Are Gay Male Leaders Just as Hirable as Straight Male Leaders?

Sarah N. McClure

Richard G. Moffett III, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology, Middle Tennessee State University

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in

Psychology

Committee Members:

Michael Hein Ph.D.

Mark Frame Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSRTACT

This study sought to clarify past research which presents conflicting mechanisms in which discrimination occurs between gay and straight applicants in leadership position. Hypothesis one predicted that negative attitudes towards gay men will result in straight male applicants being chosen for leadership positions more than gay male applicants. Hypothesis two predicted that a gay male applicant applying to the lead nurse position will be more likely to be chosen than the straight male applicant. Hypothesis three predicted that a straight male applicant applying to the accounts manager position will be more likely to be chosen than the gay male applicant. Hypothesis four predicted that gay men will be perceived as less effective in a leadership position and therefore be selected less often than a straight male for the leadership position. Hypothesis five predicted that straight men will be perceived as more effective in a leadership position and therefore will be selected more often than the gay male applicants for the leadership position. None of the hypotheses in the study were supported. Possible reasons for the lack of support are discussed.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

According to a Gallup poll (Jones, 2021) 5.6% of the U.S. population identifies as a part of the LGBTQ+ community. Gallup also reports that Americans have become more accepting of the LGBT community with 93% saying that they should have equal rights in terms of job opportunities (McCarthy, 2021). A report from 2020 found that 76% of Americans support laws that would protect lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans from being discriminated against in jobs, housing, and public accommodation (PRRI, 2021). With more Americans supporting the rights of LGBT employees, the United States has now made clarifications regarding employment protections for LGBT employees.

In the summer of 2020, the protections that many Americans supported came to fruition when the supreme court ruled in favor of Bostock in the Bostock v Clayton County, Georgia case (EEOC, 2020). This means that under Title VII it is illegal to discriminate against individuals because of their sexual orientation or transgender status by their employer. The CDC reports that negative attitudes towards gay, bisexual, or other men who have sex with men can affect their income, health, cause them to adopt poor coping skills, increase stress, and cause other risky health behaviors (CDC, 2016). Although some workplace protections for this group have evolved, gay men's wages are penalized across varying jobs and career sectors due to discrimination (Martell, 2018). According to the Human Rights Campaign (2021), 55% of the employers participated in the Cooperate Equality Index (CEI). The CEI included diversity metrics as part of senior management/ executive leadership performance standards (Human Rights Campaign Foundation, 2021).

Early research shows that diverse workgroups encourage better problem solving (Hoffman & Maier, 1961). Even today firms that have policies that encourage and accept LGBT

diversity are more likely to be innovative and perform better than firms that do not encourage LGBT diversity (Hossain et al., 2020). Furthermore, employees that perceive their organization manages diversity well and engages in fair practices are less likely to have turnover intentions (Chrobot-Mason & Aramovich, 2013). Therefore, organizations should ensure that people of different backgrounds, cultures, genders, and sexual orientations are welcomed. In doing so, organizations would increase innovation and retention rates.

Psychologists are at the forefront of studies about attitude and stereotypes of gay and lesbian individuals. They have researched topics like social roles, gender stereotypes, employee selection, and even how appearance effects perceptions of gay men (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018; Blashill & Powlishta, 2009; Callender, 2015; Fingerhut & Peplau, 2006; Laine et al., 2015; Liberman & Golom, 2015; Lippa, 2005). Fewer studies about attitudes and stereotypes of gay and lesbian individuals have been applied to leadership (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018; Laine et al., 2015; Liberman & Golom, 2015; Morton, 2017). These studies often have mixed findings and researchers have called for future attempts to replicate or expand on their findings (Laine et al., 2015; Liberman & Golom, 2015; Morton, 2017).

Barrantes and Eaton (2018) sought to study the perceptions of fitness of gay men for leadership positions. They found that gay men were perceived as stereotypically more feminine than heterosexual men and were more suited for stereotypically feminine jobs. However, they found that gay men were not seen as any less masculine and more feminine due to their sexual orientation (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018). Barrantes and Eaton (2018) made strides in understanding perceptions of fit for leadership positions, however, they did not explore the actual selection of gay men.

The present study seeks to understand how leader categorization (Lord et al., 1984), agentic and communal traits (Costa et al., 2001; Rosette & Tost, 2010), and social roles (Fingerhut & Peplau, 2006) affect the selection of gay men into leadership roles. As the United States has supported protections for members of the LGBT community (EEOC, 2020) it is increasingly important that we further our research in this area so that we can better understand the mechanisms in which discrimination against gay men.

Attitudes towards Gay Men

Blashill and Powlishta (2009) explored whether gay men and lesbian women are assumed to have attributes stereotypically associated with women and men respectively. They found that stereotypes were consistent with past research with gay men being seen as less masculine than straight men and lesbians seen as being less (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009). Blashill and Powlishta's research sought to investigate the Kite and Deaux (1987) implicit inversion theory. In the implicit inversion theory, it is suggested that gay men are likely to have more similar traits to heterosexual women, and lesbians are more likely to have traits similar to heterosexual men (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Consistent with the implicit inversion theory, gay men are seen as violating acceptable male gender roles and being more similar to women in their traits and characteristics (Madon, 1997). Gay men are stereotyped as being more similar to the female prototype than to the male prototype. Glick et al (2015) observed that gay men identified as being more masculine were seen to have more positive attitudes associated with them than gay men identified as being more feminine; this finding was predicted by participants' sexist views.

Salvati et al (2019) found that older participants, male participants, and participants who held more homonegative and sexist views were more likely to have negative attitudes toward gay individuals that presented in a nongender confirmatory way. Men with these views were also

more likely to hold more stereotypes about gay men and lesbian women compared to younger individuals or women (Salvati et al., 2019). Gay men were seen as more sociable, more feminine, and less masculine than men that were portrayed as straight (Kranz et al., 2017). Hegarty and Massey (2007) explain that anti-homosexual attitudes were focused on identity rather than actual sexual practice.

In addition to being seen as more feminine or masculine, research suggesting that people can judge sexual orientation based on the way a person's face looks (Freeman et al., 2010). Another study provides support that laypeople can detect someone's sexual orientation better than chance from their facial features/stimuli (González-Álvarez, 2017). Gender atypical body movements and shape can also affect how people perceive another's sexual orientation (Johnson et al., 2007). Other characteristics that result in an individual identifying another's sexual orientation include clothing style and fit, jewelry, posture, and both the types and frequencies of gestures (Carroll & Gilkoy, 2002). A recent study found that the sexual orientation of gay men and lesbian women could be identified from their vocal cues, which resulted in gay/lesbian-sounding individuals being rated as less competent (Fasoli & Hegarty, 2020). Taken together, many gay men and lesbian women can be identified as such through their facial features, body shape, voice, body movements, and other cues.

In summary, the literature indicates that people perceive gay men to be more like heterosexual females than heterosexual men. Gay men are seen as gender-atypical, thus violating traditional gender roles and leading to more negative attitudes towards gay men. Gay men and lesbian women are also able to be perceived as such through their facial and bodily characteristics and mannerisms. Therefore, the proposed hypothesis is:

Hypothesis One: Negative attitudes towards gay men will result in straight male applicants being chosen for leadership positions more than gay male applicants.

