

RECRUITING EMPLOYEES WITH MULTICULTURAL READINESS AND EMOTIONAL
INTELLIGENCE: INFLUENCING THE APPLICANT POOL

by

HARRIET I LANDAU

(Under the Direction of Kecia M. Thomas)

ABSTRACT

Recruitment is the primary method used to attract talent and draw human capital into the organization. Recruitment can be used to increase the pool of job applicants or to target potential applicants with specific skills and qualities. The effectiveness and utility of subsequent human resource activities, such as selection and training, depend heavily upon the quality and quantity of the applicants initially attracted to the organization by its recruitment efforts. Several recruitment scholars have suggested that organizations may be able to influence the quality or characteristics of the applicant pool by manipulating the content of information in recruitment messages. The ability of employees and management to comprehend many different cultural and emotional perspectives and the impact of those perspectives on interactions between individuals is critical to today's organizations in light of several recent trends. Thus, the ability to work, manage, and lead with multicultural and emotional competence is an important quality for organizations to consider when recruiting employees. The present study focuses on whether organizations can use recruitment literature to more effectively attract employees with multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence. More specifically, the study was designed to examine a) whether the content of organizational recruitment brochures could be manipulated to

increase the attractiveness of the organization to potential employees and b) whether the relationship between organizational attraction and content of the recruitment brochure would vary as a function of either emotional intelligence or multicultural readiness. Sections of a recruitment brochure were manipulated to reflect three categories of content related to multicultural readiness (neutral/EEO statement, emphasis on valuing diverse perspectives, and opportunity to interact with diverse others) and four categories related to emotional intelligence (neutral statement about work environment, supportive employee culture, supportive leadership, and awareness of emotions). Three measures of organizational attraction were regressed on vectors representing the brochure conditions, measures of multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence, and vectors representing cross-products of interest. Results failed to support any of the hypotheses.

INDEX WORDS: Diversity, organizational recruitment, organizational attraction, organization attractiveness, multicultural leaders, emotional intelligence, multicultural organizations

RECRUITING EMPLOYEES WITH MULTICULTURAL READINESS AND EMOTIONAL
INTELLIGENCE: INFLUENCING THE APPLICANT POOL

by

HARRIET I LANDAU

J. D., University of Michigan, 1974

M.S., University of Georgia, 2002

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

© 2004

Harriet I Landau

All Rights Reserved

RECRUITING EMPLOYEES WITH MULTICULTURAL READINESS AND EMOTIONAL
INTELLIGENCE: INFLUENCING THE APPLICANT POOL

by

HARRIET I LANDAU

Major Professor: Kecia M Thomas
Committee: Karl Kuhnert
 Gary Lautenschlager
 Laura Bierema

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special thanks to Dr. Kecia M. Thomas, my major professor, for sharing her wisdom, advice and encouragement during this project. She is a wonderful friend, colleague and mentor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

| | | |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | ORGANIZATIONAL RECRUITMENT AND ATTRACTION | 1 |
| 2 | ORGANIZATIONAL RECRUITMENT LITERATURE..... | 5 |
| 3 | WORKPLACE DIVERSITY, MULTICULTURAL READINESS, AND RECRUITMENT..... | 12 |
| 4 | EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND RECRUITMENT | 19 |
| 5 | METHOD | 29 |
| 6 | RESULTS | 39 |
| 7 | DISCUSSION | 60 |
| | REFERENCES | 67 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| A | PILOT STUDY..... | 78 |
| B | ESTIMATE OF SAMPLE SIZE | 81 |
| C | NON-MANIPULATED SECTIONS OF BROCHURE..... | 87 |
| D | DIVERSITY BROCHURE CONTENT AND ASSOCIATED MANIPULATION CHECKS | 89 |
| E | EI BROCHURE CONTENT AND ASSOCIATED MANIPULATION CHECKS ... | 90 |
| F | ADDITIONAL CONTENT REVIEW QUESTIONS | 91 |
| G | MULTICULTURAL READINESS [OTHER GROUP ORIENTATION] SCALE ... | 92 |
| H | EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE [SSRI] SCALE | 93 |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I | ORGANIZATIONAL ATTRACTION SCALES | 95 |
| J | BACKGROUND QUESTIONS | 96 |
| K | ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS | 98 |

CHAPTER 1

ORGANIZATIONAL RECRUITMENT AND ATTRACTION

The importance of recruitment to organizations is well recognized (Barber, 1998; Breugh, 1992; Carlson, Connerly, & Mecham, 2002; Rynes, 1991; Taylor & Collins, 2000) and organizations spend significant resources on recruitment activities (Barber). Recruitment is the primary method used to attract talent and draw human capital into the organization (Barber; Carlson et al., 2002; Taylor & Collins) and can be used to increase the pool of job applicants or to target potential applicants with specific skills or qualities (Barber). Recruiting and attracting superior human resources is one way human resource systems can enhance an organization's competitive advantage (Lado & Wilson, 1994; Taylor & Collins). Furthermore, the effectiveness and utility of subsequent human resource activities, such as selection and training, depend heavily upon the quality and quantity of the applicants initially attracted to the organization by its recruitment efforts (Barber; Murphy, 1996).

As pointed out by Breugh and Starke (2000), research interest in recruitment has significantly increased over the last 30 years. For example, the 1976 edition of the Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology contained only one paragraph about employee recruitment, yet the second edition, in 1991, contained an entire chapter (Barber; Rynes, 1991). In spite of its critical role, however, there remain many unanswered questions about recruitment (Aiman-Smith, Bauer, & Cable, 2001; Barber, 1998; Taylor & Collins, 2000; Rynes, 1991).

One of the first steps for an organization in creating a recruitment strategy is determining what types of applicants it wishes to attract (Breugh & Starke, 2000). Two important areas

related to organizational behavior in the 21st century are diversity and emotions in the work place (Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Daus, 2002). The ability of employees and management to comprehend many different cultural and emotional perspectives and the impact of those perspectives on interactions between individuals is critical to today's organizations in light of several recent trends, including increased a) globalization, b) diversity of the workforce c) diversity of customer base, c) shift to a service economy, and d) reliance on technology (Ashkanasy et al.). Furthermore, diversity within workgroups may lead to increased emotional and task conflict requiring group members and leaders to have good emotion management skills (Ayoko & Hartel, 2002). Fernandez and Davis (1999) propose that many organizational problems related to racism and sexism stem from low emotional intelligence. Chrobot-Mason and Leslie (2003) found empirical evidence to suggest that emotional intelligence is a predictor of multicultural competence and also suggest that successfully managing employee differences may require more emotional intelligence than cognitive ability. Thus, the ability to work, manage, and lead with multicultural and emotional competence is an important quality for organizations to consider when recruiting employees.

Several recruitment scholars have suggested that organizations may be able to influence the quality or characteristics of the applicant pool by manipulating the content and specificity of information in recruitment messages (Carlson et al., 2002; Highhouse, Stierwalt, Bachionochi, Elder & Fisher, 1999; Mason & Belt, 1986; Rynes & Barber, 1990). The present study focuses on whether organizations can use recruitment literature (more specifically, a recruitment brochure distributed to job seekers) to more effectively attract potential employees with multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence.

Despite the recognized importance of recruitment, researchers and scholars do not always conceptualize recruitment in the same way. Notwithstanding differences in conceptual boundaries, however, they all emphasize the importance of attraction between a potential applicant and the organization (e.g., Barber, 1998; Breaugh, 1992; Rynes, 1991; Taylor & Collins, 2000). Rynes and Barber (1990) describe organizational recruitment as one of many activities carried out by organizations to increase attraction, more specifically, an activity “designed to either increase the number or to change the characteristics of individuals who are willing to consider applying for or accepting a job” (p. 287). They identify four dimensions of recruitment that might influence applicant attraction: organizational representatives, recruitment messages, recruitment sources, and recruitment timing. Barber describes attraction, or generating applicants, as the primary purpose of the first stage of recruitment. In this stage, organizations attempt to identify qualified individuals and persuade them to apply for a job and become part of the applicant pool. Individuals at this stage evaluate the overall attractiveness of the organization and assess whether the organization is worth further consideration. (Although not further addressed herein, stage two is maintaining applicants and stage three is influencing job choice).

The success of activities focused on attraction determines the upper limit of potential success for later stage recruitment activities, as well as organizational efforts directed at selection and employee retention (Carlson et al., 2002; Rynes, 1991). If highly qualified individuals do not apply, there is no chance to influence their job choice decisions or to hire them. Thus, an individual’s decision whether or not to apply for a job is a critical decision for the organization. As described by Carlson et al. “the first priority of recruitment should be attracting the best possible applicants because attraction outcomes establish the maximum contribution that is

possible in any staffing system. Even heroic efforts in status maintenance, selection, gaining job acceptance, or employee retention cannot overcome poor attraction outcomes” (p. 465).

CHAPTER 2

ORGANIZATIONAL RECRUITMENT LITERATURE

One of the primary methods used by organizations to attract potential applicants and persuade them to apply for a job is dissemination of information about the job and the organization (Barber, 1998; Breugh, 1992). This information can be communicated in many ways including, newspaper advertisements, internet postings, placement office postings, recruitment brochures, job fair literature, etc. One frequently used method, especially on college campuses and at job fairs, is the recruitment brochure (Breugh, 1992; Highhouse, Hoffman, Greve, & Collins, 2002; Rynes & Boudreau, 1986). Such brochures are generally used to communicate information about the organization as a whole rather than a specific job (Breugh, 1992) and can be used to communicate information about organizational culture, values, and opportunities for advancement, as well as characteristics of existing employees (Highhouse et al., 2002).

There are two primary theories that help explain why the content of recruitment literature may impact attraction, and other recruitment outcomes: Social identity theory and signaling theory. Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) proposes that one's self-identity and sense of self-worth may be derived in part from group memberships, including the organizations for which individuals work (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Several scholars and researchers have suggested that potential applicants may prefer to join organizations with favorable images (as perceived by the applicant or as assumed to be perceived by others) as a means of enhancing one's self-esteem (Backhaus, Stone, & Heiner, 2002; Barber, 1998; Turban

& Greening, 1996). Association with an organization that has a favorable image enhances self-esteem by providing an opportunity to see oneself as affiliated with those positive qualities, creating a more positive self-evaluation.

On the other hand, signaling theory suggests that in the absence of specific and complete information about the organization, potential applicants may use the limited information from recruitment literature as signals or cues about what it would be like to work at that organization – a signal of what the working conditions are likely to be (Backhaus et al., 2002; Barber, 1998; Breaugh, 1992; Greening & Turban, 2000; Rynes, 1991; Turban & Greening, 1996). Thus information garnered from recruitment brochures about organizational attributes or values may be used in deciding which firms may be appropriate places for the individual to work – which would, in turn, increase the attractiveness of the organization as a place to work and trigger a decision to apply for a position at that organization

Researchers generally use one of three approaches in studying the impact of recruitment literature on attraction and other job related outcomes: a) examining the impact of information about organizational attributes on attracting the largest number of applicants (determining which organizational attributes will have the most impact on the most people), b) examining the role of a match or congruence between potential employees and potential employers, and c) examining the role of individual differences as a moderator of the relationship between organizational attributes and recruitment outcomes.

Organizational Attributes with the Most Impact on the Most People

Empirical evidence suggests that individuals may be more attracted to organizations with certain organizational attributes, such as a pro-environmental stance (Bauer & Aiman-Smith, 1996), de-centralized decision making (Turban & Keon, 1993), individual-based compensation

systems (Bretz, Ash & Dreher, 1989), corporate social performance (Greening & Turban, 2000; Turban & Greening, 1996), or high ecological ratings (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001). Judge and Bretz (1992) used professional degree students to assess job descriptions varying among other things the organization's emphasis on four core values: achievement, concern for others, honesty, and fairness. Results indicated that an organization's standing on these core values was significantly associated with the participants' reported likelihood of accepting a job offer. In addition, the researchers found that information about concern for others, achievement, and fairness influenced the decision-making process more than information about pay and promotional opportunities. Highhouse, Zickar, Thorsteinson, Stierwalt, & Slaughter (1999) investigated several organizational dimensions that might determine the attractiveness of fast food companies as a place of work. The dimensions most critical for teenagers were respectability, atmosphere, and hearing good things about working there. For retirees, the dimensions that best predicted attraction were similar coworkers, product image, customers, and respectability.

Turban & Greening (1996) noted that several large corporations (such as IBM, General Motors, and Microsoft) used information about their philanthropic and environmental programs as a recruitment strategy by including such information in their recruitment brochures. Using organizations familiar to students, they found that independent ratings of organizations' corporate social performance (CSP) were positively related to the organizations' reputations and attractiveness as an employer. The authors explained their findings in terms of social identity theory and signaling theory, and suggested that socially responsible firms may have a competitive advantage in attracting applicants. This idea was further supported by the results of an experimental study in which participants indicated they were more likely to pursue a job,

interview, and accept a job offer from an organization that is socially responsible as compared to an organization with a poor social performance record (Greening & Turban, 2000). Backhaus et al. (2002) further examined the role of CSP in organizational attractiveness and found that ratings of attraction increase with ratings of CSP, especially with respect to the dimensions of environment, community relations, and diversity. The authors suggest that organizations may benefit by including information about these areas in their recruitment efforts.

Matching Perspective

The second approach in understanding the impact of recruitment literature on attraction explores whether people are differentially attracted to organizations as a result of a fit or congruence (or perception of such fit) between the culture and values of the organization and their own personality, attitudes and values. Several studies support the idea that people prefer organizations that fit their personality and values and suggest that recruitment and job choice outcomes can be predicted by examining congruence. For, example, Tom (1971) asked a sample of 100 graduate students to assess the personality and values of their most and least preferred employer-organizations. The participants were later asked to evaluate themselves using the same instruments. Most participants preferred those employer-organizations that were similar to their own self-profile. Judge & Bretz (1992) also found that individuals were more attracted to organizations whose values were congruent with their own. Results from a longitudinal field study by Cable and Judge (1996) suggest that job seekers' subjective perceptions of fit predicted the likelihood of accepting a job, if offered, as well as later work attitudes such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and willingness to recommend the organization to others. Judge and Cable (1997) found that both objective person-organization fit

and subjective person-organization fit were related to organization attractiveness, and that organization attractiveness was related to job choice.

Based on the idea that job seekers may search recruitment material for signals that an organization matches their salient identity, Honeycutt and Rosen (1977) examined salient identities (family identity, career identity and balance identity) of MBA alumni and students in relation to attractiveness of organizations with different career paths and policies (flexible, dual, or traditional). All types of participants (including men, women, parents and non-parents) indicated more attraction to an organization with flexible career paths and policies. On the other hand, participants were differentially attracted to dual and traditional paths and policies. For example, balance salient individuals were more attracted to dual career paths and policies over traditional career paths and policies; yet, career salient individuals indicated no difference between dual and traditional paths and policies.

