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Abstract

Two experiments were conducted to evaluate the effect of skin color on subsequent ratings of job suitability and to evaluate the influence trait based stereotypes have on these ratings. Results showed that the effect of skin color on job suitability is moderated by the race of the rater. For white raters, more favorable job suitability ratings were attributed to light skinned applicants. For black raters, more favorable job suitability ratings were attributed to dark skinned applicants. There was no basis for attributing the skin color differences to trait based stereotypes. These findings are discussed and future research goals are presented.
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Introduction

"The Darker the Berry...": An Investigation of Skin Color Effects on Perceptions of Job Suitability

If you're white you're all right
If you're yellow you're mellow
If you're brown stick around
If you're black get back.

Source Unknown

In the past decade social cognition research has documented the importance of categorizing people. When we meet someone for the first time, we immediately and automatically classify him or her into categories in terms of important features such as gender, race, and perhaps age (Brewer, 1988). These features are often used to cue schemas. Schemas are defined by Fiske and Taylor (1991) as cognitive structures that represent knowledge about a concept or type of stimulus. There are many types of social schemas, but those based on immediately perceptible features such as skin color are particularly well documented. One reason for this attention has been interest in stereotyping and discrimination. One problem with categorizing is that once an individual is categorized on the basis of a feature, the stereotypic content of the schema is likely to apply whether or not the person appears to be similar to the typical category member (e.g., a person defined as being black is ascribed the stereotypic schema one holds of blacks, even if he/she looks white).

Categorizing an individual tends to bias the way in which his/her actions are perceived. Thus, stereotypic perceptions occur even when the
same behavior is performed by members of different categories (Sagar & Schofield, 1980; Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, & Ruderman, 1978). For example, a black person pushing an individual may be seen as aggressive and instigating a fight, while a white individual pushing an individual may be seen as engaging in "horseplay" or defending him/herself.

It has been shown that there is a basically automatic reaction to race categories which is equally characteristic of high- and low-prejudiced people. Low-prejudiced people differ from high-prejudiced people in that they actively reject this automatic reaction and replace it with equality-oriented responses under normal circumstances (Devine, 1989). Thus, stereotyping of individuals on the basis of race is common to all individuals. The problem with stereotypes is, of course, that perceivers use irrelevant (or less relevant) features (such as skin color) rather than more relevant information in making judgements.

Regardless of the way an individual is categorized, once they are put into a category, expectancies are formed that are based on their categorization. For example, a black individual may be expected to perform well athletically, and poorly academically. The effect these expectancies have is strong especially in situations where little or no relevant information is available. These expectancies are so strong that they may even override relevant information when it is provided (Jones, Farina, Hastorf, Markus, Miller, Scott, & de Sales-French, 1984).

Race is a variable which is highly visible and easily discernable. Being able to classify people according to their skin color (and into racial categories) allows for the existence of a stratifications system based upon these differences. Differences in education, occupation, and income are correlated with the different statuses in our society where white skinned
persons tend to reap the benefits of being in the upper levels of the stratification system, and darker skinned people (blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans) tend to be in the lower levels and in a sense "suffer the consequences" associated with their positions.

What may be said about the differences between the races, perhaps may also be applied to skin color differences within a race. Thus, stratification within races, such as within the black population, has been the focus of some researchers. When considering skin color differences within a race, the effects of discrimination against those of darker complexions can been seen in education, occupation, and income (Ransford, 1970; Edwards, 1972; Hughes and Hertel, 1990).

The present study was designed to investigate the effect skin color (both interracial and intraracial) has on perceptions of job suitability. Assessments of job suitability, and ratings of various job related traits were collected in two experiments. The relationship of skin color to job suitability is discussed in terms of perceptions of job applicants on white-collar related traits and blue-collar related traits.

**Research Investigating Skin Color Effects**

Differences seen between light and dark skin color on variables such as education, income, and occupation have also been documented within the black population. Although the issue of intraracial skin color differences has not received a great deal of research attention, the trend seen in the existing literature shows that perceptions of individuals who are dark skinned are associated with negative values and characteristics, while light skinned individuals are perceived more positively on these same characteristics.
Real world differences between light and dark skin blacks on variables such as occupation, income, and place of residence have been documented (Ransford, 1970; Edwards, 1972; Hughes and Hertel, 1990). Ransford (1970) interviewed blacks in order to determine the relationship skin color has with other variables. Interviewers, rated the skin color of those being interviewed. From the interviewer's skin color ratings and the interviewees' responses, it was found that skin color was related to status. More specifically, the study reported that light skinned respondents were more commonly found in white-collar positions and higher income categories than dark skinned respondents (although these differences were not present for those individuals who had attained a college degree). The study also reported dark skinned blacks as being more hostile to whites, as holding stronger separatist views, and as being more willing to use violence as a means of attaining personal objectives.

Findings congruent to those of Ransford (1970) were reported by Edwards (1973) who also interviewed blacks. Results showed a greater proportion of light skinned blacks reported having attended college, being in upper-income categories, being in white-collar occupations, and coming from families where parents were better educated. Compared to light skinned applicants, dark skinned blacks reported greater consciousness of racial discrimination (e.g., felt blacks experience job discrimination, do not believe that hard work will lead to success). In addition, dark skinned blacks had a greater sense of black pride and race identification, indicated by affirmative responses to statements such as the belief that one should "endorse blacks by patronizing black merchants whenever possible", believing "black children should learn an African language", and feeling that "black teachers should teach in black schools (Edwards, 1973, p.
"Finally, dark skinned blacks reported having a stronger sense of white hostility (e.g., believe that whites dislike blacks, whites want to keep blacks down, and whites cannot be trusted) that light skinned blacks.

More recently, Hughes and Hertel (1990) used data provided from the National Survey of Black Americans (a national probability sample of black adults interviewed in 1980) in order to document some of the real world differences skin color has as a means of assessing any change in skin color effects between 1960 and 1980. Individuals completing the survey provided a self-report of their own skin color. Unfortunately, no changes were apparent from this data. Skin color was still found to have a significant statistical relationship with all indicators of socioeconomic status. These relationships were not eliminated when controlling for age, gender, or parents' socioeconomic status. That is to say that individuals with lighter skin have higher education, occupational prestige, personal income, and family income than individuals with darker skin, and this difference cannot be explained by the fact that lighter skinned blacks come from higher socioeconomic backgrounds (i.e., their status was not dependent on their parents' status). Also there was a weak but significant relationship between black identity/black separatism and skin color where black identity and black separatism were more evident among those with darker skin complexions. Unlike the relationships reported in Ransford (1970) and Edwards (1973), the relationship in this study disappeared when age, gender, and parents' socioeconomic status were included in the analysis. That is to say that there was not a statistically significant relationship between black identity/black separatism and skin color when are, gender, and parents' socioeconomic status were controlled for.
Although these real world differences are known to exist, it is unclear to what these differences may be attributed. It is possible that such differences may be attributed to the individuals themselves. That is to say, it is possible that, due to the color stratification system within the black community where light skin is valued more than dark skin, dark skin blacks have lower self confidence, and thus try for or settle for less than light skin blacks. However, it is also possible that these differences stem from individual and societal perceptions. For example, if dark skin blacks are perceived as being less suitable for high prestige occupations even when they are equally qualified as light skin blacks, it may be assumed that perceived color differences are responsible for the real differences found in the literature. This study will investigate this second possibility, that is that the effect perceptions have on ratings of occupational suitability.

The studies just discussed document real world differences between light skinned blacks and dark skinned blacks, but they do not investigate differences in perceptions between light skinned and dark skinned individuals. The research that has investigated perceptual differences between light and dark skinned individuals has focused more on social situations than on occupational contexts. Of the studies found, none manipulated skin color as a means of investigating the differences in perceptions of light skin and dark skin blacks for various status positions (such as occupational prestige).

A signal-detection model was employed by Williams, Williams, and Beck (1973) in order to assess attitudes towards light and dark skin. Subjects for this study were black and white preschoolers who were matched for age (although not matched for other variables such as socioeconomic status). The subjects were told short "stories" and asked
whether or not the presented figure was the one depicted in the "story". For example, a subject shown a light skinned figure was told that "Some little boys are very naughty little boys. They draw pictures on the walls of their houses with crayons and upset their mothers. Do you think that this is a naughty little boy (Williams, et al., 1973, p. 590)?" Subjects were told stories using either positive adjectives (such as pretty, smart), or negative adjectives (such as naughty as used in the example above) and saw either a light skinned or dark skinned figure. Both light and dark skinned figures were presented with both positive and negative stories. It was hypothesized that all subjects would show that light-skinned figures carried more positive evaluations and dark skinned figures carried more negative evaluations.

Analyses revealed there was a significant tendency for white subjects to positively evaluate light skinned figures and negatively evaluate dark skinned figures. There was also a significant tendency for black subjects to negatively evaluate dark skinned figures although light skinned figures were not positively evaluated as was expected (i.e., light skinned figures and dark skinned figures did not differ when considering positive evaluative signals).