Stereotypes about leadership

Past research about leadership has focused on leadership traits or the characteristics that make for a successful leader (Zaccaro, 2007), the behavioral approach (Fleishman et al., 1991; Judge et al., 2004), and how leaders and followers interact in dyads or leader-member exchanges (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Uhl-bien, 1995). Although leadership research has determined that there is no one best way of leadership (Fiedler, 1964; House, 1971) we are going to focus on the leadership traits perspective for the purpose of this research.

Implicit leadership theories focus on followers' ideas of what leaders are and are not (Shondrick et al., 2010). These ideas of leadership are based on the beliefs or knowledge structures that a follower has and uses to judge a leader (Shondrick et al., 2010). A major implicit leadership theory is leader categorization theory. According to leader categorization theory judgments about an effective leader are made based on predetermined ideas of what characteristics a leader should possess and behaviors they should exhibit (Lord et al., 1984). Simply, people have general beliefs of what the typical leader is and is not. Therefore, if the person is not seen as a typical leader they may be perceived as less effective or favorable (Koenig et al., 2011; Rosette et al., 2008).

Effective leaders were seen as more masculine, leading in a way that was more focused on the task, being assertive, and being competitive (Schein, 1975). Leaders are habitually seen as more agentic than communal (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Lord & Maher, 1991). Agentic traits are associated with masculinity, for example, being dominant, task-oriented, and assertive (Lippa, 2005). Lippa described people possessing more feminine and relationship-based traits as

communal, for example, being compassionate or supportive. The traditional leader is typically seen as a heterosexual white man (Fassinger et al., 2010; Rosette et al., 2008). Gay male leaders have also been found to be perceived as more feminine and as possessing more communal traits than heterosexual male leaders (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018; Liberman & Golom, 2015), thus, meaning gay men are further away from the typical leader paradigm. Much of the leadership research focuses on gender perceptions – how women in leadership roles are perceived.

The lack of fit gender discrimination model posits that women are seen as lacking the traits needed to be in more powerful jobs (Heilman, 1983). Similarly, role congruency theory discusses how female leaders are perceived as less favorable than male leaders, and evaluations of the behaviors that a female leader enacts are also less favorable when the behaviors are being fulfilled by a woman instead of a man (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Because of the prejudice elicited by female leaders defying role congruency, it is difficult for women to become leaders and be seen as successful in such a role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Situations that heighten the incongruencies also heighten the prejudice and consequences for female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002). For example, a woman in a more stereotypically masculine job like construction management would be seen as less effective than a man would be perceived. A similar phenomenon has been seen for the fit of gay men in stereotypically masculine versus feminine positions (Fingerhut & Peplau, 2006). In actual hiring decisions for leaders, men are more likely to be chosen for leadership positions if they have no experience versus women with no experience (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011). However, men and women were chosen to a similar extent if both had leader experience (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011). According to leader categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984) and role congruency theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) women are less likely to be seen as effective leaders and are less likely to be considered for leadership roles.

In a meta-analysis Koenig et al. (2011) investigated the three leading gendered paradigms surrounding leadership: think leader think male paradigm, agency communion paradigm, and the masculinity- femininity paradigm. They found that in the think leader think male paradigm that male association was stronger in older publications and for higher status leaders. In the agency-communion paradigm they found that participants favor agentic traits over communal traits. In the masculinity femininity paradigm, they found that leaders are stereotyped as being more masculine than feminine. These findings suggest that across the three leader paradigms masculine leaders and masculine traits are preferred in leadership, although some of these relationships appear weaker in later publications (Koenig et al., 2011).

Gendered Jobs

Francesco and Hakel (Francesco & Hakel, 1981) studied how the gender and sex of applicants affected their perceived fit for jobs that were masculine, feminine, or androgynous. They found that raters overall preferred masculine candidates (of both sexes) for masculine and feminine jobs, and only preferred androgynous candidates for neutral jobs (Francesco & Hakel, 1981). In a study looking at the reactions of women in male stereotyped jobs, it was found that even when women are seen as being successful, they are less liked, seen as less competent, and seen as more interpersonally hostile (Heilman et al., 2004).

In relation to heterosexual men, Fingerhut and Peplau (2006) found that gay men in stereotypically masculine gender roles are seen as less feminine than gay men in stereotypically feminine gender roles. Gay men in feminine gender roles were seen as a typical gay man. In another study gay men in both feminine and masculine typed jobs were seen as androgynous and were rated similarly in both job types where straight men were seen as less effective in masculine typed jobs (Clarke & Arnold, 2018). Concerning leadership, gay leaders were seen as less

effective in male stereotyped organizations and more effective in female typed organizations (Pellegrini et al., 2020). When evaluated by those with higher sexual prejudice, these researchers found that gay men were seen as less effective leaders regardless of the organization, and gay men that were described as more masculine were less likely to be discriminated against than those described in a non-gender-conforming way.

This body of literature indicates that the type of job or organization those gay men inhabit will influence their perceived femininity or masculinity (Fingerhut & Peplau, 2006) thus influencing their perceived effectiveness in a leadership role (Pellegrini et al., 2020). The present research seeks to assess if the same phenomenon will be seen in leader selection or if there will be discrimination regardless of the job type. Therefore, the proposed hypotheses are:

Hypothesis Two: The gay male applicant applying to the lead nurse position will be more likely to be chosen than the straight male applicant.

Hypothesis Three: The straight male applicant applying to the accounts manager position will be more likely to be chosen than the gay male applicant.

Leadership and Gay Men

There has been some research about leadership selection and performance concerning gay men and women (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018; Clarke & Arnold, 2018; Fasoli & Hegarty, 2020; Fassinger et al., 2010; Laine et al., 2015; Liberman & Golom, 2015; Morton, 2017; Pellegrini et al., 2020). This section seeks to explore literature and discuss how we might expand the research in this area. Fassinger, Shullman, and Stevenson (2010) proposed that when discussing leadership, we must focus on the leader's sexual orientation, gender, and the context to fully understand the leadership challenges. They supported this model with previous research but at the time they had not fully explored this paradigm (Fassinger et al., 2010). Furthering the

research in this area Liberman and Golom (2015) focused on how gay male and lesbian managers were perceived through stereotypes because of their gender and sexual orientation. They found that successful managers were associated more with straight men and straight women than gay men and lesbian. It was observed that heterosexual male and female managers were rated similarly in relation to fitting with the successful manager prototype (Liberman & Golom, 2015).

Morton (2017) set out to determine if perceptions of leader effectiveness differed for gay men, if perceptions of agency and communality differed, and if homonegativity moderated the relationship. Morton only found that homonegativity moderated the effectiveness ratings, such that higher levels of homonegativity resulted in more negative perceptions of leader effectiveness. Morton (2017) used simple vignettes and did not describe the leaders' behaviors. Morton found no relationship between the leader's sexual orientation and perceived effectiveness and found no difference in effectiveness ratings between gay and straight leaders. These findings may have been due to the lack of details in the vignette. However, Barrantes and Eaton (2018) found men that were seen as having more communal traits were rated as being suitable for feminine managerial roles but found no difference between gay and straight men in perceived agency and suitability for masculine or gender natural jobs.

