes, randomly assigned	205 M 5 F (44% of those mailed surveys)	Ability of counterstereotypic individuating information to affect gender bias in hiring	 Individuating information matched personality inferences Applicants with masc traits more likely to be interviewed for all jobs Counterstereotypic information reduced trait rating bias, but bias favoring a match of job and gender remained 	P < .001 P < .05 P < .001

Heilman and Saruwatari, 1979 ³⁶	Physical attractiveness (pre-tested) of applicants for managerial and nonmanagerial jobs varied in otherwise identical resumes	Ratings (1-9) for job qualifications, hiring likelihood, and gender- stereotypic adjectival scales; ranked preferences among applicants; salary	2 x 2 x 2 Applicant appearance (attractive, unattractive) by applicant gender (M,F) by job type (managerial, nonmanagerial)	College students randomly assigned to managerial or nonmanagerial condition and evaluated applicants of both genders and levels of attractiveness	23 M 22 F	Impact of attractiveness on bias in hiring decisions	•	Attractiveness benefited all applicants for all ratings except F applicants for a managerial position (e.g., unattractive F applicants recommended for higher pay than attractive applicants) Attractive M judged more stereotypically masc and attractive F rated more stereotypically fem When gender ratings were factored out, impact of attractiveness on all ratings for M and F were eliminated	P < .05 (P < .10 for salary) P < .001 NS
Heilman, 1980 ¹⁵	Proportion of women in an applicant pool varied	Target F applicant rated 1-9 on qualifications, hiring likelihood, advancement potential, and gender stereotypic adjectival scales	2 × 5 Rater gender (M,F) by gender pool proportion (Target F + 0, 1, 2, 3, or 7 F)	MBA students rated target F in pool of 8 applicants for managerial job	50 M 50 F	Effect of gender proportion of applicant pool on activation and application of bias in decision- making	•	Target F qualifications rated lower when pool had <37.5% females Likelihood of target F hire greater when pool> 25% female Potential for target F advancement greater with more F in pool, 12.5% vs 37.5% and 100% Composite adjectival gender score more fem for target F with pool <37.5% and greatest for 12.5% Composite adjectival scale completely accounted for all effects of gender pool proportion	P < .05 P < .05 P < .05 P < .05
Heilman, 1984 ¹⁶	Information about applicant background varied	Ratings (1-9) for interview, likely success if hired, and potential for advancement; composite gender score from 5 scales of gender- stereotypic adjectival scales	2 × 3 Applicant gender (M,F) by information type (high job relevance, low job relevance, no information)	MBA students (blocked by gender) randomly assigned to 1 of 6 conditions: target M or F with each information type for lower management position	42 M 35 F	Ability of individuating information to affect gender bias in hiring	•	No effect of information type on any job rating or gender score for M target F target rated lower on all measures with low job-relevant information vs. no information or high job-relevant information With high job-relevant information, M and F rated same on all measures Target F rated more stereotypically fem in low job- relevant > no information > high job-relevant information M = F gender-stereotypic with high job-relevant information Factoring out gender score removed effect of applicant gender for all measures	NS P < .01 (for success and interview) NS P < .05 NS NS
Heilman and Martell, 1986 ³⁵	Exposure to a neutral story or story about high- performing women individually or as a	Composite rating of applicant–job match (qualifications, recommend to	2 x 2 x 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by information exposure relevance	College students randomly assigned to 1 of 10 conditions: read article with group or individual competency information	70 M 77 F	Effect of priming on applicant evaluation by exposure to	•	M applicants were rated more favorably than F Gender-stereotypic attributions for M and F applicants differed in neutral information condition	<i>P</i> < .01 <i>P</i> < .001

ore reviewing plicants	salary projection, and gender-related attributes relevant for employment	F, F as a group), plus neut information control	then evaluated M or F applicant for position		ypic information before hiring decision for F in a male sex- typed job	High- performing related group (but not individual) information improved rating of F applicants and reduced gender stereotyping	P < .05