In 1973, Hamm, Williams, and Dalhouse used two tasks to assess skin color perceptions. The first task, a "face construction task", required subjects to select a real (one most like their own) then an ideal (the nicest or most beautiful) face from a selection of eleven faces which varied in skin color (one face was white while the other ten were various shades of black). The second task was a choose-a-person task. Here subjects were presented with five social situations and asked to select the persons described in the scenario. For example, in one scenario, subjects saw two
rows of ten men each (where the men were various skin colors). Subjects were told that "five of these twenty men pictured in this police lineup are convicted criminals, ten are undesirables, and five men have never committed a criminal act. Which five men in the picture do you think have never committed a criminal act (Hamm, et al., 1973, p. 1173)?"

Skin color preferences were assessed as the difference between the subjects' ideal and real skin color choices given in the first task. Subjects did not select ideal pictures that were lighter or darker than their choices for real skin color but subjects who were darker than the median did select darker ideal faces than subjects lighter than the median. This finding seems to indicate that a respondent's skin color serves as a reference point for decisions involving skin color differences.

Results from the second task, the "choose-a-person" task, showed no overall tendency for subjects to select a light or dark skinned person for the five evaluative social situations, although there was a significant tendency for subjects to select darker individuals for a party event. The authors also reported that across all choices, younger subjects attributed more positive values to darker skin than older subjects, and concluded that this difference was due to the fact that younger subjects have "had less cultural conditioning that black is bad."

Other studies conducted around the same time (Gregor & McPherson, 1966; and Hraba & Grant, 1970), and using similar techniques reported that black children attributed positive value to dark skin. Since neither task in this study produced preferences for either light or dark skin, the authors concluded that attitudes of young blacks towards dark skin have changed. The authors felt that overall, blacks attitudes towards dark skin have shifted from negative to neutral.
Anderson and Cromwell (1977) administered a questionnaire to black subjects concerning the relation of positive and negative stereotypes to skin color gradations (black, dark brown, light brown, light-skinned). One question on the questionnaire asked respondents to rate their own skin color. In addition, the experimenter also rated each subject on the same scale.

The results indicated that skin color stereotyping by black subjects was beginning to reflect the "black is beautiful" concept, although skin color preferences still tended in the direction of lighter skin. More specifically, the results indicated that light brown (not light skin) is preferred most often when evaluating positive characteristics. That is to say that light brown skin was seen as being associated with "smarter" and "prettier" individuals. When evaluating negative characteristics, the extremes of the color gradation were chosen most often with black chosen more often than light skin. Here, black skin was associated with characteristics such as the "dumbest", "ugliest", and "dirtiest" while light skin was associated with the "worst skin color to have" and the individual who "gets the best breaks". Although being the individual who gets the best breaks could be considered a positive characteristic, the authors classified it as negative due to its association with a skin color group to which negative rather than positive characteristics were attributed. The negativity of this statement was thought to reflect a hostility to light skinned individuals.

The study also showed that the values attached to skin color, by and large, were conditioned by the subjects' views of his own skin color, and their perceptions of what their parents like or dislike. More specifically, if an individual believed that his/her parent liked light skin more than dark
skin, he/she also reported a preference for light skin. Subjects also use their own skin color as a reference point for their perceptual ratings. However, independent of these influences, there was still a negative stereotype associated with extreme blackness. One problem faced by these researchers was that the "research met with resistance and hostility (Anderson, et al., 1977, p. 84)." This resistance and hostility may have produced more "politically correct" responses from subjects, thus leaving questions of the validity of the results.

The skin color literature does show some differences in the way light skinned and dark skinned individuals are perceived. A more broad interpretation of skin color results in racial categorization. Research investigating race differences provide varied results. Some of this literature will be highlighted here.

Research Investigating Race Effects

The primary focus of this study is to examine the effect of intraracial skin color differences on perceptions of job suitability. In order to accomplish this in an unobtrusive fashion and hopefully in a way that will reflect what may be encountered in the real world, that is utilizing measures where the skin color manipulation is not obvious, it is necessary to make use of stimulus persons of different races. Since race differences in they way an individual is evaluated for a job are not the main concern of this study, a comprehensive review of this literature will not be presented here. Interested readers should refer to articles such as Kraiger and Ford (1985) for a review of this literature.

Individuals who are categorized based on irrelevant variables such as race, are often deprived of jobs and educational opportunities, and often experience effects such as lower self-esteem. These outcomes are present
both inside and outside of occupational settings (Goffman, 1963; Jones, et al., 1984). Within occupational settings, these individuals may be denied access to jobs (Sutherland, 1990), or receive differential treatment in the job, such as lower pay, inadequate training opportunities, or biased performance evaluations (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986).

Although there has been some research which suggests that the old-fashioned racism (i.e., blatant, red-neck racism) has decreased (Weigel & Howes, 1985), there is still abundant evidence that racism is still present in our society today (e.g., Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986; Kinder, 1986). That is to say that research conducted on race differences by and large shows trends in minority races being discriminated against in a variety of situations. Terpstra and Larson (1980) suggest that within occupational settings, the type of job for which an individual is applying may play a role in discrimination. More specifically, black applicants were favored for black-held positions (e.g., building custodian) while white applicants were favored for white-held positions (e.g., lathe operator). This study seems to suggest that the status of the position may affect the perceived job suitability of different race applicants.

Although the trend for race differences is fairly clear from the research that has been conducted, there are studies where diverse results have been found. The findings of these studies vary from showing no race differences (Rand & Wexley, 1975), to race differences where whites are favored (Haefner, 1976), to race differences where blacks are favored (Newman & Krystofik, 1979).

One problem with studies such as those mentioned above is that the measures used are typically obviously related to prejudice. That is to say that the race manipulations are obvious to the subjects. In these cases,
many subjects, especially modern college students, may attempt to appear non-prejudiced when providing their responses. Therefore, one might expect to be able to detect some level of prejudice when non-obvious (unobtrusive) measures are used.

Stone, Stone, and Dipboye (1992) pointed out that there have in fact been clear effects of race found (i.e., whites displaying prejudice against blacks, although this prejudice is more subtle in form) when utilizing unobtrusive measures (e.g., studies that present race based stereotypes at a subconscious level) that have not been found in research utilizing obtrusive measures (e.g., subjects having subjects rate individuals who obviously differ by race, but otherwise seem the same). Although these (unobtrusive) studies did not necessarily deal with racism inside of the organizational context they serve their purpose in pointing out the potential confounds that may arise when using obtrusive measures.

Since skin color differences as well as racial differences do exist in the real world, they are important to the field of psychology. The ramifications such differences have in an occupational context are unclear from the literature and further investigation into these ramifications falls under the responsibility of the industrial-organizational psychologist. In order to open up a door for research involving skin color effects in occupational contexts, the following study was conducted. The goal of this study is to extend past skin color research by investigating the effects skin color differences have on: (1) perceptions of job suitability, and (2) perceptions of job related characteristics. Two experiments were designed as a means of investigating these relationships.
Experiment 1

Research involving skin color effects is new to industrial-organizational psychology. For this reason, the focus of this experiment is the documentation of the differences skin color differences have on perceptions of job suitability. Based on the past research involving skin color differences, the assumption is being made that light skin is viewed more favorably than dark skin. It is also being assumed that white-collar jobs are perceived more favorably than blue-collar jobs (i.e., white-collar jobs are considered higher status than blue-collar jobs).

It is hypothesized that, when focusing on black job applicants, light skinned blacks will be perceived as being more suitable for white-collar jobs than for blue-collar jobs, whereas dark skinned blacks will be seen as more suitable for blue-collar jobs than for white-collar jobs. Because the main interest of this study was in the skin color effects, and given the sometimes conflicting results found in previous race investigations, no specific hypotheses were made about the race differences. However, given that subjects in this study reviewed applications with both white and black photos attached, an analysis of race effects was done.

Subjects provided ratings of the applicants' job suitability. Job suitability is operationalized as an individual's perception of an applicant's qualifications for a particular job. The applicant's perceived qualifications may be based on a host of variables such as educational background, and previous employment experience. It is the goal of this experiment to determine whether the applicant's skin color is among the variables which influence perceptions of job suitability.
Method

Subjects. Fifty-three community college students (26 whites and 27 blacks) participated in this study. Each student was given extra credit in exchange for his or her participation. The racial breakdown of subjects (see Design below) was as follows: 14 black subjects (nine females, six males) provided ratings for blue-collar jobs, the remaining 13 black subjects (six females, seven males) provided ratings for white-collar jobs. Thirteen of the white subjects (eight females, five males) rated blue-collar jobs while the remaining 13 white subjects (seven females, six males) rated white-collar jobs.

Design. The study was comprised of a 3 x 2 x 2 factorial design. The independent variables were applicant skin color (white, light skinned black, dark skinned black), job status (white-collar job, blue-collar job), and subject race (white, black). The applicant skin color variable was manipulated within subjects. The job status and subject race variables were manipulated between subjects. The dependent measure was the job suitability ratings.