Individual Differences Approach

Several studies have looked at the role of individual differences in moderating the relationship between organizational attributes and recruitment outcomes. Feldman and Arnold (1978) found that participants high in growth-need strength placed more importance on the use of skills and abilities, autonomy, and independence than participants low in growth-need strength. On the other hand, participants low in growth-need strength placed more importance on pay and fringe benefits than participants high in growth-need strength. In another study, differences in applicant attraction were found between MBA students with high as compared to low levels of family-to-work, work-to-family, and work-to-school role conflict with respect to recruitment brochures describing organizations with a flextime option, a telecommunicating option, both options, or a standard work arrangement (Rau & Hyland, 2002). Participants with

high levels of role conflict were more attracted to an organization with a flextime option, but reported no significant difference in attraction between organizations that offered a telecommuting option vs. a standard work arrangement. On the other hand, participants with a low level of role conflict reported no difference in their preference between organizations that offered flextime vs. a standard work arrangement, but reported more attraction to an organization offering telecommuting than one offering a standard work arrangement. Bretz et al. (1989) found participants who were more attracted to an organization with an individually oriented reward system scored higher in a measure of need for achievement than participants who were more attracted to organizations with an organizationally oriented reward system.

Turban and Keon (1993) examined the influences of need for achievement and self-esteem in connection with attraction for certain organizational attributes. They found that a) self-esteem moderated the relationship between centralization/decentralization and attraction, b) need for achievement moderated the relationship between reward structure (performance based vs. seniority based pay) and attraction, and c) both self-esteem and need for achievement moderated the relationship between organization size and attraction. For example, although participants were in general more attracted to decentralized organizations and organizations with performance based pay, individuals with lower self-esteem were more attracted to decentralized and larger organizations while people high in need for achievement were more attracted to smaller organizations as well as organizations that rewarded performance rather than seniority. Judge and Cable (1997) found that jobseeker personality, as measured by each of the Big Five personality traits, differentially predicted preferences for organizational culture. For example, neuroticism was negatively related to a preference for an innovative culture and a team-oriented

culture; extroversion was positively related to a preference for an aggressive culture and a team oriented culture, and negatively related to a preference for a supportive culture.

Although focusing on the moderating effects of individual differences on the relationship between organizational attributes and attraction, none of these studies directly considered whether an organization might desire to attract individuals with more or less of a particular individual attribute. If the individual difference moderates such relationship, however, an organization might be able to attract applicants with higher (or lower) levels of some desirable individual attribute by emphasizing a particular organizational attribute in its recruitment literature. For example, the ability to work, manage, and lead with multicultural and emotional competence is an important quality for organizations to consider when recruiting employees. Thus two individual differences of interest to organizations are multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence. Accordingly, the present study will explore whether an organization can use recruitment literature to differentially attract individuals high in multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence.

CHAPTER 3

WORKPLACE DIVERSITY, MULTICULTURAL READINESS, AND RECRUITMENT

In addition to social, moral, and legal arguments in support of diversity in the workplace, many business and diversity scholars argue that a diverse workforce should also lead to a more productive and effective organization, one that encompasses learning, flexibility, creativity and growth (Thomas & Ely, 1996). It is also recognized that this potential upside of diversity is rarely achieved. This failure to reap the benefits of diversity has been attributed to an overemphasis on the number of employees and managers representing diverse ethnic and cultural groups and on the assimilation and socialization of nontraditional employees into the culture of the majority, rather than taking advantage of the different perspectives and approaches to work that members of a diverse workforce bring to the workplace (Chrobot-Mason & Ruderman, 2004; Offerman & Phan, 2002; Thomas, 1998; Thomas & Ely).

Offermann and Phan (2002) define cultural intelligence as “the ability to function effectively in a diverse context where the assumptions, values, and traditions of one’s upbringing are not uniformly shared with those with whom one needs to work” (p. 188). They point out that although cultural intelligence is desirable for all individuals who function in multicultural environments, the responsibility for maximizing the value of a diverse workforce falls primarily on its leaders. To benefit from the advantages that diversity has to offer, an organization requires leaders and managers with more than traditional leadership skills. Leaders of a multicultural workplace require skills and abilities specifically related to diversity (Chrobot-Mason & Ruderman, 2004; Offermann & Phan; Thomas, 1998; Thomas & Ely, 1996).

Several diversity and leadership scholars have articulated the skills and abilities required of effective multicultural leaders. According to Chrobot-Mason and Ruderman (2004), effective diversity leaders will a) encourage and reward creative and innovative ideas b) support alternative work styles and approaches to problem solving, c) attempt to minimize the conflict and power struggles that arise from a diverse workforce, and d) evaluate employees as individuals with sensitivity toward diversity issues and conflicts. Offermann and Phan (2002) contend that, among other skills, multicultural leaders must a) be proficient in diagnosing diversity issues and resolving diversity-related conflicts and problems, b) play a part in reducing inequality between groups, c) create expectations and perceptions of justice and fairness, d) encourage and facilitate the open exchange of ideas and opinions, and e) match appropriate leadership behaviors and expectations to specific cross-cultural situations. According to Thomas and Ely (1996), leaders of successful multicultural organizations must also be able to establish and encourage an organizational culture that a) creates an expectation of high levels of performance from all employees, not just those from non-minority groups, b) stimulates personal development and growth of all employees, c) encourages openness and a high tolerance for debate and constructive conflict on work related issues, and d) makes workers feel valued, enabling them to feel comfortable in applying their diverse skills and experiences in nontraditional ways to improve job performance.

It is clear from these descriptions of cultural intelligence and effective multicultural leaders that organizations are likely to benefit from attracting and hiring individuals who have the potential to effectively function and lead in a multicultural organization (multicultural readiness). A review of the literature that discusses readiness for working and leading in a multicultural environment reveals many components of multicultural readiness. According to

Thomas (1998), effective multicultural leaders will be aware of their own culture and the impact of that culture upon their ability to interact with dissimilar others. They will realize the role that culture plays in their work life as well as their personal life. Furthermore, they will have given thought to their identity, especially ethnic identity, and the privileges that are associated with their group memberships. Similarly, Offermann and Phan (2002) argue that the foundation to effective multicultural leadership is greater understanding and awareness of oneself and others in terms of cultural conditioning. They argue that effective leaders must be aware of their own biases, prejudices, and attitudes toward dissimilar others. Effective multicultural leaders will also be aware of how their own culture and background affects the values and expectations they bring to the workplace and the way in which they view others.

Not only are effective multicultural leaders interested in their own culture, they are also interested in the cultures of others (Thomas, 1998) and will increase their knowledge of cultural differences, including comparable values, biases, and expectations (Offermann & Phan, 2002). Moreover, effective leaders recognize the implications and significance of cultural differences when working with members of other groups (Thomas). Finally, effective multicultural leaders appreciate, value, and respect cultural differences (Offermann & Phan; Thomas). According to Thomas, effective multicultural leaders are able to step outside of their own frame of reference, avoid imposing their own culture on others, and evaluate the culture of others without judgment. They do not try to change or eliminate the cultural idiosyncrasies of others (Thomas). Furthermore, they truly value the variety of opinions, perspectives, and insights that arise from a diverse workforce and understand that there is more than one right way to get things done (Thomas & Ely, 1996) which, in turn, enables them to assess the strengths and weaknesses of

various approaches and perspectives to work and combine them in the most optimal way to improve organizational effectiveness (Offermann & Phan).

In summary, multicultural readiness incorporates three primary themes: a) an awareness of and an interest in one's own culture as well as the culture of others, b) an appreciation of the value of diverse cultures and perspectives, and c) an appreciation of the complexity of interactions with diverse others at work or in one's personal life. It appears, however, that very little research has been published addressing the attraction and recruitment of applicants (men, women, minority, or majority) who have an ability to work, manage, or lead in a multicultural organization, even though the importance of such an ability in today's workplace is well recognized (Chrobot-Mason & Ruderman, 2004; Cox, 1994; Offerman & Phan, 2002; Thomas, 1998; Thomas & Ely, 1996).

Previous research related to organizational attractiveness and diversity has focused primarily on a) differences between races or genders, b) how to attract or recruit more women and minorities, or c) a combination of the two (e.g., Thomas & Wise; 1999; Highhouse, Steirwalt et al., 1999). For example, Williams and Bauer (1994) found that participants rated an organization more attractive if its recruitment brochure contained a paragraph describing a managing diversity policy as compared to a standard equal opportunity statement. The managing diversity policy emphasized the dignity and rights of each person, equal consideration for advancement, valuing the contributions of a diverse work force, and programs to teach all employees about the strengths that individuals from diverse background bring to the organization. Although non-whites and women found both organizations more attractive than Whites and men, there was no indication that minority groups or women rated the organization with a managing diversity policy more attractive than men or non-minorities (i.e. no joint effect).

The researchers did not examine, however, any within group differences, such as multicultural readiness. Left unasked and unanswered was whether multicultural readiness would have moderated the relationships between content of the brochure and attraction to the organization.

In one of the only studies related to organization attraction and multicultural attitudes, Avery (2003) found that the reactions of both Black and White participants to diversity or lack of diversity depicted in organization web site ads were moderated by the participants' other-group orientation (a measure of attitudes towards and interactions with other ethnic groups; Phinney, 1992). White participants with a higher other-group orientation reported more organizational attractiveness for web site ads that depicted either a) diversity in both workers and managers or b) diversity in workers, but no diversity (Whites only) in managers, over c) an ad that depicted no diversity in workers or managers. On the other hand, White participants with a lower other-group orientation reported more organizational attractiveness for a web site ad that depicted a) no diversity in workers or managers over ads that depicted either b) diversity in both workers and managers, or c) diversity in workers but no diversity in managers. Black participants with a higher other-group orientation reported more organizational attractiveness as compared to Black participants with a lower other-group orientation for web site ads that depicted either a) no diversity in workers or managers or b) diversity in both workers and managers over c) an ad that showed diversity in workers but no diversity as managers.

Because multicultural readiness is related to positive attitudes toward the culture of others, an appreciation and valuing of differences, and an interest in the cultures of others, it is logical to assume that multicultural readiness may be associated with individual preferences for a diverse workplace, an organizational culture that values different perspectives, or an opportunity to interact, work with, and learn about the values, perspectives and beliefs of others. Recruitment

brochures that emphasize such characteristics may act as a signal to job seekers about the multicultural environment of the organization, what it would be like to work in the organization, or whether the values of the organization are compatible with the individual's values and attitudes. Thus, organizations using recruitment brochures that emphasize a culture of valuing different perspectives, seeking out and using various points of view, or an opportunity to work with individuals from different backgrounds might appear more attractive to jobseekers with higher levels of multicultural readiness. In addition, based on the findings of William and Bauer (1994), such organizations are likely to be generally more attractive than organizations that do not emphasize such characteristics. This study will investigate the relationship between information on diversity in recruitment brochures and attraction to the organization, as well as the moderating effect of multicultural readiness on such relationship. Therefore, it is expected that:

H1: Job seekers will find an organization that emphasizes valuing diverse perspectives in its recruitment brochure more attractive than an organization that contains only a traditional EEO policy statement in its recruitment brochure.

H2: Job seekers will find an organization that emphasizes the opportunity to interact with individuals from different backgrounds in its recruitment brochure more attractive than an organization that contains only a traditional EEO policy statement in its recruitment brochure.

H3: The relationship between multicultural readiness and organization attractiveness will be positive, significant and stronger with respect to an organization that emphasizes valuing different perspectives in its recruitment brochure, as compared to an organization that emphasizes only a standard EEO policy.

H4: The relationship between multicultural readiness and organization attractiveness will be positive, significant and stronger with respect to an organization that emphasizes the opportunity to interact with individuals from different backgrounds in its recruitment brochure, as compared to an organization that emphasizes only a standard EEO policy.

CHAPTER 4

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND RECRUITMENT

In recent years, many researchers and scholars have begun emphasizing the role of emotions and mood in the workplace. One particular area that has received a great deal of attention is emotional intelligence (EI). The term was first used in publication by Salovey and Mayer in 1990 and later popularized by Goleman's 1995 book, *Emotional Intelligence*. Since then it has been defined and described in numerous ways and scholars have not yet reached a consensus on its underlying nature, components, or methods of measurement. (For a more detailed description of the history of EI including its roots in social intelligence, see Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000; Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002; and Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000).

There are several approaches to the conceptualization of EI (See Matthews et al., 2002; Mayer, Salovey et al., 2000; Petrides & Furnham, 2000b; Saklofske, Austin, Minski, 2003 for thorough discussion). One approach views EI as a type of intelligence, cognitive ability, or set of specific information-processing abilities (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, 2000). For example, "the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotion so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p.5) or "the ability to perceive and express emotion accurately and adaptively, the ability to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, the ability to use feelings to facilitate thought, and the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and in others" (Salovey & Pizarro, 2003, p. 263). Measurement of this type of EI is usually accomplished by a maximum performance or ability

test, based on items with correct and incorrect answers (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Mayer, Caruso and Salovey, 2000; Petrides & Furnham, 2003). In tests of EI, however, the “correct” answer is determined by an expert or by consensus, which is not the same concept as a correct answer used in traditional cognitive tests (Matthews et al).

Another approach views EI as a personal trait, personality dimension, or dispositional tendency (Matthews et al., 2002; Saklofske et al., 2003). For example, “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (Bar-On, 1997, p.14). To further confuse the issue, however, there are EI models that combine both ability and personality, sometimes referred to as mixed models (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Matthews et al.; Mayer, Salovey et al., 2000). For example, Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined EI as “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” p.189. They suggested that EI focuses on the processing of affective information, and that individuals may differ in their ability and skill at such processing. They further described EI in terms of three categories of mental processes:

1. Appraisal and expression of emotions. This category includes the accurate appraisal and expression of one’s own emotions, feelings, and moods (verbally and nonverbally) as well as the ability to accurately perceive and understand the emotions, feelings, and moods of others. Thus, people with higher EI can a) respond to their own emotions more accurately, more quickly, and more appropriately, b) express such emotions better to others, c) recognize the emotions and feelings of others more accurately and more quickly, and d) respond to the emotions of others with empathy or in another appropriate manner.

2. Regulation of emotion. This category includes regulation of emotions in the self as well as in others. For example, people with higher levels of EI a) are more adept at seeking activities, events, associates, or information that creates positive or other desired emotions or moods, b) can keep their moods and emotions under control when appropriate, c) work at attenuating negative moods and emotions, d) allow negative moods and emotions to be less destructive, e) persevere in spite of negative moods, and f) are able to prolong positive moods. Furthermore, they can affect the emotions and moods of others. They are adept at creating strong emotional reactions in others, enhancing the moods of others, and using emotions and moods to motivate others.
3. Utilization of emotion in solving problems. This category includes several methods of harnessing emotions to solve problems. For example, a) using mood swings to generate a wide variety (both positive and negative) of possible outcomes or future plans, b) using positive moods and emotions to facilitate better integration of cognitive material, in turn, leading to more creative responses, c) using mood and emotions as a signal to redirect attention to more significant problems, and d) using emotions to motivate persistence in the face of difficult challenges, such as using anxiety to prepare more thoroughly or using good moods to increase confidence.