A previous thesis research project focusing only on female managers found that attitudes towards lesbians are improving, that they were perceived to be equally as effective as their heterosexual counterparts (Laine et al., 2015). Laine et al. suggested future research should expand the study to male leaders and expanding the sample past college students. Although this focused-on lesbians, Laine et al. calls for subsequent research to consider participants outside of

a college setting, and to consider testing male leaders: these are pointing that the present research seeks to expand on.

Some sources of research in this area looked at more physical features to denote one's sexuality, although the present research will not focus on physical features it is worth discussing here as the present research will in cooperate images of the leaders on social media displays. Fasoli and Hegarty (2020) looked at whether vocal cues of sexual orientation would result in discrimination when hiring leaders. They found that the gay and lesbian sounding leaders were perceived as less competent and suitable for the job, they also discovered that lesbian-sounding women were discriminated against at a greater rate than gay men (Fasoli & Hegarty, 2020).

As more research begins to accumulate in this area, there have been some mixed results. The research suggests that discrimination happens, but it is dependent on other factors such as participant's homonegativity or prejudice, possessing a vocal tone associated with being gay, or perceptions of the traits that leaders are supposed to possess according to norms and schemas (Barrantes & Eaton, 2018; Fasoli & Hegarty, 2020; Morton, 2017). The present study seeks to replicate some of the results discussed above, expand them to selection into leadership, and clarify how discrimination in this area might take place as much of the literature presents conflicting viewpoints. Thus, the proposed hypotheses are:

Hypothesis Four: Gay men will be perceived as less effective in a leadership position and will therefore not be selected less often than a straight male for the leader position.

Hypothesis Five: Straight men will be perceived as more effective in a leadership position and will therefore be selected more often than the gay male applicants for the leadership position.

Hypotheses

To review, the present research seeks to explore the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis One: Negative attitudes towards gay men will result in straight male applicants being

chosen for leadership positions more than gay male applicants.

Hypothesis Two: The gay male applicant applying to the lead nurse position will be more likely

to be chosen than the straight male applicant.

Hypothesis Three: The straight male applicant applying to the accounts manager position will be

more likely to be chosen than the gay male applicant.

Hypothesis Four: Gay men will be perceived as less effective in a leadership position and will

be selected less often than a straight male for the leadership position.

Hypothesis Five: Straight men will be perceived as more effective in a leadership position and

will be selected more often than the gay male applicants for the leadership position

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY

Design

This study used a 2X2 between subjects' design focusing on leader sexuality and job types. I used logistic regression analyses and ANOVAs to analyze my results. Participants were asked to fill out various questions related to leader effectiveness, hiring likelihood, leader selection, sexual prejudice, and social desirability based on two candidates applying for either a lead nurse position or account manager position. The present research seeks to assess if leadership selection is dependent on job type and leader sexuality, or if candidate selection is influenced by participants attitudes towards gay applicants.

Participants

Participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Amazon Mechanical Turk is an online platform that allows researchers to crowdsource participants virtually (Amazon Mechanical Turk, Inc., 2020). According to G-power 276 participants with usable data needed to be recruited to participate in the study (Faul et al., 2007). Some of the stipulations for participation in the study included those that live in the United States, have hiring experience, are proficient in reading and speaking English, and are age 25 or above. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the majority of human resource managers are between the ages of 25 to 64 years old and have a median age of 45 years old (Statistics, 2014). By restricting our sample, we hope to be able to have results that are more representative of someone that might be hiring for supervisory or leadership positions.

A total of 241 participants were retained from the original data collected. Participants had an average age of 35 (SD=9.84), been employed for an average of 11 years (SD=9.13) and has 1-3 years of hiring experience (41.5%). The results shows that 55.6% were male and 44.4% were

female. Majority of participants were straight (85.9%). Descriptive analyses also determined

88.4% of participants were white, 5.4% were Hispanic or Latino, 2.55% were Asian, 2.1% were

black or African American, 0.8% were Native American or American Indian, and 0.8% selected

other. Participants resided in the South (27.8%), Northeast (25.3%), Midwest (32.8%), West

(13.7%), and Puerto Rico or other US territories (0.4%).

Measures

Experimental Manipulation. Similar to the manipulation used by Clarke and Arnold (Clarke &

Arnold, 2018), the participants were selected for either a stereotypically male-oriented job

(Accounts Manager) or a stereotypically female-oriented job (Lead Nurse). They were be

presented with short descriptions of each job (see appendix B). The wording in the job

descriptions was kept similar. For example, the job descriptions state "manages a team of nurses"

or "manages a team of account clerks". A list of applicants were presented for each job and

participants were asked to evaluate two applicants for selection based on the job description and

the candidate's social media profiles (appendix C).

The participants were presented with social media profiles for each applicant. The social

media pages included indicators of the sexuality of each of the applicants. The Gay applicant had

affiliations with organizations that support the LGBTQ community and was presented as having

a male partner in his bio. Straight applicant will include neutral affiliations and will have a

female partner in his bio. Materials were pilot tested to ensure that they are equivalent and biases

like perceived warmth, competence, and attractiveness do not contaminate the study.

Leadership Effectiveness. To measure leader effectiveness, we used the leader effectiveness

measure from Hais, Hogg, and Duck (1997). When used by Hais, Hogg, and Duck (1997) the

previously reported internal consistency of this scale is 0.88. In the present study the internal

consistency of this scale is 0.82 when used to assess the gay male candidate and 0.81 when used to assess the straight male candidate. The original measure includes 10 questions and is on a 9-point Likert scale. For our study, we limited the scale to a 5-point scale instead of the original 9-point scale. This measure is included in appendix D.

Social Desirability. To ensure that the present study is not confounded by social desirability participants took a short form of the Marlow and Crowne social desirability scale. The scale is a 13-item version developed by Reynolds (1982). Reynolds reported the reliability (Coefficient α) of this scale as 0.76. The reliability (Coefficient α) of this scale was reported as 0.51 in the present study. This measure can be found in appendix E.

Sexual Prejudice. To assess participants' prejudice towards gay applicants, the gay version of the Modern Homonegativity Scale was used (Morrison & Morrison, 2000). When used by Morrison the reliability coefficient of this scale was 0.91. The reliability (Coefficient α) of this scale was 0.41 in the present study. The scale is a self-report measure comprised of 12 items that measure the attitudes of gay men on a 7-point Likert scale. Some of the questions included in the MHG-G are: "many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges", "gay men do not have all the rights they need" and "the media devote far too much attention to the topic of homosexuality". This measure has been included in Appendix F.

Demographics. Participants were asked to answer questions about their age, race, gender, sexual orientation, and how many years of hiring experience they have had. Demographics questions are presented in Appendix G.

Manipulation Check. To ensure that the manipulations were effective we asked the participants to identify the gender orientation of the job category. Also, the participants were asked to identify the sexual orientation of the applicant.