Each subject saw white, light skinned black, and dark skinned black applicants in order to expose them to a diversity of faces. However, since the main interest of this experiment was a comparison of light skinned black and dark skinned black applicants, the primary analysis was a 2 (applicant skin color: light skinned black, dark skinned black) x 2 (job status: white-collar job, blue-collar job) x 2 (subject race: white, black) design. A subsidiary analysis was done as a 2 (applicant race: white, black) x 2 (job status: white-collar job, blue-collar job) x 2 (subject race: white, black) design in order to check on whether or not subjects perceived any race differences in job suitability.
The stimulus person manipulation involved eight individuals. All stimulus pictures were of males with the racial breakdown as follows: five whites, one Hispanic, and two blacks (one light skinned, one dark skinned). A racially diverse picture array was desirable in an attempt to "mask" the skin color and race manipulations. Two picture arrays were developed. They each had the same racial breakdown described above, with the difference being in the black pictures. Two light skinned blacks and two dark skinned blacks were chosen in order to give a small sampling of light and dark skinned blacks. Approximately half the subjects saw light skinned stimulus person A and dark skinned stimulus person B, while the other subjects saw light skinned stimulus person C and dark skinned stimulus person D.

It is worth noting here that no hypotheses were made concerning the Hispanic stimulus person. Although the perceptions of people of other races and other cultures are important and should be investigated, it is beyond the scope of this study. The purpose of including an Hispanic stimulus person in this study was to diversify the stimulus races in order to more realistically the population and hopefully diminish the obtrusiveness of the study which would most likely exist with a strictly black and white stimulus pool.

Procedure. Subjects were told they were completing an occupational exercise by providing ratings of job suitability for several job applicants. The subjects were told that the experiment was a simulation of a real world task. That is that although the stimulus materials represent true applications and jobs, they are not real, nor was the task they were about to complete a real task (i.e., they were not actually selecting people to fill a real world position).
Subjects were given a folder containing eight applications (five with a white picture attached, one with an Hispanic picture, one with a light skin black picture, and one with a dark skin black picture). Each application contained personal/biographical information, educational history, work history, and references (see Appendix A). All applications were designed to be approximately equivalent in terms of suitability for the jobs. Each picture was seen on each application approximately an equal number of times providing counter-balancing within groups. Subjects were also given two job descriptions (see Appendix B). Half of the subjects were given descriptions of two white-collar jobs, the others were given descriptions of two blue-collar jobs. Subjects were then asked to independently rate each applicant on their suitability for each job using a 5 point scale with anchors of 1- Not suitable for the job (under-qualified) and 5- Not suitable for the job (overqualified) and a midpoint of 3- Moderately suitable for the job. After completing the rating task, subjects were asked to rate each of the eight photos on attractiveness, intelligence, and commitment (see Appendix B).

Finally, information concerning the subjects' age, gender, race, major, and year in school was requested (see Appendix B). In order to ensure anonymity no other identifying information was obtained. Subjects were assured that the information provided was for research purposes only and would be strictly confidential. Subjects were also asked to state in their own words what they felt was the primary objective of this study.

All subjects clearly understood that their participation in this study was strictly voluntary and they were allowed to refuse to answer any or all of the questions without penalty. All of the subjects agreed to participate in the study.
Stimulus materials. The application photos used in the study were of eight males. All subjects saw the same racial breakdown of the eight photos. Each set of applications had one dark skinned black and light skinned black.

There were a total of 16 applications. Eight applications were appropriate for evaluation for the white-collar jobs and eight applications were appropriate for evaluation for the blue-collar jobs. All applications and photos were counterbalanced so that each photo was seen with each application an approximately equal number of times within each condition.

Results

Analysis of skin color differences on job suitability ratings. The two job ratings (both either for white-collar jobs or for blue-collar jobs) provided by subjects were averaged for each applicant resulting in a 2 (applicant skin color: light skinned black, dark skinned black) x 2 (job status: white-collar, blue-collar) x 2 (subject race: white black) factorial design which was used to test this hypothesis on the effects of skin color. It was hypothesized that light skinned blacks would be rated as more suitable for white-collar jobs and dark skinned blacks would be rated as more suitable for blue-collar jobs. This hypothesis would be supported by a significant skin color by job status interaction. Overall, the hypothesis was not confirmed $F(1,49)= 0.04, p > .05$. However, the hypothesis was supported when considering only the white subjects, while the responses from black subjects were exactly opposite from those predicted (i.e., black subjects rated dark skinned applicants as being more suitable for white-collar jobs and light skinned blacks as being more suitable for blue-collar jobs). This difference produced a significant three-way interaction of
applicant skin color by job status by subject race $F (1,49)= 35.87, p < .0001$, (See Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Analyses did not detect any other significant main effects, or two-way interactions (all $F < 1.50$). In order to understand the three-way interaction, $t$-tests were computed comparing the mean ratings for light skinned and dark skinned applicants provided by black and white subjects for white-collar and blue-collar jobs. Significance levels of at least $p < .05$ were reached for three of the four mean differences.

In addition to the job suitability ratings, ratings of the attractiveness, intelligence, and commitment were collected for the stimulus pictures. Analyses detected a moderately significant difference in the way light and dark skinned individuals were seen on level of commitment, $F (1,48)= 2.805, p < .10$, where dark skinned individuals were perceived as more committed. The differences between light and dark skinned individuals on attractiveness and intelligence were not statistically significant, $F (1,48)= 0.238$ and $F (1,48)= 0.09$ respectively.

**Analysis of racial differences on job suitability ratings.** Although they were not the primary interest, race differences were also examined. A reasonable hypothesis was that subjects would rate white applicants as more suitable for white-collar jobs while rating black applicants as more suitable for blue-collar jobs. A 2 (applicant race: white, black) x 2 (job status: white-collar, blue-collar) x 2 (subject race: white
### Table 1

Mean Job Suitability Ratings for Light and Dark Skinned Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Subjects</th>
<th>White Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>light skin</td>
<td>dark skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>3.731**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>(.546)</td>
<td>(.753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-Collar</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>2.679*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>(.859)</td>
<td>(.992)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Higher scores indicate more favorable job suitability ratings.

Significance of skin color comparisons indicated by *$p < .05$,  **$p < .01$**

Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.
black) factorial design was used to test this hypothesis. Following the pattern for skin color, we might expect a race of applicant by job status by subject race interaction. This three-way interaction was not significant, $F(1,49)= 0.28$, $p > .05$. However, there was also a significant tendency for black applicants to be rated higher for white-collar jobs while there was no race differences in ratings for blue-collar jobs thus providing a applicant race by job status interaction, $F(1,49)= 6.09$, $p < .05$ (see Table 2).

Insert Table 2 about here

When examining the mean job suitability ratings, there was a tendency for subjects to rate black applicants as more suitable than white applicants for both white-collar and blue-collar jobs, $F(1,49)= 9.80$, $p < .01$ (see Table 3). (The analyses did not detect any other significant effects, all $F < 1.10$).

In addition to the job suitability ratings, ratings of the attractiveness, intelligence, and commitment were collected for the stimulus pictures. Analyses detected significant differences in the way white and black applicants were seen on attractiveness and intelligence, $F(1,48)= 10.09$, $p < .01$ and $F(1,48)= 4.734$, $p < .05$ respectively. In both of these cases, black applicants were rated more favorably than white applicants. The difference on commitment was not significant, $F(1,48)= 0.89$.

Insert Table 3 about here
Table 2

Mean Job Suitability Ratings Given To White and Black Applicants For White-Collar and Blue-Collar Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Applicants</th>
<th>Black Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar Jobs</td>
<td>2.731</td>
<td>3.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>(.479)</td>
<td>(.518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-Collar Jobs</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>3.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>(.533)</td>
<td>(.709)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher scores indicate more favorable job suitability ratings. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.
Table 3
Mean Job Suitability Ratings Given By Subjects For White and Black Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Applicants</th>
<th>Black Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>3.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>(.538)</td>
<td>(.555)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.844</td>
<td>3.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>(.501)</td>
<td>(.689)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher ratings indicate applicant is perceived as more favorably suited for the jobs. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.
Discussion

The findings of this study show a more complex relationship between skin color and perceptions of job suitability than that which was hypothesized. The presence of subject race moderating the effect of skin color differences on these ratings was unexpected and intriguing. Although this experiment was successful in documenting an effect of intraracial skin color differences, it did not address the question of why these differences were found.

Since the subject's race moderated the effects of skin color, it is likely that there are different explanations for the differences that were detected. White subjects responded in the way that was hypothesized. Specifically, they preferred light skinned applicants for white-collar jobs and dark skinned applicants for blue-collar jobs. It is possible that light skinned applicants are perceived more favorably as a reflection of the real world advantages they tend to possess. By this it is meant that since light skinned blacks tend to have the better real world jobs, it is possible that white subjects have formed a stereotype that light skinned blacks are more suitable to white-collar jobs. For example, a white person may have observed light skinned blacks performing quite capably in white-collar jobs and have seen dark skinned blacks as succeeding only at blue-collar jobs. Thus the perceiver may have formed a stereotype that light skinned blacks have more positive traits, especially those related to white-collar job competence. A similar argument has been made by Eagly and Steffen (1984) about gender stereotypes. Eagly and Steffen argue that women are perceived as more nurturing and caring and as less competent on
professional job skills because people more often see women in roles that emphasize the former traits.

