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ABSTRACT

Perceptions of Asian Americans and Female Leadership Candidates: The Impact of Descriptive and Prescriptive Stereotyping

by

Jane I. Lim

Advisor: Dr. Harold Goldstein

Although Asian Americans and women tend to be relatively well represented in professional roles, they continue to be underrepresented in executive-level leadership positions. This paper examined a combination of factors believed to contribute to the shortage of Asian American and female leaders in organizations – in particular, descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping. Thus, the current study examined how participants responded to an Asian American or White, male or female applicant being considered for a leadership role. All targets were qualified, but varied on levels of warmth and/or dominance. Overall, it was hypothesized that the Asian American and female candidates behaving counterstereotypically (e.g., dominantly) would be subject to backlash, in the form of more negative affective reactions and lower leadership ratings compared to similar White and/or male candidates. A study was conducted online with White male participants recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Ultimately, the results of the study did not support the predicted hypotheses. A discussion of the results and potential reasons for these findings are included.
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Modern American organizations have become increasingly diverse; however, executive leadership continues to be dominated by White males (Calvert, 2013; Catalyst, 2016; Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). Abundant research has demonstrated that racial minorities and women still face barriers as they climb the corporate ladder, leading to underrepresentation at the executive levels (e.g., Avery, 2010; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2001; Powell & Butterfield, 1997). Proposed reasons for this underrepresentation are varied. Research has focused on examining direct obstacles such as discrimination and prejudice, and indirect obstacles such as placement in “dead end” positions with fewer opportunities for advancement and exclusion from important social networks (e.g., Avery, 2010; Powell & Butterfield, 1997). In general, this research has focused on the difficulties encountered by women and African Americans. Unfortunately, this focus has left several questions about other marginalized groups unanswered (Ruggs, Hebl, Law, Cox, Roehling, Wiener, & Barron, 2013).

Of particular interest is the experience of Asian Americans – that is, individuals of Asian descent who have immigrated to the United States or were born on U.S. soil. Members of this group have a unique history in the United States (Hurh & Kim, 1989; Woo, 2000). Currently, Asian Americans are one of the fastest growing minority groups in the country (Brown, 2014; Hoeffel, Rastogi, Kim, & Shahid, 2010). Their presence in the U.S. labor force has been increasing steadily over the past 20 years, and by 2018, Asian Americans are expected to make up 5.6% of the labor force (Toossi, 2009; U.S. Department of Labor, 2011). Compared to other minority groups, Asian Americans appear to have higher levels of educational attainment and stronger representation in professional and technical occupations (Gee, Hom, & Anand, 2014; Gee, Peck, & Wong, 2015; U.S. Census Bureau, 2016; U.S. Department of Labor, 2011).
Additionally, there are numerous positive stereotypes that tend to be associated with Asian Americans. They are generally perceived as competent, intelligent, hard-working, and well-suited for high-status jobs (e.g., Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Ho & Jackson, 2001; King, Madera, Hebl, Knight, & Mendoza, 2006; Lai & Babcock, 2013; Lee, Ottati, Lin, & Chan, 2014). However, they continue to be underrepresented in the leadership ranks (Avery, 2010; Hurh & Kim, 1989; Li-Liang, 2009; Sy, Shore, Strauss, Shore, Tram, Whitely, & Ikeda-Muromachi, 2010; Woo, 2000). Indeed, Asian American representation in executive roles has been paltry at best, in spite of their desire to hold leadership positions (Akutagawa, 2013; Gee et al., 2015; Woo, 2000). Even in Silicon Valley, where Asian Americans are considered to be overrepresented in professional level positions, they are severely underrepresented at the top levels (Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015). More specifically, an examination of over 130,000 employees at five major technology organizations (Google, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, LinkedIn, and Yahoo) showed that Asian American men are significantly less likely to hold executive-level leadership positions compared to both White men and White women. Furthermore, Asian American women are the least likely to achieve these positions compared to these groups (Gee et al., 2015). Considering roughly 80% of employed Asian Americans work for private organizations (U.S. Department of Labor, 2011), this number is troubling. The question, then, becomes why members of such a large and seemingly accomplished group are so poorly represented in executive-level leadership positions.

Despite the increased diversity of the modern workforce, research on the experiences of Asian Americans – particularly those of Asian American women – has been sorely lacking (Ruggs et al., 2013). A few studies have examined the role of factors such as stereotyping (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Rosette, Koval, Ma, & Livingston, 2016), leadership perceptions (e.g.,
Chung-Herrera and Lankau, 2005; Festekjian, Tram, Murray, Sy, & Huynh, 2014; Sy et al., 2010), and intergroup threat (Lin, Kwan, Cheung, & Fiske, 2005; Maddux, Galinsky, Cuddy, & Polifroni, 2008). Overall, researchers have found inconsistent results when examining the discrimination, prejudice, and stereotyping directed at Asian Americans compared to other minority groups (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; Sy et al., 2010; Woo, 2000). Additionally, very few studies (e.g., Festekjian et al., 2014; Sy et al., 2010) have focused specifically on reactions to Asian American leaders (or those applying for leadership positions). Therefore, additional research is necessary to gain a clearer understanding of how individuals respond to Asian Americans in the workplace – particularly as potential leaders.

On the other hand, the literature focusing on the prejudice and discrimination faced by women in the workplace has been more robust and relatively consistent. For example, numerous studies have demonstrated that women who behave in an agentic manner often face backlash – whether in the form of dislike, sabotage, or other negative reactions (e.g., Gill, 2004; Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004; Phelan, Moss-Racusin, and Rudman, 2008; Rudman & Glick, 1999; Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012).

The current investigation examines these and related topics in greater detail. Much of the research on leadership and perceptions of leaders (e.g., Bass, 1985; Conger, 1999; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004) has shown that certain traits are seen as integral for successful leadership. However, there exists a discrepancy between these traits and the stereotypes attributed to Asian Americans and women. Thus, while Asian Americans are viewed as intelligent and hardworking, they are also seen as lacking in attributes such as sociability, warmth, and assertiveness (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007; Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). Similarly, while women are seen as warm, they are viewed as less competent than men (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007;
Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). Furthermore, the solution may not be as simple as training Asian Americans or women to behave differently (i.e., more in line with what is expected of successful leaders), as research has also demonstrated that individuals who behave counterstereotypically are subject to backlash (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Gill, 2004; Phelan & Rudman, 2010).

In light of this and related research, the present study examined several key questions. Firstly, would participants have more negative reactions to an Asian American or female leadership candidate behaving counterstereotypically, compared to a White male candidate exhibiting identical behaviors? Secondly, how would people respond differently to Asian American vs. female candidates behaving in stereotype-consistent or inconsistent ways? Finally, how might participants’ Social Dominance Orientation, or “the extent to which one desires that one’s in-group dominate and be superior to outgroups,” (Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994, p. 742) influence their ratings of these candidates?

In what follows, I will begin by detailing the unique history of Asian Americans1 in the United States. This will shed light on how the distinct past of this group has influenced how they are treated in the workplace today. I will also discuss their “model minority” status, and how this seemingly positive reputation has led to negative outcomes for members of this group. Furthermore, I will also discuss the research that has been conducted on women in the workplace.

---

1 I will focus on Asian Americans in general, rather than differentiating between members of various ethnic backgrounds. It has been posited that members of non-Asian groups tend not to distinguish Asian Americans by ethnicity (Festekjian et al., 2014; Sy et al., 2010). As a result, it is likely that Asian Americans of various ethnic backgrounds will receive comparable treatment by non-Asians, particularly in terms of workplace barriers (Festekjian et al., 2014; Woo, 2000).
I will then present a brief overview of leadership in organizations, focusing specifically on transformational and charismatic leadership theories. I will focus on these theories in particular, because they emphasize characteristics that are both traditionally associated with successful leadership yet incongruent with stereotypes regarding Asian Americans and women. Additionally, I will discuss research on implicit leadership theories, and examine how individuals’ views regarding leadership can influence their reactions toward Asian Americans and women who wish to be leaders.

Furthermore, I will explore how factors such as descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping may work to shape perceptions of Asian Americans and women in leadership contexts. Some similar processes appear to be at work when Asian Americans and women attempt to attain leadership roles, but there also exist key differences. I will explore these similarities and differences to create a deeper understanding of the shared and unique experiences faced by members of these groups. Finally, I will present a study examining reactions toward Asian American or White, male or female candidates exhibiting varying levels of warmth and/or dominance. Levels of participants’ Social Dominance Orientation will also be measured, to examine its influence on participants’ reactions toward these candidates.

To begin, I will review the literature focusing on the discrimination faced by Asian Americans in general. I will also examine some of the processes possibly driving the underrepresentation of Asian Americans in top leadership positions.

**Asian Americans in the United States**

As noted, research on Asian Americans in the workplace has been scarce, particularly when compared to the literature that has focused on members of other minority groups (Lai, 2013; Ruggs et al., 2013). This has led to a lack of in-depth understanding about the reactions to
and experiences faced by Asian Americans (Avery, 2010; Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Woo, 2000). Elucidating the experiences of this group, then, is important for at least three reasons. Firstly, it may help members of the majority group better understand the issues faced by Asian Americans. Secondly, it may help organizations recognize and address potential issues in their performance management and selection systems, which may currently allow for bias against members of this group. Consequently, this could help prevent the loss of top Asian American talent, who may otherwise leave for better opportunities elsewhere (DiversityInc, 2011; Woo, 2000). Finally, it may help Asian Americans better understand the obstacles they may encounter (and the reasons behind these barriers), and help them find paths to success (Avery, 2010).

I will start with an examination of Asian Americans’ unique experiences in the United States, in order to provide a richer understanding of the distinct issues faced by this group. I will then show how many of the difficulties from the past remain today.

**Asian Americans in the American workplace.** In the past several decades, there has been a steady increase in the number of Asian Americans working in American organizations, and all signs indicate that this trend is likely to continue. Asian Americans are expected to make up approximately 8% of the American population by 2050 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004), and by 2018, approximately 5.6% of employees in the U.S. are expected to be Asian American (Toossi, 2009; U.S. Department of Labor, 2011).

Despite this increase, however, Asian Americans continue to be underrepresented in executive-level leadership positions. This is perhaps most evident when comparing the number of Asian Americans in leadership roles to their representation in professional positions. While the vast majority of working Asian Americans are employed in American corporations, they are
significantly underrepresented in the executive levels and on corporate boards (Akutagawa, 2013; Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; LEAP, 2013). According to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 2007), Asian Americans hold roughly 10% of professional level positions, but less than 4% of executive and senior level positions. Conversely, Whites represent roughly 76% of the professional workforce, but over 87% of the executive and senior level positions (EEOC, 2007).

Even within Silicon Valley-based organizations, where Asian American representation is higher than average, they remain underrepresented in executive-level leadership roles (Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015). In Gee et al.'s (2015) examination of minority and female representation at Google, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, LinkedIn, and Yahoo, the authors found that Asian Americans hold 27.2% of professional positions and only 13.9% of executive leadership roles. Whites, on the other hand, hold 62.2% of professional roles, yet 80.3% of executive positions. Additionally, the authors argue that race has a larger influence on this underrepresentation than gender, with White women having higher representation in executive leadership positions than both male or female Asian Americans (Gee et al., 2015).

Before proceeding further, an important question that must be addressed is whether or not Asian Americans even want to be leaders. According to the literature, they do (Akutagawa, 2013; Gee et al., 2015; Woo, 2000). However, studies have shown that Asian Americans, like other minority groups, are aware of and may even internalize the stereotypes attributed to them (Festekjian et al., 2014; Li-Liang, 2009). Thus, some Asian Americans may express lower levels of leadership motivation because they believe these stereotypes and consequently believe they do not have the qualities necessary for successful leadership (Festekjian et al., 2014; Li-Liang, 2009). These perceptions may be bolstered by the repeated failures they face in selection and
promotion contexts, and the fact that there are very few Asian American leaders to serve as role models and mentors (e.g., Gee et al., 2015; Li-Liang, 2009; Woo, 2000).

The shortage of Asian Americans at the executive levels is difficult to reconcile with the ubiquitous image of Asian Americans as the “model minority” and the fact that they are so well represented in professional positions (e.g., Akutagawa, 2013; Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; Lai, 2013; LEAP, 2013). In the following, I will discuss the model minority image that has been popularized in the United States, including potential reasons for its propagation. Additionally, I will present counterevidence refuting some of the tenets of this framework, along with a discussion about some of the negative consequences of the model minority myth.

**The idea of the “model minority” – and its consequences.** The American news media began to propagate the image of Asian Americans as the “model minority” in the 1960s (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Hurh & Kim, 1989). Some notable articles published during this time included, “Success Story, Japanese American Style” in New York Times Magazine and “Success Story of One Minority in the U.S.” in U.S. News and World Report (Hurh & Kim, 1989; Woo, 2000). These articles painted Asian Americans as the embodiment of the American Dream, glorifying them as minorities who had integrated into U.S. society and had gained notable levels of success through hard work and determination (Berdahl & Min, 2012; Hurh & Kim, 1989; Woo, 2000).

Part of this success could be attributed to the restriction of Asian immigration to those who were skilled and well-educated (e.g., Hurh & Kim, 1989; Woo, 2000). The 1965 Immigration Act allowed for increased immigration of Asians with professional expertise, including those in the sciences and engineering (Woo, 2000). Therefore, many of the Asian
immigrants entering the country during this time were highly educated and capable, leading to the rise of successful Asian Americans in American organizations. This likely influenced the more positive perceptions of this group (Woo, 2000).

However, while the success of some Asian Americans certainly played a role in the development of the “model minority” label, it has been argued that additional motives were also involved in this story. During the Civil Rights movement in the 1960s, the fight against race-based inequality gained momentum. African Americans and other minorities, citing a history of institutionalized prejudice and discrimination, demanded equal treatment and better opportunities. The widely disseminated portrait of Asian Americans thriving in the U.S., then, served to shift the blame to these disadvantaged minority groups who seemed unable or unwilling to achieve the same level of success (Hurh & Kim, 1989; Sue & Kitano, 1973; Woo, 2000). Furthermore, the apparent prosperity of Asian Americans was used to support the argument for the existence of a meritocratic system in the U.S. (Berdahl & Min, 2012). Thus, the minorities involved in the fight for fair treatment were portrayed as lazy and perhaps inept, particularly in comparison to members of the “model minority,” who were clearly able to succeed on their own (Berdahl & Min, 2012; Woo, 2000).

This image of Asian Americans as the “model minority” has persisted since its first appearance in the 1960s, and remains strong today. While there appear to be indications that Asian Americans as a group have indeed achieved high levels of success in terms of education and professional accomplishments, there is also evidence demonstrating that this information is flawed (e.g., Woo, 2000).

**Educational achievements.** Approximately half of Asian Americans (i.e., individuals of Asian descent residing in the U.S.) over the age of 25 currently hold a bachelor’s degree,
compared to 30.1% of similar Americans in general (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). Additionally, approximately 20% of Asian Americans over the age of 25 hold graduate or professional degrees, compared to 11.4% of similar Americans in general (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). They also represent a disproportionately high percentage of students in Ivy League colleges (Chen, 2012).

Despite being overrepresented in the top universities, educational attainment has not translated to greater upward mobility for Asian Americans (Berdahl & Min, 2012; Woo, 2000). While higher levels of educational attainment have allowed Asian Americans to gain access to and often find success in professional occupations, these achievements have not led to comparable representation in higher level leadership positions within American organizations (Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; Lai & Babcock, 2013; Woo, 2000; Yang, 2011). In fact, the lower returns on education appear to become more drastic as the level of education increases (Woo, 2000). Emphasizing the strong educational achievements of Asian Americans, then, could work to divert attention away from the problems that Asian Americans may face upon leaving school and entering the workforce.

**Professional accomplishments.** Asian Americans are well represented in certain professional occupations, particularly in the sciences and engineering. In fact, compared to other minorities, they are slightly overrepresented in professional and technical jobs (Gee et al., 2015; U.S. Department of Labor, 2011). In some areas, such as certain technology-based firms in the Silicon Valley, the proportion of Asian employees have soared to around 50% of the workforce (Nakaso, 2012). Asian Americans also appear to be relatively well represented in certain managerial positions, though they tend to be grouped at the lower levels (Gee et al., 2014; Gee et
al., 2015; Woo, 2000). Furthermore, they are significantly less likely to be in executive-level positions compared to both White men and White women (Gee et al., 2015).

Despite having high educational and professional achievements, Asian Americans have generally not achieved parity with their White counterparts at the executive levels in most American organizations. Perhaps just as problematic, however, are the negative consequences that can result from the view of Asian Americans as the model minority. For example, Ruggs et al. (2013) argue that research focusing on Asian Americans is seriously lacking, particularly when compared to the massive body of research examining the problems faced by African Americans. Therefore, there is a dearth of information about how the experiences of Asian Americans in the workplace differ from members of other groups. In other words, because of the view that Asian Americans are the model minority, there has been insufficient research on the organizational barriers faced by members of this group. This, in turn, has led to a general lack of awareness around the issues facing Asian Americans in the workplace.

Furthermore, the view of Asian Americans as the model minority can lead to resentment and jealousy, from both the dominant group and other minorities (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Ho & Jackson, 2001). Members of the dominant group may feel threatened by a successful and powerful group that is competing with them for valuable resources (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002). Additionally, other minorities may feel resentful or jealous of what Asian Americans have (purportedly) accomplished (Ho & Jackson, 2001). This may be due, in part, to the fact that members of the dominant group may treat these other minorities more harshly, blaming them for their inability to achieve comparable success (Ho & Jackson, 2001). All of these factors can lead to dislike and possibly active harm toward Asian Americans, in the form of discrimination or sabotage (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002; Maddux et al., 2008).
However, it is not entirely clear how, exactly, this plays out in the workplace. This highlights the importance of the current research, with its focus on a group that has been severely understudied.

In sum, Asian Americans are underrepresented in many high-status roles (e.g., Akutagawa, 2004; Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; Woo, 2000). Additionally, the widespread belief that they are a “model minority” has likely led to insufficient research on this group (Ruggs et al., 2013).

However, it may be argued that the scarcity of Asian Americans in leadership roles may be influenced, at least in part, by cultural differences, which can lead to distinct communication styles (Gee et al., 2014; Li-Liang, 2009), ineffective impression management techniques (Xin, 2004), or behaviors incongruent with successful leadership (Akutagawa, 2013; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015). Indeed, Gee et al. (2015) argue Asian Americans may exhibit behaviors that, while consistent with Asian cultural values, may be seen as weakness or incongruent with successful leadership in American organizations (e.g., being submissive to those in authority). Thus, while these behaviors may lead to attaining leadership roles and achieving success in Asian organizations, they may hinder Asian Americans from achieving leadership roles in the United States.

While these factors may play a role, research suggests that Asian Americans do possess the necessary knowledge and skills to be successful in leadership positions (e.g., Kawahara, Pal, & Chin, 2013; Woo, 2000). Therefore, at least some of the barriers to advancement may stem from biased preconceptions and negative reactions on the part of the perceivers. This is difficult to state definitively, however, as there appear to be very few studies that have examined reactions to an Asian American (vs. White) target clearly exhibiting behaviors associated with
effectiveness in leadership positions (e.g., assertiveness). The present study was designed to provide additional insight into this issue.

This study also focused on reactions to women within a leadership context. In what follows, I will examine the literature that has focused on women in the workplace, to better understand the barriers faced by members of this group.

**Women in the Workplace**

Since the days of Rosie the Riveter, the experiences of many women in the United States has involved a combination of making a place for themselves in the workforce while maintaining their duties at home (Shah, 2015). In more recent years, the number of female employees has increased to the point where women make up nearly half of the American workforce (Catalyst, 2016). Additionally, the number of women age 25 and over who have achieved bachelor’s degrees or higher has increased to levels comparable to similar men (Ryan & Bauman, 2016). However, this increase in education has not translated to equal salaries or representation in leadership positions. Indeed, women continue to earn roughly 80% of the wages men earn for similar jobs, with larger discrepancies for minority women (American Association of University Women, 2017). Additionally, women remain underrepresented in leadership positions, particularly at the executive levels (e.g., Catalyst, 2016; Gee et al., 2015).

Part of the explanation for this underrepresentation may stem from the women themselves. Research has shown that women may be less motivated to attain senior level executive roles, with reasons ranging from wanting to avoid the increased stress associated with such positions, perceiving more barriers to their ascent, and a desire to maintain balance between work and family (McKinsey & Company, 2015; Watts, Frame, Moffett, Van Hein, & Hein, 2015). Additionally, women may be less likely than men to repeatedly apply for leadership roles
after facing rejection (Brands & Fernandez-Mateo, 2016). In a series of studies, Brands and Fernandez-Mateo (2016) examined how male and female job candidates responded to rejection. They found that female candidates were less willing than male candidates to interview for a new leadership role if they had been previously rejected. The authors argue that this is due, in part, to women’s perceptions about how fairly they were treated during this process (Brands & Fernandez-Mateo, 2016). Therefore, at least in some circumstances, women themselves may be self-selecting out of trying to achieve leadership roles.

Nevertheless, much of the literature on the stereotyping of women in the workplace has focused on how descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes play a role in the perceptions of women in leadership. This may lead to discrimination against women who are perceived as not being a good fit for leadership roles, and/or backlash for those who do not behave in line with expectations (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983, 2001; Rudman et al., 2012). The research on women in organizations has been significantly more robust compared to research focusing on Asian Americans.

The literature has focused primarily on the impact of descriptive stereotyping (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Gill, 2004; Heilman, 1983; Schein, 1973) and prescriptive stereotyping (e.g., Gill, 2004; Heilman, 2001; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Heilman et al., 2004; Phelan et al., 2008; Rudman et al., 2012) on perceptions of and reactions toward women in the workplace. More specifically, there are descriptive stereotypes about what women tend to be like, along with prescriptive stereotypes about what women should be like (e.g., Heilman, 2001). Researchers argue that both descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping of women can play a role in their underrepresentation in organizational leadership positions (e.g., Gill, 2004; Heilman, 2001; Rudman et al., 2012). This is in many ways consistent with the research examining descriptive
and prescriptive stereotyping of Asian Americans (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002); however, there are some key differences.