Salovey and Mayer later acknowledged that this 1990 model was a mixed model because it incorporated aspects of both personality and ability (Brackett & Mayer).

The personality models and the mixed models are often grouped together as a category set apart from the intelligence/ability models. Measurement of mixed models and personality models are usually accomplished with self-report questionnaires (Matthews et al, 2002; Petrides

& Furnham, 2003; Saklofske et al., 2003). Petrides and Furnham (2000b, 2003) argue that the type of measurement (self-report vs. maximum performance) is what determines the nature of the underlying construct, suggesting that information-processing EI (measured by maximum performance or ability tests) and trait EI (measured by self-report instruments) should be considered as two distinct constructs, rather than two approaches to the same construct.

It is important to note, however, that there are several critics of the concept of EI who point out the lack of agreement as to the definition, nature and components of the construct; weak empirical support for the claims about EI; weak psychometric properties of test instruments; overlap with existing measures of personality and intelligence; and lack of theory for use of expert and consensus scoring of ability-type tests (e.g., Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Daus, 2002; Matthews et al., 2002).

Notwithstanding possible problems with the construct of EI, numerous organizational scholars have suggested that EI is an important individual difference variable to be considered in the workplace with respect to job performance (Goleman, 1998), management of employees (Ashkanasy et al., 2002), organizational effectiveness (Cherniss, 2001), and leadership (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002; George, 2000; Goleman, Boyatzis, & Mckee, 2002). Cherniss argues that EI is important at individual, group, and organizational levels and plays an important role in numerous organizational areas including employee recruitment and retention, talent development, teamwork, employee commitment, morale, innovation, productivity, efficiency, sales, revenues, quality of service, customer loyalty, client outcomes, change management, and decision making with respect to new products, markets and strategic alliances. “Look deeply at almost any factor that influences organizational effectiveness, and you will find that emotional intelligence plays a role” (Cherniss, p. 4).

The organizational area that has received the most attention with respect to EI is leadership. George (2000) argues that leadership is inherently emotional and that the mood and emotions of both leaders and followers play an essential role in leader effectiveness. Using descriptions and definitions of EI based primarily on the work of Mayer and colleagues (e.g., Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Mayer & Salovey, 1997), George describes four major aspects of EI (appraisal and expression of emotion; use of emotions to enhance cognitive processes and decision making; knowledge about emotions; and management of emotions) and discusses how those aspects of EI are likely to enhance the following fundamental components of leadership effectiveness (which according to George are based on a synthesis of Yukl, 1998; Locke, 1991; and Conger & Kanungo, 1998):

- “development of a collective sense of goals and objectives and how to go about achieving them;
- instilling in others knowledge and appreciation of the importance of work activities and behaviors;
- generating and maintaining excitement, enthusiasm, confidence, and optimism in an organization as well as cooperation and trust;
- encouraging flexibility in decision making and change;
- Establishing and maintaining a meaningful identity for an organization” (p. 1039).

Goleman et al. (2002) also suggest that the basic roots and tasks of leadership are emotional, making EI critically important for leadership success. Their book lists and discusses four broad leadership competencies directly related to EI: Self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management.

Moreover, scholars are increasingly incorporating emotions and EI into models of leadership. Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) propose a leadership model focusing on attributional and emotional responses to transformational leadership behaviors that incorporates the emotions and emotional intelligence of both leaders and members. Pescosolido (2002) proposes a model of emergent leadership in which an individual assumes a leadership role during times of ambiguity by determining the emotional response that best serves the group's needs and then modeling that response. This ability to manage the group's emotional reaction to ambiguous events allows the emergent leader to influence member behavior and group performance. Other scholars view EI not only as critically important to effective leadership, but also to team performance and effectiveness. Prati, Douglas, Ferris, Ammeter, and Buckley (2003) propose a model of leadership and team processes and outcomes in which EI of both team leaders and members influence leader and team effectiveness. Another model proposes that EI will moderate the relationship between perceptions of job insecurity and certain emotional reactions and behaviors, such that individuals high in EI will be less likely to exhibit negative behaviors as a reaction to the perception of job insecurity (Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Hartel, 2002).

One of the overarching themes of these models is that higher levels of member EI will benefit the organization in one way or another. Although only a few studies using EI as a variable have been published, the results support the importance of EI in workplace behaviors and outcomes. For example: Perceptions of leadership in small workgroups were influenced by two distinct but equally significant behavior patterns, a display of emotional abilities as well as a display of mental abilities (Kellet, Humphrey, & Sleeth, 2002); participants high in EI were able to identify the emotions represented by facial expressions faster than individuals low in EI (Petrides & Furnham, 2003); EI, especially empathic skill, played a significant role in leader

emergence within self-managing work teams (Wolff, Pescosolido, & Druskat, 2002); more successful account managers had higher levels of EI as compared to less successful account managers (Bachman, Stein, Campbell, & Sitarenios, 2000); and in a sample of undergraduate students, overall EI as well as perceiving emotions and regulating emotions contributed to individual cognitive based performance incrementally to the level attributable to general intelligence (Lam & Korby, 2002).

Although there is much discussion in the organizational and psychological literature regarding the importance of EI for both leaders and followers in organizations, there is very little discussion regarding the recruitment and selection of individuals with high levels of EI. One exception is Fernandez-Aroz (2001) who argues that the criteria traditionally used to select senior executives are inadequate and defective because they typically ignore EI. This failure to consider EI can lead to the hiring of senior executives who may not be best for the job. Notwithstanding the scarcity of discussion tying EI to recruitment and selection, it is logical to assume that recruiting individuals with higher levels of EI would be an advantage for organizations, depending, perhaps, on the cost of such efforts. The question of whether recruitment literature can be used to attract individuals with higher levels of EI remains unanswered.

None of the reported studies on organizational attraction or person-organization fit (congruence) consider the role of EI. There are, however, a few studies that have examined individual differences that are similar to aspects of EI. For example, in a policy capturing study, Judge and Bretz (1992) found that four organizational values, including *concern for others* (as well as achievement, honesty, and fairness) were positively related to the likelihood of accepting a job offer. Furthermore there was an interaction between individual value orientation and

organizational value such that individuals whose primary value orientation was concern for others were more likely than other participants to accept a job in an organization that emphasized concern for others. Concern for others was described as “a caring, compassionate demeanor [which]... might be operationalized by helping others perform difficult jobs, encouraging someone who is having a bad day, or sharing information or resources others need to do their job” (p.261). Similarly, Schein and Diamante (1988) found that individuals who score high on certain personality characteristics, including *nurturance*, report a higher level of attraction to an organization described in a manner to reflect the same characteristic. Judge and Cable (1997; based on O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991) describe several organizational culture preferences, including *supportiveness* or “the degree to which individuals prefer organizations that are supportive, promote information sharing, and praise good performance” (p. 363).

Because EI is related an ability to understand and show empathy for the emotions of others, it is logical to assume that EI may be associated with individual preferences for a compassionate, empathic organizational culture. Recruitment brochures that emphasize such an atmosphere or related behaviors may act as a signal to job seekers about the environment of the organization, what it would be like to work in the organization, or whether the values of the organization are compatible with the individual’s values and attitudes. Thus, recruitment brochures that emphasize a culture of compassion, caring, and empathy might appear more attractive to job seekers with higher levels of EI. In addition, such organizations are likely to be generally more attractive than organizations that do not emphasize such characteristics. This study will investigate the relationship between organizational attraction and information in recruitment brochures related to a compassionate culture, as well as the moderating effect of EI on such relationship. Furthermore, jobseekers may react differently to a reference about

compassionate employees in general as compared to compassionate leaders. Therefore, it is expected that:

H5: Job seekers will find an organization that emphasizes a culture of empathy, caring, and compassion among employees in its recruitment brochure more attractive than an organization that contains only a traditional statement about work environment in its recruitment brochure.

H6: Job seekers will find an organization that emphasizes empathetic, caring and compassionate leaders in its recruitment brochure more attractive than an organization that contains only a traditional statement about work environment in its recruitment brochure.

H7: The relationship between emotional intelligence and organization attractiveness will be positive, significant and stronger with respect to an organization that emphasizes a culture of empathy, caring, and compassion among employees in its recruitment brochure, as compared to an organization that contains only a traditional statement about work environment in its recruitment brochure.

H8: The relationship between emotional intelligence and organization attractiveness will be positive, significant and stronger with respect to an organization that emphasizes empathetic, caring, and compassionate leaders in its recruitment brochure, as compared to an organization that contains only a traditional statement about work environment in its recruitment brochure.

Another aspect of the recruitment brochure that might impact attraction and interact with EI is a description of organizational members as emotionally intelligent, even though not directly using the term “emotional intelligence.” Although a reference to emotions in a recruitment

brochure is unusual, it is possible that individuals with higher levels of EI will be more attracted to organizations that value awareness of emotions in its workforce. Therefore, it is expected that:

H9: Job seekers will find an organization that emphasizes emotional awareness of employees in its recruitment brochure more attractive than an organization that contains only a traditional statement about work environment in its recruitment brochure.

H10: The relationship between emotional intelligence and organization attractiveness will be positive, significant and stronger with respect to an organization that emphasizes emotional awareness of employees in its recruitment brochure, as compared to an organization that contains only a traditional statement about work environment in its recruitment brochure.

CHAPTER 5

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether organizations can use recruitment literature to more effectively attract employees with higher levels of multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence. More specifically, the study was designed to examine a) whether the content of organizational recruitment brochures could be manipulated to increase the attractiveness of the organization to potential employees and b) whether the relationship between organizational attraction and the content of the recruitment brochure would be affected by either emotional intelligence or multicultural readiness. The methodology of the Pilot study is set forth in Appendix A. The methodology of the experimental study is set forth in this Chapter.

Participants

Approximately 316 participants were recruited from the University of Georgia Department of Psychology research pool. The study was open to all individuals in the pool (except those who participated in the pilot study) and participants received course credit for their participation.

Approximately 118 additional participants were recruited from students enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses at the University Of Georgia. Some of these students received class credit for participation. The number of participants required for power of .8 was estimated to be 350 (See Appendix B). Useable data (defined as no missing data) was collected from a total of 389 participants (N = 389).

Stimulus Materials and Manipulations

Each participant was given a professional looking 3-panel brochure describing career opportunities at a fictitious company called SCR. All versions of the brochure contained identical sections labeled “Welcome to SCR,” “Salary and Benefits,” “Divisions,” and “SCR Values.” Appendix C contains the wording for each of these sections. Other sections of the brochure varied, depending on experimental conditions. The content of the section of brochure labeled “Diversity” was manipulated to represent three conditions of a categorical variable, *Diversity Brochure Content*, as follows: 1) a neutral/EEO statement, 2) an emphasis on valuing diverse perspectives, or 3) an emphasis on opportunity to interact with diverse others. All three conditions contained the neutral/EEO statement “SCR is proud to be an Equal Opportunity Employer.” Appendix D contains the wording of these three versions of the Diversity section together with the manipulation check question associated with each version.

In addition, the content of the brochure was manipulated to represent the following four conditions of the categorical variable *EI Brochure Content*: 1) a neutral statement about work environment and employees, entitled “Working Environment,” 2) an emphasis on a culture of empathy, caring, and compassion among employees, entitled “Employee Culture,” 3) an emphasis on empathetic, caring, and compassionate leaders, entitled “SCR Leadership,” or 4) an emphasis on the emotional awareness of employees, entitled “Employee Perspective.” All four conditions contained the neutral language entitled “Working Environment.” Appendix E contains the wording for these four versions of EI Brochure Content together with the manipulation check question associated with each version.

In total, there were 12 versions of the SCR brochure (3 conditions of Diversity Brochure Content x 4 conditions of EI Brochure Content). In order to assess the impact of the

manipulations, each participant was asked 14 content review questions: seven pertaining to the non-manipulated portion of the brochure (Appendix F) and seven specifically related to the manipulations, one for each condition of Diversity Brochure Content and one for each condition of EI Brochure Content (See Appendices D and E).

Measures

Multicultural readiness. Multicultural readiness was assessed with Phinney's (1992) measure of other-group orientation (OGO), a subscale of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), designed to measure the ethnic identity of adolescents and young adults across membership in specific racial or ethnic groups. More specifically, OGO is an assessment "of attitudes toward, and interactions with, ethnic groups other than one's own" (p. 159, Phinney). This scale assesses attitudes toward, and interactions with, ethnic groups other than one's own, and contains both positively and negatively scored items. It has also been described as a measure of "an individual's interest and openness to interacting with members outside one's own ethnic group" (p. 3, Wright & Littleford, 2002). Avery (2003) refers to OGO as a factor that "pertains to how an individual thinks about and relates to members of other racial/ethnic groups... Those with high other-group orientations enjoy interacting with, and therefore tend to actively seek opportunities to intermingle with, members of other racial or ethnic groups" (p. 673). The scale uses 6 four-point items (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Higher scores represent higher levels of MR. An example is "I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own." Phinney found reliability of .74 for a sample of college students, and Phinney and Alipuria (1996) found reliability of .76 for a sample of monoethnic high school and college students. In this study, reliability for this scale (coefficient alpha) was .83. Standard deviations for this scale among high school and college students range from .36 (Caucasian undergraduates from a

predominately Caucasian public university; Wright, and Littleford, 2002), .40 (high school students from small suburban Northeast public school, 85% White; Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzzi, & Saya, 2003), .48 (African American undergraduates from predominately Caucasian public university; Wright, & Littleford), .51 (college students, Phinney), to .59 (high school students, Phinney). In this study the standard deviation was .65. Appendix G contains the items from this scale.

Emotional intelligence. EI was assessed with a self-report measure developed by Schutte et al. (1998) based on Salovey and Mayer's 1990 conceptualization of EI. The scale was not given an official name by its developers and has been subsequently labeled in various ways, such as the Assessing Emotions Scale (AES; Schutte, Malouff, & Bobik, 2001), the Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS; Abraham, 1999), the Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SREIT; Brackett & Mayer; 2003) and the Schutte Self-Report Inventory (SSRI; Matthews et al., 2002). Because the scale is primarily identified with Schutte et al., it will be referred to herein as the Schutte Self-Report Inventory (SSRI).

Consistent with its reliance on a mixed model of EI as well as the use of a self-report technique, the SSRI has been described as a measure of typical performance (Schutte et al., 2001), a trait measure (Saklofske et al., 2003; Schutte et al., 2001), and a type of personality inventory (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). In accordance with the distinction made by Petrides and Furnham (2000), the SSRI can be considered a measure of trait EI as opposed to a measure of information-processing or ability EI. The scale consists of 33 five-point items (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Examples of the items include "I am aware of my emotions as I experience them" and "I help other people feel better when they are down." Higher scores represent higher levels of EI. The developers of the SSRI reported good internal reliability (.87 to .90) and two

week test-retest reliability of .78 (Schutte et al., 1998). In addition, scores on the SSRI were a) related in expected directions to 8 of 9 theoretically related characteristics such as optimism, impulse control, attention to feelings, clarity of feelings, mood control, and lack of depressed affect, b) correlated with grades during the first year of college, c) higher for therapists than for therapy clients or prisoners, d) higher for females than males, e) not related to cognitive ability as measured by the SAT, and f) associated with the openness to experience dimension of the Big Five (Schutte et al., 2001; Schutte et al., 1998). In this study reliability (coefficient alpha) was .87.