ormation about olicant's formance ability vided or not	Composite ratings from several scales (1-9) of competence potential and stereotypic gender- related traits	2 × 2 × 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by job sex-type (extremely M, moderately M) by performance ability (high, unknown)	College students reviewed work sample of M or F applicant for M sex-type jobs	60 M 181 F	Ability of counterstereot ypic individuating information to affect gender bias in hiring	 With unknown performance, M rated higher than F for competence and potential for both sex-typed jobs With high performance, F = M for moderate M sex-typed job and F > M for high M sex-typed job Stereotypic gender traits lower with high performance information for F: greatest for extreme M sex-typed job 	P < .01 P < .001 P < .01
					Effect of parental status on gender bias in		
ostudy 1: ormation about ng a parent or iparent with Idren at home vided in blication	Substudy 1: Composite ratings of commitment and anticipated competence, and recommendation for further consideration or not	Substudy 1: 2 × 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by parental status (no children, children)	Substudy 1: College students exposed to 4 conditions: 2 F and 2 M targets, one of each a parent	Substudy 1: 18 M 47 F	employee evaluation	 Substudy 1: F regardless of parental status rated less committed Parents regardless of gender rated less committed M without children most committed F and M without children equally competent and recommended to advance F with children least committed, least competent, and least likely to be advanced 	P < .001 P < .001 P < .05 NS P < .001
ostudy 2: me as substudy	Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 with addition of composite ratings for achievement striving, work dependability, and likelihood of agentic behaviors (e.g., be a leader, seek power)	Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1	Substudy 2: MBA students who were full-time employees (74% with experience in hiring decisions) randomly assigned to evaluate one target application	Substudy 2: 66 M 34 F		 Substudy 2: Commitment and competence same as Study 1 (F and M without children comparable; F with children lower than M with children) Parents also lower on achievement striving and dependability regardless of gender Likely to engage in agentic behaviors: rated lower for F with vs F without children; ;no effect of children on rating for M Recommendation to advance: lower for F but not M with 	NS (non- parents); P < .05 (F vs M parents) P < .05 P < .01 (F); NS (M) P < .001 (F); NS (M): NS
osti oprimi oprimi opri	ants ants ants ants ants ants ants ants	ants attributes relevant for employment ration about ant's mance ability led or not Composite ratings from several scales (1-9) of competence potential and stereotypic gender- related traits udy 1: nation about a parent or arent with en at home ded in ration Substudy 1: Composite ratings of commitment and anticipated competence, and recommendation for further consideration or not tudy 2: e as substudy Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 with addition of composite ratings for achievement striving, work dependability, and likelihood of agentic behaviors (e.g., be a leader, seek power)	antsattributes relevant for employmentcontrolration about ant's mance ability led or notComposite ratings from several scales (1-9) of competence potential and stereotypic gender- related traits2 × 2 × 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by job sex-type (extremely M, moderately M) by performance ability (high, unknown)udy 1: nation about a parent or arent with en at home ded in cationSubstudy 1: Composite ratings of commitment and anticipated competence, and recommendation for further consideration or notSubstudy 2: Same as substudy 1 with addition of composite ratings for achievement striving, work dependability, and likelihood of agenic behaviors (e.g., be a leader, seek power)Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1	ants attributes relevant for employment control applicant for position ants Composite ratings from several scales 2 × 2 × 2 College students reviewed work sample of by job sex-type potential and stereotypic gender- related traits Composite ratings from several scales College students reviewed work sample of M or F applicant for M sex-type jobs udy 1: nation about a parent or rena thome eat home sterio Substudy 1: Composite ratings of commitment and anticipated in thome sterion Substudy 1: 2 × 2 Substudy 1: College students exposed to 4 conditions: 2 F and 2 M targets, one of each a parent udy 2: ras substudy Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 with addition of composite ratings for achievement striving, work dependability, and likelihood of agenic behaviors (e.g., be a leader, seek power) Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 students who were target application Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 