Another possible explanation is that the responses of the white subjects is affected by conscious or unconscious prejudice. Perhaps the white subjects dislike blacks and judge dark skinned blacks more harshly because they look more like their prototypes of the black who is the object of their prejudice. It is also possible that these subjects favor the light skinned blacks because they look more "white" and thus seem more similar to the white subjects.

Contrary to prediction, black subjects preferred the dark skinned applicant for the white-collar positions while selecting the light skinned applicant as more suitable for the blue-collar position. There are several possible explanations for this finding. First, it is possible that the black population now defines the dark skinned individual as somehow "more black" than the light skinned individual, almost making the light skinned individual part of the out-group. Thus preference for the dark skinned individual is simply placing "one of their own" in a coveted position. A second alternative explanation comes from the experimenter's observation (although no record was made) that the vast majority of the black subjects were themselves dark skinned. Rating the dark skinned applicant more favorably for the higher status position may be a way of compensating for any discrimination they have experienced as a dark skinned black. A final alternative, similar to the previous one, is that black subjects, aware of (and possibly embarrassed by) the effects skin color has are overcompensating for the dark skinned black, and in a sense are attempting to "right" the "wrong" that has occurred in the past. Support for this idea of overcompensating was provided by comments made by some of the black
students. For example, one black subject commented that "I don't see things that way (meaning that light and dark skinned blacks do not differ), after all look at me, I live that life." This remark seems to reject the "taboo" which exists in the black community against the idea of skin color differences having real world consequences. Yet study results indicate that black subjects favored dark skin when considering job suitability. This remark and others similar to it seem to lean towards the explanation that black subjects are unconsciously overcompensating for the dark skinned individual in their ratings.

The lack of significant racial differences on job suitability ratings was counter to the hypothesis. It is possible that since society appears to be more aware of the connotations associated with acting in a discriminatory way toward minorities, they are more careful to respond in a "politically correct" way. This is not to say that there is no longer race discrimination taking place, but that with the manipulation used in this study, the race differences were fairly obvious to subjects. A less obtrusive measure will likely reflect more realistic differences, as suggested by Stone, Stone, and Dipboye (1992). It should be noted here that although the race manipulation should probably be considered obtrusive, the study materials will not be changed in the second experiment. It is the skin color differences which of are interest in the second experiment and since this manipulation was not obvious to subjects, the same materials will be used.

Experiment 2a

This study was designed to be a replication and extension of the first experiment. After documentation of skin color differences in Experiment 1, a second study was developed in order to further explore a possible
driving force behind these differences. It was decided to investigate the role stereotypes may have played in producing the unexpected three-way interaction between applicant skin color, job status, and subject race which was detected in the first study.

Several hypotheses have been proposed in order to account for intraracial skin color discrimination. Several of these hypotheses have been discussed with examples cited in *The Color Complex* (Russell, Wilson, & Hall, 1992). Since some of these theories would be difficult to test and given that a direct connection between them and discrimination in an occupational setting is not apparently clear, not all of them will be discussed here. For those theories not mentioned, interested readers should refer to Russell, et al., (1992, pp. 54-61).

One chapter of *The Color Complex* is dedicated entirely to color discrimination in the workplace. It highlights a recent court case in which a light skinned black female filed a complaint of skin color discrimination against a darker skinned supervisor under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The case was found in favor of the defendant for lack of supporting evidence, but in deciding the case the judge was clear to state that intraracial skin color discrimination can and does exist. The first experiment was able to document this existence, but there is still the lingering question as to why such differences do occur.

One explanation for skin color differences has been termed the "mulatto hypothesis." The "mulatto hypothesis" puts forth that some blacks, mostly those of lighter skin and presumably mixed ancestry (therefore the term mulatto), could excel in the intellectual arena while blacks as a whole were believed to be ineducable. This theory has its
origins in slavery when masters tended to choose light skinned slaves for the more responsible indoor work believing that having white blood aided them in overcoming blacks' basic inferiority.

Another position, put forth by Bonnie Allen, a free-lance writer, is that "up until World War II- when blacks became a force in the job market... it was easier to get a job if you were light skinned... because you'd had more opportunities for education." This perspective considers background as an important contributor to occupational access.

Another explanation for skin color differences may be inferred from white employers' responses to the 1964 Civil Rights Act. These employers found that they could meet the new employment guidelines while minimizing the visible presence of new black employees by hiring light skinned blacks. This policy soon met with resistance and outcry from black leaders, at which time, white employers began to diversify the skin color of blacks hired. Yet, some black officials still maintain that there are certain areas, especially in civil service, where there are a disproportionate amount of light skinned blacks.

A final explanation for skin color differences is that since light skinned blacks are at an advantage in the real world (regardless as to how they got to be advantaged), there is a "stereotype" associated with them that they have more competence in job related traits. That is to say that since light skinned blacks tend to hold positions of status and responsibility, they are also seen as possessing the traits necessary to be successful in such positions.

Previous studies investigating this association have shown mixed results as to whether or not there are different sets of traits associated with light skinned and dark skinned individuals. Secord, Bevan, and Katz
(1956) used questionnaires to assess traits associated with difference blacks and whites, and light skinned and dark skinned individuals. Whites were rated higher (more characteristic) on, among other traits, honest face, intelligent look, and air of responsibility. Black faces were rated higher on, among other traits, lazy, untidy, and immoral. The ratings given to very light skinned blacks (who were mistaken for white by a few subjects) were closer to those given to whites that those given to blacks, although this difference was not significant.

Brand, Ruiz, and Padilla (1974) review a study by C.S. Johnson in which dark skinned blacks received a disproportionately large number of negative evaluations on value statements concerning "attractiveness" and "personality." Thus there seems to be reason to suspect that stereotypes are affecting the ratings of job suitability provided in Experiment 1.

In the present experiment, it is expected that there will be specific traits associated with white-collar jobs and specific traits associated with blue-collar jobs. It is hypothesized that applicants will be perceived as possessing the traits relevant to the job for which they are seen as suitable. More specifically, white subjects are expected to rate light skinned applicants higher on white-collar traits and dark skinned applicants higher on blue-collar traits. The opposite is hypothesized to be true for black subjects. That is to say, black subjects should rate light skinned applicants higher on blue-collar traits and dark skinned applicants higher white-collar traits.

Method

Subjects. Subjects were thirty-seven community college students (17 whites and 20 blacks). All subjects were given extra credit points in their course in exchange for their participation in the study. The racial
breakdown of subjects was as follows: 18 subjects (ten blacks- four females, four males- and eight whites- four females, four males) rated blue-collar jobs, while the remaining 19 subjects (ten blacks- five females, five males- and nine whites- four females, five males) rated white-collar jobs.

Procedure. For this experiment, subjects were given the same two job descriptions reviewed by those completing Experiment 1. Thus they evaluated applications for either two white-collar jobs or two blue-collar jobs. Subjects were asked to rate both jobs on the a list of ten characteristics (see Table 4 and Appendix C). The characteristics they saw were generated from literature of similar studies (Feldman, 1972; Hopper, 1977; Secord, et al., 1956; Brand, et al., 1974; Anderson, 1968). In some cases, synonyms or antonyms were used in order to update the characteristics, to keep them positive, and to refrain from heightening the subjects' suspicions (e.g., highly literate was used instead of illiterate, and physical strength was used instead of coarse or athletic). Since many of the black stereotype traits are negative and possibly somewhat reactive, it would be better to use positive characteristics where a low score on that characteristic would indicate the black stereotype. A five point scale was used to rate the characteristics with anchors of 5- extremely high amount of the characteristic is required for the job and 1- extremely low amount of the characteristic is required for the job, and with a mid-point of 3- an average amount of the characteristic is required for the job.

These subjects were also asked to rate the attractiveness, commitment, and intelligence of the photos seen on the applications by subjects who completed Experiment 1. In addition, subjects were asked to rate the overall quality of a set of a applications reviewed by subjects in
Experiment 1 (seen here without the pictures attached). Subjects saw either a set of applications appropriate for white-collar jobs, or a set appropriate for blue-collar jobs. A five point scale was used to rate the quality of these applications with anchors of 5- extremely high quality and 1- extremely low quality, and with a mid-point of 3- average quality. The ratings given to the applications was peripheral to the study conducted, and were not analyzed.

Finally, information about the subjects' age, race, gender, year in school, and major was collected. No other identifying information was collected in order to ensure anonymity. Subjects were also asked to state in their own words what they felt the purpose of the study was.