In what follows, I will provide a detailed examination of the factors that may influence the underrepresentation of Asian Americans and women in top leadership positions. However, I will begin by outlining several theories regarding effective leadership and what is expected of leaders, in order to provide some contextual information on leadership in the United States. I will then discuss how these views on leadership, combined with factors such as categorization and stereotyping, may impact how individuals respond to Asian Americans and women within a leadership context. I will draw from the research focusing on stereotyping of women in the workplace, along with studies focusing on Asian Americans and other minorities. This will provide a more comprehensive and coherent picture of the processes involved in the perceptions of Asian Americans and women, particularly in the upper levels of organizations.

**Leadership in Organizations**

Leadership in organizations has been studied extensively for over a century (Yukl, 2010). Researchers have focused on factors ranging from the behaviors and characteristics of leaders across cultures to the effectiveness of various leadership styles in the workplace. A number of theories have examined the qualities and behaviors of successful leaders (e.g., servant leadership, situational leadership); however, charismatic leadership and transformational leadership theories have dominated the field for the past several decades (see Barling, Christie, & Hoption, 2010, for a review).

I will focus primarily on transformational and charismatic theories in particular for several reasons. Firstly, there is abundant evidence demonstrating the link between charismatic and transformational leadership styles and positive outcomes for followers and organizations
(e.g., Cicero & Pierro, 2007; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), making them important topics of research in industrial/organizational psychology. Secondly, research on implicit leadership theories has shown that the characteristics people associate with successful leaders and leadership in general are in line with those presented in charismatic and transformational leadership theories – with many characteristics being universally endorsed (e.g., Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, et al., 1999). In other words, when people think of effective leadership, they tend to think of a charismatic or transformational leader. Unfortunately, this could lead to negative consequences when a potential leader does not possess these characteristics – or is perceived to not possess them. Interestingly, certain characteristics associated with charismatic and transformational leadership (e.g., being assertive and challenging the status quo) are especially incongruent with common perceptions of Asian Americans and women (e.g., that they are nondominant; Fiske et al., 2002). Since this incongruence may influence how people respond to Asian American and female leaders, these theories are of particular interest when focusing on the experiences of these groups.

However, it cannot be discounted that focusing on other leadership theories (e.g., servant leadership) may lead to differences in how reactions to Asian American and female leadership candidates are examined. In particular, servant leadership focuses on characteristics such as humility and being other-focused (Greenleaf, 1977; Russell & Stone, 2002; van Dierendonck, 2011). In this view, then, agentic characteristics such as dominance and assertiveness play less of a role in successful leadership – and indeed, may be viewed as antithetical to being a good leader. Based on this model, it may be hypothesized that, while Asian Americans may still be rated lower on leadership characteristics and capabilities (due to stereotypes that they are cold
and unsociable; e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005), women may fare better than men (due to the stereotypes that they are – and should be – warm and other-focused; e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Heilman, 1983; 2001). Nevertheless, due to the reasons listed above, I will concentrate primarily on transformational and charismatic leadership theories for the purposes of this paper.

Charismatic leadership. Research in charismatic leadership has focused on the ability of a charismatic leader to inspire and motivate followers toward a common goal (Conger, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House, 1977; Jacobsen & House, 2001; Shamir et al., 1993). Although different views of charismatic leadership have emerged (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993), there is a great deal of overlap among them, and they adhere to the same basic tenets (Conger, 1999).

The charismatic leadership process begins with a leader creating a vision for a future that is preferable to the status quo. The leader communicates this attractive vision to his followers, stirring them to action. He then empowers and supports them as they work toward this common goal. The leader also appeals to the followers’ values and makes personal sacrifices, which increases followers’ trust in the leader’s commitment (Conger, 1999; Yukl, 2010). While charismatic leadership is more likely to arise in times of distress (Jacobsen & House, 2001), theorists argue that a crisis is not necessary for the emergence of charismatic leadership (e.g., Conger 1999; Yukl, 2010). Instead, charismatic leaders can find issues within the status quo that must be changed in order to improve the current situation.

Charismatic leadership has been associated with numerous positive outcomes, including follower job performance, job satisfaction, motivation, and satisfaction with the leader (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996, Shamir et al., 1993). Thus, charismatic
leadership may have important outcomes for followers, the leaders themselves, and the organization as a whole.

While some scholars have viewed transformational and charismatic leadership as similar or equivalent (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House & Podsakoff, 1994), others have argued that the differences are more substantial (e.g., Yukl, 2010). Transformational leadership theory, originally introduced by Burns (1978) and revised by Bass (1985), examines the behavior of transformational and transactional leaders.

**Transformational leadership.** Transformational leadership is comprised of four key components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Idealized influence involves a selfless desire to do what is best not for oneself but for the organization as a whole. The leader is dedicated to the organization and looks out for the best interest of his followers. Based on these behaviors, followers identify with and commit themselves to the leader. Leaders engaging in inspirational motivation envision an improved future state and garner employee support and enthusiasm toward this goal. Inspirational motivation also involves challenging employees to accomplish more than even they thought possible. Leaders engaging in intellectual stimulation encourage employees to challenge the status quo and tackle problems in new, creative ways. Finally, individualized consideration involves focusing on the needs of individual followers and providing support and encouragement. Leaders who exhibit individualized consideration foster learning and growth within their followers.

In contrast to transformational leadership, transactional leadership can involve contingent reward, active management by exception, or passive management by exception. Also included in
descriptions of transactional leadership is laissez-faire leadership (Avolio et al., 1999; Bass, 1985; Bass et al., 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Contingent reward occurs when leaders clarify what is expected of followers and reward those who successfully perform the expected behaviors. Followers are motivated by the potential for reward or recognition from their transactional leader. These types of behaviors have been described as important for good management (Barling et al., 2010). In active management by exception, followers understand which behaviors are acceptable and unacceptable, and the leader takes an active role in scrutinizing individuals’ behaviors and punishing those who stray from the standards that have been set. In passive management by exception, the leader takes a more passive role, and penalizes those behaviors or mistakes that have become too egregious or obvious to overlook. Finally, laissez-faire leadership involves a more hands-off approach, with the leader failing to provide clear expectations or standards, and not focusing on the needs of his followers (Avolio et al., 1999; Barling et al., 2010; Bass, 1985; Bass et al., 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Similar to charismatic leadership, transformational leadership has been associated with various positive outcomes, including the performance of military units (Bass et al., 2003), follower satisfaction with the leader (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), follower task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

**Perceptions of leaders.** In addition to transformational and charismatic leadership, researchers have also focused on what followers expect from their leaders. In general, studies have found that individuals tend to envision and prefer leaders with many of the characteristics associated with charismatic and transformational leadership (e.g., Den Hartog et al., 1999). Indeed, individuals have distinct notions regarding what constitutes successful (vs. unsuccessful) leaders, and what makes leaders different from nonleaders (e.g., Epitropaki & Martin, 2004).
Ultimately, this influences which types of people are selected for leadership positions and whom individuals choose to follow, which can lead to problems for those who do not fit these “leader” preconceptions (e.g., Asian Americans).

Lord and his colleagues (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, & Hall, 2001; Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1993) have produced an impressive body of research examining people’s perceptions of leaders and leadership in general. Work in this field has focused on the structure of individuals’ implicit leadership theories and the leader prototypes to which potential leaders are compared.

**Implicit leadership theories.** Individuals have implicit theories about what leaders are like and how they tend to behave, along with how leaders are distinct from nonleaders (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Lord & Maher, 1993; Nye & Forsyth, 1991; Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994). Implicit leadership theories (ILTs) are influenced by an individual’s background and life experiences, along with interactions with various leaders (Offermann et al., 1994).

Offermann et al. (1994) examined the structure of individuals’ ILTs and found eight factors: Sensitivity, Dedication, Tyranny, Charisma, Attractiveness, Masculinity, Intelligence, and Strength. Epitropaki and Martin (2004), however, found a six-factor structure. The authors also differentiated between two higher order dimensions: the Leadership Prototype and the Leadership Antiprototype. Similar to Offermann et al.’s (1994) findings, Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, and Dynamism were found to comprise the Leadership Prototype. These factors included behaviors such as sincerity, intelligence, cleverness, and being motivated and energetic. The Leadership Antiprototype, comprised of Tyranny and Masculinity, included behaviors such as domineeringness, conceit, and masculinity.
Research has demonstrated that the content of ILTs can vary based on the type of leader in question (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Lord, Brown, Harvey & Hall, 2001; Lord & Maher, 1993). For example, the responsibilities and job requirements for those in executive-level positions are significantly different from those required for individuals in lower level management roles. As a result, the implicit leadership theories for these different jobs will vary accordingly (see Den Hartog et al., 1999). Den Hartog et al. (1999) found that participants rated characteristics such as innovativeness and courage as important for high level leaders, while they rated characteristics such as orderliness as important for good lower level managers. They also found that, regardless of hierarchical level, attributes such as trustworthiness and the ability to remain calm were rated as equally important for lower and upper level managers (Den Hartog et al., 1999).

Furthermore, many of the characteristics associated with transformational leadership appear to be universally endorsed (Bass, 1997; Den Hartog et al., 1999; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, Gupta, et al., 2004). The GLOBE study, which gathered data from managers in 60 societies, examined behaviors categorized as beneficial or harmful for successful leadership (Den Hartog et al., 1999; House et al., 2004). The authors found that six dimensions of leadership behaviors were rated as important for successful leadership regardless of culture, including being charismatic/value-based, humane, and participative.

Thus, there are some characteristics that appear to be expected of all leaders, many of which are similar to those associated with charismatic and transformational leadership. Additionally, depending on the type and rank of the leader being described, ILTs will vary. This is particularly relevant to the present paper, as Asian Americans are often viewed as having some of the characteristics necessary to be successful in professional or managerial positions (e.g.,
orderliness), but not those associated with charismatic/transformational leadership or executive-level positions (e.g., visionary). Similarly, while women may be viewed as warm, they are generally not viewed as bold or assertive.

*Leadership prototypes and the connectionist model of leadership.* In the past several decades, Lord and his colleagues (Lord et al., 1984; Lord & Maher, 1993; Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001) have amassed a broad body of research examining individuals’ perceptions of leadership. Initially, the researchers focused on individuals’ leadership prototypes.

Leadership categorization theory (e.g., Lord et al., 1984; Lord & Maher, 1993) posits that individuals have relatively static leadership prototypes that depict a typical or average leader. When an individual encounters a target (e.g., a job applicant), the degree to which the target matches the individual’s leader prototype will influence how the individual reacts to the target (Lord & Maher, 1993; Rosette, Leonardelli, & Phillips, 2008). This will include any expectations regarding the target and explanations for his behaviors (Lord et al., 1984). In general, a target will be seen as a more effective leader and receive more positive evaluations the more closely he resembles the perceiver’s leader prototype (Rosette et al., 2008).

Drawing from research in cognitive psychology and information processing, Lord and his colleagues have focused more recently on the formation and activation of leadership prototypes (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). As a result, they have developed the connectionist model of leadership, which argues that leadership prototypes are created spontaneously, as needed, and are influenced by an individual’s characteristics and experiences. These prototypes are said to change based on contextual considerations, such as the
type of leader in question, the organization, or the task at hand (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001).

According to Lord and colleagues (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001), individuals have connectionist networks that organize and make sense of incoming information from the environment. These networks are comprised of units, which are likened to neurons in the brain. Within the networks, units will activate or inhibit surrounding connected units, depending on the input (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). Activation between units occurs when past experience has shown that these units are related to each other. For example, characteristics such as competent and intelligent should activate each other, as they are often seen together (i.e., competent people tend to also be intelligent). Inhibition between units, on the other hand, occurs when two units are somehow contradictory or unlikely to be seen together (e.g., domineering and sensitive). The strength of the activation or inhibition is determined by past experiences, and meaning arises from these networks when certain connections are activated while others are inhibited (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). In other words, the unique patterns of activation and inhibition of the units within a network, along with the varying strengths of their activation and inhibition, will influence the reception and interpretation of incoming stimuli.

Furthermore, the addition of different contextual variables (e.g., characteristics of the target; the type of organization or leader in question) can lead to significant changes in how incoming information is interpreted (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). This can, in turn, lead to different reactions to and perceptions of the target in question. Lord and his colleagues (Lord, Brown, Harvey & Hall, 2001) provide an example of how varying a target’s gender can drastically alter the interpretation of identical stimuli. Thus, considerate, supportive behavior
from a male manager may be viewed as “kind,” while identical behavior from a female manager may be seen as “too soft.” This is due to the differential patterns of activation and inhibition that occur between the units based on the inclusion of “male” compared to “female” in the connectionist network. Similar processes may occur when the race of the target is varied, depending on the characteristics associated with each race. For example, a White man exhibiting deferential behaviors may be seen as “respectful” and “courteous,” while an Asian man exhibiting identical behaviors may be seen as “weak” and “submissive.” This is consistent with theories related to categorization (e.g., Feldman, 1981; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013), which state that placing individuals into certain categories will lead to specific expectations about the target, influencing both the observer’s interpretations of the target’s actual behaviors and the observer’s behaviors toward the target.

In sum, research has demonstrated that individuals have implicit theories regarding what leaders tend to be like, and how leaders differ from nonleaders. Additionally, a preference for charismatic and transformational leadership behaviors has been shown to be relatively universal (Den Hartog et al., 1999; House et al., 2004). The connectionist model of leadership argues that different contextual variables (e.g., type of leader, characteristics of target) can influence how certain stimuli are perceived, which will influence reactions such as judgments regarding an individual’s leadership potential. It has been argued that these processes and other related issues may contribute to a shortage of minorities and women at the executive levels in organizations (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2001; Rosette et al., 2008; Sy et al., 2010). The following sections will examine more closely the factors that work together with leadership perceptions to influence reactions toward minorities and women in the workplace.

**Influence of Stereotype Processes**
**Categorization.** Individuals categorize themselves and others into groups, which allows them to perceive, understand, organize, and store information about the environment in a coherent manner (Feldman, 1981; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). This process varies depending on the characteristics of the stimulus, the perceiver, and the situation (Feldman, 1981). In social interactions, the process of categorization is influenced by pre-established guidelines about how certain people are similar or different (i.e., stereotypes; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). Additionally, this process can serve to support and maintain the current social structure and an individual’s value system (Tajfel & Forgas, 2000). As such, perceived differences in hierarchical status and the distribution of power between groups will play a role in how members of certain groups are viewed and classified (Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). Furthermore, individuals will seek to confirm their preexisting views regarding their environment, including the categories into which others have been sorted. Therefore, there may be a tendency to distort incoming information to conform to one’s existing assumptions (Tajfel & Forgas, 2000).

In intergroup relations, individuals will behave in different ways and enact certain roles depending on their status within the pre-established hierarchy (Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). Furthermore, social interactions will be influenced by not only an individuals’ actual behaviors, but perceivers’ expectations and interpretations of these behaviors, which are shaped by the classification of oneself and others (Feldman, 1981; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). In other words, a perceiver will categorize a target into a group, which may include race, gender, and class (Feldman, 1981; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). In turn, this categorization will lead the perceiver to expect certain things from the target, which will influence how the target’s actual behaviors are viewed and interpreted by the perceiver. Finally, how the perceiver
Perceivers will also store and recall information about a target differently, contingent on how the target has been categorized (Feldman, 1981). More specifically, depending on the target, perceivers will notice certain (stereotype-consistent) behaviors more easily than others, and will store and recall this information more readily in the future. Additionally, information that is inconsistent with an individual’s expectations may be ignored and/or not remembered in the future (Feldman, 1981).

These processes may have a significant impact on performance reviews and selection practices, as individuals who are categorized into certain groups may be perceived and remembered inaccurately when important decisions are made (Feldman, 1981; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Indeed, an individual member of a certain group (e.g., an Asian male) may not be remembered in terms of his individual characteristics; instead, the perceiver may simply remember the characteristics of the prototypical member of his group (e.g., competent, socially awkward) and make decisions or judgments based on this information (Feldman, 1981; Powell & Butterfield, 1997).

Furthermore, there is research supporting the notion that once a target has been categorized into a certain group (e.g., Asian American), information regarding the target (e.g., the actual behaviors he exhibits) will be filtered through and shaped by the perceiver’s beliefs regarding this group (Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). Xin and Tsui (1996) found that Asian American managers’ ratings of their own behaviors differed significantly from perceivers’ ratings of these same behaviors. The authors reasoned this may have occurred due to certain expectations or attributions made by the perceivers. Additionally, Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, and
Ruderman (1978) found that a target’s gender influenced how the target was perceived by a sample of student participants. More specifically, participants rated a male target as more influential, confident, and less sensitive than a female target, even though the targets behaved identically. In other words, participants’ ratings were strongly influenced by their preexisting assumptions and beliefs regarding men and women (Taylor et al., 1978). These findings are consistent with the connectionist model of leadership (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001), which argues that the inclusion of a contextual variable (e.g., target race and/or gender) can influence how the target’s behaviors are perceived.

Examining the processes involved in categorization and the resulting consequences can be helpful in understanding the current status differentials within society and why certain individuals work to justify and maintain the status quo (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). However, categorization is not the only factor involved in how individuals view members of other groups. Researchers focusing on intergroup conflict, prejudice, and discrimination has examined a number of variables involved in the perception and treatment of marginalized groups. Studies investigating the views of women and minorities have focused on factors such as descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Gill, 2004; Heilman et al., 2004; Rudman & Glick, 1999) and proscriptions based on status (Rudman et al., 2012). I will draw from this diverse body of research and explicate how these processes may influence reactions toward Asian Americans and women in the workplace.

**Descriptive and Prescriptive Stereotyping.** Stereotypes are defined as “a set of attributes ascribed to a group and imputed to its individual members simply because they belong to that group” (Heilman, 1983, p. 271). When referring to the stereotyping of groups, there is a
distinction made between *descriptive* stereotypes, which outline what members of these groups are like, and *prescriptive* stereotypes, which define the appropriate behaviors for these groups – what members should be like (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Heilman, 2001). In the following sections, I will discuss how both of these stereotypes impact perceptions of women and Asian Americans.

*Descriptive stereotypes.* Asian Americans are often subject to descriptive stereotyping, and the current view of Asian Americans remains similar to that of the 1960s (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005; Woo, 2000). There are numerous positive descriptive stereotypes attributed to this group, including views that they are hardworking and conscientious (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002). They are still viewed as the “model minority,” particularly in the popular press (e.g., Hewlett, 2011). As noted, this is associated with a variety of negative consequences, such as dislike and sabotage from members of other groups (Berdahl & Min, 2012; Gilbert, Carr-Ruffino, Ivancevich, & Lownes-Jackson, 2003; Ho & Jackson, 2001; Phelan & Rudman, 2010). There are also negative stereotypes attributed to this group, including views of them as antisocial, cunning, nerdy, and quiet (Ho & Jackson, 2001; Lin et al., 2005).

This type of ambivalent stereotyping is somewhat similar to reactions toward “career women.” More specifically, Fiske, Cuddy, and their colleagues (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002) discuss how both Asian Americans and “career women” are viewed in a similarly ambivalent manner (i.e., they are viewed as high on competence yet low on warmth). This perceived combination of competence and coldness is said to drive similar reactions toward members of these groups (e.g., respect yet dislike; Fiske et al., 2002). However, the stereotyping directed toward Asian Americans is qualitatively different from that directed
toward women in a number of ways (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002). In this section, I will discuss the descriptive stereotyping of Asian Americans, along with the associated consequences. However, because the literature on this group is lacking, I will draw from relevant research that has been conducted on women and other minorities when necessary.

While descriptive stereotyping can be an efficient way to interpret and understand the environment, it can cause problems in interpersonal relations (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Heilman, 1983). In general, stereotypes can be described as gross overgeneralizations about members of a certain group, which may or may not apply to individual members of that group. This can lead to erroneous attributions and expectations for individuals based solely on their group membership (Feldman, 1981; Heilman, 1983; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013).

In general, the stereotypes attributed to Asian Americans tend to be wholly different from those associated with many other minorities, and can be both positive and negative (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Gilbert et al., 2003; Jackson, Hodge, Gerard, Ingram, Ervin, & Sheppard, 1996). As noted, descriptive stereotypes of Asian Americans tend to include a combination of positive stereotypes related to their competence and intelligence, along with negative stereotypes regarding their lack of warmth and social skills (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Ho & Jackson, 2001; Lin et al., 2005).

Jackson et al. (1996) found that student participants rated Asian Americans as more self-disciplined, less popular, and more traditional than Whites. Furthermore, Gilbert et al. (2003) examined student participants’ stereotypes regarding Black and Asian men and women. The authors found that an Asian target was rated as more competent (e.g., intelligent) and more serious about work (e.g., realistic, focused) than a Black target. Overall, Gilbert et al.’s (2003)
findings demonstrate that the stereotypes associated with Asian American men and women are more positive than the stereotypes attributed to Black men and women.

The mixed nature of the stereotypes attributed to Asian Americans may hinder their organizational advancement in several ways. The positive stereotypes may cause members of other groups to feel envious or resentful, while the negative stereotypes may lead to discrimination due to dislike or a perceived lack of qualifications. Similarly, the mixed stereotypes attributed to women may also lead to negative reactions – including resentment, dislike, and perceptions of incompetence. The Stereotype Content Model (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2006; Fiske et al., 2002) and the related BIAS Map (Cuddy et al., 2007) provides additional information regarding the conflicting stereotypes attributed to Asian Americans and women, along with the potential outcomes. Furthermore, the Lack of Fit Model (Heilman, 1983) and the Role Congruity Theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) provides deeper insight into these processes.