The factor structure of the SSRI remains somewhat unclear. Some studies have found support for a single factor solution (Brackett, & Mayer; 2003; Schutte et al., 1998; Schutte et al., 2001) while other studies have found support for multiple factors (Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Soklowski et al., 2003). Furthermore, in contrast to some of the findings with respect to the SSRI by Schutte et al. (1998), other studies have found a correlation with additional dimensions of the Big Five (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Soklowski et al., 2003), reverse correlation with academic performance (Brackett, & Mayer, 2003), no gender differences (Brackett & Mayer), and no correlation with cognitive ability (Soklowski et al.). However, in some studies where correlations with personality dimensions have been found, the SSRI correlation with most other expected measures have remained significant even after controlling for the personality dimensions (Carrochi, Chan, & Bajgar, 2001; Soklowski et al.). Appendix H contains the items from the SSRI.

Organizational attraction. There are numerous measures of organizational attraction. Many of these measures combine items that on the face address several different approaches to attraction, including organizational image, prestige, job pursuit intentions, perceived

compatibility, general attractiveness, job acceptance intention, or intent to recommend the organization to another (Aiman-Smith, Bauer and Cable, 2001; Highhouse, Lievens, & Sinar, 2003). An analysis by Highhouse, Lievens et al. indicates that three components of organizational attraction can be distinguished: general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, and prestige. With respect to these scales, reliabilities were reported as .88, .82, and .83, respectively. This study used the three scales identified by Highhouse, Lievens et al. to measure organizational attraction and found reliabilities (coefficient alpha) of .91, .85, and .83 respectively. The scales contain items such as “For me, this company would be a good place to work” (general attractiveness), “I would accept a job offer from this company” (pursuit intentions), and “There are probably a lot of people who would like to work at this company” (prestige). Appendix I contains the items from these three scales.

Procedure

Participants randomly received a packet of material containing one of the 12 versions of the SCR brochure, together with a questionnaire containing the content review questions as well as the measures of organizational attractiveness, multicultural readiness, and emotional intelligence. Additional background questions were included to collect demographic and other information about each participant. (Appendix J). Based on the pilot study (see Appendix A) the content review questions, including the manipulation checks, were presented in the questionnaire prior to the measures of the dependent variables.

Participants were told: “The purpose of this study is to examine the reactions of college students to an organizational recruitment literature. Organizations often use recruitment brochures to attract potential employees. In this study you will be asked to read the recruitment brochure of a fictitious company, to answer some questions about its content, and to indicate

your opinion of the company. You will also be asked to answer some questions about yourself. Although the name of the company is fictitious, the content of the brochure has been taken from actual brochures and web-sites. As you read the brochure, please imagine that you are job hunting and are reviewing the recruitment brochure from a potential employer. Assume the company has an opening for the type of job you are seeking.”

Coding of Categorical Variables

In this study, Diversity Brochure Content and EI Brochure Content, as well as the control variables gender and ethnicity, are categorical variables. That is, the participants in the different categories or groups of any one of these variables differ in kind, not degree. To use a categorical variable as an independent variable in regression analysis, the information related to group or category membership must be coded by a set of independent variables known as code vectors. The set of code vectors for a particular categorical variable taken together represents all the information about group membership for that variable. When the variable consists of “g” categories or groups, the number of vectors required to capture all of the information about membership is “g-1.” A variable with two categories, such as gender, requires only one vector; a variable with four categories, such as EI Brochure Content, requires three vectors.

There are many different methods of coding categorical variables, including dummy, orthogonal, and effects coding. Each method requires a different interpretation of the results of the regression analysis, and the best choice of method depends on the questions the researcher is posing (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003; Pedhazur, 1997). In the present study, the primary focus was on comparing participants in a reference group to participants in other groups. For example, participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 1 were compared to participants in Diversity Brochure Condition Group 2 and 3. Similarly, participants in EI Brochure Condition 1

were compared to participants in the other EI Brochure Conditions. Thus Condition 1 was always used as a reference or control group.

In dummy coding, the vectors are coded so that in any given vector membership in one group is coded 1 and non-membership is coded 0. Furthermore, when one group is coded as 0 in all vectors, it becomes a reference group when the set is considered as a whole. In a regression analysis using a set of dummy coded vectors to represent a categorical independent variable, the intercept equals the mean of the of the reference group on the dependent variable and each unstandardized regression coefficient represents the difference between the mean of the reference group on the dependent variable and the mean of the group represented by the membership coded 1 in that vector (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003; Pedhazur, 1997). So a t-test of the unstandardized regression coefficient is a test of significance of the difference between the mean of the reference group on the dependent variable and the mean of the group represented by that vector. Accordingly, this method of coding was particularly appropriate for the present study.

The dummy-coded vectors used in this study to represent Diversity Brochure Content and EI Brochure Content are set forth in Tables 5.1 and 5.2. Gender, with two categories required only one vector: Males were coded 0 and females were coded 1. With respect to ethnicity, White/Caucasian participants were coded 0 and non-White participants were coded 1.

Table 5.1
Code vectors for Diversity Brochure Content

| | Vector 1 (representing comparison between condition 1 and condition 2) | Vector 2 (representing comparison between condition 1 and condition 3) |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Diversity Brochure Condition 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Diversity Brochure Condition 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Diversity Brochure Condition 3 | 0 | 1 |

Table 5.2
Code Vectors for EI Brochure Content

| | Vector 1 (representing comparison between condition 1 and condition 2) | Vector 2 (representing comparison between condition 1 and condition 3) | Vector 3 (representing comparison between condition 1 and condition 4) |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EI Brochure Condition 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EI Brochure Condition 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| EI Brochure Condition 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| EI Brochure Condition 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Another main focus of this study was whether the relationship between organizational attraction and Diversity Brochure Content would vary as a function of Multicultural Readiness and whether the relationship between organizational attraction and EI Brochure Content would vary as a function of Emotional Intelligence. These joint effects between the continuous and categorical variables were represented by “g-1” cross-product vectors, each formed by multiplying the continuous variable by each of the relevant dummy coded vectors.

When dummy coded vectors are entered into the regression equation along with the cross-product vectors, the unstandardized regression coefficient for each cross product vector represents the difference between a) the slope of regression line of the dependent variable on the continuous variable for the reference group and b) the slope of the regression line of the dependent variable on the continuous variable for the group represented by the coded vector (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003; Pedhazur, 1997). So a t-test of the unstandardized regression coefficient for the cross-product vector is a test of the significance of the difference between the slope of the regression line of the reference group and the slope of the regression line of the group represented by that vector.

Centering of continuous variables

As recommended by Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2003) both continuous variables, Multicultural Readiness and Emotional Intelligence, were centered before being entered into the regression analyses. A variable is considered to be centered when its mean is subtracted from each score. Centering the variable can reduce non-essential collinearity when the variable is used to form cross products that will also be entered into the regression analysis. The cross-product terms were also formed using the centered continuous variable. (Neither variable has a meaningful zero point which would render centering undesirable). Centering these variables has no effect on the regression coefficient for the cross-product vectors in the regression equation.

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS

Participants and Distribution of Manipulated Conditions

Useable data was collected from 389 participants. Seventy-four percent of the participants were female and 83% were White/Caucasian. Participants who choose an ethnicity category other than White /Caucasian were recoded into one non-White category. Fifty-seven percent of participants had never held a full time job, and only 14% had held a full time job for more than six months. Seventy percent had previously read organizational recruitment literature on-line and 53% had previously read organizational recruitment literature. Seventy-four percent found the recruitment brochure to be very or somewhat realistic. Additional demographic and background information related to the participants is set forth in Appendix K. Participants were almost equally distributed across the respective conditions of Diversity Brochure Content and EI Brochure Content (see Table 6.1)

Table 6.1
Distribution of Participants across Brochure Conditions

| | Number of Participants across Diversity Brochure Conditions | Number of Participants across EI Brochure Conditions |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Diversity Condition 1 | 129 | |
| Diversity Condition 2 | 132 | |
| Diversity Condition 3 | 128 | |
| EI Condition 1 | | 97 |
| EI Condition 2 | | 97 |
| EI Condition 3 | | 95 |
| EI Condition 4 | | 100 |

Manipulation Checks

The content review questions included seven questions specifically related to the brochure content manipulations, one for each of three conditions of Diversity Brochure Content and one for each of four conditions of EI Brochure Content (See Appendices D and E). The question related to the neutral or first condition of both Diversity Brochure Content and EI Brochure Content was expected to have a high percentage of correct answers across all conditions since the language reflecting that particular condition was repeated in each of the other Brochure conditions. On the other hand, it was anticipated that participants receiving Diversity Brochure Condition 2 or 3 and participants receiving EI Brochure Condition 2, 3, or 4, would have a higher percentage of correct answers for the questions related to their specific brochure content as compared to participants receiving a different version of the brochure. As shown in Table 6.2, this pattern was found. The percentage of correct answers to questions where high percentages of correct answers were expected are highlighted in ***bold italics*** in the Table. For example, the question that asked whether SCR was an equal opportunity employer (language repeated across all Diversity Brochure Conditions) was answered correctly by 94.6%, 95.5%, and 97.75 % of participants across the three Diversity Brochure Conditions. On the other hand, 94.7% of the participants receiving Diversity Brochure Condition 2 correctly answered the question related to Diversity Brochure Condition 2, while only 27.1 % of participants receiving Diversity Brochure Condition 1 correctly answered the same question. At the same time, Table 6.2 shows that the distinctions among the conditions were not always well defined. For example, only 78.9 % of participants receiving EI Brochure Condition 3 were able to correctly answer the question related to EI Brochure Condition 3, while 54% of participants receiving EI Brochure Condition 4 were also able to correctly answer the question related to EI Brochure Condition 3.

For purposes of comparison, the percentages of participants correctly answering the general content questions is set forth in Table 6.3.

Table 6.2
Percentage of Correct Answers to Manipulation Check Questions

| Brochure Condition Associated with the Manipulation Question | Brochure Condition Received by Participant | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| | Diversity Brochure Condition | | | EI Brochure Condition | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Diversity Condition 1 Equal Opportunity Employer | 94.6 | 95.5 | 97.7 | | | | | |
| Diversity Condition 2 Diverse perspectives | 27.1 | 94.7 | 51.6 | | | | | |
| Diversity Condition 3 Opportunity to interact | 21.7 | 75.0 | 85.2 | | | | | |
| EI Condition 1 General work environment | | | | 91.8 | 93.8 | 91.6 | 91.0 | |
| EI Condition 2 Supportive employee culture | | | | 4.1 | 91.8 | 38.9 | 13.0 | |
| EI Condition 3 Supportive leadership | | | | 21.6 | 28.9 | 78.9 | 54.0 | |
| EI Condition 4 Awareness of emotions | | | | 19.6 | 50.5 | 25.3 | 93.0 | |

Notes: All numbers = % giving correct answer
Bold & Italics = match between manipulation question and brochure condition (i.e. where higher percentage of correct answer was expected)

Table 6.3
 Percentage of Correct Answers to General Content Questions

| Topic of Content Question | Percentage of correct answers |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Competitive salary | 94.1 |
| 401K | 99.0 |
| Number of employees | 95.4 |
| Manufactures fertilizer | 99.7 |
| Location of headquarters | 99.2 |
| Core values | 97.2 |
| Hiring chemists | 99.2 |

Correlations

The zero-order correlations among most of the independent and dependent variables are set forth in Table 5.4 Diversity Brochure Content and EI Brochure Content were not included in the correlation table due to their nominal scale with more than two categories. The three dependent variables (General Attractiveness, Intent to Pursue a Job, and Prestige) were significantly correlated with each other. This is not surprising given the similarities among the dependent measures. The other significant correlations were between

- Multicultural Readiness and ethnicity (White/Caucasian participants scoring higher in Multicultural Readiness than non-White participants)
- ethnicity and Prestige (non-White participants rating the organizations higher in Prestige than White/Caucasian participants)
- Emotional Intelligence and Intent to Pursue a Job (a positive association),and
- Emotional Intelligence and Prestige (a positive association)

The relationship between Multicultural Readiness and ethnicity was also examined in more detail. The mean score on Multicultural Readiness for White/Caucasian participants was

2.11 and the mean for non-White participants was 1.63. Although all non-White participants were coded into one category for purposes of this study, the mean scores for Multicultural Readiness were also examined for each non-White group as follows: Black/African American, 1.66; Asian, 1.64; Hispanic/Latino: 1.68; bi or multi-racial, 1.48; other, 1.51. These results were unlike results from other studies where the means were somewhat higher (e.g., 3.43 to 3.74 at another predominantly Caucasian university) and non-Whites tended to score higher in Multicultural Readiness than Whites (Avery, 2003; Write & Littleford, 2002).