Results

**Analysis of job characteristics.** It should be recalled that each subject rated two jobs (either white-collar jobs or blue-collar jobs) on the list of traits. Two separate principal components analyses were performed (one on the first job rated, the other on the second job rated). Given that the resulting factor structures were similar, all job ratings were used in a single principal components analysis. Thus each subject provided ten ratings for each of the two jobs, for a total of 20 ratings per subject. Both white-collar job and blue-collar job ratings were included in the same analysis.

The principal components analysis yielded two factors with eigenvalues whose values exceeded 1.00. These values were 4.74 and 1.40. The varimax rotation method was then applied to estimate the factor loadings. The results of the varimax rotation are given in Table 4.
In examining the resulting factor structure, one might formulate some preliminary interpretations. For Factor 1, the variables which showed the highest correlations (high literacy, creativity, intelligence, ambition, and practicality) tended to be characteristics that formed a competence/intellectual dimension. Factor 2 (hard-working, dedication, productivity, cooperative, and physical strength) appeared to be a motivational/goal-oriented factor. These factors may be applied to white-collar jobs and blue-collar jobs, respectively. Analysis of the means for the factors shows support for making this distinction (see Table 5).

The $t$-tests conducted on the factor scores revealed a significant difference for factor 1, $t (72)= -6.80$, $p < .01$ and a moderately significant difference for factor 2, $t (72)= 1.60$, $p < .11$. This shows that ratings of the traits on the competence/intellectual factor (factor 1) were significantly higher for white-collar jobs than for blue-collar jobs. The trait ratings for the motivational/goal-oriented factor (factor 2) are somewhat higher for blue-collar jobs than for white-collar jobs.
Table 4
Factor Structure for White-Collar and Blue-Collar Jobs Resulting from
the Principal Components Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Literacy</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Working</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Strength</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values are multiplied by 100 and rounded to the nearest integer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue-Collar Job</td>
<td>-0.638*</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar Job</td>
<td>0.604*</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Significance in factor score differences indicated by * p < .01*
These differences do confirm that there are some of the ten traits associated with white-collar jobs and others associated more with blue-collar jobs. In order to test the hypothesis that trait based stereotypes are influencing the skin color effect, analysis of the applicants on these traits is necessary. The investigation of this hypothesis was the focus of Experiment 2b.

Experiment 2b

It should be recalled that this study was designed as a replication and extension of Experiment 1. Thus the goal was two-fold. First, it was desirable to replicate the significant three-way interaction detected in the first experiment. The second goal was to investigate whether or not perceptions of job related traits affect the relationship between skin color and job suitability.

Method

Subjects. The subjects were twenty-nine community college students (16 whites and 13 blacks). All students were given extra credit points for their class in exchange for their participation. The racial breakdown of subjects (see Design below) was as follows: seven black subjects (four females, three males) provided ratings for blue-collar jobs, the remaining six black subjects (two females, four males) provided ratings for white-collar jobs, eight of the white subjects (three females, five males) rated blue-collar jobs while the remaining eight white subjects (four females, four males) rated white-collar jobs.

Design. The design was a 2 x 2 x 2 with applicant skin color (light skinned black, dark skinned black), subject race (white, black), and job status (white-collar, blue-collar) as the independent variables. Applicant race was a within subject variable, while job status was a between subject
variable. The dependent variables were ratings of the degree to which job applicants were seen as possessing various characteristics, and ratings of perceived job suitability.

Procedure. The task was simply a replication and extension of the first experiment. Subjects were given the same materials and instructions as with the first experiment. The exception to this was that they were also given a list of the same ten characteristics seen by subjects in Experiment 2a. Subjects were asked to rate each of the applicants on these ten characteristics using a 5 point scale (more will be said about this later). As in Experiment 1, subjects rated each applicant on job suitability, and also rated the photos of the applicants on attractiveness, commitment, and intelligence.

Stimulus Materials. The majority of the materials seen by subjects for the this experiment were described in Experiment 1 and will not be repeated here (these are listed in Appendix A and Appendix B). The new material they saw was simply the list of ten (positive) characteristics upon which they were asked to rate each of the applicants. A five point scale used to rate the characteristics, with anchors of 5- applicant possesses an extremely high amount of the characteristic and 1- applicant possesses an extremely low amount of the characteristic, and with a mid-point of 3- applicant possesses an average amount of the characteristic.

Results

Analysis of skin color differences on job suitability ratings. As simply a replication of the significant three-way interaction found in the first experiment it was hypothesized that white subjects would rate light skinned applicants as being more suitable for white-collar jobs, while rating dark skinned applicants as being more suitable for blue-collar jobs.
Also, it was hypothesized that black subjects would rate dark skinned applicants as being more suitable for white collar jobs while rating light skinned applicants as more suitable for blue-collar jobs. A 2 (applicant skin color: light skinned, dark skinned) x 2 (job status: white-collar, blue-collar) x 2 (subject race: white, black) factorial design was used to test these hypotheses.

The analysis of variance did not detect any significant main effects or any significant two-way interactions (all $F < 2.00$). However, the predicted three-way interaction was significant $F (1,25) = 43.8201$, $p < .0001$, thus providing support for the hypotheses. As can be seen in Table 6, all ratings were in the hypothesized direction.

Insert Table 6 about here

Finally, t-tests conducted to detect statistical in the differences between the means for skin color revealed that three of the four mean differences were statistically significant.

In addition to the job suitability ratings, ratings of the attractiveness, intelligence, and commitment were collected for the stimulus pictures. Analyses detected a significant difference in the way light skinned and dark skinned individuals were seen on level of commitment, $F (1,62) = 7.937$, $p < .01$. This difference was due to the fact that light skinned blacks were rated lower that dark skinned blacks. The differences on attractiveness and intelligence were not significant, $F (1,62) = 0.002$ and $F (1,62) = 0.521$, respectively.
### Table 6
Mean Job Suitability Ratings for Light and Dark Skinned Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black Subjects</th>
<th>White Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>light skin</td>
<td>dark skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.833**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>(.758)</td>
<td>(.516)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-Collar</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>2.071**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>(1.058)</td>
<td>(1.272)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Higher scores indicate more favorable job suitability ratings.

Significance of skin color comparisons indicated by *p < .05, **p < .01
Analysis of perceived applicant characteristics. Ratings of the eight applicants on the list of traits were collected in order to determine if the perceptions of various characteristics mediated the relationship between skin color and job suitability. A reasonable hypothesis would be that job applicants are perceived as possessing various characteristics and it is these perceptions which influence the type of job for which they are seen as being suitable. More specifically, given that there were significant three-way interactions detected in Experiment 1 and previously in this experiment, it was expected that white and black subjects used different criteria to evaluate the applicants. Because all application materials seen by both races of subjects were the same, it is likely that some perception of the applicants is affecting the resulting job suitability ratings. It is expected that light skinned blacks and dark skinned blacks are seen as possessing different job related characteristics. In turn, the perceptions of these applicants on the various traits are expected to affect the job suitability ratings. For example, given that black subjects saw light skinned blacks as more suited for blue-collar jobs, it would be expected that they also see these applicants as possessing more “blue-collar” traits than “white-collar” traits. Thus, if the hypothesis is correct, black subjects perception of which traits the light skinned applicant possesses should influence the job suitability ratings.

Two versions of path analyses were conducted in order to determine whether or not the trait ratings mediated the relationship between skin color and job suitability. From the factor analysis presented earlier, white-collar traits and blue-collar traits were defined (with white-collar traits being those that loaded on factor 1 - high literacy, creativity, intelligence, ambition, and practicality- and blue-collar traits being those that loaded on
factor 2 - hard-working, dedication, productivity, cooperative, and physical strength). Each subject was assigned a white-collar score and a blue-collar score for each applicant they rated. These scores were simply an average of the ratings they provided for these traits. These scores served as the mediating variables tested in the first version of the path analysis. The correlations between the white-collar and blue-collar scores were fairly high (Pearson correlation coefficients ranged from 0.752 to 0.889), so in the second version of the path analysis the mediating variable tested was simply an average of all the trait ratings provided for an applicant (this variable was called the trait score).

Each of the two versions of the path analysis were comprised of four different models. Each had a model for black subjects rating blue-collar jobs, for black subjects rating white-collar jobs, for white subjects rating blue-collar jobs, and for white subjects rating white-collar jobs. It was necessary to conduct these separate paths due to the interaction detected in the earlier experiments which suggests that black and white subjects would respond differently to skin color differences depending on the job they are rating. Thus investigating the trait based stereotypes for the various subject race by job status combinations was possible.

In order to establish mediation, three conditions must be met, as set forth by Baron and Kenny (1986), for each of the eight models. First, applicant skin color must significantly affect the trait ratings. Second, applicant skin color must affect the job suitability ratings. Last of all, the trait ratings must affect the job suitability ratings. Once these conditions are met, then it must be shown that the effect on the job suitability of the applicant skin color with the trait ratings is less than the effect the applicant skin color alone has on job suitability.
The conditions mentioned above were not met for any of the eight analyses conducted. Although some of the paths were statistically significant, there was not a case in which all three of the necessary paths were significant, thus no support for the hypothesis was detected. Consequently, trait based ratings did not mediate the relationship between skin color and perceptions of applicant job suitability. The results of the analyses will not be presented here.