Quality Control. To ensure that the participants are paying attention to quality control questions were asked at various points. Quality control questions are presented in Appendix H.

Procedure

First, participants encountered reCAPTCHA which was used to deter any bots from participating. Participants were asked if they have any experience hiring employees, if they are at least 25 years of age, and live in the United States. Those that do not have hiring experience, are not at least 25 years of age, and do not live in the United States were excluded from the study. Additional requirements within MTurk were that that participants should have above a 90% HIT approval rate, and have completed at least 500 HITs, and reside in the United States. These inclusion criteria are instituted to increase participant effort in the survey and decrease dishonesty about participant eligibility criteria. Participants were compensated $1.25 for participating in the study.

After the inclusion criteria and informed consent (Appendix A) participants were presented with a short description of the job (either masculine stereotyped or feminine stereotyped) and a list of applicants. Participants were randomized into two groups, one with a female stereotyped job and one with a male stereotyped job. Participants were presented with a gay and straight candidate applying for the leadership position. They were presented with professional social media pages for each candidate. The social media pages included the candidate's name, their skills, a picture, and a brief bio about the candidate. They asked to judge their perception of the candidate's leadership effectiveness and identify which candidate they would hire. After judging the leader's effectiveness and indicating the candidate they preferred the participants filled out a survey for homonegativity, and social desirability. Participants also encountered a manipulation check and several attention checks during the survey. Finally, the

participants filled in demographic information and were thanked for their participation in the

study. The survey took an average of 11.00 minutes (SD=10.09) for participants to complete.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Quality Control

Our initial data set had a total of 654 participants. A total of 413 participants were removed from the data set. First, those with missing data from any scales or demographics were removed (*n*=112). Next, those that submitted outrageous numbers for age or years of experience were removed (*n*=27), for example stating that they had 100 years of experience or that they were 500 years of age. Those that were identified as answering with a pattern, such as all true, were removed (*n*=35). Next, anyone that was identified as failing an attention check was removed from the data (*n*=125) Finally those who completed the survey in less than 4 minutes were removed from the dataset (*n*=94). The final question used to ensure quality control asked participants whether their data should be used. After deleting participants based on the above quality control process no other participants were deleted based on this question. Ultimately analyses were conducted using 241 participants.

Manipulation Checks

Participants encountered two manipulation checks when participating in the survey. First participants were asked to identify what gender predominantly applied to the job that they were selecting a candidate for. In the accounts manager position, intended to be male stereotyped, 88.6% (*n*=109) of participants correctly identified the position as being male stereotyped. In the lead nurse position, intended to be female stereotyped, 15.3% (*n*=18) of participants correctly identified the position as being female stereotyped.

In the second manipulation check, participants were asked to identify the sexual orientation of David, the gay applicant. The results indicated that 47.3% of participants identified

him as straight, while only 33.6% of participants identified him as gay, 18.7% identified him as

being asexual and 0.4% identified him has other.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and internal consistency estimates of

reliability for each candidate type's leadership effectiveness scores, homonegativity scores, and

social desirability scores. The results indicated that the reliability for the leadership effectiveness

scales were good with the straight candidate's leadership effectiveness scale measuring at an α =

0.81 and the gay candidate's leadership effectiveness scale measuring at an α = 0.82. The scale

used to assess participants homonegativity had an internal consistency of α = 0.41, this score

falls in the unacceptable range for reliability. Similar results occurred for the measurement of

social desirability with the score for this scale falling in the poor range at α = 0.51. Because of

the poor reliability for social desirability and the homogeneity assumption not being fulfilled,

analysis of variance were ran instead of analysis of covariance.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviation, and Internal Consistency of Leadership Effectiveness Scores,
Homonegativity, and Social Desirability scores

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Straight Male Leadership Effectiveness	0.81	3.80	0.56	241
Gay Male Leadership Effectiveness	0.82	3.75	0.59	241
Homonegativity	0.41	49.24	6.69	241
Social Desirability	0.51	4.85	2.06	241

Hypothesis Testing

Descriptive statistics for leadership effectiveness scores and type of job are shown below

in table 2. A logistic regression was used to test the effect of homonegativity scores on final

leadership candidate choices. The logistic regression showed that there was no significant difference between in homonegativity scores and candidate choice. Two factorial analyses for variance (ANOVA) using between-subject factors were used to test the effect of type of job (male stereotyped versus female stereotyped). Finally, two logistic regressions were used to analyze leadership effectiveness scores for each candidate type and final leadership choice. Neither regression showed a significant effect of type of job and leadership effectiveness ratings for each of the candidates and no significant results for leadership effectiveness and candidate choice.

The logistic regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between homonegativity and overall candidate choice. Hypothesis one states that negative attitudes towards gay men will result in straight male applicants being chosen for leadership positions more than gay male applicants. The results show that the logistic regression model was not statistically significant $\chi2(1) = 17.88$, $p = 0.98$. The model explained 20.6% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variance in candidate choice and correctly classified 65.6% of cases. Increasing homonegativity score was not associated with candidate choice. Therefore, hypothesis one was not supported. Table two summarizes the descriptive statistics for homonegativity scores and candidate selection.

Table 2
Logistic Regression Summary for Homonegativity Scores and Candidate Selection

	DF	Wald χ2	p	Nagelkerke R2
Homonegativity Scores	1	17.88	0.98	0.206

The first and second ANOVA examined the relationship between likelihood of hiring scores for gay and straight applicants across job types. Hypothesis two predicted that the gay

applicant applying to the lead nurse position will more likely to be hired than the straight

applicant. The results show that there was not a significant main effect for job type and

likelihood of hiring score $F(1, 241) = 0.63$, MSE $= 0.65$, p $= 0.43$, $n^2_p = 0.003$. This means that

hypothesis two was not supported. Hypothesis three predicted that the straight applicant applying

to the accounts manager position will be more likely to be hired than the gay applicant. The

results show that there was not a significant main effect for job type and likelihood of hiring $F(1,$

$241) = 0.53$, MSE $= 0.67$, p $= 0.47$, $n^2_p = 0.002$. This means that hypothesis three was not

supported.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Likelihood of Hiring Scores and Type of Job

| | | Likelihood Scores | | |
	Group Type	Mean	SD	*n*
Straight Male	Accounts Manager	3.98	0.79	123
	Lead Nurse	3.91	0.86	118
	Total	3.95	0.82	241
Gay Male	Accounts Manager	3.94	0.82	123
	Lead Nurse	4.03	0.79	118
	Total	3.98	0.81	241

Hypotheses four and five were analyzed using logistic regression, they examined the

relationship between leadership effectiveness ratings and actual candidate selection choice.

Hypothesis four anticipated that gay men would be perceived as less effective in a leadership

position therefore be selected less often than a straight male for the leadership position. The

results show that the logistic regression model was not statistically significant $\chi2(1) = 17.88$, p $=$

0.98. The model explained 0.00% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variance in candidate choice and

correctly classified 59.8% of cases. This means that there is no evidence that the perceptions of

overall leadership effectiveness of the gay male candidate influenced leadership selection.