The Stereotype Content Model and Asian Americans. According to the Stereotype Content Model, or the SCM (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006; Fiske et al., 2002), the stereotypes that individuals form about outgroups can be separated into two dimensions: warmth and competence. These two dimensions are considered to be the basic attributes on which individuals judge others (Fiske et al., 2006). In general, people want to determine two things: whether members of an outgroup have positive or negative motives toward the ingroup (which will influence warmth judgments) and whether or not the outgroup can achieve their goals (which will influence competence judgments; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). For example, a high-status, powerful outgroup that competes with the ingroup for valuable resources will be perceived as competent but cold (Fiske et al., 2002). Thus, the
stereotypes assigned to outgroups are rarely universally positive or negative; rather, they tend to vary along the two dimensions, depending on the group’s perceived intent and capabilities (Fiske et al., 2002).

The SCM posits that an outgroup’s unique standing on the two dimensions will elicit different types of reactions from perceivers (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002; Wojciszke, Abele, & Baryla, 2009). Cuddy et al. (2011) argue that respect for an outgroup stems from the perceived competence of that group, while liking depends on warmth. Indeed, Wojciszke et al. (2009) found, across a variety of samples, that information about a target’s communality had greater impact on how much participants liked the target, compared to information about a target’s agency. On the other hand, information regarding a target’s agency affected participants’ respect for the target more than information about the target’s communality. The authors argue this is due to the different inferences that are made based on communal versus agentic information about a target. In other words, communal traits are associated with benevolence and an outward focus, while agentic traits are associated with being selfish and ambitious (Wojciszke et al., 2009). Therefore, a group perceived as competent but cold will be respected, but disliked. This type of group elicits envious prejudice from perceivers, who begrudgingly respect the group’s high achievements and status, but dislike and remain suspicious of them (Fiske et al., 2006).

Building on the tenets of the SCM, Cuddy et al. (2007) present the BIAS Map, which examines in greater detail the stereotypes attributed to various groups and their consequences. Firstly, in line with the SCM, the Bias Map shows that perceivers will have wide-ranging responses toward members of different groups, which will depend on the “social structural appraisals” (Cuddy et al., 2007, p. 632) of these groups. That is, judgments regarding the abilities
of the outgroup (i.e., competence) and whether or not they are viewed as a source of competition (i.e., warmth) will influence how perceivers respond to them. Secondly, the relationship between the types of stereotypes attributed to the outgroup and the ensuing emotional and behavioral responses to the group will be related in a systematic manner. Therefore, depending on a group’s perceived standing on warmth and competence, they will experience distinct forms of discrimination and prejudice (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2006). Finally, the BIAS Map states that behaviors toward members of outgroups will be linked more closely to emotions than stereotypes. In other words, stereotypes regarding competence and warmth will lead to specific emotions, and it will be these emotions that will predict the behaviors toward the group (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2006).

Cuddy and her colleagues (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2006) also argue that a perceiver’s main concern is what an outgroup’s intentions are toward the ingroup. Therefore, judgments regarding warmth are primary, while judgments regarding competence are secondary. As a result, stereotypes related to warmth will elicit active behaviors (i.e., harassment or helping), while competence stereotypes will lead to passive behaviors (i.e., associating with the group or neglecting the group; Fiske et al., 2006). For example, members of groups seen as incompetent and warm (e.g., the elderly) may be pitied and neglected, while members of groups seen as competent but cold (e.g., Asians) may be envied and harassed (Fiske et al., 2006).

Furthermore, perceivers make different types of observations and judgments when determining warmth and competence in outgroup members (Cuddy et al., 2011). Since warmth is primary, perceivers are quick to notice any relevant information or behaviors that may indicate that the target is merely pretending to be warm. Therefore, a few hostile or cold behaviors, especially by a member of a stereotypically cold group, may be enough to cement perceptions
about an individual’s cold disposition (Fiske et al., 2006). Furthermore, since warmth is considered easy to fake, any warm behaviors are viewed as less diagnostic. In other words, warm behaviors enacted by a member of a stereotypically cold group (e.g., Asian Americans) will generally not change how that individual is perceived. Instead, perceivers may view this individual as calculating or disingenuous (Cuddy et al., 2011). For judgments regarding warmth, then, a few cold behaviors will provide more diagnostic information about the individual’s warmth (i.e., whether or not the individual poses a potential threat) than warm behaviors, which can be feigned (Cuddy et al., 2011).

Competence, however, is not viewed as easy to “put on” or fake (Fiske et al., 2006). Therefore, if an individual demonstrates some competent behaviors, he is viewed, at least initially, as a competent person. On the other hand, if an individual, particularly a member of a stereotypically competent group, engages in a few incompetent behaviors, the individual is given the benefit of the doubt (Fiske et al., 2006). Thus, a few competent behaviors will be seen as indicative of the individual’s (high) level of competence, while a few incompetent behaviors will not be overly detrimental (Fiske et al., 2006).

Additionally, members of an outgroup may be rated highly on competence or warmth, but they are unlikely to be rated highly on both (Lin et al., 2005). With regard to Asian Americans in particular, Lin et al. (2005) argue that “…the Asian outgroup can be perceived relatively favorably, at most, on only one dimension….The representation of Asians as highly competent hard workers does not allow room for corresponding levels of sociability” (p. 35). Therefore, while a high status, competent group may be (begrudgingly) admired for their achievements and capabilities, they will be labeled as “cold” and disliked due to their self-interested nature and lack of sociability (Lin et al., 2005). On the other hand, members of a warm
but incompetent outgroup may be liked, but will be viewed as less competent and not respected (Fiske et al., 2002).

Furthermore, Cuddy et al. (2011) contend that there is a negative relationship between warmth and competence perceptions. In a series of studies with undergraduate participants, Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, and Kashima (2005) examined and found empirical support demonstrating the inverse relationship between warmth and competence. In one study, they presented undergraduate participants with two groups – “Greens” and “Blues” - with corresponding behavioral information about each group. The authors found that the competent group was rated as less warm than a less competent group. On the other hand, a group described as very warm was rated as less competent than a colder group.

In another study, Judd et al. (2005) examined how student participants’ own (perceived) membership in a certain group influenced their warmth and competence ratings of others. After completing a test ostensibly measuring competence, participants were told they were members of either a high- or low-competence group. They were then asked to rate the warmth and competence of two target groups, one of which was presented as highly competent while the other was low on this trait. Replicating the findings of their previous study, the authors found that the high and low competence target groups were rated differently on warmth, such that the high competence target group was rated as less warm than the low competence target group.

A major consequence of this type of ambivalence may include bias at higher levels in organizations:

As leadership positions are increasingly viewed as requiring both warmth and
competence, members of ambivalently stereotyped groups may find themselves excluded, but for different reasons – some groups for lacking competence, other groups for lacking warmth. (Cuddy et al., 2011, p. 86)

Thus, capable yet cold Asian Americans may be excluded from leadership positions due to their perceived lack of warmth, while warm and compassionate women may be excluded due to their perceived lack of competence.

Within this framework, one group of particular interest is Asian American women, as their simultaneous membership in two different groups can lead to somewhat contradictory stereotypic perceptions. If one encounters an Asian American woman, is she viewed as incompetent yet warm because she is a woman, or competent yet cold because she is Asian American – or some other combination? Some insight can be gleaned from Rosette et al. (2016), who examined views of women of different racial backgrounds. They found that White women were more likely to be described in communal terms (e.g., kind), compared to Black women and Asian women. On the other hand, Asian women were more likely to be viewed as intelligent and mild-tempered (e.g., reserved), compared to White women and Black women. Therefore, Rosette et al. (2016) contend that, while White women were viewed as more communal, Asian women were viewed as more intelligent but socially aloof.

Additionally, in line with previous research (Berdahl & Min, 2012), Rosette and her colleagues (2016) view agency as comprised of both competence and dominance. They argue that, since Asian women are stereotypically viewed as highly competent – a characteristic associated with effective leadership – they should be perceived as having more leadership potential than women in general, who are typically viewed as lower on this trait. On the other hand, they note that Asian women are also stereotyped as less dominant, and this lack of
dominance is both descriptive and prescriptive. In other words, not only are Asian American women generally viewed as less dominant, it is believed that they should remain so. Therefore, the authors argue that Asian American women behaving in a dominant manner are likely to face negative consequences. However, they did not test their predictions.

In sum, the mixed stereotypes regarding Asian Americans depict them as high in competence (e.g., intelligent), yet lacking in warmth (e.g., unsociable; Fiske et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005). On the other hand, women are generally viewed as less competent but warm (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). What might be some outcomes of being categorized in this manner, especially in the workplace? More research has been conducted on the various stereotypes attributed to working women (and the prejudice and discrimination they face as a result) compared to the research on Asian Americans. Therefore, I will draw from the literature focusing on women in the workplace to examine the potential consequences of this type of stereotyping for members of both groups.

Descriptive stereotyping and perceived lack of fit for women. Discrimination can arise in the workplace when there is a perceived discrepancy between the stereotypes attributed to members of certain groups and preconceptions about what is necessary to successfully perform a specified job or role (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983). Research examining this phenomenon has focused primarily on women in the workplace. More specifically, the Lack of Fit Model (Heilman, 1983) and Role Congruity Theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) suggest that sex-based bias in leadership roles is due, in part, to the perceived lack of fit between the stereotypes associated with women and the qualifications believed to be necessary for executive, male-typed positions.
In general, women tend to be described in communal terms (e.g., compassionate, sentimental), whereas men tend to be described in agentic terms (e.g., aggressive, independent; Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Chin, 2010; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983; Heilman, 2001; Rudman et al., 2012). At the same time, high status, executive-level positions are “male sex-typed” (Heilman, 2001, p. 668), such that the typical incumbents of these types of jobs are men, and these roles are generally viewed as requiring characteristics that are masculine in nature (e.g., assertive; Heilman, 1983; Lyness & Heilman, 2006). Therefore, when women apply for or occupy these roles, they face discrimination, because they are perceived as lacking the traits necessary to be successful. This bias is more evident in roles that are perceived as more masculine (e.g., military leadership and leadership in fields such as aircraft assembly; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman et al., 2004).

Bias based on descriptive stereotypes has been examined by Schein (1973) and other researchers who have conducted studies using the Schein paradigm (e.g, Duehr & Bono, 2006; Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989). Schein (1973) examined how perceptions of “successful middle manager” compared to perceptions of “men in general” and “women in general.” She had a sample of male insurance managers rate “successful middle manager,” “men in general,” or “women in general” on a number of characteristics (e.g., emotionally stable, objective, intuitive, creative), and then compared the ratings of these different targets. The results showed a high correspondence between ratings for “men in general” and “successful middle manager,” while almost no similarity between ratings for “women in general” and “successful middle manager.” Indeed, a total of 60 traits (e.g., aggressive, self-reliant, objective, direct) were considered to be characteristic of both managers and men in general, while only 8 items (e.g., understanding, helpful, aware of feelings of others, neat) were considered to be characteristic of
managers and women in general. In short, men were seen as much more similar to the idea of a “successful middle manager” than women.

Heilman and her colleagues (1989) conducted a similar study using the Schein paradigm, roughly 15 years after the initial experiment. The authors drew from a sample of male managers across a variety of industries to examine whether the discrepancies remained, and how perceptions might differ for additional targets. In their study, they examined how participants rated Schein’s (1973) original targets (e.g., “women in general”), but also focused on perceptions of other groups as well (e.g., “women managers” and “successful women managers”). Similar to Schein (1973), they found that the degree of correspondence in ratings between “men in general” and “successful middle manager” was significantly higher than for “women in general” and “successful middle manager.” Additionally, the authors found that the relationship between the ratings of women and successful managers was greater when the target was “women managers,” and was the highest when the target was presented as successful (i.e., “successful women managers”). Nevertheless, the ratings showed that women were viewed as significantly less similar to “successful middle managers” compared to men.

Heilman et al. (1989) also found that when the target was “women managers,” the ratings were higher on characteristics such as bitter, quarrelsome, selfish, and less understanding compared to “women in general,” “men in general,” and “successful managers.” Therefore, while women who hold leadership positions may be seen as more similar to successful managers on certain characteristics, they are also perceived as having more negative traits. This is in line with research indicating that warmth and competence have a negative relationship (e.g., Cuddy, Norton, & Fiske, 2005; Judd et al., 2005). Thus, in Heilman et al.’s (1989) study, when a female target was seen as relatively successful and competent, she was also rated as less warm overall.
In a more recent examination of this phenomenon, Duehr and Bono (2006) found that male managers’ views of “women in general” had shifted drastically over time: there was a stronger relationship between ratings of “women in general” and “successful middle managers.” Additionally, women were rated higher on a variety of agentic traits, and the ratings of men and women were more similar on characteristics attributed to “successful middle managers.” These findings were similar for ratings of “women managers.”

However, while women may be seen as relatively suitable for middle management positions, where there is an emphasis on interacting with subordinates in a supportive manner, they may be seen as less appropriate for executive roles, which are viewed as requiring more agentic and masculine behaviors (Eagly & Karau, 2002). This is somewhat similar to the dilemma faced by Asian Americans, who may be seen as appropriate for middle management positions because they are competent and diligent, but less appropriate for executive-level positions, because they lack confidence and assertiveness (e.g., Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; Gee et al., 2014).

Despite the shift in the characteristics attributed to men, women, and successful managers, individuals may still perceive a lack of fit between women and certain jobs or roles, which can lead to a variety of negative consequences. Perceptions regarding the suitability of an individual for a given role will influence expectations for that individual (Heilman, 1983, 2001). When perceivers believe there is a good fit between an individual and a certain role, they will anticipate success for that individual in that role. On the other hand, if they perceive a poor fit, they will expect the individual to fail (Heilman, 2001). Heilman (1983) argues that “performance expectations create a predisposition, or a cognitive set, toward negativity or positivity that colors judgments of self and others” (p. 279). This is in line with Feldman’s (1981) argument that the
classification of individuals into certain categories can lead to differential expectations and
terpretations of behavior. It also echoes the tenets of the connectionist model of leadership, that
changing certain units within a network (e.g., gender) can lead to different interpretations
regarding a target and his or her behaviors (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). For example, a
woman who delays a decision may be perceived as indecisive, while a man who behaves
identically may be seen as cautious or sensible (Heilman, 2001). Therefore, although a woman
and a man may exhibit identical behaviors, they may be interpreted differently, such that the man
is viewed as more capable than the woman (Heilman, 1983; Taylor et al., 1978).

Numerous studies have examined the potential negative outcomes associated with a
perceived lack of fit (Davison & Burke, 2000; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Glick, Zion, & Nelson,
1988; Heilman, 1983; Heilman, 2001). Glick et al. (1988) found that providing individuating
information about a target did not eliminate discrimination when it came to matching men and
women to sex-typed jobs. A sample of managers and business professionals were given
information indicating an applicant’s level of masculinity or femininity. This manipulation was
successful in shaping participants’ perceptions of the targets, such that the male and female
targets were rated as equally “masculine” or “feminine” (depending on the information
provided). However, the female applicant was still more likely to be matched with the
“feminine” job (dental receptionist), while the male applicant was more likely to be matched
with the “masculine” (management) position. The authors argue that sex-based hiring
discrimination may not be based entirely on the perceived characteristics of the applicant;
instead, the applicant’s gender, in and of itself, may influence hiring decisions. Thus, a woman
may be seen as more suitable for a nursing position not only because she is perceived as kind and
warm, but because she is a woman (Glick et al., 1988). This indicates that simply altering an
individual’s characteristics may not be sufficient to reduce this type of discrimination, and these findings are likely to have implications for other groups as well (e.g., Asian Americans).

In a meta-analysis, Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) examined 45 studies focusing on ratings of male and female leaders in a variety of organizations in several different countries. Across the studies, the raters included the leaders themselves, their subordinates, and/or their peers. The authors found that female leaders were more likely to be rated as exhibiting behaviors and attributes in line with transformational leadership (e.g., individualized consideration). As noted, transformational and charismatic leadership behaviors tend to be widely viewed as consistent with successful leadership (e.g., Den Hartog et al., 1999; House et al., 2004). However, based on Glick et al.’s (1988) findings, even if women exhibit these behaviors, they may still be viewed as a poor fit for leadership – simply because of their gender.

Lyness and Heilman (2006) tested the lack of fit framework by examining how the gender of a job incumbent and the sex typing of his or her role interacted to produce different job-related outcomes. They reviewed the performance ratings of men and women in line jobs (positions associated with higher levels of power and authority) versus staff jobs (lower level, support positions). The authors found that women working in line positions received the lowest performance ratings compared to all other groups (i.e., women in staff jobs, and men in either staff or line jobs). Furthermore, stricter standards were used for women in line positions, such that they had to have higher performance ratings than men in order to be promoted. Finally, the authors found that women’s performance ratings also played a larger role in determining their promotion. Lyness and Heilman (2006) argue their findings are consistent with the Lack of Fit Model (Heilman, 1983), such that women in (male-typed) line jobs received the most
unfavorable evaluations, due to the lower level of perceived fit between the woman’s characteristics and the qualities required by the job. Furthermore, not only did women have to perform better than their male counterparts in order to receive comparable promotions, but men were more likely than women to be promoted for reasons other than their performance (e.g., their social ties within the organization).

Heilman (2001) notes that this type of discrimination may be more likely to occur in certain situations, such as when the requirements for a role are not clearly specified. Vague role requirements can lead to individuals distorting or misinterpreting the qualities necessary for success in these types of positions. Furthermore, she argues that having ambiguous criteria for evaluating an employee’s job performance or the suitability of a candidate is also problematic. More specifically, when evaluation criteria are specific and clearly laid out (e.g., specific behaviors that must be performed for an individual to receive high ratings), there is less of a chance that the rating will be biased, since the manager simply has to determine whether or not the individual performed the necessary behaviors. However, when the ratings are more vague (e.g., rating the employee’s overall effectiveness), this can lead to a manager relying on either his stereotypical beliefs regarding the individual or simply remembering the attributes of the category into which the individual has been placed (e.g., Feldman, 1981; Heilman, 2001). This may lead to bias against minorities or women attempting to achieve executive-level positions, as job descriptions and the criteria for performance evaluations tend to become increasingly vague as one goes higher up the organizational hierarchy (Heilman, 2001).

The theoretical perspectives (Eagly & Chin, 2010; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983; 2001) and the research findings regarding women in the workplace (e.g., Glick et al., 1988;
Descriptive stereotyping and lack of fit for Asian Americans. Similar to the perceptions of women, there is a perceived mismatch between the descriptive stereotypes attributed to Asian Americans and the characteristics required for certain roles. As noted, Asian Americans are perceived as competent but cold, and lacking in sociability (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Ho & Jackson, 2001; Lin et al., 2005). Other characteristics associated with this group include femininity, passiveness, modesty, and being emotionally withdrawn (Galinsky, Hall, & Cuddy, 2013; Kawahara et al., 2013; Sy et al., 2010). Many of these characteristics are incongruent with the traits perceived as necessary for success in leadership positions (e.g., decisiveness, charisma) which can lead to perceptions of lack of fit and subsequent discrimination (Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; Duehr & Bono, 2006; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Heilman et al., 1989; House et al., 2004).

According to Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz (2013), the hierarchical differences between various racial groups in society are conveyed through the different levels of masculinity that are attributed to the members of these groups. The White male standard is perceived as having the ideal level of masculinity, and members of other racial groups are contrasted against this standard. Therefore, Black men are perceived as excessively masculine, while Asian men perceived as lacking in this attribute (Galinsky et al., 2013; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). In a series of studies, Galinsky et al. (2013) found that adult participants recruited online associated more feminine characteristics with “Asians” compared to “Blacks” or “Whites.” Furthermore, of the three targets, Asians were the least likely to be selected for a masculine leadership role, which was said to require a fierce and competitive candidate.
As noted, studies in the Schein paradigm (Schein, 1973) have examined how perceptions of women are incongruent with perceptions of successful managers (Duehr & Bono, 2006; Heilman et al., 1989). In the same tradition, Chung-Herrera and Lankau (2005) examined the correspondence between the characteristics attributed to managers of different racial backgrounds and those attributed to a “successful middle manager.” In a sample of White managers working in hospitality, the authors found that, compared to ratings for “Hispanic manager” and “African American manager,” the ratings for “White manager” and “Asian American manager” were more similar to the ratings for “successful middle manager.” Nevertheless, there were still some important differences in the ratings for these groups. For example, while the “White manager” was rated as more similar to “successful middle manager” on key attributes such as self-confident and articulate, the “Asian American manager” was rated as more similar to “successful middle manager” on traits such as competent, conscientious, and well-informed. Furthermore, the “Asian American manager” was seen as less confident, more technically proficient, more reserved, and more timid than the “successful middle manager.” Therefore, while there may be some overlap in the traits attributed to “Asian American manager” and “successful middle manager,” there remain some key differences – differences indicating that, Asian Americans are viewed as conscientious and technically proficient, but lacking in assertiveness and social skills (Burris, Ayman, Che, & Min, 2013; Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005).

These results, which appear to show that Asian Americans are viewed as similar to the idea of a “successful middle manager,” do not necessarily indicate that Asian Americans are viewed as capable leaders. Indeed, it is precisely this type of stereotyping that may contribute to Asian Americans being able to achieve professional and even lower level management positions,
while remaining underrepresented in executive-level leadership roles (e.g., Sy et al., 2010). Management and leadership have been described as fundamentally distinct, in terms of the characteristics and behaviors necessary to enact each successfully (e.g., Zaleznik, 1977). In other words, while a good manager may be focused on working efficiently and conscientiously, a strong leader must create an appealing vision and motivate others toward this goal (Zaleznik, 1977). Therefore, while an Asian American target may be seen as a good fit for certain managerial positions (e.g., Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005), this may not occur for other roles, such as executive-level leadership.