Analysis of race differences on job suitability ratings. Although they were not the primary interest, race differences were also examined. A reasonable hypothesis was that subjects would rate white applicants as more suitable for white-collar jobs while rating black applicants as more suitable for blue-collar jobs. A 2 (applicant race: white, black) x 2 (job status: white-collar, blue-collar) x 2 (subject race: white black) factorial design was used to test this hypothesis. The prediction was a race of applicant by job status by subject race interaction. This three-way interaction was not significant, $F(1,49)= 0.07, p > .05$. The analyses did not detect any other significant effects, although there was a marginally significant main effect of subject race, $F(1,25)= 4.17, p < .10$, where white subjects rated all stimulus person higher on the job suitability scale.

In addition to the job suitability ratings, ratings of the attractiveness, intelligence, and commitment were collected for the stimulus pictures. Analyses detected significant differences in the way white and black individuals were seen on attractiveness, $F(1,62)= 3.76, p < .05$, intelligence, $F(1,62)= 8.699, p < .01$, and commitment $F(1,62)= 7.49, p < .01$. Specifically, blacks were rated higher than whites on all three of the characteristics.
Discussion

This second experiment was conducted with two primary goals in mind. First it was desirable to replicate the results found in the first experiment, given that the results from that experiment were somewhat unexpected. The second goal of this experiment was to investigate whether or not stereotypes were a potential force behind these skin color effects.

Replication of the intriguing three-way interaction detected in the first experiment was successful in this experiment. White subjects perceived light skinned blacks as being more suitable for white-collar jobs and dark skinned blacks as being more suitable for blue-collar jobs. Black subjects did the opposite, rating dark skinned blacks as more suitable for white-collar jobs and light skinned blacks as more suitable for blue-collar jobs.

Since the replication was successful, it was desirable to analyze the trait ratings that were added to the data collected in this experiment in an attempt to detect stereotypes of light skinned and dark skinned blacks. The trait ratings for the jobs revealed two factors, one consisting of "white-collar" traits, the other consisting of "blue-collar" traits. An analysis of the resulting factor scores revealed that white-collar jobs were positively correlated with the factor of "white-collar" traits and negatively correlated with the factor of "blue-collar" traits and that blue-collar jobs were positively correlated with the factor of "blue-collar" traits and negatively correlated with the factor of "white-collar" traits.

After confirming two separate factors of traits, the ratings given to light skinned and dark skinned applicants for these traits were investigated. Path analyses were unable to confirm the role of the traits as a mediating variable in the relationship between skin color and job suitability.
Although these results were not very encouraging, they do not necessarily eliminate the possibility of stereotypes affecting the relationship between skin color and job suitability. The inability to test the significance of the mediator in this experiment may be due to the traits that were selected for the analysis. The traits that were rated were selected and phrased in a way so as not to be reactive. It is possible that this selection process in a sense reduced the relationship between the traits and job suitability. The lack of significant paths may also be due to a lack of power in the tests given that there was a fairly small sample size for each of the path analyses conducted (N ranging from 12 to 16).

In addition, although a factor analysis conducted revealed two separate factors, seven of the ten traits analyzed (intelligence, ambition, practicality, hard-working, dedication, productivity, and cooperative) loaded somewhat highly on both of the resulting factors. This may have affected the relationship between the traits and the job suitability ratings if the distinction between "white-collar" traits and "blue-collar" traits was not apparently clear. Although the mediator tested in this experiment was not significant, this does not necessarily conclude that there is not some mediating variable or variables affecting the skin color-job suitability relationship, or even that trait-based stereotypes serve as the mediator. However, it is possible that stereotypes are not responsible for the effect of skin color difference in job suitability, but rather that there is prejudice influencing these differences. More will be said about this in the general discussion.

General Discussion

The present research focused on the effect of skin color differences on perceptions of job suitability. In addition, the influence that
stereotyping of light skinned and dark skinned blacks has on these job suitability perceptions was investigated. As mentioned earlier, for white subjects, light skinned blacks were perceived as being more suitable for white-collar jobs and as possessing more characteristics associated with white-collar jobs. For black subjects, it was dark skinned blacks that were perceived as being more suitable for white-collar jobs, and again as possessing characteristics associated with white-collar jobs. Caution must be taken when interpreting these results, when discussing the implications the results have, and when considering what steps should be taken next.

The question as to why light skinned and dark skinned blacks are perceived differently for white-collar and blue-collar jobs was unanswered by the results of this study. It is still possible that stereotypes associated with light skinned and with dark skinned blacks are responsible for the differences in their perception of job suitability. What is not known is whether such a stereotype is based on traits not included in this study, or if the traits in conjunction with another variable or variables (such as background, or perceived organizational fit) are the basis of stereotypically driven skin color differences. Future research should attempt to detect these and other mediating variables which affect the skin color-job suitability relationship.

Another possible explanation, which should be investigated in the future, is that of prejudice. It is possible that white subjects, who possess some bias against blacks, are more biased against darker skinned individuals because they appear to be “more black” than light skinned individuals. While the lighter skinned blacks are favored somewhat perhaps because they look more like whites do. For the black subjects, there could be a bias against whites, which is transferred to light skinned
individuals since they look “more white” than do darker skinned individuals.

In order to heighten awareness of the skin color issue and to better understand the reasons why differences related to skin color occur, we need more research. I think that it is of importance to mention here that there is a need for developing better methodology for studying skin color effects. As mentioned earlier, Stone, Stone, and Dipboye (1992) attributed the diverse findings in the race literature to the obtrusiveness of the study. It is very likely that the race manipulation was indeed obvious to the subjects, especially when considering that all subjects tended to rate blacks as more suitable than whites for jobs. Fortunately the manipulation of interest, the skin color effect, was not readily apparent to the subjects even given the rudimentary manipulation. Thus the study was able to detect differences in the way light skinned and dark skinned individuals were perceived. The advantage of developing better ways of measuring such differences is that even more subtle differences can be detected. This would be helpful when investigating other variables that may serve as mediators in the skin color-job suitability relationship.

As far as future research is concerned, we simply need more studies done that will address the problems associated with skin color differences. This research should also branch out into other ethnicities such as Hispanics, and Indians. Future research should also expand into other areas such as investigating skin color differences in social situations, and examining the psychological consequences associated with skin color perceptions. Although these areas are important, suggestions for future research discussed here will consider the black community, and will be within the realm of industrial-organizational psychology.
The perceptions of suitability of job applicants was rated simply from an employment application. Other methods used by organizations to screen an select job applicants should also be investigated to determine whether or not skin color effects are still present. For example, it is possible that the interaction with the job applicant in an interview may "override" any potential skin color biases.

The present study focused only on access of light and dark skinned blacks to organizations, while no attention was given to their treatment in organizations. There are two areas of potential interest when considering treatment. First there is simply documentation of the effect. It is possible that once working in a position, whatever stereotype was responsible for producing skin color effects when considering suitability has been dissipated. Second, it would be of interest to investigate how light skinned and dark skinned blacks are treated in both white and black organizations and whether or not the treatment of light and dark skinned individuals reflects the same effects found in the suitability ratings.

The findings of black subjects, although consistent across studies, were not initially expected by the author. I feel that there is a need for future studies to investigate what might be mediating these findings. One potential mediator is the subjects' skin color. This variable, while not recorded by the experimenter, has been shown as influencing perceptions in previous studies (Ransford, 1970; Edwards, 1973; Anderson and Cromwell, 1977). It is possible that dark skinned blacks would view dark skinned applicants more favorably, while light skinned applicants would fair better with light skinned subjects.

Future research should also use white, light skinned black, and dark skinned black experimenters in order to investigate whether or not
experimenter race/skin color has an effect on the ratings subjects provide. In all experiments conducted for this study, the author, a dark skinned, black female, served as the experimenter. When considering the results of race differences (blacks were rated more favorably) it is possible that subjects may have been trying to appear non-prejudiced in the presence of a black experimenter, or may simply have been careful to respond in the "socially desirable" way. For skin color effects, it is doubtful that the experimenter's dark skin affected the responses given by white subjects since the skin color issue is not well known within the white population. However, the experimenter's dark skin may have produced the reversal of responses provided by black subjects. Because, as a whole, the black population is aware of and cautious about skin color differences, the black subjects may have been responding in a "socially desirably" way for the black community. That is to say that, in the presence of a dark skinned experimenter and knowledgeable of skin color differences in the black community, they may have rated dark skinned applicants more favorably in an attempt to avoid discriminating based on color.

Finally, another variable which deserves consideration is the subjects level of "black pride". There are a great number of clubs, social organizations, and activities that endorse the "black cause". An individual's strong belief in and commitment to such issues may affect their reaction to skin color differences. For example, an individual with a strong belief in contributing to black run and owned businesses may respond differently to skin color differences than an individual who is not committed to that issue.