students who were target application	ants attributes relevant for employment control applicant for position aution about ant's mance ability led or not Composite ratings from several scales (1-9) of competence potential and stereotypic gender- related traits 2 x 2 x 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by bs sex-type (extremely M, moderately M) by performance ability (high, unknown) College students reviewed work sample of M or F applicant for M sex-type jobs 60 M 181 F udy 1: ration about a parent or erent with et al no stereotypic gender- related traits Substudy 1: 2 x 2 composite ratings of commitment and anticipated competence, and recommendation for further consideration or not Substudy 1: 2 x 2 Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 Same as substudy 1	ants attributes relevant for employment control applicant for position before hiring decision for F in a male sex- typed job tation about ant's mance ability competence potential and stereotypic gender- related traits Conjege students Applicant gender (M,F) by ob sex-type potential and stereotypic gender- related traits College students Applicant gender (M,F) by ob sex-type (stype jobs 60 M 181 F Ability of counterstereotypic information to affect gender bias in hiring udy 1: nation about arent with en at home and home ation Substudy 1: 2 x 2 Substudy 2: 3 are at home comsideration or not Substudy 2: 3 are as substudy 1 Substudy 2: 3 are as as are as are as are	ants attributes relevant for employment control applicant for position applicant for position before hing decision for f h a male sex- type d/bb and reduced gender stereoryping ution about and search and ards Composite ratings from several scales (1-9) d College students reviewed work sample of by job sex-type jobs 60 M Ability of competence and potential for both sex-type jobs • With unknown performance, M rade higher than F for competence and potential for both sex-type jobs ution about for one Composite ratings from several scales (1-9) d Substudy 1: 2 × 2 × 2 College students reviewed work sample of sex-type jobs 60 M Ability of competence and potential for both sex-type jobs • With hingh performance, F = M for modurated with sex-typed job utidy 1: with not about a patient traits Substudy 1: 2 × 2 × 2 College students exposed to 4 conditions: 2 F and 2 whingh performance to 4 conditions: 2 F and 2 whingh performance information for F; greateles of parental status rated less committed to 4 conditions: 2 F and 2 whing ependebility, and generation about consideration on not Substudy 1: 2 × 2 Substudy 1: 2 × 2 × 2 Substudy 2: 3 × 7 Substudy 2:

Hodgins and Kalin, 1985 ³⁰	Type of individuating information about applicants: sex- typed personality descriptors vs no information					Effect of individuating information about applicant on gender and job sex-type match		
3		Substudy 1 and 2: Suitability (1-9) of 3 M & 3 F student resumes for 8 sex- typed jobs	Substudy 1: 2 × 2 × 2 Rater gender (M,F) by applicant gender (M,F) by job sex-type (M,F)	College students in mock role of guidance counselor rated resumes of 3 M & 3 F; Raters were scored for explicit gender bias	Substudy 1: 14 M 62 F		Substudy 1 Gender of applicant and sex- typed job were congruent; no effect of explicit gender bias Substudy 2 Individuating information:	<i>P</i> < .01; NS
		Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 with masc, fem, or neut individuating information added	Substudy 2 : 2 × 2 × 2 × 3 Same as substudy 1 by individuating information (masc, fem, neut)	Same as substudy 1	Substudy 2: 33 M 82 F		 neut = same as substudy 1; Masc or fem match with job-type more important than resume gender Raters with greater explicit gender bias showed more bias in 	<i>P</i> < .001
		to resumes					job suitability ratings	P < .005
Kawakami et al., 2005 ²⁵	Counterstereotype training with or without a filler task or distraction task	Best candidate for leadership position from 4 applications (2 M, 2 F)	2 x 4 Applicant gender (M,F) by training and task	College students read applications and letters of recommendation and selected best out of 4	19 M 33 F 18 un-	Ability to manipulate correction processes	Training did reduce response time for counterstereotypic responses	P < .001
	or no training before applicant evaluation		(roo training only, training plus filler, training plus distraction)	under one of four randomly assigned conditions	known (Nether-lands)	against "anti- bias" training	 Hiring favored M over F equivalently for no training and training-only conditions Hiring bias against F eliminated with training plus filler or training plus distraction 	<i>P</i> < 0.01 NS (M vs F)