Hypothesis five anticipated that straight men would be perceived as more effective in a

leadership position and therefore be selected more often than the gay male applicants for the

leadership position. The results show that the logistic regression model was not statistically

significant $\chi2(1) = 1.39$, $p = 0.24$. The model explained 0.8% (Nagelkerke $R2$) of the variance in

candidate choice and correctly classified 59.8% of cases. There was no significant interaction

between straight male leadership effectiveness scores and the candidate selection.

Table 4

Logistic Regression Summary for Applicant Leadership Effectiveness Scores and Candidate Selection

	DF	Wald $\chi2$	p	Nagelkerke R2
Gay Applicant Scores	1	0.07	0.79	0.000
Straight Applicant Scores	1	1.39	0.24	0.008

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

Discussion

This study aimed to evaluate the mechanisms in which discrimination occurs between gay and straight applicants in leadership position. Past research has presented conflicting ideas as to how discrimination may occur. Some research had investigated discrimination as being more blatant and reliant on the attitudes and biases of those that are hiring candidates. Another body of research suggests that discrimination is more likely to occur in certain job types, i.e. straight applicants being more suited for male-stereotyped oriented jobs where the gay applicant is seen as being suited for more feminine-stereotyped oriented jobs. The hypotheses that were investigated in this study sought to investigate both of these schools of research. Firstly, looking at if there was a difference in candidate selection based on the decision makers homonegativity scores. Secondly, the research set out to investigate the differences between job type and leadership effectiveness. Lastly, I looked at the influence that perceived effectiveness had on the overall choices for applicants gay versus straight.

After analyzing group differences using ANOVAs and logistic regression analyses, none of the hypothesis in this study were supported. The logistic regression showed that there was no difference in candidate selection when accounting for participants homonegativity scores. The ANOVA results showed that there were no significant main effects for position type and likelihood of hiring. The final logistic regression analyses showed that leadership effectiveness did not influence selection of a candidate regardless of sexuality. The results did not support hypothesis one because there was no significant effect found between gay and straight applicants being chosen and homonegative attitudes or participants. Hypotheses two and three were not supported because there was no significant effect found between leadership effectiveness scores

for each candidate (gay versus straight) and the type of jobs that participants were presented with (male stereotyped versus female stereotyped).

A possible reason for the nonsignificant findings for hypothesis one could be the poor reliability of the scale used to assess participants homonegative attitudes. The reliability of the scale fell in the unacceptable range. This means we have no way of knowing if the scale accurately assessed participants homonegative attitudes. It is possible that homonegative attitudes could have influenced participants leadership choices but because of the poor reliability of the measure we are unable to see that effect.

Another possible explanation for the nonsignificant findings is that leadership sexuality may not have been clear to participants as suggested by the results of the manipulation checks. The manipulation checks also indicate that scenarios were not strong enough, this means that participants did not see a difference between the two job types in terms of masculinity or femininity. In addition, participants did not see a difference between the two applicants in terms of sexual orientation. With the manipulation check for sexuality, it could be that participants were not clear which candidate the question was asking them about as it only asked them the sexual orientation of David but did not present the pictures from earlier in the survey. Because the situations and candidate profiles were perceived as not being different from each other it makes sense that participants would answer in a way that indicates similar scores for both applicants across both situations.

While there is evidence that the manipulations were not as strong as we believed, we must acknowledge the possibility that discrimination truly did not occur. It is possible that the participants in this sample saw the gay candidate and the straight candidate as equally effective

regardless of job type. Participants truly could have chosen the candidates that they felt were most effective regardless of the candidate's sexual orientation.

Limitations

There are several limitations regarding this study. The first limitation being the quality of the sample, although a concerted effort was made to collect high quality data participants may have still been careless in their answers as the average time to take the study as determined by pilot testing was 15 minutes the average time included in the analysis was 11 minutes, with a large amount of variance. Had more data been collected the proportion of analyzed results may have been of better quality. Another limitation could have been associated with the type and number of attention checks that were used in the study. While participants who did not pass the attention checks were removed, these checks may not have been strong enough, clear enough, or the study may have had too few to ensure the attention checks worked as intended thus meaning poor quality data could have been retained.

Another limitation to the results is the quality of the scenarios and stimuli material. Participants may have not clearly understood that the jobs were feminine or masculine and therefore may not have factored those traits into their decision. In addition, with these being hypothetical scenarios participants may not have carefully reviewed the applicants' qualifications as they may have in a real-life situation. In addition, participants did not identify the situations as presenting masculine or feminine jobs, nor did they identify the gay applicant as being gay. We used professional social media as a way to present information about the subject. Although more and more people use social media platforms such as LinkedIn to source applicants, some hiring managers may not look at social media at all. Therefore, participants may not have taken either applicant seriously based on how the qualifications were presented to them.

Lastly, participants may have also experienced survey fatigue and paid less attention towards the end of the survey. This may have resulted in the participants paying less attention to the question being asked resulting in poor answers. This could explain the poor reliability for social desirability and homonegativity as those scales appeared later in the survey. Because of the poor reliability of the Homonegativity Scale it is possible that we were unable to accurately identify if participant attitudes have an overall influence on candidate selection.

Future Directions

There are several directions that the research could be taken at this point. Because of the quality concerns surrounding MTurk, researchers may want to consider using a different data collection method or incorporating better attention checks and survey quality control measures (Chmielewski & Kucker, 2020). Focusing on collecting better quality data could help to increase reliability of the scales and may produce significant results.

Researchers could attempt to conduct similar research using more salient stimuli and more reliable measures of homonegative attitudes. This may help to further confirm the results in the present research as well as to determine the if discrimination occurs because of homonegative attitudes.

The participants were unable to identify the job type or the sexual orientation which means researchers may also want to create more salient and detailed scenarios to in cooperate in the research, as those included in the present research were not have been clear enough to participants. Researchers may also want to determine alternative ways to present candidate information to participants. Additionally, it may be that discrimination occurs later in the hiring process, perhaps during the interviewing phase of a selection process. It may be wise to use more substantial scales that provide better reliability for social desirability and homonegative attitudes

as in the present research those scales were less reliable. Lastly, future research could analyze the data for protentional moderators such as age or region of the US to determine if discrimination against this group happens more based on demographics of the person making the selection decision.

Conclusion

The present study sought out to investigate two competing bodies of research. One that suggests discrimination occurs due to homonegative attitudes of those making selection decisions. The other being that discrimination occurs due to a gay applicant being associated with more feminine traits therefore they would be selected for more feminine stereotyped jobs, where a straight applicant is associated with more male masculine traits therefore, they would be selected for more masculine stereotyped jobs. To summarize this study intended to clarify the relationships between negative attitudes towards gay men and selection as leaders, job types and perceived effectiveness, and perceived effectiveness of gay and straight applicants and final selection decisions. While none of these relationships were significant there were some limitations that may have prevented significant results like insufficient experimental manipulation and poor reliability of some critical scales to the hypothesis. It may also be that the participants in this study may not have held biases against gay men being selected as leaders which may reflect a change in societal attitudes.