It is difficult to propose a means for remedying the effects of skin color differences. A legislative approach to combating skin color
discrimination is not appropriate. We can no more make it illegal to discriminate against dark skinned blacks as we can make it illegal to discriminate against brunettes, or people with green eyes, or "lefties". This leaves us with the responsibility of making society more aware of the skin color issue and encouraging social sensitivity directed towards individuals of darker skin complexions.

Again, there is difficulty involved with heightening awareness of the skin color issue. Primarily, this difficulty stems from within the black population. Within the black community, the skin color issue has long been considered unmentionable, and has even been called the "last taboo". While "most blacks are careful about letting whites in on their 'dirty little secret'... whites ought not be isolated from the concerns of blacks, especially since they so often have the power to hire [and] promote... them... [after all] ignorance of another's culture only breeds racism" (Russell, et al., 1992, p. 3).

Research conducted on the skin color issue needs to be presented to the black community as a means of raising awareness of the issue among whites as well as blacks. It must be stressed that the goal is not a harmful one. Rather, the intention is to produce "informed individual[s who] can make choices more freely and can better resist social practices and cultural attitudes that are meaningless and unfair (Russell, et al., 1992, p. 7).

Given that this study was able to detect differences in perception of job suitability for light and dark skinned blacks, future research needs to be done. Some areas which logically follow from these experiments were discussed. The goal of this research and others like it should all be the same, to gain a better understanding of how individual characteristics systematically are seen differently by different people.
I feel it is necessary to again address the black community on this issue of skin color. There is bound to be a very negative reaction to research such as this and even more negativity directed to the thought that more research should be done on the skin color issue. But I strongly believe that the potential benefits of such research by far outweigh the "emotional costs" blacks have associated with this issue. In understanding intraracial color discrimination, it must first be understood that colorism is a product of societal racism. It is not something that must be hidden away from the white community. It is long past time to open up discussion and research on this subject, because despite claims made by others, this issue is still present in 1993 and its effects reach out into many facets of life, education, socioeconomic status, self-esteem, and as demonstrated in this paper, occupational organizations.
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APPENDIX A

Sample job applications
application for employment

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Date: Oct 9, 1992  Social Security Number: 453-26-1942

Name: John Harrison  Age: 22  Sex: Male

Present Address: 6372 Weithimer Rd  Houston, Texas  77024

Permanent Address: 1601 Royal Crest Drive  Austin, TX 78741

Phone Number: 668-7900  Own Home X  Rent  Board

Date of Birth: 11-21-63  Height: 5' 10"  Weight: 170  Hair Color: Brown  Eye Color: Brown

Married: Single  Widowed  Divorced  Separated

Number of Children: 0  Dependents other than Wife or Children: 0

U.S. Citizen: Yes X  No  Referred By: Newspaper ad

If Related to Anyone in Our Employment, State Name and Department:

EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Name and Location of School</th>
<th>Years Attended</th>
<th>Date Graduated</th>
<th>Subjects Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar School</td>
<td>Wiley Elementary Austin, Texas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aug 1990</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or Business School</td>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aug 1990</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects of Speciality or Research Work:

What Foreign Languages Do You Speak Fluently? Read X Write

U.S. Military or Naval Service Rank Present Membership in National Guard or Reserves

Activities Other Than Religious (Civic, Athletic, Fraternal, etc.) Golden Key National Honor Society member

Hospital volunteer

EXCLUDE ORGANIZATIONS, THE NAME OR CHARACTER OF WHICH INDICATES THE RACE, CREED, COLOR, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN OF ITS MEMBERS.
FORMER EMPLOYERS
(List Below Last Four Employers, Starting With Last One First)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Month and Year</th>
<th>Name and Address of Employer</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From June 1990</td>
<td>Herman Hospital, Houston, Texas</td>
<td>$350/mo</td>
<td>Administration Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From August, 1988</td>
<td>City National Bank, Austin, Texas</td>
<td>$950/mo</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To May, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFERENCES:
(List the Names of Three Persons Not Related To You, Whom You Have Known At Least One Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Years Acquainted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Scott</td>
<td>3200 Fox Hollow, Round Rock, TX, Clerk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Harrison</td>
<td>4545 S. Post Oak, Houston, TX, Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Brown</td>
<td>2310 Harris St, Austin, TX, Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I authorize investigation of all statements in this application. I understand that misrepresentation or omission of facts is a cause for dismissal. Further, I understand that my employment is for an indefinite period and may, regardless of the date of payment of my wages and salary, be terminated at any time without any previous notice.

Date: Oct 9, 1992
Signature: [Signature]

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

REMARKS:

Neatness | Character
---------|----------

Personality | Ability
-----------|---------

Hired | For Dept. | Position | Will Report | Salary |
-----|-----------|----------|-------------|--------|

Approved: 1 | 2 | 3

Employment Manager | Dept. Head | General Manager
application for employment

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Date 10-13-92 Social Security Number 46-1-90-3251e
Name MARGUS GOVAN Age 25 Sex MALE
Present Address 5011 FOURNAISE DR #1122 HOUSTON, TX 77001
Permanent Address SAME
Phone Number 713-7992 Own Home Rent X Board
Date of Birth 8-18-67 Height 6'2" Weight 205 lb Hair Color Eye Color BROWN
Marital Status X Single Widowed Divorced Separated
Number of Children 2 Dependents other than Wife or Children
U.S. Citizen yes X no Referred by FRIEND
If Related to Anyone in Our Employ, State Name and Department

EDUCATION

Name and Location of School Name and Location of School

Grammar School
J.T. HABERSON ELEMENTARY BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
High School

Work NELSON H.S. College
Boston MA Massachusetts

BOSTON COLLEGE BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
Trade or Business School

Years Attended 6 4 1
Date Graduated 5-85 —
Subjects Studied GENERAL GENERAL

Subjects of Speciality or Research Work

What Foreign Languages Do You Speak Fluently? Read Write

U.S. Military or Naval Service Rank Present Membership in National Guard or Reserves

Activities Other Than Religious (Civic, Athletic, Fraternal, etc.)

EXCLUDE ORGANIZATIONS, THE NAME OR CHARACTER OF WHICH INDICATES THE RACE, CREED, COLOR OR NATIONAL ORIGIN OF ITS MEMBERS.
**FORMER EMPLOYERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name and Address of Employer</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 1-81</td>
<td>TEXACO CORPORATION</td>
<td>$6.00/hr</td>
<td>COUNTER CLERK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 10-79</td>
<td>BOSTON HERALD</td>
<td>$11.29/hr</td>
<td>DRIVER</td>
<td>MOVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 6-81</td>
<td>BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 6-85</td>
<td>JENSEN'S CUSTODIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>$3.42/hr</td>
<td>JANITOR</td>
<td>NEW OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1-80</td>
<td>CUNNINGHAM'S HARDWARE</td>
<td>$3.70/hr</td>
<td>STOCK BDY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 5-81</td>
<td>BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REFERENCES:**

List the names of three persons not related to you, whom you have known at least one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Years Acquainted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MACK CAMPBELL</td>
<td>11800 WILCREST, HOUSTON, TX</td>
<td>CITY OF HOUSTON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 JAMES KELLEY</td>
<td>4117 OSS #33, HOUSTON, TX</td>
<td>HOSPITAL ADMIN.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 WILLIAM WASHINGTON</td>
<td>1023, WICKERS, MARINE, PA</td>
<td>TRACHER</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I authorize investigation of all statements in this application. I understand that misrepresentation or omission of facts called for in this form for dishonesty or further. I understand that my employment is for an indefinite period and that, regardless of the date of payment of my wage or salary, be terminated at any time without any previous notice.

Date: 12-13-72  Signature: **Mary H. Jones**

**DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE**

Interviewed By:  Date:  

**REMARKS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neatness</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Hired:  For Dept.  Position:  Will Report:  Salary:  

Approved: 1  Employment Manager  Dept. Head  2  3  General Manager
APPENDIX B

Study Material from Experiment 1
There are two parts to this experiment. The first part is a simulation of an occupational task many human resource people complete. You are to read through some job descriptions and job applications. After you have read these, you will be asked to make some judgements on how suitable each applicant is for each job. You may refer back to the applications in order to make these decisions. Please remember that although this task is just a simulation (i.e. neither the applications or the jobs are real ones) this task is one that exists in the working world and how people make these decisions is important so please take the time to properly review the material before you make the suitability ratings.

The second task of this experiment is simply to complete a few brief questions about yourself and the task you have just completed. This information is strictly anonymous and is for research purposes only. No one will know who you are or what answers you gave since the project is interested in how people as a whole make decisions, not any individual in particular. So please answer all of these questions to the best of your ability.

If, after your participation, you have any questions about this study or the data that has been collected, please contact Ana Kennedy in the Psychology Department at Rice University.