Correlations among these independent and dependent variables were also examined by each Brochure Condition. Tables 6.5 through 6.11 show the results of these additional correlations. As expected, the three dependent variables are highly correlated in all seven conditions. Ethnicity and Multicultural Readiness are also correlated across all conditions. Other correlations are not consistent across Brochure Conditions, however. Thus, some of the zero-order correlations depend on the level of Brochure Condition:

- Ethnicity and Prestige are related only in EI Brochure Condition 1.
- Emotional Intelligence and Intent to Pursue are related only in EI Brochure Condition 4.
- Emotional Intelligence and Prestige are related in all Brochure conditions except Diversity Brochure Condition 1, EI Brochure Condition 1 and EI Brochure Condition 2.
- Emotional Intelligence and Multicultural Readiness are related only in Diversity Brochure Condition 2.
- Emotional Intelligence and Ethnicity are related only in EI Brochure Condition 4.
- Gender and General Attractiveness are related only in EI Brochure Condition 2

Table 6.4.
Correlations among Variables: All Participants

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | .01 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | -.01 | -.28** | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | -.05 | .04 | .09 | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | .02 | .04 | -.02 | .07 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | .02 | .03 | -.04 | .15* | .82** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | .02 | .12* | -.00 | .18** | .52** | .63** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
N= 389
a: 0 = male; 1 = female
b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Table 6.5
Correlations among Variables: Participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 1

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|--------|------|-----|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | -.07 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | .03 | -.33** | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | .15 | .06 | -.02 | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | .06 | .05 | -.00 | .09 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | .02 | .04 | -.10 | .14 | .82** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | .09 | .16 | -.12 | .07 | .60** | .67** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
N= 129
a: 0 = male; 1 = female
b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Table 6.6
Correlations among Variables: Participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 2

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | .04 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | .02 | -.28** | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | -.09 | .04 | .21* | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | .02 | .01 | -.06 | .01 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | -.01 | .01 | -.00 | .12 | .84** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | -.01 | .14 | .13 | .19* | .50** | .62** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N= 132

a: 0 = male; 1 = female

b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Table 6.7
Correlations among Variables: Participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 3

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | -.01 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | -.09 | -.24** | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | -.17 | .01 | .09 | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | -.00 | .08 | .01 | .11 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | .06 | .05 | -.01 | .07 | .78** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | -.03 | .04 | .00 | .28** | .47** | .57** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N= 128

a: 0 = male; 1 = female

b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Table 6.8
Correlations among Variables: Participants in EI Brochure Condition 1

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | -.06 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | .03 | -.34** | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | -.12 | -.02 | .17 | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | -.01 | .02 | -.09 | .03 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | .00 | .01 | -.15 | -.03 | .75** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | -.08 | .20* | -.16 | .19 | .48** | .58** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N= 97

a: 0 = male; 1 = female

b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Table 6.9
Correlations among Variables: Participants in EI Brochure Condition 2

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | .08 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | .01 | -.31** | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | .04 | -.09 | .09 | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | .22* | .07 | -.02 | -.07 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | .19 | .06 | -.01 | .04 | .83** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | -.06 | .02 | .18 | -.05 | .50** | .65** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N= 97

a: 0 = male; 1 = female

b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Table 6.10
Correlations among Variables: Participants in EI Brochure Condition 3

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | -.00 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | -.19 | -.22* | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | -.08 | .02 | .06 | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | .03 | -.05 | -.06 | .12 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | -.06 | -.07 | -.02 | .15 | .81** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | .06 | .10 | -.19 | .25* | .53** | .68** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N= 95

a: 0 = male; 1 = female

b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Table 6.11
Correlations among Variables: Participants in EI Brochure Condition 4

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|-------------------------|------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| 1 | Gender ^a | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Ethnicity ^b | -.04 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| 3 | Multicultural Readiness | .10 | -.27** | 1.0 | | | | |
| 4 | Emotional Intelligence | -.01 | .24* | .05 | 1.0 | | | |
| 5 | General Attractiveness | -.15 | .10 | .06 | .18 | 1.0 | | |
| 6 | Intent to Pursue | -.10 | .12 | -.01 | .25* | .86** | 1.0 | |
| 7 | Prestige | .08 | .16 | .09 | .33** | .58** | .59** | 1.0 |

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N= 100

a: 0 = male; 1 = female

b: 0 = White/Caucasian; 1 = Non-White

Evaluation of Continuous Measures

This study used five measures of continuous variables (two predictor variables and three dependent variables). Table 6.12 sets forth the means, standard deviations and coefficient alpha for each of these measures. Internal reliability as measured by coefficient alpha is higher or similar to reliabilities previously found for both Multicultural Readiness and Emotional Intelligence.

Table 6.12
Means, Standard deviations and Coefficient Alpha for Continuous Variables

| Measure | Variable | Mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient Alpha |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| OGO | Multicultural Readiness | 2.03 | .65 | .83 |
| SSRI | Emotional Intelligence | 1.99 | .38 | .87 |
| Highhouse, Lievens & Sinar scales | General Attractiveness | 2.37 | .89 | .91 |
| | Intent to Pursue | 2.39 | .76 | .85 |
| | Prestige | 2.23 | .66 | .83 |

Hypothesis Testing

Influence of Brochure Conditions on Attraction. Hypotheses 1 and 2 predicted that organizations emphasizing either valuing diverse perspectives (Diversity Brochure Condition 2) or an opportunity to interact with diverse others (Diversity Brochure Condition 3) would be more attractive to participants than organizations emphasizing only a standard EEO policy (Diversity Brochure Condition 1). Thus, it was anticipated that the means for all three dependent variables would be significantly higher for participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 2 and Diversity Brochure Condition 3 as compared to the means of participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 1. To examine these hypotheses, each dependent variable was

regressed on the two dummy coded vectors representing Diversity Brochure Content. The resulting regression coefficient for each vector represents the difference between the mean of the reference group (Diversity Brochure Condition 1) on the dependent variable and the mean of the Diversity Brochure Condition represented by that vector. Thus the t-test of the regression coefficient is a test of significance of the difference between the respective means on the dependent variable.

Similarly, hypotheses 5, 6, and 9 predicted that organizations emphasizing a supportive culture among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 2), supportive leadership (EI Brochure Condition 3), or an awareness of emotions among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 4) would be more attractive to participants than organization that provides only general information about its work environment (EI Brochure Condition 1). Thus, it was anticipated that the means for all three dependent variables would be significantly higher for participants in EI Brochure Conditions 2, 3, and 4 as compared to the means of participants in EI Brochure Condition 1. To examine these hypotheses, each dependent variable was regressed on the three dummy coded vectors representing EI Brochure Content. The resulting regression coefficient for each vector represents the difference between the mean of the reference group (EI Brochure Condition 1) on the dependent variable and the mean of the EI Brochure Condition represented by that vector. Thus the t-test of the regression coefficient is a test of the significance of the difference between the respective means on the dependent variable.

The means for each dependent variable by brochure condition are set forth in Table 6.13, and the results of the t-tests for the planned mean comparisons (based on examination of the regression coefficients from the two regression analyses) are set forth in table 6.14. A review of Table 6.13 does not indicate any consistent pattern across the data. For example, with respect to

Diversity Brochure Content, the mean (i.e. the degree of attraction) for Condition 2 (supportive employee culture) is higher than Condition 1 (Neutral/EEO) for all three dependent variables. On the other hand, the mean for Condition 3 is lower than both Condition 1 and Condition 2 with respect to Prestige, but falls between the means for Condition 1 and Condition 3 with respect to General Attractiveness and Intent to Pursue a Job. The pattern for EI Brochure Content is even less capable of generalization, except that with respect to General Attractiveness, the mean (degree of attraction) for Condition 1 (general work environment) is higher than any of the other conditions. Furthermore, as set forth in Table 6.14, none of the planned comparisons are significant. Accordingly there is no support for hypotheses 1, 2, 5, 6, or 9.

Table 6.13
Means of Dependent Variables across Brochure conditions

| | | Dependent Variable | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------|
| | | General Attractiveness | Intent to Pursue | Prestige |
| Brochure Content | | | | |
| Diversity Brochure Content | Condition 1 Neutral/EEO | 2.30 | 2.33 | 2.22 |
| | Condition 2 Diverse Perspectives | 2.50 | 2.47 | 2.30 |
| | Condition 3 Opportunity to Interact | 2.32 | 2.36 | 2.17 |
| EI Brochure Content | Condition 1 General Work environment | 2.43 | 2.40 | 2.28 |
| | Condition 2 Supportive Employee Culture | 2.34 | 2.40 | 2.22 |
| | Condition 3 Supportive Leadership | 2.33 | 2.40 | 2.24 |
| | Condition 4 Awareness of Emotions | 2.34 | 2.39 | 2.23 |

Table 6.14
T-tests of Planned Mean Comparisons

| Planned Comparisons | | General Attractiveness | | Intent to pursue | | Prestige | |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-----|------------------|------|----------|-----|
| | | t | p | t | p | t | p |
| Diversity Conditions Compared | | | | | | | |
| | 1 & 2 | 1.77 | .08 | 1.0 | .15 | .08 | .31 |
| | 1 & 3 | .14 | .84 | .09 | .80 | .08 | .50 |
| EI Conditions Compared | | | | | | | |
| | 1 & 2 | -.72 | .48 | .02 | .99 | -.63 | .53 |
| | 1 & 3 | -.77 | .44 | .00 | 1.00 | -.37 | .71 |
| | 1 & 4 | -.385 | .70 | -.523 | .59 | -.87 | .38 |

Additional analyses were performed to assess whether any of the planned comparisons between means would be significant if gender or ethnicity was entered first as a control variable, or if only males, female, Whites, or non-Whites, respectively, were selected. Significant differences between means were not found under any of these circumstances.

Influence of Multicultural Readiness and Emotional Intelligence. Hypotheses 3 and 4 predicted that the relationship between Multicultural Readiness and organization attraction would be positive, significant, and stronger (i.e. larger regression line slopes) with respect to organizations that emphasize either valuing diverse perspectives (Diversity Brochure Condition 2) or an opportunity to interact with diverse others (Diversity Brochure Condition 3) as compared to the same relationship with respect to organizations that emphasize only a standard EEO policy (Diversity Brochure Condition 1).

Hypotheses 7, 8, and 10 predicted that the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and organization attraction would be positive, significant, and stronger (i.e. larger regression line slopes) with respect to organizations that emphasize a supportive culture among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 2), supportive leadership (EI Brochure Condition 3), or an awareness of

emotions among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 4) as compared to the same relationship with respect to organizations that emphasize only general information about its work environment (EI Brochure Condition 1).

To initially examine the pattern of these relationships, correlations between Multicultural Readiness and each of the three dependent variables were compared across three Diversity Brochure Conditions. In addition, correlations between Emotional Intelligence and each of the three dependent variables were compared across the four EI Brochure Conditions. These correlations are set forth in Table 6.15. None of the correlations between multicultural readiness and any of the three dependent variables are significant. Additionally, there are no significant correlations between Emotional Intelligence and organization attraction with respect to the dependent measure of General Attractiveness or with respect to either of EI Brochure Condition 1 or 2. However, the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Intent to Pursue a Job is significant and positive for participants in EI Brochure Condition 4 (awareness of emotions). Furthermore, the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Prestige is significant and positive for participants in EI Brochure Condition 3 (supportive leadership) and 4 (awareness of emotions).

To assess whether there are significant differences between the correlations in Diversity Brochure Condition 1 as compared to the other Diversity Brochure Conditions, and to assess whether there are significant differences between the correlations in EI Brochure Condition 1 as compared to the other EI Brochure Conditions, two series of regression analyses were conducted. The first series regressed each dependent variable on a) Multicultural Readiness, b) the two dummy-coded vectors representing Diversity Brochure Content and, c) the two vectors representing the cross-products of Diversity Brochure Content and Multicultural Readiness. The

second series regressed each dependent variable on a) Emotional Intelligence, b) the three dummy-coded vectors representing EI Brochure Content, and c) the three vectors representing the cross-products of EI Brochure Content and Emotional Intelligence. Both Multicultural Readiness and Emotional Intelligence were centered before being entered into the regression analysis. In each case, the regression coefficient for a cross-product vector represents the difference between a) the slope of regression line of the dependent variable regressed on the continuous variable for the reference group and b) the slope of the regression line of the dependent variable regressed on the continuous variable for the group represented by the coded vector. The t-test of the unstandardized regression coefficient for a cross-product vector is a test of the significance of the difference between the slopes of the two regression lines. Table 6.16 shows the results of such t-tests from the regression analyses.

As indicated in Table 6.16, the slope of the regression line for Prestige regressed on Multicultural Readiness for participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 2 is significantly different than the slope of the regression line for Prestige regressed on Multicultural Readiness for participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 1. In addition, the slope of the regression line for Intent to Pursue regressed on Emotional Intelligence for participants in EI Brochure Condition 4 is significantly different than the slope of the regression line for Intent to Pursue regressed on Emotional Intelligence for participants in EI Brochure Condition 1. The results shown in Table 6.16, however, are before consideration of any control variables. To address the influence of gender, ethnicity and the impact of the diversity related variables on the EI outcomes and visa versa, three hierarchical regression analysis were conducted, one for each of the three dependent variables. Ethnicity and gender were entered in Step 1. Diversity Brochure Condition and EI Brochure Condition (via dummy-coded vectors) were entered in step 2. The

individual difference variables, Multicultural Readiness and Emotional Intelligence (each centered) were entered in step 3. Finally, cross-products vectors for the interactions of interest were added in step 4. The results of these hierarchical regression analyses are set forth in Tables 6.17, 6.18, and 6.19. Examination of the results, indicate that after all variables were entered into the analyses, none of the planned comparisons between slopes of the regression lines are significant. Thus, Hypotheses 3, 4, 7, 8, 10 are not supported.

Table 6.15

Comparisons of Correlations between Continuous Variables and Dependent Variables across Brochure Conditions

| | | Dependent Variable | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------|
| | | General Attractiveness | Intent to Pursue | Prestige |
| Correlation with Multicultural Readiness | Diversity Condition 1 Neutral/EEO (N = 129) | -.00 | -.10 | -.12 |
| | Diversity Condition 2 Diverse Perspectives (N= 132) | -.06 | -.00 | .13 |
| | Diversity Condition 3 Opportunity to Interact (N= 128) | .01 | -.01 | .00 |
| Correlation with Emotional Intelligence | EI Condition 1 General Work environment (N = 97) | .03 | -.03 | .19 |
| | EI Condition 2 Supportive Employee Culture (N = 97) | -.07 | .04 | -.05 |
| | EI Condition 3 Supportive Leadership (N = 95) | .12 | .15 | .25* |
| | Condition 4 Awareness of Emotions (N = 100) | .18 | .25* | .33** |

* correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

** correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Table 6.16
T-tests of Planned Comparisons between Slopes of Regression Lines of each
Dependent Variable Regressed on Associated Continuous Variable

| Continuous Variables | | Dependent Variables | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-----|------------------|------------|----------|------------|
| | | General Attractiveness | | Intent to pursue | | Prestige | |
| Multicultural Readiness: Diversity Conditions Compared | | t | p | t | p | t | p |
| | 1 & 2 | -.59 | .55 | .74 | .46 | 2.05 | .04 |
| | 1 & 3 | .09 | .92 | .65 | .51 | .91 | .37 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Emotional Intelligence: EI Conditions Compared | | | | | | | |
| | 1 & 2 | -.65 | .52 | .48 | .63 | -1.55 | .12 |
| | 1 & 3 | .68 | .50 | 1.28 | .20 | .57 | .57 |
| | 1 & 4 | .116 | .25 | 2.01 | .05 | 1.44 | .15 |

Table 6.17
Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis: General Attractiveness

| Independent Variables | | Dependent Variable: General Attractiveness | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------|---------|------|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | From Step Four | | | | R ² | p | ΔR ² | p |
| | | b | B | Sig (p) | tol | | | | |
| Step 1 | | | | | | .002 | .70 | | |
| | Gender ^a | .07 | .03 | .52 | 1.00 | | | | |
| | Ethnicity ^b | .05 | .02 | .70 | .89 | | | | |
| Step 2 | | | | | | .014 | .59 | .012 | .44 |
| | Diversity Brochure Content ^c | | | | | | | | |
| | -DIV Group 2 Vector (DV2) | .20 | .10 | .08 | .72 | | | | |
| | -DIV Group 3 Vector (DV3) | .01 | .00 | 1.0 | .71 | | | | |
| | EI Brochure Content ^d | | | | | | | | |
| | -EI Group 2 Vector (EI2) | -.10 | -.05 | .46 | .65 | | | | |
| | -EI Group 3 Vector (EI3) | -.10 | -.05 | .42 | .66 | | | | |
| | -EI Group 4 Vector (EI4) | -.03 | -.17 | .80 | .65 | | | | |
| Step 3 | | | | | | .019 | .61 | .004 | .42 |
| | Multicultural Readiness Centered (MR) | .03 | .02 | .78 | .38 | | | | |
| | Emotional Intelligence Centered (EI) | 1.0 | .04 | .68 | .27 | | | | |
| Step 4 | | | | | | .030 | .64 | .011 | .51 |
| | Interactions | | | | | | | | |
| | MR*DV2 | -.16 | -.07 | .35 | .55 | | | | |
| | MR*DV3 | -.03 | -.01 | .85 | .58 | | | | |
| | EI*EI2 | -.26 | -.06 | .44 | .52 | | | | |
| | EI*EI3 | .26 | .05 | .45 | .54 | | | | |
| | EI*EI4 | -.32 | .07 | .34 | .52 | | | | |