REFERENCES

Amazon Mechanical Turk, Inc. (2020). *Amazon mechanical turk*. The Amazon Company.

    https://www.mturk.com/

Barrantes, R. J., & Eaton, A. A. (2018). Sexual orientation and leadership suitability: How being

    a gay man affects perceptions of fit in gender-stereotyped positions. *Sex Roles*, *79*(9–10),

    549–564. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0894-8

Blashill, A. J., & Powlishta, K. K. (2009). Gay stereotypes: The use of sexual orientation as a

    cue for gender-related attributes. *Sex Roles*, *61*(11–12), 783–793.

    https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9684-7

Bosak, J., & Sczesny, S. (2011). Gender bias in leader selection? Evidence from a hiring

    simulation study. *Sex Roles*, *65*(3–4), 234–242. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0012-7

Callender, K. A. (2015). Understanding antigay bias from a cognitive-affective-behavioral

    perspective. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *62*(6), 782–803.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.998965

Carroll, L., & Gilkoy, P. J. (2002). Role of appearance and nonverbal behaviors in the perception

    of sexual orientation among lesbians and gay men. *Psychological Reports*, *91*(1), 115–122.

    https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2002.91.1.115

CDC. (2016). *Gay and bisexual men's health*. Center for Disease Control and Prevention.

    https://www.cdc.gov/msmhealth/index.htm

Chmielewski, M., & Kucker, S. C. (2020). An MTurk crisis? shifts in data quality and the impact

    on study results. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *11*(4), 464–473.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619875149

Chrobot-Mason, D., & Aramovich, N. P. (2013). The psychological benefits of creating an

    affirming climate for workplace diversity. *Group & Organization Management*, *38*(6), 659–

    689. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113509835

Clarke, H. M., & Arnold, K. A. (2018). The influence of sexual orientation on the perceived fit

    of male applicants for both male- and female-typed jobs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1–10.

    https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00656

Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits

    across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social*

    Psychology, *81*(2), 322–331. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.322

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership

    within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process.

    Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, *13*(1), 46–78.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(75)90005-7

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders.

    Psychological Review, *109*(3), 573–598. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

EEOC. (2020). *What you should know: The EEOC and protections for LGBT workers*. U.S.

    Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/what-

    you-should-know-eeoc-and-protections-lgbt-workers

Fasoli, F., & Hegarty, P. (2020). A leader doesn't sound lesbian!: The impact of sexual

    orientation vocal ues on heterosexual persons' first impression and hiring decision.

    Psychology of Women Quarterly, *44*(2), 234–255.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319891168

Fassinger, R. E., Shullman, S. L., & Stevenson, M. R. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist*, *65*(3), 201–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018597

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*(2), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 149–190. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60051-9

Fingerhut, A. W., & Peplau, L. A. (2006). The impact of social roles on stereotypes of gay men. *Sex Roles*, *55*(3–4), 273–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9080-5

Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *37*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056314

Francesco, A. M., & Hakel, M. D. (1981). Gender and sex as determinants of hireability of applicants for gender-typed jobs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* (Vol. 5, pp. 747–757). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1981.tb01098.x

Freeman, J. B., Johnson, K. L., Ambady, N., & Rule, N. O. (2010). Sexual orientation perception involves gendered facial cues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*(10), 1318–1331. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210378755

González-Álvarez, J. (2017). Perception of sexual orientation from facial structure: A study with artificial face models. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *46*(5), 1251–1260. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0929-6

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership : Development of leader-member exchange (LMX). *Management Department Faculty Publications*, *57*,

30.

https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1059&context=managementfac

pub

Hais, S. C., Hogg, M. A., & Duck, J. M. (1997). Self-Categorization and leadership: Effects of

group prototypicality and leader stereotypicality. *Personality and Social Psychology

Bulletin*, *23*(10), 1087–1099. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672972310009

Hegarty, P., & Massey, S. (2007). Anti-homosexual prejudice... as opposed to what? Queer

theory and the social psychology of anti-homosexual attitudes. *Journal of Homosexuality*,

52(1–2), 47–71. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v52n01_03

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in

Organizational Behavior*, *5*, 269–298.

Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success:

Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied

Psychology*, *89*(3), 416–427. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.416

Hoffman, L. R., & Maier, N. R. F. (1961). Quality and acceptance of problem solutions by

members of homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. *Journal of Abnormal and Social

Psychology*, *62*(2), 401–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044025

Hossain, M., Atif, M., Ahmed, A., & Mia, L. (2020). Do LGBT workplace diversity policies

create value for firms? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *167*(4), 775–791.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04158-z

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science

Quarterly*, *16*(3), 321. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905

Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2021). *Corporate Equality Index 2021*.

https://reports.hrc.org/corporate-equality-index-2021

Johnson, K. L., Gill, S., Reichman, V., & Tassinary, L. G. (2007). Swagger, sway, and sexuality:

judging sexual orientation from body motion and morphology. *Journal of Personality and*

Social Psychology, *93*(3), 321–334. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.321

Jones, J. (2021). *LGBT identification rises to 5.6% in latest U.S. estimate*. Gallup.

https://news.gallup.com/poll/329708/lgbt-identification-rises-latest-estimate.aspx

Judge, T., Piccolo, R., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and

initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(1), 36–51.

Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit

inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *11*(1), 83–96.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00776.x

Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes

masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*(4),

616–642. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023557

Kranz, D., Pröbstle, K., & Evidis, A. (2017). Are all the nice guys gay? The impact of sociability

and competence on the social perception of male sexual orientation. *Psychology of Men &*

Masculinity, *18*(1), 32–39. https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000034

Laine, K. E., Moffett, R. G., Frame, M. C., & Mccarthy, P. M. (2015). *Differences in perceptions*

of homosexual female leaders in relation to heterosexual female leaders [Unpublished

Thesis]. Middle Tennessee State University.

Liberman, B. E., & Golom, F. D. (2015). Think manager, think male? Heterosexuals' stereotypes

of gay and lesbian managers. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, *34*(7), 566–578.

https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2015-0005

Lippa, R. A. (2005). Sexual orientation and personality. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, *16*,

119–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/10532528.2005.10559831

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & De Vader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory:

Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational*

Behavior and Human Performance, *34*(3), 343–378. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-

5073(84)90043-6

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions

and performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*(1), 153–156.

https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1993.3997511

Madon, S. (1997). What do people believe about gay males? A study of stereotype content and

strength. *Sex Roles*, *37*(9–10), 663–685. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02936334

Martell, M. E. (2018). Identity management: Worker independence and discrimination against

gay men. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, *36*(1), 136–148.

https://doi.org/10.1111/coep.12233

McCarthy, J. (2021). *Gallup first polled on gay issues in' 77. What has changed?.* Gallup.

https://news.gallup.com/poll/258065/gallup-first-polled-gay-issues-changed.aspx

Morrison, M. A., & Morrison, T. G. (2000). Development and validation of a scale measuring

modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *43*(2),

2002.