Thank-you for your participation.
### JOB POSTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB NO.</th>
<th>JOB DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WORKING SCHEDULE</th>
<th>JOB RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>40 hours a week, 5 days a week (Open 7 days a week)</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Attention to detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Diligent worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Able to follow explicit directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Must be able to work occasional weekends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must have pleasant personality and courteous manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school graduate. One year of work experience required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Security Officer</td>
<td>40 hours a week with possibility for overtime; all hours available</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Reliable transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Good written and oral skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Home telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Valid state driver license</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Able to work ALL shifts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must have neat and well-groomed appearance, and courteous manner. Must complete training program. Uniforms provided at no cost. One year work experience required. High school diploma or GED required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the rating scale below, please rate each applicant for each job.

1 Not suitable for the job (under-qualified)
2 Somewhat suitable for the job
3 Moderately suitable for the job
4 Highly suitable for the job
5 Not suitable for the job (overqualified)

**JOB #1 Custodian**
- David Anderson
- Robert Matthews
- Russell Dunlap
- Steve Galey
- Thomas Moore
- John Harrison
- Marcus Govan
- Michael Fuentes

**JOB #2 Security Officer**
- David Anderson
- Robert Matthews
- Russell Dunlap
- Steve Galey
- Thomas Moore
- John Harrison
- Marcus Govan
- Michael Fuentes
## JOB POSTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB NO.</th>
<th>JOB DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WORKING SCHEDULE</th>
<th>JOB RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counter Sales Clerk</td>
<td>40 hours a week weekend work required</td>
<td>Guaranteed $1500 per month for 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Strong communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Must interact well with co-workers and customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Clean, neat appearance and polite manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College degree preferred. Paid vacation, paid medical insurance, 401k retirement plan. Guaranteed monthly income with generous commission structure and annual bonus plan. Excellent opportunity to advance into management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Branch Manager</td>
<td>8:00 a.m. 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Knowledge of management principles and practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ability to supervise and motivate employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ability to exercise sound judgement in making administrative recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ability to develop, analyze, and interpret policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong oral and written communication skills. Bachelor's Degree required. Knowledge of workers compensation and insurance preferred. Two years of supervisory experience preferred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the rating scale below, please rate each applicant for each job.

1 Not suitable for the job (under-qualified)
2 Somewhat suitable for the job
3 Moderately suitable for the job
4 Highly suitable for the job
5 Not suitable for the job (overqualified)

**JOB #1 Counter Sales Clerk**
- David Anderson
- Robert Matthews
- Russell Dunlap
- Steve Galey
- Thomas Moore
- John Harrison
- Marcus Govan
- Michael Fuentes

**JOB #2 Branch Manager**
- David Anderson
- Robert Matthews
- Russell Dunlap
- Steve Galey
- Thomas Moore
- John Harrison
- Marcus Govan
- Michael Fuentes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How difficult was it to make the ratings?

- Not difficult
- Somewhat difficult
- Very difficult

If somewhat or very difficult, what other information would make the task easier?

On a scale of 1 to 4, please rate how much influence the following had on your job suitability ratings.

1 = no influence
2 = a little influence
3 = moderate influence
4 = great influence

- Personal information
- Former Employers (i.e. place or type of job)
- References
- Other (please specify)

The following requested information is for research purposes only. Please DO NOT put your name anywhere on this form.

Age
Race
Gender
Major

What do you feel this purpose of this study is?
APPENDIX C

Study Materials For Experiment 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB NO.</th>
<th>JOB DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WORKING SCHEDULE</th>
<th>JOB RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>40 hours a week, 5 days a week (Open 7 days a week)</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Attention to detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Diligent worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Able to follow explicit directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Must be able to work occasional weekends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must have pleasant personality and courteous manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school graduate. One year of work experience required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Security Officer</td>
<td>40 hours a week with possibility for overtime; all hours available</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Reliable transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Good written and oral skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Home telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Valid state driver license</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Able to work ALL shifts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must have neat and well-groomed appearance, and courteous manner. Must complete training program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniforms provided at no cost. One year work experience required. High school diploma or GED required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please read the job descriptions given above. After reading them, please rate how much of each characteristic listed below you feel is required for each of the jobs. In making these ratings, you are to use the following scale.

5 Extremely high amount of the characteristic is required
4 Above average amount of the characteristic is required
3 Average amount of the characteristic is required
2 Below average amount of the characteristic is required
1 Extremely low amount of the characteristic is required

**CUSTODIAN**

- [ ] Physical Strength
- [ ] Intelligence
- [ ] Dedication
- [ ] Practicality
- [ ] Creativity
- [ ] Productivity
- [ ] Ambition
- [ ] Hard-working
- [ ] High literacy
- [ ] Cooperative

**SECURITY OFFICER**

- [ ] Physical Strength
- [ ] Intelligence
- [ ] Dedication
- [ ] Practicality
- [ ] Creativity
- [ ] Productivity
- [ ] Ambition
- [ ] Hard-working
- [ ] High literacy
- [ ] Cooperative
JOB POSTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB NO.</th>
<th>JOB DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WORKING SCHEDULE</th>
<th>JOB RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counter Sales Clerk</td>
<td>40 hours a week, weekend work required</td>
<td>Guaranteed $1500 per month for 3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strong communication skills.
- Must interact well with co-workers and customers.
- Clean, neat appearance and polite manner.
- College degree preferred. Paid vacation, paid medical insurance, 401k retirement plan. Guaranteed monthly income with generous commission structure and annual bonus plan. Excellent opportunity to advance into management.

| 2       | Branch Manager | 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. | Open |

- Knowledge of management principles and practices.
- Ability to supervise and motivate employees.
- Ability to exercise sound judgement in making administrative recommendations.
- Ability to develop, analyze, and interpret policies and procedures.
- Strong oral and written communication skills. Bachelor's Degree required. Knowledge of workers' compensation and insurance preferred. Two years of supervisory experience preferred.

Please read the job descriptions given above. After reading them, please rate how much of each characteristic listed below you feel is required for each of the jobs. In making these ratings, you are to use the following scale.

5 Extremely high amount of the characteristic is required
4 Above average amount of the characteristic is required
3 Average amount of the characteristic is required
2 Below average amount of the characteristic is required
1 Extremely low amount of the characteristic is required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTER SALES CLERK</th>
<th>BRANCH MANAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Strength</td>
<td>Physical Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>Practicality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-working</td>
<td>Hard-working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High literacy</td>
<td>High literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate each of the eight applicants on the following characteristics, indicating how much of each characteristic you feel that applicant possesses. When making your ratings, please use the scale below. If necessary, refer back to the applications in order to make your ratings.

5 Possesses an extremely high amount of the characteristic
4 Possesses an above average amount of the characteristic
3 Possesses an average amount of the characteristic
2 Possesses a below average amount of the characteristic
1 Possesses an extremely low amount of the characteristic

DAVID ANDERSON

___ Physical Strength
___ Intelligence
___ Dedication
___ Practicality
___ Creativity
___ Productivity
___ Ambition
___ Hard-working
___ High literacy
___ Cooperative

ROBERT MATTHEWS

___ Physical Strength
___ Intelligence
___ Dedication
___ Practicality
___ Creativity
___ Productivity
___ Ambition
___ Hard-working
___ High literacy
___ Cooperative

RUSSELL DUNLAP

___ Physical Strength
___ Intelligence
___ Dedication
___ Practicality
___ Creativity
___ Productivity
___ Ambition
___ Hard-working
___ High literacy
___ Cooperative

STEVE GALEY

___ Physical Strength
___ Intelligence
___ Dedication
___ Practicality
___ Creativity
___ Productivity
___ Ambition
___ Hard-working
___ High literacy
___ Cooperative
5 Possesses an extremely high amount of the characteristic
4 Possesses an above average amount of the characteristic
3 Possesses an average amount of the characteristic
2 Possesses a below average amount of the characteristic
1 Possesses an extremely low amount of the characteristic

THOMAS MOORE

____ Physical Strength
____ Intelligence
____ Dedication
____ Practicality
____ Creativity
____ Productivity
____ Ambition
____ Hard-working
____ High literacy
____ Cooperative

JOHN HARRISON

____ Physical Strength
____ Intelligence
____ Dedication
____ Practicality
____ Creativity
____ Productivity
____ Ambition
____ Hard-working
____ High literacy
____ Cooperative

MARCUS GOVAN

____ Physical Strength
____ Intelligence
____ Dedication
____ Practicality
____ Creativity
____ Productivity
____ Ambition
____ Hard-working
____ High literacy
____ Cooperative

MICHAEL FUENTES

____ Physical Strength
____ Intelligence
____ Dedication
____ Practicality
____ Creativity
____ Productivity
____ Ambition
____ Hard-working
____ High literacy
____ Cooperative
Please rate each application on its overall quality. In making your ratings, use the scale provided below. There are no "right" or "wrong" ratings. Your ratings should simply represent your opinion on the quality of the applications.

5 Extremely high quality
4 Above average quality
3 Average quality
2 Below average quality
1 Extremely low quality

____ Application #1
____ Application #2
____ Application #3
____ Application #4
____ Application #5
____ Application #6
____ Application #7