Interestingly, Chung-Herrera and Lankau’s (2005) findings are consistent with the concepts presented in the connectionist model of leadership (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). As noted, this theory states that leadership prototypes are created spontaneously as necessary, and that contextual variables (e.g., target race or gender, type of organization) will influence how incoming information is interpreted and understood. Therefore, the race of the target individual being examined will influence the pattern of activation or inhibition across units in an individual’s network. For example, if the target is a White leader, activated units might include “assertive” and “charming.” On the other hand, if the target is an Asian leader, these same units might be inhibited, while others, such as “intelligent” and “industrious,” might be activated (e.g., Sy et al., 2010). This differential activation and inhibition of various units will influence the type of leadership prototype created when examining the target (e.g., charismatic vs. competent leader; Festekjian et al., 2014; Sy et al., 2010). In turn, this prototype will affect how the target’s behavior is interpreted, along with judgments regarding the target’s suitability for certain types of roles and expectations of success or failure (Festekjian et al., 2014; Sy et al., 2010).
Sy et al. (2010) tested these ideas on a sample of male and female working adults from a variety of racial backgrounds working in the Los Angeles region. The authors examined how describing an Asian or White target as a “sales manager” or “engineer project manager” influenced participants’ ratings. In a series of between-subject studies, participants rated one of four targets on technical competence (e.g., problem solving ability), perceptions of fit (e.g., “This job is a good fit for ___.”) and leadership perceptions (e.g., “How typical of a leader is ___?”). The authors found an interaction between race and job type for perceptions of technical competence and fit, such that the Asian American engineering manager received the highest ratings, compared to all other targets. For leadership perceptions (measured using items such as, “To what extent does ___ demonstrate leadership behaviors?”), there was a main effect for race, such that the White target received higher ratings than the Asian target. Thus, despite perceiving the Asian American target as highly qualified for the “engineer project manager” position, participants still viewed the White candidate as better suited for leadership overall.

To examine the processes underlying these results, Sy et al. (2010) focused on the different prototypical leadership characteristics attributed to the targets. They found that different leadership prototypes were activated automatically in participants’ minds when presented with the Asian American manager compared to the White manager. More specifically, a “competent-leader” prototype was activated when the target was an Asian American manager, meaning that the target was perceived to be high in intelligence and dedication. On the other hand, an “agentic-leader” prototype was activated when the target was a White manager, meaning the target was perceived as having high levels of masculinity and dynamism, and low levels of tyranny. The perceived prototypical characteristics were found to mediate the relationship between the target’s race and leadership perceptions. In short, participants rated the Asian
American target as a good fit for the engineering manager position, due to the activation of a competent-leader prototype. The White target, however, was seen as a good fit for both positions, because he activated the agentic leader prototype.

Additionally, Rosette et al. (2008) posit that most Americans’ leadership prototypes contain the characteristic of “being White.” According to the authors, this is due to people in the U.S. being exposed to more Whites in leadership positions, creating the perception that the typical leader is someone who is White. Across two studies, the authors showed that, when a target was presented as a leader, undergraduate and MBA students were more likely to assume the target was White.

The results of these studies support the argument that contextual variables, such as the race of the target, can lead to the activation of different leadership prototypes (Festekjian et al., 2014; Sy et al., 2010). Furthermore, Asian Americans may be perceived as less suitable for executive-level leadership positions in the United States because they activate the competent-leader prototype rather than the agentic-leader prototype (Festekjian et al., 2014; Sy et al., 2010).

Unfortunately, the problems associated with descriptive stereotyping are not the only issues faced by women and Asian Americans in the workplace, as they are also subject to prescriptive stereotyping. For example, research has shown that, not only are Asian Americans stereotyped as less assertive, but they face backlash if they behave in a manner that contradicts this stereotype (Berdahl & Min, 2012). The consequences of prescriptive stereotypes differ from those of descriptive stereotypes, since they are driven by different mechanisms (e.g., Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Heilman, 2001). In the following, I will provide a brief description of prescriptive stereotypes, and then examine how they may work to hinder the advancement of women and Asian Americans in the workplace.
Prescriptive stereotypes. Bias stemming from prescriptive stereotyping differs from that driven by descriptive stereotyping (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Gill, 2004). Descriptive stereotypes, as noted, attempt to explain what members of certain groups are like and how they differ from members of other groups (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Heilman, 1983; 2001). The previous section outlined the types of consequences that may result from this type of stereotyping, including exclusion from leadership positions due to a presumed lack of fit (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983).

On the other hand, prescriptive stereotypes state how members of certain groups should behave, and proscriptions describe how individuals should not behave (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Rudman, 2010). Individuals who break these rules face backlash, in the form of dislike, rejection, or other related consequences (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Gill, 2004; Heilman, 2001). Prescriptive stereotypes help to maintain the status quo by punishing or rejecting individuals who do not fall in line with the “rules,” which have been established to support and maintain the current hierarchical structure within society (e.g., Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Gill, 2004; Heilman, 2001; Moss-Racusin et al., 2010; Rudman & Phelan, 2008; Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 2001).

Additionally, while descriptive stereotypes may lead to a “cold” form of discrimination based on stereotypes about the outgroup’s interests, skills, or knowledge, prescriptive stereotypes are likely to lead to “hot” discrimination, based on “disgust, resentment, hostility, and anger” (Fiske, 1998, pp. 374-375). Therefore, as laid out by Burgess and Borgida (1999), discrimination based on descriptive stereotyping may involve bypassing a female candidate due to a perceived lack of fit between the candidate and a particular role, while discrimination based on prescriptive
stereotyping may involve punishing a woman for refusing to comply with the prescriptive stereotypes for her gender.

*Prescriptive stereotypes for women and men.* In the previous section, I discussed the various descriptive stereotypes attributed to women and minorities. However, as noted, that is only half the story. To see the whole picture, there must also be an examination of the various prescriptions and proscriptions for members of these groups, which dictate how they should or should not behave (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 2001; Rudman et al., 2012).

Heilman (2001) argues that women are penalized if they demonstrate high levels of competence, particularly on masculine tasks. This is because competent women are seen as engaging in agentic behaviors, which are traditionally reserved for men. Additionally, as competence and warmth are perceived to be negatively related (e.g., Judd et al., 2005), competent women are also viewed as violating the prescription for warmth. Therefore, Heilman (Heilman, 2001; Heilman et al., 2004) contends that a woman who is capable and agentic, while seen as otherwise fitting the requirements for a (masculine) leadership position, will be subject to derogation and dislike, due to her rejection of prescriptive stereotypes. This is in line with Heilman et al.’s (1989) findings that “women managers” (compared to “men managers” and “women in general”) were rated significantly higher on traits such as bitter, selfish, and less understanding.

Heilman et al. (2004) found that when a female target was described as competent and successful in a job that was male-typed (i.e., an assistant vice president in a Financial Planning Division), she was subject to backlash. For example, she was rated as significantly less likeable than a male target in the same position. Moreover, ratings of likeability influenced how the
student participants rated the target on variables such as desiring the target for a manager and salary recommendations for the target. In a similar vein, Rudman (1998) found that, while a female target who engaged in self-promotion (e.g., highlighting one’s accomplishments and strengths) was rated higher on competence, she tended to be less liked. These negative consequences are troubling, since acceptance and liking can strongly influence hiring and promotion decisions (Heilman, 2001). Furthermore, this is likely to be most evident at higher levels in organizations, where hiring criteria and performance ratings are not as objective or explicit (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Heilman, 2001).

Phelan and colleagues (2008) extended these findings by examining the factors that influence hireability ratings for male vs. female job applicants. Student participants were provided with information about a male or female candidate who was agentic or communal, and then asked to make ratings on competence, social skills, and hireability. Consistent with the literature, the agentic female candidate was rated lower on social skills than the agentic male, though viewed as equally competent. On the other hand, the communal female target received higher ratings on social skills, but was perceived to be less competent.

Furthermore, the agentic male received the highest hireability ratings compared to all other candidates. When examining what influenced the participants’ hireability ratings, the authors found competence to be the most important factor – except for the agentic female target. Hence, when participants judged the hireability of this candidate, they shifted their focus to emphasize the importance of social skills, leading to lower hireability ratings. However, when rating the hireability of the communal female candidate (who received lower competence ratings), participants weighted competence more heavily than social skills, again leading to lower hireability ratings. In other words, participants differentially emphasized certain criteria when
judging the hireability of the female candidate, leading to hiring discrimination (Phelan et al., 2008).

As descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping stem from different sources, there are different factors that drive the consequences of each (Gill, 2004). As noted, descriptive stereotypes can be likened to assumptions about an individual based on his or her membership in a certain group (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Gill, 2004; Heilman, 2001). Heilman (1984) showed how discrimination based on descriptive stereotypes could be reduced by providing individuating information about the individual. Participants were provided with no information, job-relevant information, or job-irrelevant information about a male or female job applicant. When provided with no information or job-irrelevant information, participants preferred the male applicant. However, the male and female applicants were rated similarly when job-relevant information was presented. Thus, when relevant, individuating information about a target is available, people may rely on this information (more than stereotypes) when making decisions, leading to a decrease in discrimination (Heilman, 1984).

Prescriptive stereotypes (e.g., women should be communal), however, stem from a desire to maintain the status quo, particularly with regard to power and status differentials (e.g., Gill, 2004; Heilman, 2001; Rudman et al., 2012). Therefore, discrimination based on prescriptive stereotyping, or “hot” discrimination (Fiske, 1998), is less likely to be attenuated by providing individuating information – even if it is job-relevant. Indeed, Gill (2004) found that a female target who violated prescriptive stereotypes (e.g., self-promoting by making statements such as, “I am the best candidate for your...position....I am competitive and ambitious”, p. 631) faced discrimination from male participants who endorsed more traditional prescriptions for women (e.g., those who endorsed statements such as, “Ideal women, in my view, should be helpful”).
Rudman et al. (2012) take the discussion on stereotyping a step further with the Status Incongruity Hypothesis (SIH). The authors argue that, along with descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes, there are also proscriptions, which dictate which behaviors are prohibited for members of certain groups. These behaviors are not generally considered to be positive; instead, they consist of actions that may be tolerated for certain groups (e.g., men) but are strictly forbidden for others (e.g., women).

The authors also argue that individuals are highly motivated to maintain the status quo, or the current power and status differentials within society (Rudman et al., 2012). Thus, men are expected to perform high-status behaviors (prescriptions for agency) while avoiding low-status behaviors (proscriptions for weakness). Women, however, are prohibited from performing high-status behaviors (proscriptions for dominance) while expected to perform behaviors that are not associated with high or low status (prescriptions for communality). Consequently, a woman who exhibits agency and dominance will experience backlash because “[b]y exhibiting masculine competencies, agentic women undermine the presumed differences between the genders, and discredit the system in which men have more access to power and resources for ostensibly legitimate reasons” (Rudman et al., 2012, p. 166).

Furthermore, Rudman et al. (2012) introduce the concept of the dominance penalty. They argue that, since a woman behaving in a dominant manner is seen as violating proscriptions for her gender and thus threatening the gender hierarchy, her behaviors will be perceived as excessively dominant. It is this perceived excessive dominance that will drive the negative affective reactions (e.g., dislike) toward agentic women.

Rudman et al. (2012) examined their predictions in several studies, which involved undergraduate participants making various ratings of dominant or communal male or female job
candidates. All participants were presented with candidates who were clearly competent and qualified for the job at hand. However, depending on the condition, the applicant differed in terms of gender and dominance or communality. Consistent with previous findings (e.g., Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Rudman & Glick, 2001), the (competent) female applicants did not face backlash if they also exhibited communal characteristics. In other words, the likeability and hireability ratings they received were comparable to the ratings for the male applicants (Rudman et al., 2012).

However, the results also showed that participants rated the dominant female applicants significantly lower on likeability and hireability compared to the dominant male applicants, and the lower hireability ratings were fully explained by the likeability ratings. Furthermore, dominant female applicants were rated higher on female dominance proscriptions (e.g., intimidating, ruthless) compared to dominant male applicants (Rudman et al., 2012). This backlash was found to be particularly strong in high “gender system justifiers” (i.e., those who endorsed items such as, “Society is set up so that men and women usually get what they deserve”).

In sum, the Status Incongruity Hypothesis (Rudman et al., 2012) states that women are prohibited from behaving in ways that are incongruent with their (lower) status, because such behaviors threaten the current power and status differentials within society. Therefore, women who engage in high-status, dominant behaviors will face backlash. Furthermore, because of the dominance penalty, women who behave in dominant, masculine ways will be perceived as excessively high on these traits, leading to dislike and discrimination.

Prescriptions and proscriptions are not just for women, however. Men are also faced with standards dictating how they should or should not behave. While women are expected to be
warm and kind (e.g., Heilman, 2001), men are expected to be agentic (e.g., Moss-Racusin et al., 2010; Rudman et al., 2012). In other words, men are only allowed to behave in a manner that demonstrates or enhances their high status (Rudman et al., 2012). Thus, men are not supposed to exhibit weakness or emotionality, nor are they supposed to achieve success in feminine jobs (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010; Phelan et al., 2008). Men who engage in these proscribed or prohibited behaviors are penalized, much like women who defy prescriptions or proscriptions for their gender (e.g., Phelan et al., 2008; Rudman, 1998). For example, male job applicants who were self-effacing were liked less and received lower hireability ratings compared to a man who engaged in self-promotion (Rudman, 1998).

Moss-Racusin et al. (2010) argue this type of backlash can also be explained by the SIH. As noted, the SIH states that individuals want to maintain the status quo, so those who threaten the current social structure are punished (Rudman et al., 2012). Therefore, men are punished if they violate prescriptions to engage in high-status behaviors (e.g., exhibiting confidence or ambition) or proscriptions prohibiting low-status behaviors (e.g., exhibiting weakness or insecurity; Moss-Racusin et al., 2010). Much like women who attempt to act “above” their status, men who behave in ways that are “below” their status face a number of negative consequences (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010; Rudman et al., 2012).

Moss-Racusin et al. (2010) found that student participants rated an unassertive male job applicant as weak and lacking in agency. In other words, he was viewed as violating both prescriptions and proscriptions for his gender. These ratings influenced how much participants liked the applicant, such that an unassertive male job applicant was liked less than a similar female applicant. Interestingly, however, there were no significant differences in hireability ratings between the applicants. Thus, while men who violate prescriptions and proscriptions may
be disliked, they may not be subject to hiring discrimination, unlike women who violate these rules (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010).

**Prescriptive stereotypes for Asian Americans.** Racial minorities, including Asian Americans, are also subject to prescriptive stereotypes and proscriptions (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Phelan & Rudman, 2010; Ridgeway & Kricheli-Katz, 2013). The prescriptions and proscriptions for Asian Americans function to maintain the existing status hierarchy, similar to the prescriptions and proscriptions for women (e.g., Moss-Racusin et al., 2010; Rudman et al., 2012). Therefore, Asian Americans who violate these rules are also subject to “hot” discrimination (Fiske, 1998), likely fueled by anger and resentment (Berdahl & Min, 2012).

Phelan and Rudman (2010) found that Asian confederates were penalized for behaving in ways that were inconsistent with their stereotypes. Student participants were told they would be competing with another participant (actually, a White or Asian confederate) on a knowledge test. Depending on the condition, the knowledge test included questions regarding various types of beers, Asian culture, or Black musicians. All participants (ostensibly) lost to the confederate. Results showed that the Asian confederates who exhibited knowledge on topics considered to be counterstereotypical (e.g., beer, Black musicians) were sabotaged by participants on a later task. According to the authors, this type of backlash was a way for the participants (members of the dominant group) to punish Asian Americans who violated expectations. In other words, participants used sabotage in an attempt to maintain and protect their existing worldview, which includes what Asian Americans are like and should be like (Phelan & Rudman, 2010).

Ho and Jackson (2001) developed the Attitudes Toward Asian Americans scale (ATA), a two-factor measure examining the positive and negative attitudes held about Asian Americans. According to the authors, these affective attitudes stem from both positive and negative
stereotypes. They distinguish between positive instrumental (e.g., intelligent, successful),
positive noninstrumental (e.g., family oriented), and negative (e.g., nerdy, antisocial) stereotypes.
Accordingly, they contend that positive attitudes result from attributing positive instrumental and
noninstrumental stereotypes to Asian Americans, while negative attitudes result from both
positive instrumental stereotypes and negative stereotypes.

Ho and Jackson (2001) examined the correlations between their ATA scale, stereotypes
attributed to Asian Americans, and affective reactions toward this group. They found that
participants who had higher scores on the positive ATA subscale (e.g., “Asian Americans tend to
be hardworking and diligent”) reported higher levels of both admiration and envy of Asian
Americans. These affective reactions were also found in participants who thought Asians had
more “model minority” characteristics (e.g., hardworking). Participants who had high scores on
the negative ATA subscale (e.g., “There are too many Asian Americans in this country”) reported higher levels of hostility and fear. These emotions were also reported by participants
who attributed more negative traits (e.g., antisocial) to Asian Americans. In sum, Ho and Jackson
(2001) found that participants’ responses toward Asian Americans were mixed – they perceived
Asian Americans to have both positive and negative stereotypical traits, which led to different
types of attitudes and emotional reactions. This is in line with previous research (e.g., Fiske et
al., 2002) indicating that Asian Americans are described in both positive and negative ways,
leading to mixed reactions from members of other groups.

Interestingly, an otherwise positive or neutral attribute may be perceived negatively if it
is attributed to Asian Americans (Berdahl & Min, 2010). More specifically, being assertive may
be considered a positive characteristic for members of one’s ingroup, but may be perceived as
power-hungry and excessively forceful when seen in an outgroup (e.g., Rudman et al., 2012) –
such as Asian Americans. This builds on the predictions of the stereotype content model, or SCM (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002), which argues that Asian Americans are seen as competent because they have achieved high status, but cold because they are trying to take valuable resources from the ingroup. These predictions are also in line with the SIH (Rudman et al., 2012), which argues that women (i.e., members of a lower status group) face backlash and a dominance penalty if they exhibit dominant (i.e., high status) behaviors. Thus, traits such as assertiveness or dominance, which may be seen as necessary for leadership roles (and acceptable when exhibited by members of the dominant group), may be viewed as inherently negative or threatening when exhibited by Asian Americans (Berdahl & Min, 2012).

Berdahl and Min (2012) examine this idea in greater detail, while building on the SCM (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). They argue that agency, which is generally treated as a unidimensional trait, is comprised of two factors – competence and dominance – for Asian Americans. Thus, according to the authors, research focusing on Asian American stereotypes should consider three separate traits: competence, dominance, and warmth. Additionally, while the authors concur with previous findings that Asian Americans are perceived as competent yet cold (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005), they add that a lack of dominance is a stereotype that is also ascribed to this group.

The authors argue that this lack of dominance is not only a descriptive stereotype, but a prescriptive stereotype as well. Therefore, Asian Americans are not only viewed as nondominant, but perceivers believe that they should remain so. As noted, the perception of Asian Americans as competent but cold can lead to feelings of envy and resentment (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). According to Berdahl and Min (2012), this is precisely why the view of Asian Americans as nondominant is crucial:
Descriptive stereotypes of East Asians as relatively competent and cold pose a threat to Whites, whose relative status, comfort, and safety may be usurped by a shrewd competitor. If this relatively competent and cold group does not try to take charge, however, – if East Asians are nondominant, unwilling to assert their own ideas and viewpoints, and unlikely to seek dominance or positions of leadership – then this threat is quelled. (p. 143)

Therefore, like other prescriptive stereotypes, the nondominance prescription functions to maintain and perpetuate the current status hierarchy. As a result, individuals who violate this prescription are punished, whether through dislike, harassment, or rejection (Berdahl & Min, 2012).

Berdahl and Min (2012) examined their hypotheses regarding the nondominance stereotype in a series of studies. In one study, the authors found that student participants’ likeability ratings for a dominant Asian American target were the lowest compared to all other targets (i.e., a nondominant Asian American, and dominant and nondominant White targets). In another study, the authors asked a sample of working adults to rate themselves on characteristics such as dominance and warmth, and then report on any instances of race-based harassment they had experienced. There was a main effect for race, such that Asian Americans reported the highest levels of harassment compared to all other groups. Furthermore, Asian Americans who rated themselves higher on dominance reported experiencing more harassment than members of all other groups – including dominant participants of other races. This seems to indicate that dominance may not be prohibited for all races, but only for Asian Americans (Berdahl & Min, 2010).
Furthermore, and perhaps surprisingly, Asian American participants who rated themselves as high on warmth reported experiencing more harassment compared to Asian Americans who rated themselves lower on this trait. Conversely, warm participants of other races reported experiencing less harassment than their colder counterparts. Therefore, (lack of) warmth may not just be a descriptive stereotype for Asian Americans, but a prescriptive stereotype as well (Berdahl & Min, 2012). The authors argue that, by punishing Asian Americans when they behave warmly, members of the dominant group are ensuring that this group remains “cold,” which keeps negative reactions toward them (e.g., dislike, rejection) justified. Another potential explanation may be that, since Asian Americans are often seen as sly, cunning, and selfish (Ho & Jackson, 2001; Lin et al., 2005), individuals may think that an Asian American behaving warmly is being manipulative and disingenuous (Cuddy et al., 2011), thus deserving of harassment. Finally, yet another explanation may be that the warm Asian American participants merely perceived greater harassment compared to other participants. Therefore, another aim of the current study was to examine how participants would react to and rate Asian American targets behaving warmly.

**Potential Moderators**

Along with the categorization and stereotyping processes outlined above, specific individual difference variables could impact how individuals perceive and respond to members of outgroups. One such variable includes Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). As noted, SDO refers to “the extent to which one desires that one’s in-group dominate and be superior to outgroups” (Pratto et al., 1994, p. 742). Individuals high on SDO are more likely to favor viewpoints and roles supporting hierarchical inequality between groups (Pratto et al., 1994). Research has shown that levels of SDO tend to be higher in men compared to women, and high
SDO individuals are more likely to engage in prejudice and discrimination toward members of outgroups (i.e., behaviors that serve to maintain the present hierarchy; Duckitt, 2006; Kteily, Sidanius, & Levin, 2011; Pratto et al., 1994; Umphress, Simmons, Boswell, & Triana, 2008).

High SDO individuals are more likely to endorse items such as, “Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others” and “It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others” (Pratto et al., 1994). Therefore, individuals with higher SDO should be more likely to respond negatively to members of lower status groups behaving counterstereotypically – particularly those exhibiting “high-status” behaviors or behaving in ways that indicate competition for valuable resources (e.g., leadership roles within an organization). This is consistent with Rudman et al.’s (2012) findings, showing that women who engaged in dominance proscriptions (i.e., behaving in ways “reserved” for members of high-status groups) faced backlash.