Notes: N= 389

a: 0 = male, 1 = female; b: 0 = White/Caucasian, 1 = all other ethnicity categories;

c: Diversity Brochure Content dummy coded so that Condition 1 is reference group, Condition 2 represented by Group 2 Vector, and Condition 3 represented by Group 3 Vector; d: EI Brochure Content dummy coded so that Condition 1 is reference group, Condition 2 represented by Group 2 Vector, Condition 3 represented by Group 3 Vector,

and Condition 4 represented by Group 4 Vector;

tol = tolerance

Table 6.18
Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Intent to Pursue a Job

| Independent Variables | | Dependent Variable: Intent to Pursue a Job | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------|---------|-----|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | From Step Four | | | | R ² | p | ΔR ² | p |
| | | b | B | Sig (p) | tol | | | | |
| Step 1 | | | | | | .001 | .80 | | |
| | Gender ^a | .04 | .02 | .70 | .97 | | | | |
| | Ethnicity ^b | .01 | .01 | .92 | .89 | | | | |
| Step 2 | | | | | | .009 | .85 | .007 | .72 |
| | Diversity Brochure Content ^c | | | | | | | | |
| | -DIV Group 2 Vector (DV2) | .12 | .08 | .20 | .72 | | | | |
| | -DIV Group 3 Vector (DV3) | .00 | .00 | 1.0 | .72 | | | | |
| | EI Brochure Content ^d | | | | | | | | |
| | -EI Group 2 Vector (EI2) | .01 | .01 | .92 | .65 | | | | |
| | -EI Group 3 Vector (EI3) | -.01 | -.00 | 1.0 | .66 | | | | |
| | -EI Group 4 Vector (EI4) | -.04 | -.02 | .73 | .65 | | | | |
| Step 3 | | | | | | .02 | .51 | .013 | .09 |
| | Multicultural Readiness Centered (MR) | -.09 | -.08 | .36 | .38 | | | | |
| | Emotional Intelligence Centered (EI) | -.03 | -.02 | .87 | .27 | | | | |
| Step 4 | | | | | | .03 | .55 | .012 | .49 |
| | Interactions | | | | | | | | |
| | MR*DV2 | .07 | .03 | .65 | .55 | | | | |
| | MR*DV3 | .05 | .02 | .72 | .58 | | | | |
| | EI*EI2 | .13 | .03 | .65 | .52 | | | | |
| | EI*EI3 | .38 | .09 | .20 | .54 | | | | |
| | EI*EI4 | .53 | .13 | .07 | .52 | | | | |

Notes: N= 389

a: 0 = male, 1 = female; b: 0 = White/Caucasian, 1 = all other ethnicity categories;

c: Diversity Brochure Content dummy coded so that Condition 1 is reference group, Condition 2 represented by Group 2 Vector, and Condition 3 represented by Group 3 Vector;

d: EI Brochure Content dummy coded so that Condition 1 is reference group, Condition 2 represented by Group 2 Vector, Condition 3 represented by Group 3 Vector, and Condition 4 represented by Group 4 Vector;

tol = tolerance

Table 6.19
Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Prestige

| Independent Variables | | Dependent Variable: Prestige | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------|------|---------|-----|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | | From Step Four | | | | R ² | p | ΔR ² | p |
| | | b | B | sig (p) | tol | | | | |
| Step 1 | | | | | | .014 | .06 | | |
| | Gender ^a | .04 | .03 | .61 | .97 | | | | |
| | Ethnicity ^b | .17 | .10 | .06 | .89 | | | | |
| Step 2 | | | | | | .024 | .23 | .01 | .57 |
| | Diversity Brochure Content ^c | | | | | | | | |
| | -DIV Group 2 Vector (DV2) | .08 | .06 | .31 | .72 | | | | |
| | -DIV Group 3 Vector (DV3) | -.06 | -.04 | .45 | .72 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | EI Brochure Content ^d | | | | | | | | |
| | -EI Group 2 Vector (EI2) | -.05 | -.03 | .63 | .65 | | | | |
| | -EI Group 3 Vector (EI3) | -.02 | -.01 | .89 | .66 | | | | |
| | -EI Group 4 Vector (EI4) | -.06 | -.04 | .54 | .65 | | | | |
| Step 3 | | | | | | .053 | .01 | .029 | .00 |
| | Multicultural Readiness Centered (MR) | -.06 | -.06 | .50 | .38 | | | | |
| | Emotional Intelligence Centered (EI) | .26 | .15 | .16 | .27 | | | | |
| Step 4 | | | | | | .078 | .01 | .025 | .08 |
| | Interactions | | | | | | | | |
| | MR*DV2 | .17 | .10 | .15 | .55 | | | | |
| | MR*DV3 | .05 | .02 | .72 | .58 | | | | |
| | EI*EI2 | -.34 | -.10 | .16 | .51 | | | | |
| | EI*EI3 | .15 | .04 | .53 | .53 | | | | |
| | EI*EI4 | .30 | .08 | .22 | .52 | | | | |

Notes: N= 389

a: 0 = male, 1 = female; b: 0 = White/Caucasian, 1 = all other ethnicity categories;

c: Diversity Brochure Content dummy coded so that Condition 1 is reference group, Condition 2 represented by Group 2 Vector, and Condition 3 represented by Group 3 Vector; d: EI Brochure Content dummy coded so that Condition 1 is reference group,

Condition 2 represented by Group 2 Vector, Condition 3 represented by Group 3 Vector, and Condition 4 represented by Group 4 Vector;

tol = tolerance

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

Several recruitment scholars have suggested that organizations may be able to influence the quality or characteristics of the applicant pool by manipulating the content and specificity of information in recruitment messages (Carlson et al., 2002; Highhouse, Stierwalt, Bachionochi, Elder & Fisher, 1999; Mason & Belt, 1986; Rynes & Barber, 1990). The present study focused on whether organizations can use recruitment literature to more effectively attract potential employees with higher levels of multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence. More specifically, the study was designed to examine a) whether the content of organizational recruitment brochures could be manipulated to increase the attractiveness of the organization to potential employees and b) whether the relationship between organizational attraction and the content of the recruitment brochure would vary as a function of either emotional intelligence or multicultural readiness.

Hypotheses

Influence of Brochure Conditions on Attraction

Hypotheses 1 and 2 predicted that organizations emphasizing either valuing diverse perspectives (Diversity Brochure Condition 2) or an opportunity to interact with diverse others (Diversity Brochure Condition 3) would be more attractive to participants than organizations emphasizing only a standard EEO policy (Diversity Brochure Condition 1). Thus, it was anticipated that the means for all three dependent variables would be significantly higher for participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 2 and Diversity Brochure Condition 3 as compared

to the means of participants in Diversity Brochure Condition 1. Similarly, hypotheses 5, 6, and 9 predicted that organizations emphasizing a supportive culture among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 2), supportive leadership (EI Brochure Condition 3), or an awareness of emotions among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 4) would be more attractive to participants than organizations providing only general information about their work environment (EI Brochure Condition 1). Thus, it was anticipated that the means for all three dependent variables would be significantly higher for participants in EI Brochure Conditions 2, 3, and 4 as compared to the means for participants in EI Brochure Condition 1. However, none of these hypotheses were supported.

Influence of Multicultural Readiness or Emotional Intelligence

Hypotheses 3 and 4 predicted that the relationship between Multicultural Readiness and organization attraction would be positive, significant, and stronger (i.e. larger regression line slopes) with respect to organizations that emphasize either valuing diverse perspectives (Diversity Brochure Condition 2) or an opportunity to interact with diverse others (Diversity Brochure Condition 3) as compared to the same relationship with respect to organizations that emphasize only a standard EEO policy (Diversity Brochure Condition 1). Hypotheses 7, 8, and 10 predicted that the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and organization attraction would be positive, significant, and stronger (i.e. larger regression line slopes) with respect to organizations that emphasize a supportive culture among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 2), supportive leadership (EI Brochure Condition 3), or an awareness of emotions among its employees (EI Brochure Condition 4) as compared to the same relationship with respect to organizations providing only general information about its work environment (EI Brochure Condition 1). However, none of these hypotheses were supported.

Possible Reasons for Lack of Significant Findings

There are numerous possibilities for the lack of significant findings. Perhaps the descriptions in the brochure were not adequate to distinguish among the organizations with respect to the areas of interest. The fact that the participants answered the manipulation questions in the anticipated manner can not be directly interpreted as an indication that, for example, they viewed the organization in one Brochure Condition differently than the organization in another Brochure Condition. It is possible that the participants read more into the descriptions than intended. Recall that although the overall pattern of answers to the manipulation questions was as expected, many of the expected differences between Brochure Conditions were small. For example, EI Brochure Condition 3 emphasized a) empathetic, caring, and compassionate leaders, b) their friendly, supportive and concerned approach to managing employees, and c) the fact that they take the feelings of employees into consideration when making decisions. The manipulation question associated with this Brochure Condition, asked (true or false) whether leaders and managers take employees feelings into consideration when making decisions. Seventy-nine per cent of participants in EI Brochure condition 3 correctly answered true to this question. However, 22%, 29%, and 54% of participants in EI Brochure Condition 1, 2, and 4, respectively, also answered this question correctly. Perhaps 22% of participants in EI Brochure Condition 1 assumed leaders would take the feelings of employees into consideration from the reference in EI Brochure Condition 1 to a friendly, first name basis.

It is also possible that the content of recruitment literature related to soft issues is discounted as exaggeration or advertising puffery. Even though 74% of participants found the brochure to be very realistic or somewhat realistic, this does not mean they gave credence to the accuracy of the content. Highhouse, Hoffman, Greve, and Collins (2002) suggest there may be a

boundary condition to the positive impact of presenting positive organizational information in recruitment literature. They propose that participants in some previous studies that have found a positive relationship between attraction and favorable organizational aspects (e.g., core values), may have interpreted the information as a factual, objective description rather than promotional materials supplied by an organization trying to influence potential job applicants. In their own studies, they found that organizational attraction and credibility were higher when descriptions of core values in a recruitment brochure were supported by statistical evidence as compared to descriptions supported by no evidence or by anecdotal evidence. In this study the manipulated statements about the organization were not supported by any evidence. Perhaps, the participants did not believe the content. The lack of perceived credibility may be a significant factor for experienced workers as well as students.

Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) suggests that individuals may be more attracted to an organization that is perceived to have a favorable image such that association with that organization would create a more positive self-image (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Backhaus, Stone, & Heiner, 2002; Barber, 1998; Turban & Greening, 1996). In the present study, the brochure descriptions may not have created a sufficiently favorable condition such that joining the organization would have increased self-esteem. Or, it is possible that neither the general population nor individuals higher in multicultural readiness are more attracted to organizations that emphasize valuing diverse perspectives or opportunities to interact with diverse others. It is likewise possible that neither the general population nor individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence are more attracted to an organization that emphasizes a supportive employee culture, supportive leadership, or a workforce aware of their emotions.

Signaling theory suggests that in the absence of specific and complete information about the organization, potential applicants may use the limited information from a recruitment brochure as a signal about what it would be like to work at that organization and then use that information to decide whether it would be an appropriate place for the individual to work (Backhaus et al., 2002; Barber, 1998; Breugh, 1992; Greening & Turban, 2000; Rynes, 1991; Turban & Greening, 1996). If the potential applicant sees a fit between his or her values or personality and the values or personality of the organization, it is more likely that that the organization would be viewed as an appropriate place to work (Cable & Judge, 1996; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Judge & Cable, 1997; Schein & Diamante, 1998; Tom, 1971). In the present study individuals higher in multicultural readiness may not have perceived or may not have been concerned with a fit between their own view of themselves related to dimensions of multicultural readiness and the manifestations of diversity depicted in the brochures. Similarly, individuals higher in emotional intelligence may not have perceived or may not have been concerned with a fit between their own view of themselves related to dimensions of emotional intelligence and the manifestations of emotional intelligence depicted in the brochures. Perhaps emotional intelligence and multicultural readiness are not salient values for college students.

It is also conceivable that the measures of multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence did not adequately capture the underlying concepts. For example, three of the six questions on the measure of multicultural readiness revolved around spending time, being involved in activities with, or getting to know and meet people from other ethnic groups. In a predominantly Caucasian university, this may not be a sufficient measure of multicultural readiness due to the number of activities that may involve primarily White students.

Furthermore, the job seeking scenario may not have been sufficiently relevant to undergraduate students. Only 18% were currently seeking employment and 57% had never held a full time job. It is also possible that the factors important to college students in considering a potential job might be very different than factors considered by individuals who have been in the workforce for a few years or more.

Another consideration is the economic climate at the time of the study. For several months prior to the study, numerous newspapers and magazines discussed the difficulties of finding jobs and the fact that graduate school enrollment was up due to the poor job market. Perhaps in an economy where there is high unemployment, all organizations with an available job will look equally attractive.

Finally, the demographic composition of the sample was very homogeneous. Eighty-three percent were White/Caucasian, 74% were female, 94% were under the age of 23. All of the participants were in college. This may be one of the reasons that the variance for multicultural readiness and emotional intelligence as measured in this sample was not very large, adding to the difficulty of finding significant results. The use of graduate or professional students might have yielded different results.

It should also be noted that the independent variables of Diversity Brochure Content and EI Brochure Content could not be manipulated outside of a lab study. An organization could only represent in its recruitment brochure what was true about the organization. If it did not value diverse perspectives, or if the leadership were not supportive, then such statements in a recruitment brochure would be inappropriate.

Conclusion

The extent to which organizations may be able to influence the quality or characteristics of the applicant pool by manipulating the content and specificity of information in recruitment messages remains unanswered, but still worth pursuing. Future researchers may want to use a more diverse group of participants or focus on older, more experienced workers. In addition, they may want to examine individual differences other than multicultural readiness or emotional intelligence.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs, 125*, 209-25.
- Aiman-Smith, L., Bauer, T. N., & Cable, D.M. (2001). Are you attracted? Do you intend to pursue? A recruiting policy-capturing study. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16*(2), 219-237.
- Arthur, W., Jr., Doverspike, D., & Feuntes, R. (1992). Recipients' affective responses to affirmative action interventions: A cross-cultural perspective. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 10*, 229-343.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 20-39.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. J., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Diversity and emotion: The new frontiers in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Management, 28*, 307-338.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Zerbe, W. J., & Hartel, C. E. J. (2002). Managing emotions in a changing workplace. In N. M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe, & C. E. J. Hartel (Eds.), *Managing emotions in the workplace* (pp. 3-22). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Avery, D. R. (2003). Reactions to diversity in recruitment advertising – Are differences black and white? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 672-679.
- Ayoko, O.B., & Hartel, C. E. J. (2002). The role of emotion and emotion management in destructive and productive conflict in culturally heterogeneous workgroups. In N.M. Ashkanasy, W. J. Zerbe, & C.E.J. Hartel (Eds.), *Managing emotions in the workplace* (pp. 77 – 97). Armonk NY: M. E. Sharpe.