Kawakami et al.,2007 ²⁶ eval or af canc	Counterstereotype training with applicant evaluation before or after ranking candidates on gender stereotypic	ype Best candidate for leadership position from 4 applications re (2 M, 2 F)	$2 \times 2 \times 2$ Counterstereotype training (Y/N) by order of job hire task after training (1 ^{st,} or 2 nd to trait rating task) by instructor (attend to	College students randomly assigned to one of 8 conditions rated 4 resumes (2 M & 2 F) for masc or fem traits and job hire in varied order with or without leadership basis	45 M 111 F (Nether-lands)	Ability to manipulate correction processes against "anti- bias" training	 Training did reduce response time for counterstereotypic responses More men chosen in no training or when job hire task immediately followed training 	<i>P</i> < .001 <i>P</i> < .05 (M vs F)
	traits and instruction to either select the best		leadership vs general impression)				 Hiring bias against women eliminated when job hire task 2nd after trait rating task 	(M vs F)
	candidate or the best candidate						Trait rating aligned with applicant gender in no training	P < .001
	specifically based on leadership qualities						• No effect of training when trait rating 1 st ; eliminated stereotypic rating when 2 nd after job hire task	NS (1 st); P < .01 (2 nd)
							 No effect of instruction to evaluate for leadership traits 	NS
Marlowe et al., 1996 ¹⁹	Physical attractiveness (pre-tested) of applicant varied	Ratings (1-9) of suitability for hire and likelihood of advancement:	2 x 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by applicant appearance (highly	Managers in financial institutions assessed for experience evaluated 4 resumes varied for	46 M 66 F	Impact of applicant attractiveness on gender	 Hire and advancement: highly attractive > marginally attractive; M > F Managers with law as moderate 	P < .001 (appear- rance); P < 02 (Mys E)
	with identical, well- qualified applicants	vith identical, well- qualified applicants applicants at	attractive, marginally attractive)	gender and attractiveness		bias in hiring	 Managers with low or moderate but not high levels of experience had positive bias for highly attractive M 	P < .01 (low and mod- erate): NS
							 All managers had negative bias for likelihood of advancement of marginally attractive F 	(high) P < .02
							For all levels of experience, highly attractive applicants most	<i>P</i> < .02 (appear-

							likely to be ranked number 1 with no gender difference NS (ance), (M vs F)
Muchinsky and Harris, 1977 ²⁴	Scholastic standing and academic major varied for applicants for M, F, and neut sex-typed jobs	Rating (1-20) for hiring or M, F, x-typed	or 2 × 2 × 3 × 3 Rater gender (M,F) by applicant gender (M,F), by scholastic standing (Iow, average, high) by job sex-type (M, F,	College students rated 24 applicants in random order (3 packets of 6 experimental + 2 sham resumes grouped by major); explicit bias toward F supervisors measured	50 M 50 F	Impact of qualifications on gender bias for sex- typed employment	M rated F applicants higher for F sex-typed job (day-care center worker); F gave higher ratings to F applicants for M (mechanical engineer) and neutral (copy editor) sex-typed jobs and to M applicants for F sex-typed job	P < .025
							Higher ratings for F applicants applying for M sex-typed job F applicants with average or low	P < .025
							scholastic standing rated higher than M for F sex-typed job	P<.01
							standing rated higher than F for neutral sex-typed job	P<.01
Ng and Weisner, 2007 ³¹	Presence or absence of employment equity	Choice of hire for M or F as 1 of 3 applicants for job	$2 \times 3 \times 2$ Job (nurse, police) by qualifications of	Classes of college students randomly assigned to one of 6	191 M 205 F	Effect of equity directives on	When underrepresented applicants less qualified, more M than F hired	P < .05
	directives	as nurse (sex- typed F job) or police officer (sex-	underrepresented gender (less, equal, more) by	conditions; students made two hiring decisions each:1 for nurse, 1 for		gender blas in hiring	 When underrepresented applicants equally or more qualified, hiring for M = that for F 	NS
		typed in job)	high urgency)				Basic and stronger equity statements increased hiring of less qualified M but not F	P < .05, P < .001
							 Equity directives and provision of employment equity information increased hiring of equally qualified M and F 	P<.05
Renwick and Tosi, 1978 ¹⁷	Marital status and job-relevant educational	Suitability (1–7) for each of two positions; most	$5 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 5$ Undergraduate major (5 choices) by	Graduate students in Administration randomly assigned to review 10 resumes for 2 job descriptions	64 M 16 F (39% single, 54% married, and 7% divorced; 39% parents)	Effect of job- relevant education and marital status on gender bias in hiring	No gender differences for any measures or choice of most suitable candidate	NS