There appear to be no studies examining the influence of SDO on reactions toward Asian Americans in leadership. Therefore, it is believed that this study was the first to examine how people with different levels of SDO would react to White or Asian American, male or female candidates being considered for leadership positions.

**The Present Study**

This study was designed to fulfill several objectives. Firstly, it examined how participants responded to a White or Asian American, male or female leadership candidate behaving in ways that were counterstereotypical for Asian Americans and women, but congruent with effective leadership (e.g., dominant). Secondly, the study also examined participants’ differential reactions to counterstereotypical Asian American vs. female candidates. In examining the factors above, the study set out to support the tenets of the connectionist model of leadership (Lord, Brown,
Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001) and the Status Incongruity Hypothesis (Rudman et al., 2012). In particular, it was expected the study would demonstrate that the inclusion of certain contextual variables (e.g., candidate race or gender) would influence reactions to the candidate, and that participants would exhibit backlash toward members of low-status groups (i.e., Asian Americans and women) engaging in behavioral proscriptions (e.g., exhibiting dominance).

Thirdly, as noted earlier, Asian Americans are overrepresented in professional roles (e.g., Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; Woo, 2000), and previous studies have shown that views of Asian Americans are similar to perceptions of a “successful middle manager” (e.g., Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005). However, they continue to be underrepresented in upper-level leadership positions (e.g., Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; Woo, 2000). Therefore, examining participants’ responses to an Asian American candidate being considered for a leadership role (with potential for executive-level leadership in the future) was expected to shed some light on the factors that may underlie this discrepancy. This was of particular interest, as previous studies focusing on Asian American leadership (e.g., Sy et al., 2010) have only examined reactions to targets in managerial roles.

Fourth, the following study was expected to provide additional support for Berdahl and Min’s (2012) assertion that nondominance is a prescriptive stereotype for Asian Americans, as it was hypothesized that the qualified and dominant Asian American candidate would evoke negative reactions in participants. Fifth, while Berdahl and Min (2012) found that warm Asian American employees reported higher levels of harassment, this has not been examined in other studies. Thus, one focus of this study was to examine participants’ reactions to a warm Asian American candidate.
Finally, participants’ Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) was measured. As the present study examined reactions to targets behaving counterstereotypically and, indeed, in ways that may be “reserved” for the dominant group (e.g., assertive; Rudman et al., 2012), SDO was measured to examine its influence on participants’ reactions to the targets.

Participants were told to imagine they were employed at a large organization planning to undergo a massive transformation, and that there would be an upcoming project integral to this effort. They were then presented with a resume for one of the candidates being considered to lead the project: Andrew Davis, Andrew Wong, Anna Davis, or Anna Wong. The candidates’ qualifications were held consistently strong across the candidates, while levels of dominance and/or warmth were manipulated. Once the participants reviewed the materials, they responded to manipulation checks and rated their affective reactions toward the candidate, along with the candidate’s leadership-relevant traits and perceived leadership capabilities.

**Hypotheses**

Overall, it was hypothesized that participants would generally respond more negatively to an Asian American or female candidate behaving counterstereotypically, compared to White males exhibiting identical behaviors. More specifically, it was expected that a warm and/or dominant Asian American candidate would receive lower affective reaction and leadership ratings. Additionally, while dominant female candidates were expected to receive lower affective reaction and leadership ratings, it was expected that warm female candidates would receive relatively high affective reaction ratings but lower leadership ratings. The dominant and warm female candidate was expected to receive high affective reaction and leadership ratings. Finally, three-way interactions between participants’ Social Dominance Orientation and the candidates’ qualifications and race or gender were predicted.
Hypothesis 1. For the Asian American candidate, participants’ affective reaction ratings (e.g., general impressions, perceptions regarding likeability) were expected to be consistent with the tenets of the Stereotype Content Model (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002) and Berdahl and Min’s (2012) findings. Specifically, the Asian American candidates who were qualified and dominant; qualified and warm; or qualified, dominant, and warm were expected to receive more negative affective reactions compared to White candidates behaving identically. This was predicted because these Asian American candidates would be seen as demonstrating counterstereotypical (i.e., dominant and/or warm) behaviors2 (Berdahl & Min, 2012; Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). Additionally, the Status Incongruity Hypothesis argues that women (members of a lower status group) face backlash when they behave in dominant, agentic ways, because these behaviors are reserved for high status individuals (i.e., men; Rudman et al., 2012). Thus, it was predicted that an Asian American candidate (a member of a lower status group) exhibiting high status behaviors would receive similar negative reactions.

However, it was expected that, when the Asian American candidate was simply described as qualified for the role (e.g., hardworking, dedicated) without reference to his/her dominance or warmth, affective reaction ratings would not be lower than ratings for the comparable White candidate, since this would be seen as consistent with the perceptions and stereotypes of Asian

---

2 While it may seem counterintuitive that Asian Americans who behave warmly should face backlash, the literature on stereotyping (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Fiske et al., 2002; Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011) appears to indicate that this should be likely. For instance, as noted, Berdahl and Min (2012) found that Asian American participants who rated themselves higher on warmth also reported higher levels of workplace harassment compared to members of other racial groups. In their explanation, the authors point to the Stereotype Content Model (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002), which argues that members of the outgroup are categorized based on perceived levels of warmth and competence. The classification of Asian Americans as high on competence and low on warmth helps to justify the lower status of this group (i.e., they may be capable, but they are not nice). Thus, Berdahl and Min (2012) argue, when Asian Americans behave warmly, they face backlash for behaving in a manner that violates these stereotypes (and therefore threatens the justification of the status quo).
Americans (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). Therefore, the following hypothesis was predicted:

**Hypothesis 1**: The relationship between candidate characteristics and affective reaction ratings will be moderated by race, such that the *qualified and dominant; qualified and warm*; and the *qualified, dominant, and warm* Asian American candidates will receive lower affective reaction ratings than the qualified Asian American candidate and the White candidates, regardless of characteristics.
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*Figure 1. Hypothesis 1*

**Hypothesis 2**. It was hypothesized that the Asian American candidates would uniformly receive lower ratings on leadership characteristics (e.g., energetic, leadership ability) and
perceived leadership capabilities (e.g., potential effectiveness in leadership role) than the White candidates – across all characteristics. For the qualified and dominant Asian American candidate, this prediction is in line with the SIH and research demonstrating that dominant female targets are subject to hiring discrimination because they are viewed as violating proscriptions for their gender (Rudman et al., 2012). Rudman et al. (2012) also argue that dominant behaviors, while tolerated in members of high-status groups, are forbidden for members of low status groups. Therefore, it was predicted that dominant behaviors enacted by an Asian American candidate would lead to more negative impressions about the candidate’s leadership characteristics and capabilities.

Furthermore, the connectionist model of leadership (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001) states that the addition of certain contextual variables (e.g., the gender or race of the target) can lead to different interpretations of the same behavior. In other words, the same behavior can be viewed positively or negatively, depending on who is performing them. This is said to occur because the addition of the contextual variable leads to different patterns of activation and inhibition in the perceiver’s connectionist network. Therefore, if a candidate is Asian American, there should be a different pattern of activation within the perceiver’s connectionist network compared to the pattern of activation for a White candidate. For the counterstereotypical Asian American candidates, this was expected lead to negative interpretations of the candidates’ behaviors, leading to lower ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities.

As noted, participants were not expected to have negative affective reactions toward the qualified Asian American candidate, since the candidate would be described as behaving in a stereotype-consistent manner (e.g., hard-working, capable). Nevertheless, the qualified Asian
American candidate was still expected to receive lower leadership ratings, because there was expected to be a perceived lack of fit between the perceived (stereotypical) characteristics of the qualified Asian American candidate (e.g., not assertive) and those required for the leadership position. In other words, while the participants were not expected to dislike the Asian American candidates, it was predicted that the candidates would still be viewed as lacking the characteristics necessary for successful leadership (e.g., confidence, assertiveness). This hypothesis is consistent with Role Congruity Theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) and the Lack of Fit Model (Heilman, 1983), which argue that women face discrimination at higher levels in part because of this perceived lack of fit. While Chung-Herrera and Lankau (2005) found a strong correspondence between perceptions of “successful middle managers” and Asian Americans, Asian Americans were rated lower than Whites on several key traits generally associated with successful leadership (e.g., confidence, charisma). Since the present study focused on ratings of candidates for a transformational leadership role that could lead to higher levels of leadership in the future, it was predicted that the qualified Asian American would not be viewed as having the requisite characteristics for this role.

_Hypothesis 2:_ The Asian American candidate will receive lower ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities than the White candidate, regardless of candidate characteristics.
Figure 3. Anticipated findings for Hypothesis 2

**Hypothesis 3.** Similar to Rudman et al.’s (2012) findings regarding dominant female targets, it was expected that the dominant Asian American candidates would be subject to the dominance penalty, such that they would be rated higher on dominance proscriptions compared to the dominant White candidates. In other words, the dominant Asian American candidates were expected to be seen as excessively dominant, while the dominant White candidates would not. As such, the following hypothesis was predicted:

**Hypothesis 3a:** The qualified and dominant Asian American candidate will be subject to the dominance penalty, such that he/she will receive significantly higher ratings on dominance proscriptions than the qualified and dominant White candidate.

Based on the mediating effects found in Rudman et al. (2012), it was expected that these higher ratings on dominance proscriptions would explain the negative affective reactions toward the dominant Asian American candidates. In other words, the dominant Asian American candidates were expected to be seen as overly dominant (i.e., they would be subject to the
dominance penalty), which would lead participants to have more negative affective reactions toward them.

_Hypothesis 3b_: There will be a mediated moderation, such that the moderating effect of race on the relationship between the candidate’s characteristics and affective reaction ratings for the _qualified and dominant_ Asian American candidate will be mediated by the dominance penalty.

![Figure 4. Hypothesis 3b](image)

**Hypothesis 4.** Previous research has shown that women who behave counterstereotypically (i.e., in an agentic manner) elicit negative affective reactions, which, in turn, explain their lower leadership ratings (e.g., Heilman et al., 2004; Rudman et al., 2012). Therefore, it was expected that lower affective reaction ratings for the qualified and dominant Asian American candidate would explain the lower ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities. In other words, it was predicted that the qualified and dominant Asian American would be liked less, which would lead to lower leadership ratings. Furthermore, since warmth is also counterstereotypical for Asian Americans, similar results were expected to occur for both the qualified and warm candidate and the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate. Thus, the following hypotheses were predicted:
Hypothesis 4a: There will be a mediated moderation, such that the moderating effect of race on the relationship between the candidate’s characteristics and ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities for the qualified and dominant Asian American candidate will be mediated by affective reaction ratings.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be a mediated moderation, such that the moderating effect of race on the relationship between the candidate’s characteristics and ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities for the qualified and warm Asian American candidate will be mediated by affective reaction ratings.

Hypothesis 4c: There will be a mediated moderation, such that the moderating effect of race on the relationship between the candidate’s characteristics and ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities for the qualified, dominant, and warm Asian American candidate will be mediated by affective reaction ratings.

Figure 5: Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 5. There are several similarities between the backlash faced by Asian Americans and the backlash faced by “career women.” The literature focusing on agentic or dominant women (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2011; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Fiske et al., 2002; Heilman et al., 2004; Phelan et al., 2008; Rudman et al., 2012) has demonstrated that assertive women are less liked than comparable men. Additionally, Rudman et al. (2012) found that dominant women
were subject to backlash, in the form of higher ratings on dominance proscriptions, lower likeability ratings, and lower hireability ratings compared to dominant men. Therefore, it was expected that the qualified and dominant female candidate would receive lower affective reaction ratings than the qualified and dominant male candidate.

On the other hand, there should be some differences in when backlash occurs against Asian Americans versus women. Firstly, unlike Asian Americans, competence is counterstereotypical for women, leading competent women to be rated as less likeable than comparable men (e.g., Phelan et al., 2008). Therefore, it was expected that the qualified female candidate would receive lower affective reaction ratings than the qualified male candidate.

Secondly, in contrast to Asian Americans, warmth or communality is viewed as stereotype-consistent for women (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002), so negative affective reactions were not predicted for the warm female candidate. Additionally, Heilman and Okimoto (2007) have demonstrated that backlash against an agentic woman can be mitigated if she also exhibits communal or warm behaviors. The authors argue this occurs because backlash against agentic women is driven primarily by a perceived lack of communality or warmth, rather than the agency in and of itself. Therefore, it was predicted that the qualified and warm female candidate and the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate would receive similar affective reactions as the comparable male candidates. Thus, the following hypothesis was predicted:

*Hypothesis 5*: The relationship between candidate characteristics and affective reaction ratings will be moderated by gender, such that the *qualified* female candidate and the *qualified and dominant* female candidate will receive lower ratings than the *qualified and warm* female candidate; the *qualified, dominant, and warm* female candidate; and the male candidates, regardless of characteristics.
**Figure 6. Hypothesis 5**

**Figure 7: Anticipated findings for Hypothesis 5**

**Hypothesis 6.** For the qualified and dominant female candidate, it was expected that ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities would be consistent with Rudman et al.’s (2012) findings showing that dominant women received lower hireability ratings than comparable men. However, it was predicted that the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate would receive similar leadership ratings as the qualified, dominant, and warm male candidates. This prediction is consistent with Heilman and Okimoto’s (2007) findings, showing that an agentic female target was viewed more positively when information regarding her communality was also presented. Since the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate
would unmistakably exhibit characteristics required for the leadership role while also demonstrating (stereotype-consistent) warm attributes to balance out her dominance, ratings were expected to be similar to ratings for the comparable male candidate.

Consistent with Heilman’s (1983) Lack of Fit Model and Eagly and Karau’s (2002) Role Congruity Theory, it was expected that ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities would be lower for the qualified female candidate and the qualified and warm female candidate. As noted, the descriptive stereotypes of women are often incongruent with expectations for leaders. While research has found that qualified women are not necessarily seen as less capable for some higher-level roles (e.g., Heilman et al., 1989; Phelan et al., 2008), these studies examined ratings of female candidates for managerial positions. Again, since this study asked participants to rate a candidate for a particularly challenging and transformational leadership position that could lead to higher level leadership roles in the future (i.e., those more likely to be associated with men; Eagly & Karau, 2002), it seemed likely that the qualified female candidate and the qualified and warm female candidate would not be viewed as strong enough for this role.

*Hypothesis 6:* The relationship between candidate characteristics and ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities will be moderated by gender, such that the qualified; qualified and dominant; and qualified and warm female candidate will receive lower ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities compared to the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate and the male candidates, regardless of characteristics.
Hypothesis 7. It was expected that this study would replicate Rudman et al.’s (2012) findings regarding the dominance penalty for women (i.e., that dominant women received higher ratings on dominance proscriptions compared to dominant men) and the resulting consequences (i.e., negative affective reactions). In other words, it was predicted that the qualified and dominant female candidate would be rated as excessively dominant, and that this would lead to more negative affective reactions. Thus, the following hypotheses were predicted:

Hypothesis 7a: The qualified and dominant female candidate will be subject to the dominance penalty, such that she will receive significantly higher ratings on dominance proscriptions than the qualified and dominant male candidate.
Hypothesis 7b: There will be a mediated moderation, such that the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between the candidate’s characteristics and affective reaction ratings for the qualified and dominant female candidate will be mediated by the dominance penalty.

Figure 10. Hypothesis 7b

Hypothesis 8. It was expected that this study would be consistent with previous research (e.g., Heilman et al., 2004; Rudman et al., 2012), such that the qualified and dominant female candidate would receive lower affective reaction ratings, which would then explain lower ratings on leadership variables. In other words, participants were expected to have more negative affective reactions toward the qualified and dominant female candidate, which would then explain lower ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities.

Hypothesis 8: There will be a mediated moderation, such that the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between the candidate’s characteristics and ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities for the qualified and dominant female candidate will be mediated by affective reaction ratings.
Hypothesis 9. Up to this point, the discussion has focused on comparisons between Asian American and White candidates, along with comparisons between female and male candidates. How might ratings differ, however, when comparing Asian American candidates to female candidates?

To begin, competence is stereotype-consistent for Asian Americans but not for women (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002). Therefore, it was expected that a qualified Asian American candidate would face less backlash than a similarly competent woman. Conversely, warmth is stereotype-consistent for women, but counterstereotypical Asian Americans. Therefore, an Asian American candidate exhibiting warmth was expected to receive more negative affective reactions compared to a female candidate behaving identically.

Dominance, on the other hand, is counterstereotypical for both women and Asian Americans, and it is associated with backlash for members of both groups (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Rudman et al., 2012). Therefore, it was expected that there would be no difference between affective reaction ratings of the qualified and dominant female candidate and the qualified and dominant Asian American candidate. However, for the qualified, dominant, and warm candidates, the female candidate was expected to fare better than the Asian American. As noted, warmth can mitigate backlash against agentic women (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007), but
both dominance and warmth are counterstereotypical for Asian Americans (Berdahl & Min, 2012). Therefore, the following hypothesis was predicted:

**Hypothesis 9:** There will be a three-way interaction between race, gender, and candidate characteristics, such that the *qualified and warm* Asian American candidate will receive lower affective reaction ratings than the *qualified* Asian American candidate and the *qualified and warm*; and the *qualified, dominant, and warm* female candidates. The *qualified* female candidate will receive lower affective reaction ratings than the *qualified and warm* and the *qualified, dominant, and warm* female candidates and the *qualified* Asian American candidate.

![Figure 12. Anticipated findings for Hypothesis 9](image)

**Hypothesis 10.** For leadership ratings, it was expected that the dominant female candidate and the dominant Asian American candidate would receive similarly low ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities, as this trait is counterstereotypical for both groups (Berdahl & Min, 2012; Rudman et al., 2012). Additionally,
the warm female candidate and the warm Asian American candidate were also expected to receive similarly low ratings, as communality exhibited by members of these groups would likely cause them to be seen as a poor fit for the leadership role (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983). Additionally, it was expected that the warm Asian American would face backlash for behaving counterstereotypically (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012). However, since warmth can alleviate backlash against dominant women (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007) but both warmth and dominance are counterstereotypical for Asian Americans (Berdahl & Min, 2012), it was expected that the qualified, dominant, and warm Asian American candidate would receive lower leadership ratings than the comparable female candidate. Finally, the qualified Asian American candidate and the qualified female candidate were expected to receive similarly low ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities, due to their being perceived as not having the characteristics required for leadership (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983).

**Hypothesis 10**: Race and gender will moderate the relationship between candidate characteristics and ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities, such that ratings for candidates with equivalent characteristics will differ depending on candidate race and gender. In other words, there will be a three-way interaction between race, gender, and candidate characteristics, such that the *qualified, dominant, and warm* Asian American candidate will receive lower leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities ratings than the *qualified, dominant, and warm* female candidate.
Hypotheses 11-12. Participants’ SDO was measured to examine the influence of this variable (e.g., “Some people are just more worthy than others”) on their reactions to counterstereotypical targets. As noted, research has shown that SDO is associated with prejudice and discrimination against members of outgroups (e.g., Duckitt, 2006; Kteily et al., 2011; Pratto et al., 1994; Umphress et al., 2008). Thus, it was expected that higher levels of SDO would lead to more negative reactions toward a member of a minority group (whether Asian American or female) behaving dominantly or otherwise counterstereotypically.

The qualified Asian American candidate was not expected to receive more negative affective reactions from those high in SDO compared to those low in SDO, as competence is stereotype-consistent for Asian Americans (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002). However, those high in SDO (e.g., more likely to endorse items such as, “It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others”) likely view the current overrepresentation of White males in higher level leadership as appropriate and deserved, and
not suitable for members of lower status groups (e.g., Pratto et al., 1994). Therefore, it was predicted that ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities would be lower for the qualified Asian American candidate, as they would be seen as a poor fit for this role (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983).

It was also expected that higher levels of SDO would be associated with more negative reactions toward Asian Americans behaving warmly and/or dominantly, as this would be seen as counterstereotypical and threatening to the current status quo (in which Asian Americans are viewed as competent, but “not allowed” to be warm; Berdahl & Min, 2012; Fiske et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005). This was expected, in turn, to translate to lower ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities.

Therefore, the following hypotheses were predicted:

_Hypothesis 11:_ There will be a three-way interaction between participants’ Social Dominance Orientation and the candidates’ race and characteristics, such that high SDO participants will have lower affective reaction ratings for the _qualified and dominant_; _qualified and warm_; and the _qualified, dominant, and warm_ Asian American candidates compared to low SDO participants.
Figure 14. Anticipated findings for Hypothesis 11

Hypothesis 12: There will be a three-way interaction between participants’ Social Dominance Orientation and the candidates’ race and characteristics, such that high SDO participants will rate the Asian American candidates lower on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities than low SDO participants.
Hypotheses 13-14. Those high in SDO were expected to have more negative affective reactions toward the qualified female candidate compared to those lower in SDO, since the candidate would be viewed as defying stereotypes and exhibiting high levels of competence (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Rudman et al., 2012). This was expected to carry over to more negative ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities, since the qualified female candidate would be viewed as a poor fit for the role (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983).

Since warmth is expected of women (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002) and can protect agentic women from backlash (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007), the qualified and warm female candidate and the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate were not expected to elicit more negative affective reactions from those high in SDO. Similarly, it was predicted that the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate would not receive lower leadership ratings from high-SDO participants, as she would be viewed as both having the necessary characteristics for
the role while also exhibiting ( stereotype-consistent ) warmth ( Heilman & Okimoto, 2007 ).

However, similar to the qualified female candidate, the qualified and warm female candidate was expected to be viewed as a poor fit for the role, leading to lower leadership ratings ( e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983 ).

**Hypothesis 13:** There will be a three-way interaction between participants’ Social Dominance Orientation and the candidates’ gender and characteristics, such that high SDO participants will have lower affective reaction ratings for the qualified and qualified and dominant female candidate than low SDO participants.