Morton, J. W. (2017). Think leader, think heterosexual male? The perceived leadership effectiveness of gay male leaders. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences de l'Administration*, *34*(2), 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.1434

Pellegrini, V., De Cristofaro, V., Giacomantonio, M., & Salvati, M. (2020). Why are gay leaders perceived as ineffective? The role of the type of organization, sexual prejudice and gender stereotypes. Personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *157*(November 2018), 109817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109817

PRRI. (2021). *Despite partisan rancor, Americans broadly support LGBTIQ rights*. https://www.prri.org/research/despite-partisan-rancor-despite-partisan-rancor-americans-broadly-support-lgbtq-rights-broadly-support-lgbtq-rights/

Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *38*(1), 119–125. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(198201)38:1<119::AID-JCLP2270380118>3.0.CO;2-I

Rosette, A. S., Leonardelli, G. J., & Phillips, K. W. (2008). The White standard: Racial bias in leader categorization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 758–777. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.758

Rosette, A. S., & Tost, L. P. (2010). Agentic women and communal leadership: How role prescriptions confer advantage to top women leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(2), 221–235. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018204

Salvati, M., Piumatti, G., Giacomantonio, M., & Baiocco, R. (2019). Gender stereotypes and contact with gay men and lesbians: The mediational role of sexism and homonegativity.

Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, *29*(6), 461–473.

https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2412

Schein, V. E. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management

characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*(3), 340–344.

https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076637

Shondrick, S. J., Dinh, J. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Developments in implicit leadership theory

and cognitive science: Applications to improving measurement and understanding

alternatives to hierarchical leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(6), 959–978.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.004

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). *Employed persons by detailed occupation and age*.

https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11b.htm

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 6–

16. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6

APPENDIX

Appendix A:

The following information is provided to inform you about the research project in which you have been invited to participate. Please read this disclosure and feel free to ask any questions. The investigators must answer all of your questions and please save this page as a PDF for future reference.

- Your participation in this research study is voluntary.
- You are also free to withdraw from this study at any time without loss of any benefits.

For additional information on your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) Office of Compliance (Tel 615-494-8918) or send your emails to irb_information@mtsu.edu. (URL: http://www.mtsu.edu/irb).

Please read the following and respond to the consent questions in the bottom if you wish to enroll in this study.

Purpose: To determine a candidates likelihood for hiring based on their professional social media page.

Description: There are several parts to this project. They are:

- o   5 items in the consent form
- o   4 items to determine your qualifications for the study
- o   4 questionnaires with a total of 48 items
- o   7 items measuring demographics
- o   7 items for quality control and manipulation checks

IRB Approval Details

- o   Protocol Title:
- o   Primary Investigator: Sarah McClure
- o   PI Department & College: Department of Psychology in the College of Behavioral and Health Sciences
- o   Faculty Advisor (if PI is a student): Dr. Rick Moffett
- o   Protocol ID: ____   Approval Date: ____   Expiration Date: ____

Duration: The whole activity should take about 15 minutes. The participants must at least take 4 minutes to complete the survey for their data to be included in analyses.

Here are your rights as a participant:

- Your participation in this research is voluntary.
- You may skip any item that you don't want to answer, and you may stop the experiment at any time (See the note regarding your completion code in the compensation section below).
- If you leave an item blank by either not clicking or entering a response, you may be warned that you missed one, just in case it was an accident. But you can continue the study without entering a response if you didn't want to answer any questions.
- Some items may require a response to accurately present the survey.
-

6. Risks & Discomforts: The potential risk of participating in this research is minimal psychological discomfort. None of the questions in this study ask for sensitive information, and you may quit the study at any time.

7. Benefits:

    Benefits to you that you may not receive outside this research: Aside from the compensation, there are no direct benefits to you.

    Benefits to the field of science or the community: A better understanding of the relationship between worker characteristics and preference for leadership behaviors.

8. Identifiable Information: You will NOT be asked to provide identifiable personal information.

9. Compensation: The participants will be compensated as described below:

Value per participation $1.25

Compensation Requirements:

- After you complete this consent form you will answer 4 screening questions regarding the following qualifications: being at least 25 years of age, proficient in reading and speaking English, currently working in the United States, and having had some hiring experience. If you do not meet all of these qualifications, you will not be included in the research and you will not be compensated.
- Please do not participate in this research more than once. Multiple attempts to participate will not be compensated.
- To be compensated, you must receive a completion code. That requires clicking on the final screen of the study. If you choose to stop for any reason, you will still need to click through until the end to receive compensation (just leave the items blank and click through until the end). If items require a response to present the survey accurately, you will need to respond to those items as your progress to the end of the survey.

10. Confidentiality. All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep your personal information private but total privacy cannot be promised. Your information may be shared with MTSU or the government, such as the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board, Federal Government Office for Human Research Protections, if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

11. Contact Information. If you should have any questions about this research study or possible injury, please feel free to contact Sarah McClure by email snm5g@mtmail.mtsu.edu OR my faculty advisor, Dr. Rick Moffett, at rick.moffett@mtsu.edu You can also contact the MTSU Office of compliance via telephone (615 494 8918) or by email (compliance@mtsu.edu). This contact information will be presented again at the end of the experiment.

You are not required to do anything further if you decide not to enroll in this study. Just quit your browser. Please complete the response section below if you wish to learn more or you wish to take part in this study.

Appendix B

Instructions:

You are the human resource manager for Humankind Health. You are seeking a lead nurse for your company.

General Description:

This position is for a full-time Lead Nurse

The primary responsibilities are:

1. Manages the nursing staff for a district within Humankind Health.

2. Is responsible for overseeing Humankind's plan for the nursing staff's safety.

3. Works with other functions to ensure smooth operations.

Six applicants have applied for the positions, they are listed below:

1. Ms. Amy Jacobs

2. Mrs. Erin Weathers

3. Mr. David Freid

4. Mrs. Jane Williams

5. Mrs. Rebecca Jennings

6. Mr. Mike Anderson

You are currently reviewing David's and Mike's applications. To make your decision you will review a short job description and two professional social media pages. You will then complete a feedback form about each applicant's suitability.

Instructions:

You are the human resource manager for Humankind Health. You are seeking an Accounts

Manager for your company.

General Description:

This position is for a full-time Accounts Manager

The primary responsibilities are:

1. Manages the accounting clerks for a district within Humankind Health.

2. Is responsible for overseeing payment of Humankind Health's product orders.

3. Works with health insurance companies to resolve escalated billing issues.

Six applicants have applied for the positions, they are listed below:

1. Mr. Ethan Jacobs

2. Ms. Erin Weathers

3. Mr. David Freid

4. Mr. Ralph Jennings

5. Mr. Joseph Williams

6. Mr. Mike Anderson

You are currently reviewing David's and Mike's applications. To make your decision you will

review a short job description and two professional social media pages. You will then complete a

feedback form about each applicant's suitability.

Appendix C

#InItTogether

David Freid
Account Team Lead

Human Alliance Health

About

I am a passionate accountant that has worked in the field for approximately 10 years. I have served as a team lead for several years in Health Care accounts and other related areas. Outside of accounting, I enjoy walking my dogs with my partner Eric. I have also served in the community by volunteering for the local LGBT Pride group.