	background varied	and least suitable	graduate degree (MBA, MS) by job (traveling, home office)				Applicants more suitable with relevant majors or MBA	P < .05
			(Maveing, norme office) by applicant gender (M,F) by marital status (married, single, divorced, married with				 Most suitable job applicant = married M with 2 children with business major and MBA vs. least desirable = divorced M with bistory major and MS 	<i>P</i> < .01
			2 children, divorced with 2 children)				 Most suitable F applicant = single, industrial sociology major and MBA vs least suitable F = single history major with MA 	<i>P</i> < .01
							No difference in most and least suitable M and F	NS
Rosen and Mericle, 1979 ²⁰	Presence of weak or strong employee equity	Hiring recommendation (14), salary	2 × 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by equity directive	Municipal administrators in managerial positions randomly assigned to	57 M 11 F	Effect of equity directives on	 No gender difference in hiring recommendations for weak or strong equity policy 	NS
	directives (including expectation of accountability)		(weak, strong)	review one applicant		gender bias in hiring	Lower salary recommended for F applicants with strong equity directives	P < .025

Rudman, 1998 ³⁷ (Substudies 2 and 3)		Ratings of task aptitude, social attraction and hireability; composite social desirability scale; self-promotion index; gender typicality scale				Impact of self- promoting or self-effacing behavior on evaluation of applicants		
	Substudy 2: Applicant responded in interview with either self- promoting or self- effacing verbal and popyorbal chilo		Substudy 2: 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 Rater gender (M,F) by task goal (accuracy, outcome) by applicant gender (M,F) by style (self-promoting, self- offaciac)	Substudy 2: College students randomly assigned to view videotaped "practice job interview" under conditions of accuracy or outcome	Substudy 2: 82 M 81 F		 Substudy 2: Task aptitude and hireability: self-promoters of both genders> self-effacers for accuracy goal Self-effacing M > F and self- promoting M = F for outcome goal 	P < .001 P < .04 (effacers), NS
	and raters were instructed to pick best applicant for project success (accuracy) and best score on		endoing)				 Social attraction: M raters gave F self-effacers higher scores for accuracy goal and F self-promoters higher ratings for outcome goal F raters gave F self-effacers 	(promoters) P < .01
	game to be played together (outcome)						higher ratings in both goal conditions	<i>P</i> < .001
							 F raters and raters with outcome goal preferred self-promoting M but no difference for M raters or raters with accuracy goal Self-promoting M more likable and hireable than the self- promoting F 	P < .01 (F raters, outcome goal); NS (M raters, accuracy ooal)
							 Self-promoting M more likable and hireable than the self- effacing M 	P < .05
							 Self-effacing M more likeable than self-promoting F but latter was more hireable 	P < .05
							• Self-effacing M = F for hireability	P < .05
		-						NS
	Substudy 3: Similar to substudy 2 but all F applicants were self-promoting (M		Substudy 3: 2 x 2 x 2 Male applicant style (self-promoting, self- effacing) by rater	Substudy 3: Same as substudy 2 except all rated for outcome condition and interview was in person	Substudy 3: 19 M 21 F		Substudy 3: Task aptitude and hireability: F but not M raters gave self- promoting M higher scores than self-promoting F	P < .05 (F raters); NS (M raters)
	were either self- promoting or self-		gender (M, F) by target gender (M,F)	rather than video			Self-effacing M lower than self- promoting F	<i>P</i> < .001
	effacing) and outcome goal was the only condition						 Social attraction: F but not M raters preferred M over F applicants; no effect of style Partner selection: self-effacing F over self-effacing M; self- promoting M > self-promoting F (for F raters only) 	P < .05 (M vs F); NS (style) P < .01
Rudman and Glick, 2001 ¹³	Applicant's agentic (e.g. "my goal is to be a winner") or	Composite scores of competence, social skills, and	2 x 2 x 2 x 2 Applicant gender (M,F) by applicant attributes	College students viewed videotaped interview of highly agentic applicant	67 M 105 F	Potential for backlash against	Competence: agentic > androgynous regardless of gender	P < .01

	"androgenous"l (e.g. "life is about	hireability	(agentic, androgynous) by job	(responses in direct, self- confident manner);		agentic women	 Social skills: agentic M > F; androgynous M = F 	<i>P</i> = .05; NS