![Figure 16. Anticipated findings for Hypothesis 13](image)

**Hypothesis 14:** There will be a three-way interaction between participants’ Social Dominance Orientation and the candidates’ gender and characteristics, such that high SDO participants will rate the qualified; qualified and dominant; and qualified and warm female candidates lower on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities than low SDO participants.
Method

Participants and Design

The present study was conducted on the Qualtrics survey platform, with data collected from White men recruited via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Much has been written regarding the benefits and potential drawbacks of using Amazon’s MTurk (e.g., Barger, Behrend, Sharek, & Sinar, 2011; Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Casler, Bickel, & Hackett, 2013; Cheung, Burns, Sinclair, & Sliter, 2017; Landers & Behrend, 2015; Mason & Suri, 2012; Paolacci & Chandler, 2014; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010; Rouse, 2015; Zhou & Fishbach, 2016). While there exists some ambivalence regarding its use, it appears that MTurk can serve as a useful tool in social science research – given that the appropriate precautions are taken (e.g., Barger et al., 2011; Casler et al., 2013; Cheung et al., 2017; Landers & Behrend, 2015; Mason & Suri, 2012). Indeed, Landers and Behrend (2015) note similarities between samples from MTurk and other types of convenience samples (e.g., snowball samples), and argue that sampling via
MTurk can be useful for research in industrial/organizational psychology. Additionally, researchers have shown how data gathered on MTurk can be comparable or even slightly superior to data gathered using more traditional samples (e.g., Burhmester et al., 2011; Casler et al., 2013; Paolacci et al., 2010).

Several steps were taken to help ensure the quality of the data collected, based on best-practices outlined in the literature (e.g., Cheung et al., 2017; Mason & Suri, 2012; Paolacci et al., 2010; Rouse, 2015). For example, participants were screened based on the number of the previous tasks they had completed and the percentage that had been accepted (i.e., >95%), and Worker IDs were tracked to prevent participants from participating in the study more than once (Mason & Suri, 2012). Attention checks were included throughout to confirm that participants were paying sufficient attention to the tasks presented to them (Cheung et al., 2017; Paolacci et al., 2010; Rouse, 2015). Additionally, data from participants who sped through the study (determined via timing information provided by Qualtrics) were removed, along with data from participants who incorrectly responded to the manipulation and/or attention checks3 (e.g., Cheung et al., 2017; Mason & Suri, 2012).

The study followed a 2 (Asian vs. White) x 4 (qualified vs. qualified and dominant vs. qualified and warm vs. qualified, dominant, and warm) x 2 (male vs. female) between-subjects design. Race and gender of the candidates were manipulated via the candidates’ names on the resume and interview transcript (i.e., Andrew Davis, Andrew Wong, Anna Davis, or Anna

---

3 Six participants who failed only one manipulation check or attention check question (e.g., selected “Very Positive” when asked to select “Positive”) were included in the final sample, because they did not show any other signs of inattention (e.g., they responded correctly to all other attention and manipulation check questions and did not speed through the study materials). There were no significant differences in results when comparing analyses conducted with or without these six participants.
The candidates’ qualifications were consistently strong, and their levels of dominance and warmth were manipulated via interview transcripts and a self-description.

A pilot study was conducted to determine that the study materials (i.e., the candidate’s resume, cover letter, and interview transcript) portrayed equally qualified candidates with different levels of dominance and warmth. White male participants living in the U.S. were recruited through Amazon’s MTurk, and a total of 55 men participated.

Participants were asked to review information about a change project taking place in their department, along with the resume, self-description, and interview transcript of an individual being considered to lead the project. They were then asked to rate the target on a variety of measures, including their affective reactions toward the target and their views regarding the target’s characteristics and potential for leadership. The final pilot sample included data from 27 White male participants. Data from 4 participants were removed due to failing manipulation checks, while data from 2 participants were removed for speeding. Additionally, data from 22 respondents were removed due to changes in the study materials.

Based on a power analysis, it was determined that approximately 192 participants would be needed to attain sufficient power for the main study. Overall, 338 individuals participated in the main study via Amazon’s MTurk. Data from 129 participants were excluded for inattentive or careless responding: 79% (n=102) responded incorrectly to crucial manipulation check

---

4 Based on discussions regarding appropriate sample sizes for pilot studies (e.g., Connelly, 2008), the necessary sample size for this pilot study was estimated by calculating 10% of 192 (i.e., the planned sample size for the main study) and rounding upward. Although Hertzog (2008) argues that the sample sizes for pilot studies may need to be higher in certain situations (e.g., when validating measures), this requirement does not appear to apply when testing the appropriateness or clarity of study materials.

5 The number of participants was determined by conducting a power analysis using G*Power. With a medium anticipated effect size (effect size f = .25), alpha set at .05, power equal to .80, the numerator df equal to 3, and the number of groups set to 16, the results of the power analyses indicated a necessary sample size of 179. To divide evenly across 16 conditions, the number was increased to 192. As will be discussed in the Limitations section, however, the sample may not have been large enough to detect significant differences between the groups.
questions (e.g., did not correctly indicate the name of the candidate), and 21% ($n=27$) sped through the study and/or failed attention checks. The final sample included 209 White male participants. The majority of the sample were under the age of 50 ($n=189, 90\%$), working in industries such as information technology ($n=26, 13\%$), retail ($n=26, 13\%$), and construction ($n=10, 5\%$). Most participants were at the managerial level or below ($n=204, 98\%$), with 30 years of work experience or less ($n=197, 95\%$), managing 20 or fewer people ($n=198, 95\%$). Nearly half ($n=85, 41\%$) of participants had a bachelor’s degree, while 103 participants (49%) had an associate’s degree or lower. Approximately 10% ($n=20$) of the sample had completed some post-graduate or higher. While this sample skewed younger than the overall American population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011), the educational attainment levels of this sample were comparable to the national averages for White American men between the ages of 25-29 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016).

Materials

**Project information.** Participants were instructed to play the role of an operations employee in a large, successful organization, which was about to undergo a major transformation over the next five years. It was explained that the first phase of the transformation would occur in their department – a major change project that would be integral to the overall organizational transformation. The description also stated that several candidates were being considered to lead this crucial project, and that the executive team wanted to hear the participant’s feedback about one of them. This information can be found in Appendix A.

**Applicant information.** Participants reviewed information regarding one of the candidates being considered to lead the major change project. Depending on the condition, they
were provided with the resume, self-description, and interview transcript for Andrew Davis, Andrew Wong, Anna Davis, or Anna Wong. The sample resume can be found in Appendix B.

The candidates’ qualifications remained constant across the conditions. The levels of dominance and/or warmth were manipulated via the self-description and interview transcripts (e.g., “I am very dedicated to my work, I am tough, I am energetic, and I am determined to get ahead” vs. “I am dedicated to my work, I am friendly and supportive, I am energetic, and I want to help people get ahead”). The candidates’ self-description and interview transcripts can be found in Appendix C.

**Manipulation check.** Participants were asked to identify the candidate’s name, gender, and race, along with the role for which s/he was being considered. They also rated the candidate’s suitability for the role and his/her dominance and warmth, to test whether the manipulations had their intended effect. The scores for the measures of qualifications, dominance, and warmth all exhibited high reliability, with $\alpha=.90$ for the qualification measure, and $\alpha=.94$ and $\alpha=.86$ for the measures of warmth and dominance, respectively. The manipulation check can be found in Appendix D.

**Dominance proscriptions.** Participants were asked to rate the candidate on a 19-item trait measure designed to assess levels excessive dominance (Epitropaki and Martin, 2004; Rudman et al., 2012). It was expected that Asian American and female candidates would be subjected to the dominance penalty, such that they would receive higher ratings on characteristics such as “intimidating” and “arrogant” compared to the White and/or male candidates. The scores for this measure exhibited high reliability, with $\alpha=.98$. The complete measure can be found in Appendix E.
Affective reactions. Participants’ affective reactions toward the candidate were measured through eight items tapping into perceptions regarding the candidate’s likeability (e.g., “This candidate seems like a likeable person”) and the impression that the candidate made on the participant (e.g., “What is your general impression of this candidate?”). The scores for this measure demonstrated high reliability, with $\alpha=.96$. The complete measure can be found in Appendix F.

Leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities. Participants rated the candidate on 34 characteristics associated with leadership (e.g., self-confident, knowledgeable, energetic, trustworthy; e.g., Duehr & Bono, 2006; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). They also rated the candidate’s potential for success and effectiveness in the role via a 12-item measure of perceived leadership capabilities (e.g., “How well do you think this candidate would lead this project?”). The scores for both leadership measures exhibited high reliability, with $\alpha=.96$ for leadership characteristics and $\alpha=.88$ for the measure of perceived leadership capabilities.

As there was a combination of 6-point and 5-point Likert scale response options for questions measuring perceived leadership capabilities, responses for the 6-point questions were transformed to 5-point responses, so comparisons could be made across the items$^6$. The following formula was used to convert the scores (IBM Support, 2016):

$$Y = \frac{4}{5}x + \frac{1}{5}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $x$ is equal to the original scale value and $Y$ is equal to the new scale value. Both measures can be found in Appendix G.

---

$^6$ While there are limitations to transforming the scores in this manner, this method was selected over the use of z-scores because the data collected were not normally distributed. Analyses conducted with z-scores produced similar results as those conducted with transformed scores. In other words, there were no significant differences between groups on this variable, regardless of whether transformed scores or z-scores were used.
Attention checks. Since participants for the present study were recruited on Mturk, several items were included throughout to ensure participant attention (e.g., “What is the third word in this question: ‘How many stars are in the American Flag?’”; Rouse, 2015, p. 305). The measure can be found in Appendix H.

Social Dominance Orientation. As the study examined participants’ reactions to individuals who behave counterstereotypically and, in some conditions, “above” their status (Rudman et al., 2012), participants’ Social Dominance Orientation was measured via Pratto et al.’s (1994) 14-item Social Dominance Orientation scale (e.g., “Some people are just more worthy than others”). Scores for the measure demonstrated high reliability, with $\alpha=.96$. The full measure can be found in Appendix I.

Demographic information. Potentially relevant demographic information (e.g., age, current role) was collected to examine the possible influence of these characteristics on participant behavior. Additionally, while participants were screened via MTurk (i.e., the study description clearly stated the study was intended only for White men), participants were again asked to indicate their race and gender. The full set of questions can be found in Appendix J.

Procedure

Participants were recruited for the study on Amazon’s MTurk through a brief description of what the study would entail. Upon agreeing to participate in the study and completing an informed consent form, participants were randomly assigned to one of the 16 study conditions. Each participant was then presented with a description of their task. They were told they were employed in a large, successful manufacturing organization, which would be undergoing a major transformation – the first step of which would involve a crucial project in their department. They were given a description of the project and were told the organization’s leadership wanted their
opinion on one of the candidates being considered to lead the project. They were then presented with the resume, self-description, and interview transcript for one of the candidates. For both the pilot and main studies, the resume was always shown first, while the presentation order of the self-description and interview transcript was randomized. All candidates were qualified for the role, differing only in race, gender, and levels of dominance and/or warmth.

After reading the project description and information about the candidate, participants first rated the candidates on dominance proscriptions. They then rated their affective reactions toward the candidate and rated the candidate on a variety of leadership characteristics. Participants also rated their perceptions of the candidate’s leadership capabilities and completed the SDO measure. Once participants completed these measures, they were thanked and debriefed.

**Results**

As noted, participants were expected to respond negatively to an Asian American or female candidate behaving counterstereotypically. It was also hypothesized that, depending on the condition, the Asian American or female candidate would generally receive lower ratings on affective reactions, leadership characteristics, and perceived leadership capabilities, compared to the White male candidate. Finally, it was expected that participants’ Social Dominance Orientation would interact with candidate characteristics and the candidates’ race and/or gender to influence affective reactions and leadership ratings.

**Pilot Study**

Pilot studies were conducted to ensure the study materials (resume, self-description, and interview transcript) led to similar perceptions of each candidate’s qualifications, and different perceptions their dominance and/or warmth. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four
conditions (i.e., qualified candidate; qualified and dominant candidate; qualified and warm
candidate; qualified, dominant, and warm candidate). They were then asked to review a project
description, along with the resume, self-description, and interview transcript of a candidate being
considered to lead the project. Participants were asked to rate the candidate on whether s/he was
qualified for the role (e.g., “This candidate is qualified for this leadership role”) and on
characteristics such as “warm” and “dominant.”

The results from the first pilot study indicated that the study materials did not have the
intended effect. More specifically, the qualified and dominant candidate was not rated as
significantly more dominant ($M=3.95, SD=.80$) than the qualified candidate ($M=3.94, SD=.52,$
$p=.329$). Based on these initial results, the wording in the self-description and interview
transcripts were updated to strengthen the effect of the manipulations. Therefore, materials for
the qualified condition were updated to present a candidate who was less dominant (e.g., “I am
dedicated to my work, I am driven and energetic, and I am determined to get ahead” was
changed to “I am dedicated to my work, and I am focused and energetic”).

In a second pilot study, the results showed that the qualified, dominant, and warm
candidate was not viewed as significantly more dominant ($M=3.92, SD=.49$) than the qualified
candidate ($M=3.41, SD=.74, p=.121$). Therefore, the materials in the qualified, dominant, and
warm condition were changed to present a more dominant candidate (e.g., “I also speak candidly
to people, because I care about their development” was changed to “I also speak candidly to
people, even when the feedback is critical”).

The final pilot study sample included data from 27 participants. Results of a one-way
ANOVA demonstrated that the candidates were not viewed as significantly different on their
qualifications for the role – i.e., as intended, they were all viewed as highly qualified, with means
ranging from 4.94 for the qualified condition, to 5.71 for the qualified, dominant, and warm condition \((F(3, 23)=2.18, p=.12, \eta^2=.22)\). Scores for the qualification measure demonstrated high reliability, with \(\alpha=.90\).

Results of one-way ANOVAs also demonstrated that the candidates were viewed as exhibiting significantly different levels of warmth \((F(3,23)=7.24, p=.001, \eta^2=.49)\) and dominance \((F(3,23)=9.59, p=.000, \eta^2=.56)\). Scores for the measures of warmth and dominance also demonstrated high reliability, with \(\alpha=.91\) for warmth and \(\alpha=.81\) for dominance.

Post-hoc analyses using Dunnett’s test showed that the qualified and warm candidate was rated significantly higher on warmth \((M=4.27, SD=.90)\) than the qualified candidate \((M=3.25, SD=.67, p=.032)\). Additionally, the qualified and dominant candidate was rated significantly higher on dominance \((M=4.14, SD=.50)\) than the qualified candidate \((M=3.41, SD=.74, p=.02)\). Finally, the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate was rated significantly higher on dominance \((M=4.38, SD=.44, p=.004)\), and higher on warmth \((M=4.10, SD=.67, p=.070)\) compared to the qualified candidate \((M=3.41, SD=.74, M=3.25, SD=.67, for\ dominance\ and\ warmth,\ respectively)\). Descriptive statistics, ANOVA results, and Dunnett’s test results are presented in Tables 1-3.

Once the materials for the main study were finalized, data for the main study were collected. The results for the main study are presented below.

**Main Study**

**Manipulation check.** Upon reading the project description and information about the candidate, participants were asked to respond to questions about the candidate’s characteristics (including qualifications for the role, warmth, and dominance). Results from a one-way ANOVA show that participants rated the candidates significantly differently on dominance \((F(3,\)
205)=35.93, \( p=.000, \eta^2=.34 \) and warmth \( (F(3, 205)=43.14, \ p=.000, \eta^2=.39) \). Results also showed candidate characteristics had a small effect on qualification ratings \( (F(3,205)=2.633, \ p=.051, \eta^2=.04) \).

Post-hoc analyses showed the warm candidate was viewed as significantly warmer \( (M=4.54, SD=.45) \) than the qualified candidate \( (M=3.57, SD=.79, \ p=.000) \). The dominant candidate was also viewed as significantly more dominant \( (M=4.49, SD=.58) \) than the qualified candidate \( (M=3.93, SD=.81, \ p=.000) \). While the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate was viewed as significantly more dominant \( (M=4.25, SD=.56) \) than the qualified candidate \( (M=3.93, SD=.81, \ p=.017) \), s/he was not viewed as significantly warmer \( (M=3.45, SD=.93) \) than the qualified candidate \( (M=3.57, SD=.79, \ p=.940) \). This is surprising, considering the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate received relatively high ratings on warmth \( (M=4.10) \) in the pilot study. However, previous studies have demonstrated that competence and warmth are inversely related (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2005; Judd et al., 2005). In other words, individuals viewed as highly competent are more likely to be viewed as less warm. Additionally, once a person is identified as cold, it becomes difficult for the person to be viewed as warm (Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2006). In a similar manner, the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate may have been categorized as competent and dominant, leading to lower perceptions of warmth – despite the candidate exhibiting warm characteristics.

While this is somewhat of an issue for the present study, it does not appear that the results are extremely problematic. As I outline below, many of the results for the qualified and dominant and the qualified and warm Asian American or female candidates did not reach significance (e.g., the qualified and dominant Asian American candidate was not rated significantly differently than the qualified and dominant White candidate). As many of the hypotheses were
not supported, it does not appear likely that the results would have been very different for the Asian American or female qualified, dominant, and warm candidates. Thus, while the qualified, dominant, and warm manipulation did not have the exact intended effect, the lack of significant effects of the dominance and warmth manipulations on the dependent variables appears to indicate that similar results would have occurred for candidates with both characteristics as well\(^7\). However, as the current manipulation for this condition was not successful, it is difficult to know with certainty.

**Tests of hypotheses.** It was predicted that the counterstereotypical Asian American candidate and female candidate would generally receive lower affective reaction ratings and lower leadership ratings compared to White male candidates behaving identically. Additionally, a mediated moderation was expected, such that the moderating effect of race or gender on the relationship between the candidate’s characteristics and leadership ratings would be mediated by affective reaction ratings. Finally, it was expected that there would be a three-way interaction between the participants’ levels of Social Dominance Orientation, the candidates’ characteristics, and race or gender, such that participants with higher levels of SDO would exhibit more negative reactions to counterstereotypical minority candidates compared to those lower in SDO. Correlations between the dependent variables of interest and Social Dominance Orientation are presented in Table 4.

**Hypothesis 1.** It was predicted that participants’ affective reaction ratings (e.g., feelings toward the candidate, general impressions) for the Asian American candidate would be consistent with the Stereotype Content Model (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002) and Berdahl and Min’s (2012) findings. More specifically, it was predicted that the

---

\(^7\) Indeed, ANOVAs conducted without the participants in the Qualified, Dominant, and Warm condition produced similar results (i.e., differences between groups for all of the dependent variables of interest were nonsignificant).
Asian American candidates who were qualified and dominant; qualified and warm; or qualified, dominant, and warm would receive more negative affective reactions compared to White candidates behaving identically, while the qualified candidate would receive comparable ratings (Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al., 2011; Fiske et al., 2002).

Results of a 2-way ANOVA demonstrated that there was a significant main effect of candidate characteristics ($F(3, 200)=30.19, p=.000, \eta^2= .31$) on affective reaction ratings. However, there was no significant main effect of race ($F(1, 200)=.26, p=.609, \eta^2= .00$). The interaction of race and qualifications did not have a significant influence on participants’ affective reactions toward the candidates ($F(3, 200)=.14, p=.934, \eta^2= .00$). In other words, the Asian American candidate received comparable affective reactions as the White candidate, regardless of levels of dominance and/or warmth. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported. Descriptive statistics and the results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 5.

**Hypothesis 2.** Hypothesis 2 predicted that the Asian American candidates would uniformly receive lower ratings on leadership characteristics (e.g., inspiring, confident) and perceived leadership capabilities (e.g., potential effectiveness in leadership role) than the White candidates – across all levels of warmth and/or dominance.

Results of a one-way ANOVA showed there was no significant main effect of race on ratings of leadership characteristics ($F(1, 201)=.35, p=.557, \eta^2= .00$). Interestingly, for perceived leadership capabilities, the Asian American candidate received slightly higher ratings than the White candidate ($F(1, 195)=3.45, p=.065, \eta^2= .02$). Overall, however, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 6.

---

8 Results of all post-hoc analyses on significant findings are presented in a separate section.
**Hypothesis 3.** Hypothesis 3a predicted that the qualified and dominant Asian American candidate would be rated significantly higher on dominance proscriptions than the White candidate. Hypothesis 3b predicted a mediated moderation, such that lower affective reaction ratings for the dominant Asian American candidate would be explained by these higher dominance proscription ratings.

The interaction effect of race and candidate characteristics on dominance proscription ratings was nonsignificant \( (F(3, 197)=.13, p=.940, \eta^2=.00) \). However, the main effect of candidate characteristics was again significant \( (F(3, 197)=64.76, p=.000, \eta^2=.50) \). Since Hypothesis 3a was not supported, the mediated moderation hypothesis (Hypothesis 3b) was not tested. Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 7.

**Hypothesis 4.** It was predicted that there would be a mediated moderation, such that the lower leadership ratings for the counterstereotypical Asian American candidate would be explained by lower affective reaction ratings. However, since the Asian American candidate did not receive significantly lower affective reaction or leadership ratings than the White candidate, this hypothesis was not tested.

**Hypothesis 5.** It was predicted that counterstereotypical female candidates (i.e., qualified and qualified and dominant) would receive lower affective reaction ratings than identical male candidates. The interaction of candidate characteristics and gender did not have a significant effect on affective reaction ratings \( (F(3, 200)=.67, p=.572, \eta^2=.01) \). Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 8.

**Hypothesis 6.** It was predicted that there would be an interaction between gender and candidate characteristics, such that all of the female candidates – except for the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate – would receive lower leadership ratings than the male
candidates. Results of an ANOVA showed no significant interaction effect for candidate characteristics and gender on ratings of leadership characteristics \((F(3, 195)=1.06, p=.366, \eta^2=.01)\). The interaction effect was similarly nonsignificant for ratings of leadership capabilities \((F(3, 189)=.33, p=.803, \eta^2=.00)\). Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was not supported. Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVAs are presented in Table 9.