- Bachman, J., Stein, S., Campbell, K., & Sitarenios, G. (2000). Emotional intelligence in the collection of debt. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(3), 176-182.
- Backhaus, K. B., Stone, B. A., & Heiner, K. (2002). Exploring the relationship between corporate social performance and employer attractiveness. *Business and Society*, 41, 292-318.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Bar-On, R., & Parker, J.D.A. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bauer, T. N., & Aiman-Smith, L. (1996). Green career choices: The influences of ecological stance on recruiting. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10, 445-458.
- Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2003). Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(9), 1147-1158.
- Breaugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and practice*. Boston: PWS-Kent.
- Breaugh, J. A., & Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management*, 26, 405-434.
- Bretz, Jr, R. D., Ash, R. A., & Dreher, G. F. (1989). Do people make the place? An examination of the attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 561-581.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 294-311.

- Carlson, K. D., Connerly, M. L., & Mecham, R. L. (2002). Recruitment evaluation: The case for assessing the quality of applicants attracted. *Personnel Psychology, 55*, 461-490.
- Cherniss, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and organizational effectiveness. In C. Cherniss, D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations* (pp. 3-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chrobot-Mason, D., & Leslie, J. B. (2002). The role of multicultural competence and emotional intelligence in managing diversity. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, Florida.
- Chrobot-Mason D., & Ruderman, M. N. (2004). Leadership in a diverse workplace. In M. S. Stockdale & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (pp. 100-121). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A. Y. C., Bajgar, J. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 1105-1119.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 155-159.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cox, T. H. (1994). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader-member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 615-634.
- Doverspike, D., & Arthur, W, Jr. (1995). Race and sex differences in reactions to a simulated selection decision involving race-based affirmative action. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *21*, 181-200.
- Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A review and evaluation study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *15*, 341-372.
- Feldman, D. C., & Arnold, H. J. (1978). Position choice: Comparing the importance of organizational and job factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *63*, 706-710.
- Fernandez, J. P., & Davis, J. (1999). Race, gender, and rhetoric: *The true state of race and gender relations in corporate America*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fernandez-Aroz, C. (2001). The challenge of hiring senior executives. In C. Cherniss, D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*, (pp. 182-206). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, *53* (8), 1027-1055.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., Mckee, A. (2002). *Primal Leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Greening, D. W., & Turban, D. B. (2000). Corporate social performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce. *Business and Society*, *39*, 254-280.

- Highhouse, S., Hoffman, J. R., Greve, E. M., & Collins, A. E. (2002). Persuasive impact of organizational value statements in a recruitment context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 1737-1755.
- Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. (2003). Measuring attraction to organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 63*, 986-1001.
- Highhouse, S., Stierwalt, S. L., Bachionochi, P., Elder, A. E., & Fisher, G. (1999). Effects of advertised human resource management practices on attraction of african american applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 425-442.
- Highhouse, S., Zickar, M. J., Thorsteinson, T. J., Stierwalt, S. L., & Slaughter, J. E. (1999). Assessing company employment image: An example in the fast food industry. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 151-172.
- Honeycutt, T.L., & Rosen, B. (1977). Family friendly human resource policies, salary levels and salient identity as predictors of organizational attraction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*, 271-290.
- Humphrey, R. H. (2002). The many faces of emotional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 493-504.
- Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Hartel, C.E. J. (2002). Emotional intelligence as a moderator of emotional and behavioral reactions to job insecurity. *Academy of Management Review, 27* (3), p. 361-373.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D., Jr. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 262-271.
- Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 359-394.

- Kelley, J. B., Humphrey, R. H., & Sleeth, R. G. (2002). Empathy and complex task performance: Two routes to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 523-544.
- Kluegel J. R. (1985). If there isn't a problem, you don't need a solution: The basis of contemporary affirmative action attitudes. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *28*, 761-784.
- Kravitz, D. A. (1995). Attitudes toward affirmative action plans directed at blacks: Effects of plan and individual differences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *25*, 2192-2220.
- Kravitz, D. A., & Platanai, J. (1993). Attitudes and beliefs about affirmative action: Effects of target and of respondent sex and ethnicity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 928-938.
- Lado, A. A., & Wilson, M. C. (1994). Human resource systems and sustained competitive advantage: A competency-based perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *19*, 699-727.
- Lam, L. T., & Kirby, S. L. (2002). Is emotional intelligence an advantage? An exploration of the impact of emotional and general intelligence on individual performance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *14* (1), 133-143.
- Mason, N. A., & Belt, J. A. (1986). Effectiveness of specificity in recruitment advertising. *Journal of Management*, *12*, 425-432.
- Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. (2002). *Emotional intelligence: Science and myth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Maxwell, S. E. (2000). Sample size and multiple regression analysis. *Psychological Methods*, *5*(4), 434-458.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., and Salovey, P. (2000). Selecting a measure of emotional intelligence. In R. Bar-On & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence*, (pp. 320-342). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R. (2000). Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as personality, and as a mental ability. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (92-117). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murell, A. J., Dietz-Uhler, B. L., Davidio, J. F., Gartner, S. L., & Drout, C. (1994). Aversive racism and resistance to affirmative action: Perceptions of justice are not necessarily color blind. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 71-86.
- Murphy, K. R. (1996). When your top choice turns you down: Effect of rejected offers on the utility of selection tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 133-138.
- Offerman, L. R., & Phan, L. U. (2002). Culturally intelligent leadership for a diverse world. In R. E. Riggio, S. E. Murphy, & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership*, (pp.187-214). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction*. (3rd ed.). Fort Worth , TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers
- Pescosolido, A. T. (2002). Emergent leaders as managers of group emotion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, p. 583-599.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000a). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. *Sex Roles*. 432(5/6), 449-461.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000b). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 313-320.

- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: Behavioral validation in two studies of emotion recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of Personality* 17, 39-57.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156-176.
- Phinney, J. S., and Alipuria, L. L. (1996). At the interface of cultures: Multiethnic/multiracial high school and college students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 139-158.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Stracuzzi, T., & Saya, R. (2003). The multigroup ethnic identity measure (MEIM): Psychometric review and further validity testing. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63(3), 502-5-5.
- Prati, L. M., Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, leadership effectiveness, and team outcomes. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11, 21-40.
- Rau, B. L., & Hyland, M. M. (2002). Role conflict and flexible work arrangements: The effects on applicant attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 111-136.
- Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial & organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 399-444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 286-310.
- Rynes, S. L., & Boudreau, J. W. (1986). College recruiting in large organizations: Practice, evaluation, and research implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 729-757.

- Saklofske, D. H., Austin, E. J., & Minski, P. S. (2003). Factor structure and validity of a trait emotional intelligence measure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 707-721.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition & Personality, 9*, 185-211.
- Salovey, P., & Pizarro, D. A. (2003). The value of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg, J. Lautrey, & T. I. Lubart (Eds.), *Models of intelligence: International perspectives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schein, V. E., & Diamante, T. (1988). Organizational attraction and the person-environment fit. *Psychological Reports, 62*, 167-173.
- Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., Rhodes, E., & Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(4), 523-536.
- Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J.T., Golden, C.J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences 25*, 167-177.
- Slaughter, J. E., Sinar, E. F., & Bachiochi, P. D. (2002). Black applicants' reactions to affirmative action plans: Effects of plan content and previous experience with discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 333-344.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Taylor, M.S., & Collins, C. J. (2002). Organizational recruitment: Enhancing the intersection of research and practice. In C. L. Cooper & E. A. Locke (Eds.) *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice*. (pp.304-334). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. *Harvard Business Review*, 79-90.
- Thomas, K. M. (1998). Psychological readiness for multicultural leadership. *Management Development Forum*, 1, 99-112.
- Thomas, K. M., & Wise, P. G. (1999). Organizational attractiveness and individual differences: Are diverse applicants attracted by different factors? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 375-390.
- Tom, V. R. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the recruiting process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 6, 573-592.
- Turban, D. B., & Keon, T. L. (1993). Organizational attractiveness: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 184-193.
- Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. (1996). Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 658-672.
- Williams, M. L., & Bauer, T. N. (1994). The effects of a managing diversity policy on organizational attractiveness. *Group and Organization Management*, 19, 295-308.
- Wolff, S. B., Pescosolido, A. T., & Druskat, V. U. (2002). Emotional intelligence as the basis of leadership emergence in self-managing teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 505-522.
- Wong, C. & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 242-274.

Wright, M. O., & Littleford, L. N. (2002). Experiences and beliefs as predictors of ethnic identity and intergroup relations. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30*, 2-20.

APPENDIX A

PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was conducted a) to assess whether the brochure conditions were distinguishable and b) to determine if presenting content review questions (which included the manipulation checks) prior to the measure of the dependent variables would have an impact on the dependent variable scores. Fifty-six individuals participated in the pilot study. Sixty-two percent of participants were female; 85% were White or Caucasian; 53% had read recruitment brochures; 70% had read on-line about jobs or career at a specific company; and 72% were currently seeking employment. Twelve versions of the brochure (3 conditions of Diversity Brochure Content x 4 conditions of EI Brochure Content) were randomly distributed to the participants.

Distinct Conditions

Participants were instructed to answer the content review questions based only on the written content of the brochure. It was anticipated that participants would correctly answer (true, false, or insufficient information, as appropriate) questions related to general content, but provide a correct answer to a manipulation check only if the question were related to the specific brochure condition read by the participant. The percentage of participants correctly answering questions related to general content ranged from 87.5% to 100%.

Diversity Brochure Content. As anticipated, 100% of participants in condition 1 correctly answered the manipulation check related to that condition. As further expected, a much smaller percentage of those participants correctly answered the manipulation check related to condition 2

(15 %) or condition 3 (20%). In addition, 82 % of participants in condition 2 and 84 % of participants in condition 3 correctly answered their respective manipulation checks. Although the primary focus of the study involved comparisons of each condition to condition 1 (the neutral condition) , as opposed to comparing condition 2 to condition 3, it was noted that the distinction between condition 2 and 3 was not very strong. Thus, the researcher made additional changes to the content of the brochures and manipulation checks to strengthen the difference between condition 2 and condition 3.

EI Brochure Content. Due to an error in wording, the interpretation of the manipulation check for the first condition was meaningless. However, as anticipated, only a small percentage of participants in condition 1, correctly answered the manipulation checks related to condition 2 (14%), condition 3 (14%), or condition 4 (14%). Furthermore, 93% of participants in condition 2, 85 % of participants in condition 3, and 80% of participants in condition 4 correctly answered their respective manipulation checks. Although the primary focus of the study involved comparisons of each condition to condition 1 (the neutral condition), as opposed to making comparisons among the other conditions, it was noted that the distinction between condition 3 and 4 was not very strong. Thus, the researcher made additional changes to the content of the brochures and manipulation checks to strengthen the difference between condition 3 and condition 4.

Order of Questions

Twenty-four participants received a questionnaire (Q1) that presented the measures of the dependent variables prior to the content review questions and 32 participants received a questionnaire (Q2) that presented the content review questions prior to the measures of the dependent variables. The means and standard deviations of all three dependent variables were

higher for participants with questionnaire Q2. See Table A.1 Accordingly, the researcher chose to use the format of Q2 for the main study due to the larger variance in the measure of the dependent variables.

Table A.1
Mean and SD of Dependent Variables: Pilot Data

| <i>Dependent variable</i> | <i>Mean</i> | | <i>Standard Deviation</i> | |
|---------------------------|-------------|------|---------------------------|--------|
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q1 | Q2 |
| General attractiveness | 2.04 | 2.65 | .75982 | .94220 |
| Intent to pursue | 1.92 | 2.53 | .54314 | .84767 |
| prestige | 2.00 | 2.45 | .54053 | .66817 |

Q1 = questionnaire 1
Q2 = questionnaire 2

APPENDIX B

CALCULATION OF SAMPLE SIZE

Determining the sample size (N) required to achieve adequate statistical power in a multiple regression analysis has been the subject of much debate and discussion, often clouded by the various purposes for which such analysis may be performed: obtaining a useful prediction equation, testing the significance of the multiple correlation coefficient, or understanding the role played by a specific independent variable (see Maxwell, 2000).

Sample size for the present study was determined by examining the results from several different methods of estimating N, and then choosing a number on which the methods appeared to converge. This approach is strongly recommended by Maxwell (2000). In each case, the calculations were based on a desired power of .8 and an alpha level of .05. This study was designed to examine 8 independent /predictor variables:

- 1) Diversity Brochure Content, a categorical variable with 3 levels,
- 2) EI Brochure Content, a categorical variable, with 4 levels,
- 3) Emotional Intelligence, a continuous variable
- 4) Multicultural Readiness, a continuous variable, and
- 5-8) Four joint effects variables: the 2 categorical variables x the 2 continuous variables.

Six methods of estimating sample size were considered. The first two were based on conventional rules of thumb and the second two were based on Cohen's (1988, 1992) estimation of effect sizes. Maxwell (2000) points out several difficulties with using rules of thumb as well as Cohen's approach, especially where the primary interest is focused on the impact of one or

more specific predictors rather than on the significance of the multiple correlation coefficient. Accordingly, the last two methods rely on Maxwell's suggestion of estimating sample size using formulas based on the zero order correlations of the predictor variables with each other and with the dependent/criterion variable.

Method A

An often quoted common rule of thumb is that there must be at least 10 participants for each predictor variable (see Maxwell for discussion). In the present study this would mean at least 80 participants.

Method B

Nunnally (1978, as described by Maxwell) recommends 300 to 400 participants for a moderate number of predictor variables. For purposes of this analysis, a sample size of 350 was assumed for this method.

Method C

Cohen (1988, as interpreted by Maxwell) suggests that a) 400 participants would be necessary for an anticipated small effect size ($N = 392 + p = 400$) and b) 60 participants would be necessary for an anticipated medium effect size ($N = 52 + p = 60$), where p = number of variables. Cohen defines a small effect size as .02 and a medium effect size as .15. The most obvious difficulty with this method is anticipating the true effect size which is unknown, although small effect sizes in psychological research are not uncommon.

Method D

Cohen (1992) published a table of suggested sample sizes which indicates that a study with eight variables would require a sample size of a) 757 participants for a small effect size and b) 107 participants for a medium effect size.