	being connected to other people") life philosophy statement read before viewing and rating highly		sex-typed (M,F) by rater gender (M,F)	implicit bias and explicit gender bias assessed		applying for F sex-typed jobs	Hireability: androgynous M and F comparable; agentic M and F comparable for M sex-typed job but agentic F less hireable than M for F sex-typed job	NS (androgy- nous); NS (M sex- typed); P < .05 (F sex-typed)
	ageniic applicant						 Raters with greater implicit (but not explicit) bias rated agentic F lower on social skills for F sex- typed job and rated agentic M as more hireable for M sex-typed job 	P < .05
Sczesny and Stahlberg, 2002 ²⁷						Ability of olfactory cues to activate gender bias in		
	Substudy 1: Pre-tested masc, fem, or no perfume applied to applications before	Substudy 1: Decision to hire (Y/N), certainty of decision (1-5), scent detected (Y/N), and how	Substudy 1: 3 × 2 Scent (masc, fem, none) by applicant gender (M,F)	Substudy 1: College students acting as personnel managers randomly assigned to review one applicant	Substudy 1: 37 M 37 F	hiring	 Substudy 1: M and F applicants with masc scent hired with greater certainty than those with fem scent No perfume most likely to be 	<i>P</i> = .003
	rating	pleasant (1-5)					hired	<i>P</i> = .001
	Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1 but perfume on person rather than paper application	Substudy 2: Same as substudy 1	Substudy 2: 3 × 2 × 2 Scent (M,F, none) by applicant gender (M,F) by rater gender (M,F)	Substudy 2: College students randomly assigned to conduct a job interview for leadership position	Substudy 2 : 57 M 59 F		 Substudy 2: M and F applicants with masc scent hired with greater certainty than those with fem or no perfume Fem scent no different than no scent 	P < .05
				with scripted confederate				NS
Sczesny and Kühnen, 2004 ²⁸	Rating of applicant with masc or fem	Leadership competence on 10	$2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ Physical appearance	College students randomly assigned to	72 M 72 F	Separate effects of	Leadership competence higher for M & F applicants rated	P < .01
2004	attentional demand	decision to hire or not	(HIII, Hasc) by applicant gender (M,F) by attentional demand (Y/N) by rater gender (M,F) (attractiveness and likeability as co-	competence of 1/12 applicants (3 per condition)		gendered physical appearance and biological sex on attribution of	 Without distraction: leadership competence greater for F; F (but not M) raters more certain to hire F 	<i>P</i> < .05 (compe- tence); <i>P</i> < .01 (hiring)
			variates)			leadership competence and hiring	 With distaction. M = F for leadership competence; F (but not M) raters more certain in hiring M 	NS (compe- tence); <i>P</i> < .01 (hiring)
							 Higher leadership competence for masc vs fem appearance (regardless of distraction or applicant gender) 	P < .001
Smith et al., 2005 ¹⁴	Presence or absence of employment discontinuities on resumes of prospective applicants	Recommend to interview (1–7) and further consideration (1– 7); starting salary; summary scores for motivation and commitment; coded written	2 x 3 Applicant gender (M,F) by employment gap (none, single 9 months; three 12 weeks) by	143 respondents out of 400 randomly selected members of human resource associations who were mailed one resume to review	54% F	Gender differences in the impact of discontinuous employment on hiring	 No gap in employment: M > F salary; M = F for interview and consideration. 	P < .01 (salary); NS (interview and considera- tion)

		commentary					•	Single gap: M = F	NS
								Multiple gaps: M - E salan: M -	NS (salarv):
								F for interview and consideration	P < .01 (interview); P < .001 (considera- tion)
							•	F rated more committed in all conditions M applicants with multiple gaps rated least committed M = F on motivation	P < .01 P < .01 NS
							•	Content coding: M judged more harshly than F for discontinuous employment	Qualitative
Uhlman and Cohen, 2005 (Study	Presence or absence of	Ratings (1-11) of strength of strootwise or	$2 \times 2 \times 2$ Rater gender (M,F) by	Visitors to local beach and town fair randomly	63 M 51 F 3 upkpown	Tendency to revise the	•	M and F applicants rated as similarly streetwise and educated	NS
3) ²²	value of applicant qualifications	educated characteristics of	by prior commitment	either a M or F candidate for police chief	3 UIKIOWI	applicant qualifications	•	No-commitment group rated education less important when applicant was M	<i>P</i> = .04
	of applicant	importance of characteristic to	(Y/N)			in way that appears to be	•	No-commitment M (but not F) raters favored M applicant	P = .009
		success as police chief				without gender bias	•	Prior commitment eliminated gender discrimination	NS

*M, male; F, female; masc, masculine; fem, feminine; neut, neutral; MBA, Master in Business Administration.