**Hypothesis 7.** Hypothesis 7a predicted that the qualified and dominant female candidate would receive higher ratings on dominance proscriptions than the qualified and dominant male candidate, while Hypothesis 7b predicted that these higher ratings would lead to lower affective reaction ratings for the qualified and dominant female candidate. Results of a two-way ANOVA showed that the interaction between candidate characteristics and gender had no significant effect on dominance proscription ratings \((F(3, 197)=.32, p=.814, \eta^2=.00)\). Therefore, Hypothesis 7a was not supported. Additionally, since the qualified and dominant female candidates did not receive higher dominance proscription ratings or lower affective reaction ratings than the male candidates, Hypothesis 7b was not tested. Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 10.

**Hypothesis 8.** It was predicted that lower leadership ratings for the female candidate would be explained by lower affective reaction ratings. However, since the female candidate did not receive significantly lower leadership or affective reaction ratings compared to the male candidate, Hypothesis 8 was not tested.

**Hypothesis 9.** As noted, dominance is counterstereotypical for women while warmth is not, while both dominance and warmth are counterstereotypical for Asian Americans (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Fiske et al., 2002). Therefore, it was expected that the qualified and warm and the qualified, dominant, and warm Asian American candidate would receive lower affective
reaction ratings than female candidates with the same characteristics, while the qualified and dominant Asian American and female candidates were expected to receive comparable (low) ratings. However, since Asian Americans are stereotyped as competent while women are not (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002), it was predicted that the qualified Asian American candidate would not face backlash, and would therefore receive higher affective reaction ratings than the qualified female candidate.

Results of a three-way ANOVA showed that the three-way interaction between candidate characteristics, race, and gender was non-significant for affective reaction ratings ($F(3, 192) = .65$, $p = .582$, $\eta^2 = .01$). In other words, there were no significant differences in affective reaction ratings for Asian American and female candidates, regardless of their characteristics. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was not supported. Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 11.

**Hypothesis 10.** It was hypothesized that the qualified and dominant and the qualified and warm Asian American candidates would receive similarly low leadership ratings as female candidates with the same characteristics. However, it was expected that the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate would receive higher ratings than the qualified, dominant, and warm Asian American candidate. Results of the ANOVA demonstrated that the three-way interaction between candidate characteristics, race, and gender had no significant effect on ratings of leadership characteristics ($F(3, 187) = .60$, $p = .613$, $\eta^2 = .01$) or perceived leadership capabilities ($F(3, 181) = .48$, $p = .700$, $\eta^2 = .01$). Descriptive statistics and results of the three-way ANOVAs are presented in Tables 12 and 13.

**Hypothesis 11.** Hypothesis 11 focused on how the three-way interaction between participants’ Social Dominance Orientation and the candidates’ race and characteristics would
influence affective reaction ratings. More specifically, it was predicted that high SDO participants would have more negative affective reaction ratings toward the counterstereotypical Asian American candidate compared to low SDO participants.

Participants were categorized as “high SDO” vs. “low SDO” based on a median split. In other words, those with average SDO scores at or above the median were labeled as “high SDO,” while those below the median were labeled “low SDO.” Results of an ANOVA showed that the three-way interaction between participants’ SDO and the candidates’ race and characteristics did not have a significant effect on affective reaction ratings ($F(3, 188)=.73, p=.536, \eta^2=.01$). Thus, Hypothesis 11 was not supported. Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 14.

**Hypothesis 12.** It was predicted that high SDO participants would rate Asian American candidates lower on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities than low SDO participants, while this difference would not occur for White candidates.

Results of an ANOVA showed that the three-way interaction of candidates’ characteristics, race, and participants’ SDO had no significant effect on ratings of leadership characteristics ($F(3, 184)=.37, p=.775, \eta^2=.00$) or perceived leadership capabilities ($F(3, 178)=1.81, p=.147, \eta^2=.02$). Surprisingly, there was a significant main effect of SDO on leadership characteristics ratings ($F(1, 184)=5.07, p=.025, \eta^2=.02$), such that low SDO participants rated candidates higher on leadership characteristics ($M=3.97, SD=.67$) than high SDO participants ($M=3.73, SD=.58$). Descriptive statistics and results of the three-way ANOVAs are presented in Table 15 and Table 16.

**Hypothesis 13.** It was expected that high SDO participants would have more negative affective reactions toward the qualified female candidate and the qualified and dominant female
candidate compared to low SDO candidates. Affective reaction ratings were expected to be comparable across SDO levels for the qualified and warm female candidate and the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate.

The three-way interaction of candidate characteristics, candidate gender, and participants’ SDO was non-significant \( (F(3, 188)=.88, p=.453, \eta^2=.01) \). Therefore, Hypothesis 13 was not supported. Descriptive statistics and results of the three-way ANOVA are presented in Table 17.

**Hypothesis 14.** It was expected that high SDO participants would rate the qualified; qualified and dominant; and qualified and warm female candidates lower on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities than low SDO participants. This difference was expected to be absent for the qualified, dominant, and warm female candidate. The three-way interaction between candidate characteristics, candidate gender, and participants’ SDO had a nonsignificant effect on ratings of leadership characteristics \( (F(3, 184)=.53, p=.660) \) and perceived leadership capabilities \( (F(3, 178)=1.28, p=.282) \). Descriptive statistics and results of the ANOVAs are presented in Table 18 and Table 19.

**Post hoc analyses.** Based on the results of the hypothesis tests, additional post-hoc tests were carried out to examine the data in greater detail.

**Role of candidate characteristics.** As noted, there was a significant main effect of candidate characteristics for ratings of affective reactions, leadership characteristics, perceived leadership capabilities, and dominance proscriptions. I will explore each of these in turn.

**Affective reaction ratings.** There were significant differences in affective reaction ratings based on candidate characteristics \( (F(3, 204)=30.77, p=.000, \eta^2=.31) \), such that the qualified and warm candidate received the highest ratings \( (M=5.50, SD=.60) \), while the qualified and dominant candidate received the lowest \( (M=3.69, SD=1.19) \). Results of the Games-Howell procedure
demonstrated that all candidates were rated significantly differently from one another (all \( ps = .000 \)), except for the qualified candidate and the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate \( (p = .988) \). Averages of the affective reaction ratings can be found in Figure 18.

**Figure 18.** Average affective reaction ratings by candidate characteristics

**Leadership characteristics ratings.** Leader characteristics ratings were significantly different across candidate characteristics \( (F(3, 199) = 19.20, p = .000, \eta^2 = .22) \), such that the qualified and warm candidate received the highest ratings \( (M = 4.32, SD = .50) \), while the qualified and dominant candidate received the lowest \( (M = 3.50, SD = .51) \). Results of the Games-Howell procedure showed that the qualified and warm candidate received significantly higher ratings than the other candidates \( (all \ ps = .000) \). The remaining three candidates were not rated significantly differently on leadership characteristics. Averages of the leadership characteristics ratings can be found in Figure 19.
Perceived leadership capabilities ratings. Participants rated the candidates significantly differently on perceived leadership capabilities, depending on the candidates’ characteristics ($F(3, 193)=6.11, p=.001, \eta^2=.09$). On average, the qualified and warm candidate received the highest scores ($M=4.29, SD=.58$), while the qualified and dominant candidate received the lowest ($M=3.67, SD=.86$). Results of the Games-Howell procedure showed that the qualified and warm and the qualified and dominant candidate differed significantly from each other on ratings of perceived leadership capabilities ($p=.000$). There were no significant differences between ratings of the other candidates. The average scores for perceived leadership capabilities ratings can be found in Figure 20.
Figure 20. Average perceived leadership capabilities ratings by candidate characteristics

**Dominance proscriptions.** Candidates were rated significantly differently on dominance proscriptions ($F(3, 202)=69.24, p=.000, \eta^2=.51$), such that the qualified and dominant candidate received the highest ratings ($M=3.21, SD=.82$), while the qualified and warm candidate received the lowest ($M=1.22, SD=.27$). Results of the Games-Howell procedure showed that all of the candidates were rated significantly differently on dominance proscriptions (all $ps=.000$), except for the qualified candidate and the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate. The average scores for dominance proscription ratings can be found in Figure 21.
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**Figure 21.** Average ratings of dominance proscriptions by candidate characteristics

*Interaction between race and gender.* Research on the stereotyping of Asian Americans has demonstrated that members of this group are viewed as having some of the characteristics associated with successful leadership (e.g., competence, hard-working), yet not others (e.g., sociability; Fiske et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005). Similarly, there is said to be a lack of fit between the characteristics associated with women (e.g., warm) and those associated with leaders (e.g., agentic; Cuddy et al., 2011; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983; Heilman et al., 1989; Schein, 1973).

Additionally, Rosette et al. (2016) found that Asian American women – who hold memberships in two groups with somewhat contradictory stereotypes – were viewed as competent, yet passive. Therefore, while Asian American women were viewed as more competent than women in general, they were still viewed as less agentic than what would be expected for a successful leader. Based on these findings, how might affective reactions and
leadership ratings differ for Asian American or White, male or female candidates – regardless of candidate characteristics?

The interaction of race and gender had no significant impact on the dependent variables of interest. Ratings were similar for Asian American or White, male or female candidates for affective reactions ($F(1, 204)=.17, p=.678, \eta^2=.00$), leadership characteristics ($F(1, 199)=1.22, p=.271, \eta^2=.01$), perceived leadership capabilities ($F(1, 193)=.02, p=.877, \eta^2=.00$), and dominance proscriptions ($F(1, 201)=.02, p=.882, \eta^2=.00$). Therefore, the combination of race and gender alone did not significantly influence participants’ ratings of the targets.

**Specific characteristics.** Based on previous research on perceptions of women and Asian Americans, ratings of candidates on certain characteristics were examined.

**Race and leadership-relevant characteristics.** Sy and his colleagues (2010) found that an Asian American target activated certain groups of leadership attributes (i.e., Intelligence, Dedication), while White targets activated others (i.e., Masculinity, Tyranny, Dynamism). Additionally, Chung-Herrera and Lankau (2005) found that perceptions of Asian American managers were rated lower on certain characteristics that were viewed as common amongst perceptions of “White managers” and “Successful managers” (e.g., self-confident, charismatic). Therefore, ANOVAs were conducted to examine if participants rated the Asian American vs. White candidates differently on these traits.

Results of the ANOVAs demonstrated that the White and Asian American candidates were rated similarly on Dynamism ($F(1, 205)=2.07, p=.152, \eta^2=.01$). The Asian American candidate ($M=4.28, SD=.50$) received slightly higher ratings than the White candidate ($M=4.12, SD=.70$) on Intelligence; however, this difference was not significant ($F(1, 206)=3.27, p=.072, \eta^2=.02$). There was a significant but small main effect of race on Dedication ratings ($F(1,
such that the Asian American candidate \( M=4.59, SD=.53 \) received higher ratings than the White candidate \( M=4.40, SD=.61 \). Therefore, these results partially supported Sy et al.’s (2010) findings demonstrating that Asian American targets prompt the “competent leader prototype.” However, due to the post-hoc nature of these findings, they should be interpreted with caution. Additional research would be necessary before definitive conclusions could be drawn regarding these results.

Additionally, the White and Asian American candidates were rated similarly on specific leadership-relevant characteristics (e.g., charismatic, confident) that were previously rated differently in Whites vs. Asians (e.g., Chung-Herrera & Lankau, 2005; all \( ps>.05 \)). However, it should be noted that Sy et al. (2010) and Chung-Herrera and Lankau (2005) did not present candidates with strong qualifications. Sy et al. (2010) provided ambiguous information about their targets, while Chung-Herrera and Lankau (2005) examined reactions to targets such as “Asian American managers” (with no descriptive information). Therefore, the inclusion of strong (vs. ambiguous) descriptions of the candidates may have played a role in candidate ratings on these characteristics.

**Race and warmth ratings.** As noted, Cuddy et al. (2011) argue that, since warmth is easily faked, a few warm behaviors from members of a stereotypically cold group would not be considered diagnostic. Therefore, I examined whether Asian American candidates were viewed as less warm than White candidates overall, and whether warm Asian American candidates were rated as less warm than the warm White candidates. The results of an ANOVA showed that the main effect of race on warmth ratings was nonsignificant \( F(1,207)=1.07, p=.302, \eta^2=.00 \). Similarly, the interaction of race and characteristics had no significant impact on warmth ratings.
(F(3, 201)=.67, p=.570, \eta^2=.01), with warm Asian American candidates (M=4.51, SD=.53) receiving similar average warmth ratings as White candidates (M=4.57, SD=.36).

Gender and leadership-relevant characteristics. Heilman et al. (1989) found that perceptions of male managers were closer to perceptions of “successful managers” on characteristics such as self-confident and assertive. However, Duehr and Bono (2006) found that, amongst male managers, the differences between views of women managers and “successful managers” were less different. Based on the characteristics examined by Duehr and Bono (2006), ANOVAs were conducted to examine if the female candidates were perceived differently on characteristics related to transformational leadership (e.g., inspiring, trustworthy) and relationship-oriented leadership (e.g., cooperative, inclusive), along with other characteristics where women might be rated differently than men (e.g., confident, intelligent). Results of the ANOVAs demonstrated that the male and female candidates were viewed similarly on characteristics associated with transformational and relationship-oriented leadership (all \(p>.05\)).

Gender and warmth ratings. As noted, female targets who exhibit competence are rated more negatively on traits associated with social skills or warmth (e.g., Heilman et al., 1989, Phelan et al., 2008). Therefore, I examined if qualified and qualified and dominant female candidates received lower ratings on warmth than qualified and qualified and dominant male candidates, respectively. Results of an ANOVA demonstrated that the interaction of qualifications and gender had no significant effect on ratings of warmth, with the qualified female candidate (M=3.55, SD=.87) receiving similar warmth ratings as the qualified male candidate (M=3.58, SD=.73). Additionally, the qualified and dominant female candidate (M=2.91, SD=.84) received similar warmth ratings as the qualified and dominant male candidate (M=2.91, SD=.84).
Additional analyses. As noted, some of the results of the hypothesis tests approached significance. I will examine each of them in greater detail below, to disentangle where there may be notable differences between candidates.

Race and perceived leadership capabilities. The Asian American candidates received slightly higher ratings on overall perceived leadership capabilities than the White candidate \(F(1, 195)=3.45, p=.065, \eta^2=.02\). When examining the differences in ratings for specific questions, the biggest difference in ratings were for the questions, “This candidate’s leadership would benefit the organization” \((M=5.15, SD=1.03\) for the Asian American candidate, and \(M=4.67, SD=1.38\) for the White candidate) and “How successful do you think this candidate will be in this organization?” \((M=4.24, SD=.76\) for the Asian American candidate, and \(M=3.94, SD=.10\) for the White candidate). In other words, Asian American candidates were rated as having slightly higher leadership potential compared to the White candidates. Similar to the previous findings, due to the post-hoc nature of these analyses, the results should be interpreted with caution. Additional analyses would need to be conducted before stating definitively whether Asian American leadership candidates would be viewed differently from White candidates on these types of leadership perceptions.

SDO and leadership characteristics ratings. There was a significant main effect of Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) on ratings of leadership characteristics \(F(1, 198)=7.82, p=.006, \eta^2=.04\), such that low SDO participants rated candidates slightly higher on leadership characteristics \((M=3.97, SD=.67)\) than high SDO participants \((M=3.73, SD=.58)\) – across all races and genders. Additional analyses showed that the biggest differences in ratings for high vs. low SDO participants were for characteristics such as sense of purpose \((M=4.45, SD=.75\) for low SDO participants, and \(M=4.11, SD=.87\) for high SDO participants) and considers others’ ideas
(M=3.44, SD=1.14 for low SDO participants, while M=3.02, SD=1.02 for high SDO participants). It seems unclear why SDO would influence ratings of leadership characteristics. Again, due to the post-hoc nature of these analyses, the results should be interpreted with caution and additional tests should be conducted before making conclusive statements regarding the effects of SDO on leadership ratings.

**Discussion**

The present study examined White male participants’ ratings of qualified White or Asian American, male or female leadership candidates exhibiting dominance and/or warmth. Based on the extensive body of previous literature examining prescriptive and descriptive stereotyping of women and other minority groups (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al. 2011; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Fiske et al., 2002; Heilman, 1983; Heilman, 2001; Rudman et al., 2012), it was hypothesized that the Asian American and female candidates behaving counterstereotypically would generally receive more negative ratings than White candidates behaving identically. The results demonstrated that this did not occur. For the most part, the Asian American and female candidates received comparable ratings to the White candidate, regardless of their levels of warmth or dominance – across measures of affective reactions, leadership characteristics, and perceived leadership capabilities. These similar ratings were consistent regardless of participants’ levels of Social Dominance Orientation. Only the candidates’ characteristics had a significant main effect on the dependent variables of interest, with the qualified and warm candidate receiving consistently higher ratings.

These findings are inconsistent with previous research demonstrating the negative consequences of the prescriptive and descriptive stereotyping of women (e.g., Gill, 2004; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Rudman et al., 2012) and Asian Americans (e.g., Berdahl & Min,
Indeed, it is particularly surprising that qualified and dominant female candidate did not receive more negative ratings compared to qualified and dominant male candidate, as the qualified and dominant female candidate was portrayed as challenging both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes that women are not competent and should be warm (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2007; Cuddy et al. 2011; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983; 2001; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007; Rudman et al., 2012). It is also surprising that the qualified and dominant and the qualified and warm Asian American candidates did not face backlash, considering Berdahl and Min’s (2012) findings showing that dominant and warm Asian American participants reported higher levels of harassment. Potential explanations for these findings are presented below.

**Potential Factors Influencing Results**

**Strength of qualifications.** Research in the aversive racism framework (e.g., Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Hodson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2002) has demonstrated that discrimination against Black targets is more likely to occur when their qualifications are ambiguous. However, when a Black target has clearly strong qualifications, this discrimination is minimized. Aversive racism focuses on a more subtle, modern form of racism that exists in people who argue for and often believe in equal rights for all groups, yet feel ambivalence toward outgroup members (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005; Hodson et al., 2002; Pearson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2009). Therefore, when a Black target’s qualifications are clearly strong, White participants will not discriminate against the target – because it is obvious that the Black candidate deserves the job. However, when the qualifications are less clear (e.g., a Black job candidate is presented with both strengths and weaknesses), the White participant who is high on aversive racism is more likely to discriminate against the Black candidate, as there is justification.
The purpose of the present study was to examine participants’ reactions to candidates who were all clearly qualified for the position but exhibiting counterstereotypical behaviors. Therefore, it may have been the case that, due to the targets’ strong qualifications, it was clear how participants should respond to them (e.g., providing higher ratings on leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities) – regardless of the candidate’s race, gender, or levels of warmth and/or dominance. This would be in line with the findings from Dovidio, Gaertner, and colleagues (e.g., Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005; Hodson et al., 2002; Pearson, 2009), demonstrating that, when the qualifications were clearly strong, there was less discrimination against Black candidates.

**Strength of characteristics.** The results also showed that the candidates’ characteristics had a significant main effect on each of the dependent variables of interest (i.e., affective reactions, ratings of leadership characteristics and perceived leadership capabilities, and dominance proscription ratings). Since the impact of the candidates’ characteristics were so strong, it may be the case that the influence of their race and gender were made significantly weaker by comparison. In other words, while the addition of race or gender may have influenced candidates’ perceptions of their behaviors, the characteristics themselves were so strong and unambiguous that they may have overpowered any influence of race and/or gender, leading to relatively similar ratings across different races and genders.

Kunda and Thagard’s (1996) parallel-constant-satisfaction theory argues that people’s impressions of targets are influenced by a combination of objective data (e.g., the actual behaviors) and stereotypes about the group to which the target belongs. Additionally, the
connectionist model of leadership (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001; Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001) states similar factors are at play when determining the appropriateness of a target for leadership positions. However, both of these theories note that the influence of stereotypes in people’s impressions are likely to be stronger when the stimuli are ambiguous (i.e., when it is unclear how the target’s behaviors should be interpreted).

The connectionist model of leadership also states that the activation between units within a network is stronger when the units have been activated together repeatedly in the past (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). In this instance, it may have been the case that the connection between “warmth” (or “dominance”) and “leadership” were so strong that the candidate’s race and/or gender did not make a noticeable impact. In other words, since the interpretation of the candidate’s behaviors was overwhelmingly colored by and interpreted through the lens of the candidate’s warmth and/or dominance, the impact of the candidate’s race and/or gender may have been less influential.

These results are inconsistent with Rudman et al.’s (2012) findings, which showed that agentic women received more negative ratings (e.g., hireability and likeability) than similar men – despite being strongly qualified and rated as similarly competent. This difference in results may be due, in part, to the fact that Rudman et al. (2012)’s participants were comprised of students. Duehr and Bono (2006) found significant differences between male managers’ and students’ ratings of women, with students exhibiting higher levels of bias. As this study was conducted only on White men, it may be that the present findings differed from Rudman et al.’s (2012) results because of the different populations from which the samples were drawn.

**Potential changes in perceptions.** One could make the argument that, as the American workplace (and the population overall) has gotten more diverse, perceptions of women and Asian
Americans in leadership have become more positive, such that there is less difference between how members of these groups are viewed compared to White males. Indeed, Duehr and Bono (2006) found that perceptions of women had changed over time, when compared to Heilman et al.’s (1989) findings.

However, more recent research (e.g., Bono, Braddy, Liu, Gilbert, Fleenor, Quast, & Center, 2016; Haines, Deaux, & Lofaro, 2016; Rosette et al., 2016) appears to demonstrate that this is likely not the case – stereotyping of women and minorities remains evident and affects perceptions of members of these groups. Additionally, this bias appears to exist in non-student samples (e.g., Bono et al., 2016; Rosette et al., 2016) as well as student samples (e.g., Haines et al., 2016). Therefore, it does not seem likely that society has changed to the point where, for example, Asian Americans or women behaving dominantly will not face backlash – despite the findings of the present study.