Method E

Maxwell argues that a reasonable alternative to determining sample size based on estimating effect size, is to use a formula based on estimates of zero-order correlations among the predictor and criterion variables. A starting place is a formula based on an exchangeable correlation structure, which assumes equal zero-order correlations among the predictor variables and between each of the predictor variables and the criterion variable. Maxwell points out many theoretical and statistical perspectives that justify assuming exchangeability of the zero-order correlations for purposes of estimating an appropriate sample size. In addition, when a researcher is trying to estimate a sample size when actual correlations are unknown, exchangeability may be justified as a working hypothesis, not so much because of a belief they are equal, but because of a lack of evidence to the contrary. Using Maxwell’s formula for estimating sample size based on an exchangeable correlation structure (equation 18, page 442) and substituting a range of zero-order correlations from .1 to .4 for both the estimated zero-order correlations among the predictor variables as well as between each predictor variable with the criterion variable, the estimates of sample size set forth in Table B.1 were obtained.

Table B.1
Sample Size Estimates Using Maxwell’s Exchangeable Correlation Structure

| ρ_{xx} | ρ_{xy} | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| | .1 | .2 | .25 | .3 | .35 | .4 |
| .1 | 2268 | 489 | 275 | 159 | 89 | 44 |
| .2 | 5015 | 1130 | 663 | 410 | 257 | 158 |
| .25 | 6993 | 1597 | 949 | 597 | 385 | 248 |
| .3 | 9490 | 2189 | 1313 | 837 | 550 | 364 |
| .4 | 16554 | 3877 | 2355 | 1529 | 1031 | 708 |

ρ_{xy} = estimated population correlation among all predictor variables

ρ_{xy} = estimated population correlation between each predictor variable and the criterion variable

Cell value = N

This researcher estimated that the zero-order correlations among the predictor variables were most likely to be low, that is, in the range of .1 to .25. Furthermore, there was no reason to expect any significant correlation among the other predictor variables. In addition, this researcher estimated that correlations among the predictor variables and the criterion variable were most likely to range from .25 to .35. Accordingly, the sample sizes highlighted above in gray were considered to be likely estimates for an adequate sample size.

Method F

Maxwell also suggests a relaxed exchangeable correlation structure may be more appropriate where one of the predictor variables is the variable of most interest. Under this approach, zero order correlations for the variable of interest (X1) are estimated separately from the zero-order correlations of the remaining variables. In this study, the variables of most interest are two joint effect variables (MR x Diversity Brochure Content and EI x EI Brochure Content). Because the other variables are not expected to have as large an effect on the criterion variables, and because the diversity related manipulations are not expected to affect the EI related outcomes (and visa versa) , sample size was also estimated using the relaxed exchangeable correlation structure. Using Maxwell's formula for estimating sample size based on a relaxed exchangeable correlation structure (equations 5, 20 & 22; pages 436 and 445) and substituting a range of zero-order correlations as indicated in Table B.2, the estimates for sample size set forth in Table B.2 were obtained.

Convergence

Table B.3 is a summary of the estimates obtained from the six different methods. It is apparent that the estimated sample sizes are quite discrepant. In part this is due to using a wide range of estimates for the formula parameters. The mean of the sample sizes above is 265 and the

median is 219. To be more conservative, another summary was prepared deleting the lower set of estimates for the Cohen approach, and also eliminating all results under 100. This summary is set forth in Table B.4 The mean of these remaining samples sizes is 311 and the median is 266 and only four of the estimates exceed 350. Accordingly a target sample size of 350 was chosen for this study.

Table B.2
Sample Size Estimates Using Maxwell's Relaxed Exchangeable Correlation Structure

| ρ_{xx} | ρ_{x1x} | ρ_{xy} | ρ_{x1y} | | | N |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|------|
| .05 | .05 | .05 | .05 | | | 5722 |
| .05 | .05 | .05 | .1 | | | 1019 |
| | | | | | | |
| .15 | .15 | .15 | .2 | | | 480 |
| .1 | .1 | .1 | .2 | | | 293 |
| .05 | .05 | .05 | .2 | | | 219 |
| | | | | | | |
| .15 | .15 | .15 | .3 | | | 139 |
| .1 | .2 | .1 | .3 | | | 136 |
| .1 | .1 | .1 | .3 | | | 108 |
| .05 | .1 | .05 | .3 | | | 97 |

X1 = independent variable of primary interest (e.g., joint effect)
 ρ_{xx} = Estimated population correlation among all IV's except X1
 ρ_{x1x} = Estimated population correlation of X1 with all other IV's
 ρ_{xy} = estimated population correlation of all IV's (except X1) with DV
 ρ_{x1y} = estimated population correlation between X1 and DV

Table B.3
Summary of Estimated Sample Sizes

| Method | N |
|--------|-----|
| | |
| A | 80 |
| B | 350 |
| C | 400 |
| | 60 |
| D | 757 |
| | 107 |
| E | 89 |
| | 159 |
| | 275 |
| | 257 |
| | 410 |
| | 663 |
| F | 480 |
| | 293 |
| | 219 |
| | 139 |
| | 136 |
| | 108 |
| | 97 |

Table B.4
Modified Summary of Estimated Sample Sizes

| Method | N |
|--------|-----|
| | |
| B | 350 |
| D | 757 |
| | 107 |
| | 159 |
| | 275 |
| | 257 |
| | 410 |
| F | 663 |
| | 480 |
| | 293 |
| | 219 |
| | 139 |
| | 136 |
| | 108 |

APPENDIX C

NON- MANIPULATED SECTIONS OF BROCHURE

- *Welcome to SCR*

For nearly 60 years, the name SCR has stood for high quality products, excellent service, and customer satisfaction. Through its various holdings, SCR offers products and services in a wide variety of areas including entertainment, convenience foods, finance, education, and medical technology. With over 2500 employees in 63 locations, SCR is full of opportunities for continually building and reinventing your career. You will find opportunities to vary your responsibilities and enhance your job skills without having to change companies ... SCR truly offers the best of all worlds.
- *Salary and Benefits*

With SCR, you can expect:

 - Competitive salaries
 - Comprehensive benefits, including
 - 401(k)
 - paid vacation and holidays
 - health, life, disability
 - World-class training
 - Professional development
- *Divisions*

As a growing company, we are continuously looking to fill positions in each of our divisions:

 - Research & Development
 - Finance
 - Human Resources, Training & Development
 - Information Systems & Technology
 - Operations
 - Sales and Marketing
 - Public Relations
 - Legal and Compliance
- *[No title]*

To learn more about job opportunities at SCR, visit us and apply on-line at
xxx.xxx.xxx

- *Core Values*

SCR is guided by a set of core values that permeate the way we conduct our business.

Excellence and Achievement

We continually strive for excellence in both our business and our community. We focus on achieving meaningful and actionable results that support our financial goals and the delivery of quality products and services to our customers.

Integrity and Honesty

We uphold uncompromising integrity. We demonstrate honest, ethical behavior in all transactions, placing the success of our business and its people ahead of any personal gain.

Trust and Credibility

We work in an environment in which we can trust one another and share information freely. By consistently delivering on our commitments, we earn the credibility of those around us.

Opportunity

We support continual improvement and personal renewal. We give our employees opportunities to learn, grow and advance in their careers.

APPENDIX D

DIVERSITY BROCHURE CONTENT AND ASSOCIATED MANIPULATION CHECKS

Table D.1
Diversity Brochure Content and Associated Manipulation Checks

| <i>Level</i> | <i>Brochure Content</i> | <i>Manipulation Check [true/false/insufficient information]</i> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Neutral | (ALL VERSIONS) <i>Diversity</i> SCR is proud to be an equal opportunity employer. | SCR is an equal opportunity employer. |
| 2. Diverse Perspectives | SCR provides a culture that encourages and values the different backgrounds, perspectives, and beliefs that our employees bring to the workplace. To realize the benefits of diversity, we must be open to the wide range of ideas, viewpoints, skills, and experiences that each of us offer. | SCR culture values the different perspectives that employees from different backgrounds bring to the work place. |
| 3. Opportunity to Interact | SCR offers many opportunities within employee networks, teams, and workgroups to interact with people from different cultures and backgrounds | SCR offers many opportunities to interact with individuals from different backgrounds |

APPENDIX E

EI BROCHURE CONTENT AND ASSOCIATED MANIPULATION CHECKS

Table E.1
EI Brochure Content and Associated Manipulation Checks

| <i>Level</i> | <i>Brochure Content</i> | <i>Manipulation Question</i> <i>[true/false/insufficient information]</i> |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Neutral | <p>(ALL VERSIONS) Work Environment SCR has numerous locations, varying in size and function. To some extent work environment depends upon the location, but several themes are common across all of our sites, including a friendly first name basis, a business casual dress code, and a challenging work environment.</p> | SCR has a business casual dress code. |
| 2. Supportive employee culture | <p>Employee Culture SCR employees are empathetic, caring, and compassionate. This may take the form of helping others who perform difficult tasks, encouraging someone who is having a bad day, or sharing resources others need to do their job.</p> | SCR employees are empathetic and compassionate and help others who perform difficult tasks. |
| 3. Supportive leadership | <p>SCR Leadership SCR leaders are empathetic, caring, and compassionate. They exhibit a friendly, supportive, and concerned approach to managing employees, thoughtfully considering employees feelings -- along with other factors -- in the process of making intelligent decisions.</p> | SCR leaders and managers take employees' feelings into consideration when making decisions. |
| 4. Awareness of emotions | <p>Employee Perspective SCR employees are aware of their own emotions and the emotions of others. They understand the impact of workplace events on emotions as well as the impact that one's emotions can have on subordinates, colleagues, customers, and clients. They have an ability to identify when emotional reactions to an issue may interfere with objectivity.</p> | SCR employees are aware of their emotions and understand the impact of workplace events on the emotions of others. |

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL CONTENT REVIEW QUESTIONS

The following content review questions were used in addition to the manipulation checks set forth in Appendices D and E. Answer choices were *true*, *false*, or *insufficient information*.

1. SCR's core values include honesty and integrity.
2. SCR offers competitive salaries.
3. SCR is headquartered in Minneapolis.
4. SCR is primarily interested in hiring research chemists.
5. SCR has approximately 300 employees.
6. SCR offers a 401(k) program.
7. SCR produces agricultural fertilizer.
8. SCR has business dress code.

APPENDIX G

MULTICULTURAL READINESS

[OTHER GROUP ORIENTATION] SCALE

This scale consists of six four-point items, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:

1. I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.
2. Sometimes I feel it would be better if different ethnic groups didn't try to mix together.
(Reversed scored)
3. I often spend time with people from ethnic groups other than my own.
4. I don't try to become friends with people from other ethnic groups. (Reversed scored)
5. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups.
6. I enjoy being around people from ethnic groups other than my own.

APPENDIX H

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE [SSRI] SCALE

This scale consists of 33 five-point items, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:

1. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others.
2. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them.
3. I expect that I will do well on most things I try.
4. Other people find it easy to confide in me.
5. I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people.
6. Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important.
7. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities.
8. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living.
9. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them.
10. I expect good things to happen.
11. I like to share my emotions with others.
12. When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last.
13. I arrange events others enjoy.
14. I seek out activities that make me happy.
15. I am aware of the non-verbal messages I send to others.
16. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others.

17. When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me.
18. By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing.
19. I know why my emotions change.
20. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas.
21. I have control over my emotions.
22. I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them.
23. I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on.
24. I compliment others when they have done something well.
25. I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send.
26. When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced this event myself.
27. When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas.
28. When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail.
29. I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them.
30. I help other people feel better when they are down.
31. I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles.
32. I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice.
33. It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do.

APPENDIX I

ORGANIZATIONAL ATTRACTION SCALES

The three subscales of this measure each consist of five five-point items, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:

General Attractiveness

1. For me, this company would be a good place to work.
2. I would not be interested in this company except as a last resort. (reversed scored)
3. This company is attractive to me as a place for employment.
4. I am interested in learning more about this company.
5. A job at this company is very appealing to me.

Intentions to Pursue

1. I would accept a job offer from this company.
2. I would make this company one of my first choices as an employer.
3. If this company invited me for a job interview, I would go.
4. I would exert a great deal of effort to work for this company.
5. I would recommend this company to a friend looking for a job.

Prestige

1. Employees are probably proud to say they work at this company
2. This is a reputable company to work for.
3. This company probably has a reputation as being an excellent employer.
4. I would find this company a prestigious place to work
5. There are probably many people who would like to work at this company.

APPENDIX J

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

The following background information was solicited from each participant:

1. What is your age?
 - a. 18–19
 - b. 20–22
 - c. 23–28
 - d. 29–35
 - e. 36 or over

2. What is your gender?
 - a. male
 - b. female

3. What is your major?
 - a. Physical science
 - b. Social science
 - c. Math or math related subject
 - d. Business, accounting, IS or related subject
 - e. Education
 - f. Pre-professional
 - g. other

4. What is your Ethnicity?
 - a. White/Caucasian
 - b. Black /African American
 - c. Asian
 - d. Hispanic/Latino
 - e. Biracial/Multiracial
 - f. Other

5. Have you ever held a full time job(s)?
 - a. no
 - b. yes, for less than 2 months
 - c. yes, for 2- 6 months
 - d. yes, for 7-12 months
 - e. yes, for more than 12 months

6. What year are you in school?
 - a. freshman
 - b. sophomore
 - c. junior
 - d. senior
 - e. other

7. Have you read organizational recruitment brochures before?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

8. Have you read about careers or jobs at specific organizations on-line before?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

9. If you have read such material, how is the is the SCR brochure similar or different from other brochures or information found on-line:
 - a. Very similar
 - b. Somewhat similar
 - c. Somewhat different
 - d. Very different
 - e. not applicable

10. Are you currently seeking employment?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

11. When will you be seeking fulltime permanent employment?
 - a. 2004
 - b. 2005
 - c. 2006
 - d. after 2006

12. In your opinion, how realistic is the SCR Brochure?
 - a. Very realistic
 - b. Somewhat realistic
 - c. Somewhat unrealistic
 - d. Very unrealistic

APPENDIX K

ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS

- Age
 - 94% 18-22 years of age
- Major
 - 32 % social science majors,
 - 19 % pre-professional
 - 12 % business IT or accounting
- Length if time held a full-time job
 - 57 % none
 - 24 % for at least 2-6months
- Year in school
 - 21 % freshman
 - 34 % sophomore
 - 23 % junior
 - 18 % senior
- Previously read organizational recruitment literature
 - 53 % yes
 - 47 % no
- Previously read organizational recruitment information on-line
 - 70 % yes
 - 30 % no
- Found the SCR Brochure to be realistic
 - 17% very realistic
 - 57 % somewhat realistic
 - 23% somewhat unrealistic
 - 3% very unrealistic
- Found the SCR Brochure similar to other recruitment literature or web-sites
 - 13 % very similar
 - 49 % somewhat similar
 - 10 % somewhat dissimilar
 - 3 % very dissimilar
 - 27 % not applicable
- Currently seeking employment
 - 18 % yes
 - 82 % no
- When they are likely to seek employment
 - 2 % 2004
 - 12 % 2005
 - 14 %v 2006
 - 72 % after 2006