Experience

Accounts Team Lead
Human Alliance Health
Jan 2020 - Present · 2 years 5 months

Account Specialist
BuisnessWorks Accounts
May 2014 - Dec 2019 · 5 years 8 months

Account Coordinator
Clinic Group Payable
Apr 2012 - May 2014 · 2 years 2 months

Honors & Awards

Community Care Award
LGBT Pride Group
Jan 2020

#InItTogether

David Freid
Nursing Team Lead

Human Alliance Health

About

I am a passionate registered nurse that has worked in the field for approximately 10 years. I have served as a team lead for several years in hospitals and patient care centers. Outside of nursing, I enjoy walking my dogs with my partner Eric. I have also served in the community by volunteering for the Lifelong AIDS Alliance.

Experience

Nursing Team Lead
Human Alliance Health
Jan 2020 – Present · 2 years 5 months

Staff Registered Nurse
Human Hearts Hospital
May 2014 – Dec 2019 · 5 years 8 months

Nurse
TrustHealth Clinics
Apr 2012 – May 2014 · 2 years 2 months

Honors & Awards

Community Care
Lifelong AIDS Alliance
Jan 2020

Mike Anderson

Account Payable Team Leader

Life Path Health Group

About

I am a motivated Accounts manager that has worked in the field for about 10 years. I have been employed as a team leader for many years in many areas of accounting, including in Health Care accounts. When I am not working, I enjoy spending time with my wife Ann and our dogs. I also enjoy seeing the community by volunteering at the local YMCA.

Experience

Accounts Payable Team Lead
Life Path Health Group
2020 – Present · 2 years

Account Manager
Accoord Accounts
2015 – 2020 · 5 years

Account Assistant
Humana
2012 – 2015 · 3 years

Honors & Awards

Community Service Award
YMCA
Dec 2019

Mike Anderson

Registered Nurse

Life Path Health Group

About

I am a motivated registered nurse that has worked in the field for about 10 years. I have been employed as a team leader for many years in many areas of patient care including hospitals. When I am not practicing, I enjoy spending time with my wife Laura and our dogs. I also enjoy seeing the community by working with local Hospice centers in my free time.

Experience

Nurse Team Lead
Life Path Health Group
2020 – Present · 2 years

Humana
8 years

- **Registered Nurse**
  2015 – 2020 · 5 years

- **Nursing Assistant**
  2012 – 2015 · 3 years

Honors & Awards

Community Service Award
Home Care Hospice
Dec 2019

Appendix D

Perceived Leader Effectiveness

Items					
	To no extent	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	To an extremely large extent
To what extent does the subject have qualities for good leadership?	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent does the subject match your image of a good leader?	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent do you believe the subject will behave as a leader should?	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent do you think the subject would be an effective leader?	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent do you think you'd like the subject as a leader?	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent do you think the subject would be a good leader?	1	2	3	4	5
To what degree would you support the subject as a leader?	1	2	3	4	5
To what degree would you endorse the subject as a leader?	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent would you be willing to defer to the subject as the leader?	1	2	3	4	5

To what extent do you think you'd be influenced by the subject as the leader?	1	2	3	4	5

Hains, S. C., Hogg, M. A., & Duck, J. M. (1997). Self-Categorization and leadership: Effects of group prototypicality and leader stereotypicality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*(10), 1087–1099. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672972310009

The following question assessing selection will be as follows:

1. Please indicate the likelihood that you will hire David

Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Please indicate the likelihood that you will hire Mike

Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
1	2	3	4	5

3. Which candidate would you choose to hire for the position?

a. Mr. David Freid

b. Mr. Mike Anderson

Appendix E

Social Desirability

Listed below are statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.		
It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.	T	F
I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	T	F
On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.	T	F
There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	T	F
No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.	T	F
There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	T	F
I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.	T	F
I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	T	F
I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	T	F
I have never been irked when people express ideas very different from my own.	T	F
There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	T	F
I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	T	F
I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	T	F

Scoring:
- Add 1 point to the score for each "True" response to statements 5, 7, 9, 10, and 13. Add 0 points to the score for each "False" response to these statements.
- Add 1 point to the score for each "False" response to statements 1,2,3,4,6, 8, 11, and 12. Add 0 points to the score for each "True" response to these statements.

Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the marlowe-crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *38*(1), 119–125. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(198201)38:1<119::AID-JCLP2270380118>3.0.CO;2-I

Appendix F

Modern Homonegativity Scale

1. Many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges. (MHS)

2. Gay men seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals and ignore the ways in which they are the same. (MHS)

3. Gay men do not have all the rights they need. (MHS)*

4. The notion of universities providing students with undergraduate degrees in Gay and Lesbian Studies is ridiculous. (MHS)

5. Celebrations such as "Gay Pride Day" are ridiculous because they assume that an individual's sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride. (MHS)

6. Gay men still need to protest for equal rights. (MHS)*

7. Gay men should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people's throats. (MHS)

8. If gay men want to be treated like everyone else, then they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture. (MHS)

9. Gay men who are "out of the closet" should be admired for their courage. (MHS)*

10. Gay men should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society, and simply get on with their lives. (MHS)

11. In today's tough economic times, tax dollars shouldn't be used to support gay men's organizations. (MHS)

12. Gay men have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights. (MHS)

* Items are reverse scored

Morrison, M. A., & Morrison, T. G. (2000). Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *43*(2), 2002.

Appendix G

Demographics Questions

1. What is your age in years? (fill in blank)

2. What is your gender? (Male, female, other, prefer not to say)

3. What is your sexuality? (gay, straight, other, prefer not to say)

4. What is your ethnicity? (White, Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Native American or American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern or North African, Other, Prefer not to say)

5. In which region of the U.S. do you work? (Midwest, Northeast, South, West, Puerto Rico or other U.S. territories, Other [please specify], None)

6. How many total years have you been employed? (fill in blank)

7. How many years of hiring experience do you have? (less than 1 year, 1-3 years, 4-6 years, more than 6 years)

Appendix H

Quality Control Items

1. For validity purposes please mark _to a moderate extent_ for this question.
2. For validity purposes please mark _false_ for this question.
3. For validity purposes please mark _strongly disagree_ for this question.
4. Is there any reason why we should **_NOT_** use your data? Your answer to this question will **_NOT_** affect your compensation. (My data should be included in your analyses/My data should **_NOT_** be included in your analyses)

Manipulation Check Items

1. Please select the sexual orientation of David.
2. Please indicate which gender predominately applied to the original job posting for the position.

Screening Questions

1. Are you at least 25 years of age?
2. Do you have experience in hiring employees?
3. Are you proficient in reading and speaking English?
4. Are you currently working in the United States?

Appendix I

Debriefing

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

The goal of this study is to better understand the reasons that leaders may be chosen for a position when they are effectively equivalent, specifically when one of those leaders is gay. In the survey, you were asked to provide your opinions of two candidates for a leadership position at Humankind Health.

The data we collect from this survey will be used to determine whether leaders who are gay are discriminated against. In addition, it will help us more accurately define the circumstances in which discrimination occurs in this group. Ultimately, knowing this could contribute to a better understanding of discrimination against individuals who are gay.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact us at snm5@mtmail.mtsu.edu (primary investigator) or rick.moffett@mtsu.edu (faculty advisor).