**Study design.** The participants were not making actual decisions about their current workplaces; instead, they were asked to review information online about a fictional company and candidate. While efforts were made to make the materials as realistic as possible, the fact that the study was conducted online – with no real-world ramifications on participants’ work lives – may have affected their investment in the study. More specifically, the level of cognitive and emotional investment necessary to create the expected reactions in this study may not have been fully present.

However, as noted, there was a significant main effect of candidate characteristics on the dependent variables, with warm candidates receiving generally more positive ratings than the other candidates. This seems to indicate that participants did pay attention to at least some of the materials, as there were some differences in ratings between these groups. Nevertheless, since
the participants knew their ratings would not impact them directly, they may still have been less committed to participating fully and providing accurate ratings.

Additionally, limiting the sample to only White men who completed the study online may have influenced the results. Many of the studies focusing on prejudice and discrimination cited in this paper were conducted on samples of male and female undergraduate students of different racial backgrounds. Additionally, many of these studies were conducted in laboratory settings. Therefore, the difference between the present results and what has been found in the research may be partially explained by the sample makeup and the different setting in which the study was conducted. However, it is unclear the extent to which these factors may have influenced participants’ ratings of the various candidates.

**Implications**

While the hypotheses in this study were not supported, there are nevertheless several implications – both theoretical and practical – of the present research. I will examine each of these below.

**Theoretical implications.** The present study was designed to examine the principles laid out in several different theories. As noted, the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske et al., 2002) states that individuals stereotype outgroup members on two dimensions – competence and warmth – with certain groups (e.g., Asian Americans) being viewed as high on one dimension but low on the other. Berdahl and Min (2012) expand on this idea by stating that, for Asian Americans, the agency dimension is comprised of both competence and dominance. While Asian Americans are viewed as competent, they are also viewed as nondominant. They also argue that warmth and nondominance are not only descriptive stereotypes of Asian Americans, but prescriptive as well – such that Asian Americans who exhibit either experience backlash.
Furthermore, Heilman’s (1983) Lack of Fit Model and Eagly & Karau’s (2002) Role Congruity Theory state that one potential factor influencing the underrepresentation of women in leadership roles is a perceived lack of fit between the stereotypical characteristics attributed to women and those deemed necessary for successful leadership. Additionally, Rudman et al.’s (2012) Status Incongruity Hypothesis states that the women who do exhibit these agentic behaviors are penalized for exhibiting behaviors “reserved” for high-status groups.

Finally, the connectionist model of leadership (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, & Hall, 2001; Lord et al., 1984; Lord & Maher, 1993) states that the inclusion of certain contextual variables (e.g., the race or gender of a target) can influence how the target’s behaviors are viewed, via activation and/or inhibition of different nodes within the perceiver’s connectionist network.

The findings of the present study did not provide support for the predictions made by these theories. For example, while the Status Incongruity Hypothesis (Rudman et al., 2012) would predict that the qualified and dominant female candidate would be viewed more negatively and receive lower leadership ratings than the dominant male candidate, this did not occur in the present study. Furthermore, while Berdahl and Min’s (2012) findings would lead one to expect backlash against the Asian American candidate exhibiting dominance and/or warmth, the present study found that these Asian American candidates received affective and leadership ratings similar to comparable White candidates.

As noted, all candidates were clearly qualified for the leadership role. It may be the case that descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping has a stronger influence on reactions to counterstereotypical Asian Americans and women primarily when qualifications are more ambiguous. Again, this would be in line with the aversive racism framework, which states that.
individuals are more likely to show bias against Black targets when qualifications are less clear (e.g., Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Hodson et al., 2002).

It may also be the case that the present findings did not provide support for the aforementioned theories because the impact of the candidates’ characteristics (i.e., warmth and/or dominance) was so strong that it stifled the effects of the descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping processes. The robust main effects for candidate characteristics point to the strength of their influence on participants’ ratings. Thus, while the addition of the “Asian American” or “female” variable may have influenced participants’ reactions toward the candidate (Lord, Brown, & Harvey, & Hall, 2001; Lord et al., 1984; Lord & Maher, 1993), this influence may have been overpowered by strength of the characteristics. Therefore, more subtle manipulations of counterstereotypical traits may lead to the results predicted by the theories listed above.

**Practical implications.** It appears that, if an Asian American and/or female candidate has very clearly strong qualifications, prejudice and discrimination may be less likely to occur. Gee and his colleagues (Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al. 2014; Gee et al., 2015) have argued that the underrepresentation of Asian Americans in executive-level leadership positions may be partly due to a disconnect between Asian Americans’ cultural values and resulting behaviors, and the behaviors believed to be necessary for successful leadership in American organizations. For example, the Asian tradition of showing respect for authority figures may be viewed as weakness by others. Additionally, Asian Americans may fail to self-promote, believing that they will get noticed if they simply work hard enough (e.g., Akutagawa, 2013; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; Woo, 2000). These and related behaviors may contribute to Asian Americans being overlooked for leadership positions in the United States (e.g., Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015). Thus, Gee and others (e.g., Akutagawa, 2013; Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al. 2014; Gee et al.,
argue that Asian Americans may need specific leadership training, which could help them
develop the skills and cultural insights necessary to climb the leadership ranks in American
organizations. Based on the findings of the present study, it may be the case that training Asian
Americans to exhibit leadership-relevant characteristics, including warmth and/or assertiveness,
may not necessarily lead to backlash, and may even be beneficial for those seeking to attain
leadership positions.

This could also apply to women, who may apply descriptive stereotypes to themselves
(e.g., warm, not competent; Fiske et al., 2002). Therefore, similar to Gee and his colleagues’
(Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015) assertions regarding Asian Americans, it may be beneficial
for women to engage in similar training and development opportunities, in order to cultivate
some of the characteristics associated with successful leadership (e.g., assertiveness). The
present findings seem to indicate that qualified, agentic women may not always face backlash
when attempting to attain leadership roles.

Limitations and Future Directions

Participants for the present study were recruited via Amazon’s Mturk. Since participants
completed the study independently with no supervision, there was no way to ensure that close
attention was paid to the materials or to the questionnaires. As noted, in line with best practice
recommendations (e.g., Cheung et al., 2017; Mason & Suri, 2012), attention checks and timing
measures were embedded throughout the study to ensure the quality of the data collected.
However, there was still no guarantee that participants were fully invested in the experiment.
Future research could be conducted in a more controlled setting where participants could be
monitored. While there is likely no feasible way to guarantee participants’ attention and
involved throughout the duration of a study, monitoring their behavior in person would likely lead to improved attention and participation.

Furthermore, the recruitment materials clearly stated that the study was intended only for White males living in the United States, and participants were prevented from proceeding with the study if they indicated in a screening questionnaire that they did not fit these criteria. Additionally, Amazon’s filtering system allowed for the selection of only those participants living in the U.S. Finally, a measure was included at the end of the study that asked participants to indicate both their race and their gender. The participants included in the study indicated for a second time that they were, indeed, White males. Nevertheless, since the study was conducted online, it was not possible to confirm the race and gender of all participants. Future research could be conducted in person, where the participants’ race and gender could be checked somewhat more easily. While seeing participants in person would not necessarily guarantee complete confirmation of race and gender, this would likely provide more information than a study conducted solely online.

Additionally, the small sample size may have contributed to the lack of significant findings. While having more participants would likely not have led to significant differences for many of the results, some of the findings (e.g., the impact of characteristics and race on perceived leadership capabilities ratings) may have been bolstered by an increase in power. Therefore, future research could examine these variables with a higher number of participants.

As noted, it has been argued that members of non-Asian groups do not distinguish Asian Americans by nationality (Festekjian et al., 2014; Sy et al., 2010), leading to Asian Americans of various backgrounds being treated similarly. Indeed, much of the research on prejudice and discrimination against Asian Americans (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Festekjian et al., 2014;
Phelan & Rudman, 2010; Rosette et al., 2016; Sy et al., 2010) does not distinguish between different nationalities, choosing instead to examine how participants respond to an “Asian American” target. This could be problematic, however, as one participant’s perception of “Asian American” (e.g., Chinese American) may differ from another’s (e.g., Japanese American). Future research could address this issue by first examining what comes to mind for participants when presented with the term “Asian American,” and seeing where the similarities and differences lie. Additionally, studies could focus on whether participants’ reactions to Asian Americans vary depending on the candidates’ nationalities.

Additionally, the Asian American candidate’s resume, self-description, and interview transcript presented someone who had clearly spent a large portion of his/her life in the United States and could speak English fluently. Indeed, even the names of the Asian American candidates were Western – “Andrew” and “Anna.” It may be the case that the impact of the candidate’s race was different due to his/her “American” name and fluency in English. Future studies could examine if participants would respond differently to Asian American candidates presented as less acculturated to American culture (e.g., candidates with degrees from foreign universities or candidates with Asian sounding names).

This study showed that the types of characteristics exhibited by a leadership candidate significantly influenced ratings of affective reactions, leadership characteristics, and perceived leadership capabilities. The warm leadership candidate received the most positive ratings across the dependent variables of interest, while the dominant candidate tended to receive more negative ratings. Indeed, the pattern of findings indicate that the effect of the characteristics tended to be additive – compared to the qualified candidate, the qualified and warm candidate
generally received stronger ratings, the qualified and dominant candidate received weaker ratings, and ratings for the qualified, dominant, and warm candidate fell somewhere in between.

That the warm candidate received the most positive ratings across all variables of interest is in line with some of the tenets of transformational leadership, which focuses, in part, on the importance of developing and inspiring followers (e.g., Avolio et al., 1999; Bass et al., 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Additionally, these findings are consistent with the ideas associated with servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977; Russell & Stone, 2002; van Dierendonck, 2011), which stresses behaviors such as humility, empowering others, and demonstrating compassion (van Dierendonck, 2011). It appears that leaders who exhibit these behaviors may be viewed more positively by perceivers – both in terms of affective reactions and perceptions about leadership. Future studies could examine which warm behaviors in particular lead to higher leadership ratings. Furthermore, the manipulation of these characteristics could be made more ambiguous, to see if this would lead to different ratings for candidates across race, gender, or other demographic variables.

Additionally, as noted, the strength of the qualifications may have played a role in the nonsignificant findings, as the impact of race and/or gender may have been significantly weaker in comparison to the strong impact of the qualifications. Future research could examine whether using less strong (more ambiguous) qualifications would lead to differential outcomes for Asian American and/or female candidates.

Interestingly, Asian American candidates received slightly higher ratings on perceived leadership capabilities than White candidates \( (p=.065) \). This is somewhat consistent with findings from Sy et al. (2010) and Chung-Herrera and Lankau (2005), showing that Asian American managerial targets were rated relatively positively on certain characteristics associated
with leadership. It may be the case that the qualified Asian American was viewed as slightly more capable for leadership than the White candidate. Another potential explanation is that, because Asian Americans are stereotypically viewed as not fit for leadership (e.g., Sy et al., 2010), participants may have regarded the Asian American candidates as having more potential for successful leadership because they were comparing this target against their perceptions of stereotypical Asian Americans. In other words, participants may have “shifted their standards” when rating the Asian American candidates on perceived leadership capabilities and rated them higher because the candidate exhibited qualities viewed as stereotypically low or non-existent in Asian Americans (Biernat, 2003; Biernat & Manis, 1994; Biernat, Manis, & Nelson, 1991). Indeed, Biernat and her colleagues (Biernat, 2003; Biernat et al., 1991) argue that this changing of standards is more likely to occur when ratings are subjective (e.g., using Likert scales) rather than objective (e.g., estimating yearly earnings). However, as the Asian American candidate did not receive higher ratings on leadership characteristics, it is unclear if this process was occurring. Future research could address this by using more objective measures of leadership perceptions. For example, one could examine whether a qualified Asian American candidate would be equally likely to be selected for a leadership role compared to a White candidate when only one leadership position was available.

As noted, the experimental nature of the study itself may have affected the results, as participants may not have been fully committed to carefully examining the materials and providing accurate ratings. Future research could be conducted in workplace settings, where individuals could be asked to provide their reactions toward actual leadership candidates exhibiting dominance and/or warmth. These reactions could be examined to see if there are differences when the candidate is female and/or Asian American. Additionally, researchers could
examine archival data, to see how employees of different genders and ethnic backgrounds with different levels of dominance and/or warmth (measured using personality inventories) fare when compared to White males with the same scores.

**Conclusion**

The present study found that Asian American and female leadership candidates who were described as exhibiting dominance and warmth did not fare worse than White male candidates exhibiting identical behaviors. Despite previous literature indicating the contrary (e.g., Berdahl & Min, 2012; Rudman et al., 2012), the present study provides some evidence that backlash may not always be present against qualified Asian Americans and women behaving counterstereotypically.

However, these results should be taken with caution, as the experimental nature of the present study may have led to less negative results than what would be seen in actual workplace settings. Additionally, the strength of both the qualifications and characteristics of the candidates may have led to the candidates’ race and/or gender having a weaker impact on participants’ ratings. Nevertheless, this study may provide evidence for the argument that Asian Americans and women may be able to make their way into executive-level leadership positions – if they are able to develop and express the characteristics associated with successful leadership (e.g., Akutagawa, 2013; Gee & Hom, 2009; Gee et al., 2014; Gee et al., 2015; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007).
### Table 1
**Descriptive Statistics for Qualification, Warmth, and Dominance ratings by Characteristics for Pilot Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=27.*
Table 2
Results of a one-way ANOVA for ratings of Qualification, Warmth, and Dominance for Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Warmth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.24**</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.59**</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, N=27.
### Table 3
*Results of Dunnett’s Test for Pilot Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p*<.05, N=27.*
Table 4

*Overall Correlations between dependent variables and SDO*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Affective reactions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Characteristics</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived Leadership Capabilities</td>
<td>.803**</td>
<td>.824**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance Proscriptions</td>
<td>-.732**</td>
<td>-.582**</td>
<td>-.434**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-.160*</td>
<td>-.207**</td>
<td>-.143*</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *p<.05, **p<.001. Affective Reactions, N=208. Leadership Characteristics, N=203. Perceived Leadership Capabilities, N=197. Dominance Proscriptions, N=205. Social Dominance Orientation, N=205. For each variable, 1 to 12 participants were excluded due to missing data.
Table 5

Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Affective Reaction ratings by Characteristics and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *$p<.001$. $N=208$. One participant was excluded due to missing data.
Table 6
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Leadership Characteristics and Perceived Leadership Capabilities ratings by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Leadership Characteristics, N=203. Six participants were excluded due to missing data for the Leadership Characteristics variable. Perceived Leadership Capabilities, N=197. Twelve participants were excluded due to missing data for the Perceived Leadership Capabilities variable.
### Table 7

**Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for dominance proscriptions ratings by Characteristics and Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>64.76*</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics x Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *$p<.001$. N=205. Four participants were excluded due to missing data.*
Table 8
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Affective Reaction ratings by Characteristics and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>.21</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.646</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic x Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>.67</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.572</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.001. N=208. One participant was excluded due to missing data.
Table 9
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Leadership Characteristics and Perceived Leadership Capabilities ratings by Characteristics and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Leadership Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Perceived Leadership Capabilities</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>18.79**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>5.80*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05; **p<.001. Leadership Characteristics, N=203. Six participants were excluded due to missing data for the Leadership Characteristics variable. Perceived Leadership Capabilities, N=197. Twelve participants were excluded due to missing data for the Perceived Leadership Capabilities variable.
Table 10

Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for dominance proscription ratings by Characteristics and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.41*</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.001. N=205. Four participants were excluded due to missing data.
Table 11
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for affective reaction ratings by Characteristics, Gender, and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Gender x Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=208. One participant was excluded due to missing data.
Table 12
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Leadership Characteristics ratings by Characteristics, Race, and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Race x Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=203. Six participants were excluded due to missing data.
Table 13
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Perceived Leadership Capabilities ratings by Characteristics, Race, and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Race x Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=197. Twelve participants were excluded due to missing data.
Table 14
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for affective reaction ratings by Characteristics, Race, and SDO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Race x SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=204. Five participants were excluded due to missing data.*
## Table 15
**Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Leadership Characteristics ratings by Characteristics, Race, and SDO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Race x SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=200. Nine participants were excluded due to missing data.*
Table 16

Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Perceived Leadership Capabilities ratings for Characteristics, Race, and SDO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Race x SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=194. Fifteen participants were excluded due to missing data.
Table 17
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for affective reaction ratings by Characteristics, Gender, and SDO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Gender x SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=204. Five participants were excluded due to missing data.
Table 18
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Leadership Characteristics ratings by Characteristics, Gender, and SDO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Gender x SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=200. Nine participants were excluded due to missing data.
Table 19
Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results for Perceived Leadership Capabilities ratings by Characteristics, Gender, and SDO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics x Gender x SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Dominant, &amp; Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SDO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SDO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( N=194 \). Fifteen participants were excluded due to missing data.
Appendix A: Project Description

You currently work in the operations department of a large, successful manufacturing company based in the United States. The organization’s performance has been strong over the past decade; however, the CEO and the executive team believe the company must make some major changes to better prepare the company for the future. As a result, they have laid out a 5-year plan for the organization’s transformation, in line with their long-term strategic vision.

The first phase of this plan will take place in your department. The executive team has planned a major change project that they believe will be vital to the overall transformation, and they would like someone from your department to take the lead. They have narrowed down the list of potential candidates, and they would like your feedback on one of them. They want to select someone who demonstrates strong leadership skills and has the potential to be an outstanding senior leader. Ultimately, the executive team is hoping to identify someone who can help lead the newly transformed organization into the future.

In sum, this change project will play a crucial role in the massive transformation that this organization will undertake over the next five years. This project must go well in order for the overall organizational transformation to be successful. Thus, whoever is selected for this role must have exceptional leadership capabilities – they must be able to lead this project to its successful completion. Furthermore, they will not only be leading this major change project; they will likely also be considered for executive-level leadership roles after the organization’s transition. Therefore, it is important that you provide your honest and candid feedback regarding your impressions of the candidate and your beliefs regarding the candidate’s ability to lead.

Thank you for your time and feedback.
Appendix B: Applicant Resume

Andrew {Anna} Wong {Davis}
123 Juniper St. New York, NY 10012 | (917) 555-000 | andrew{anna}.wong{davis}@email.com

Experience

OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR | BDE CORPORATION 09/2010 - PRESENT
· Spearheaded efforts to streamline operational processes throughout the organization, increasing organizational efficiency by over 25% in 2016
· Led initiative to change and consolidate suppliers for necessary materials in the supply chain, saving the organization $125k in 2016
· Collaborate with HR to continually identify, develop, and retain high potential talent across the operations department
· Work together with analysts to forecast and develop plans for future operational processes

SENIOR OPERATIONS SPECIALIST | BDE CORPORATION 01/2006 TO 08/2010
· Developed partnerships across functions to maintain efficient processes across all areas of the organization
· Reviewed ROI on various investments throughout the organization and ensured cost/reward optimization
· Created and delivered presentations to senior leaders examining the organization’s purchases and investments
· Tracked employee progress toward organization’s fiscal goals and adjusted benchmarks as needed

OPERATIONS SPECIALIST | FGH, INC. 06/1999 TO 12/2005
· Contributed to the development of organizational efficiency initiatives to increase profitability and decrease cost
· Developed and managed project timelines to ensure steady progress toward stated objectives
· Mentored and trained employees regarding best practices in operations and organizational efficiency

OPERATIONS INTERN | FGH, INC. 09/1998 TO 05/1999
· Aided in the development of timelines to enable tracking of progress across various projects
· Conducted cost/benefit analyses across various functions throughout the organization
· Drafted reports on the organization’s ROI across various investments

Education

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY | 06/2009 | NEW YORK, NY
Master of Business Administration
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY | 05/1999 | NEW YORK, NY
Bachelor of Science in Business
Areas of Expertise
Strategic planning, Business development, Employee training, Employee development, Cost reduction, Process improvement

Professional Memberships and Certifications
- Member of APICS, SOMA, and ASHRAE
- ASHRAE OPMP Certified
Appendix C: Candidate Self-Description

**Qualified**

I am passionate about finding new and innovative ways to help the organization grow and improve. In my current role, I am responsible for figuring out how the organization can function more efficiently and see improvements on ROI year over year. Most recently, I have led projects that have saved the organization over $125,000 in purchasing costs and have increased the organization’s overall efficiency by over 25%.

There are several reasons why I am the best candidate to lead this major organizational change initiative. Firstly, I have been with BDE for over ten years. During my time here, I have worked tirelessly both with my team and across functions to improve operational processes and save money for the organization. We have accomplished all of this while increasing employee engagement and retention.

Additionally, I have over seventeen years of experience in operations. I am knowledgeable about the industry, and I am aware of the challenges that BDE will face during the transformation. In particular, I know the transition will be difficult for many employees – especially those who have been with the organization a long time. I will work with other leaders to find ways to help these employees comply with the change.

Finally, I am deeply familiar with the needs of the organization – both presently and as it strides into the future. I have the necessary skills and industry expertise to lead this change initiative and meet these needs. I am confident that I can direct this project successfully and continue to grow as the organization transforms. After the transformation, I hope to lead the organization toward continued, long-term success.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Qualified and Dominant

I am dedicated to developing new and innovative ways to make the organization grow and improve. In my current role, I figure out how the organization can function more efficiently, so it can see improvements on ROI year over year. Most recently, I have led projects that have saved the organization over $125,000 in purchasing costs and have increased the organization’s overall efficiency by over 25%.

There are numerous reasons why I am clearly the best candidate to lead this major organizational change initiative. I have worked at BDE for over ten productive years. During my time here, I have worked tirelessly to improve operational processes and save money for the organization. I have accomplished all of this while increasing employee engagement and retention.

Additionally, I have over seventeen years of experience in operations. I am knowledgeable about the industry, and I am aware of the challenges that BDE will face during the transformation. In particular, I know the transition will be difficult for many employees – especially those who have been with the organization a long time. I will work with other leaders to find ways to make these employees comply with the change.

Finally, I am extremely familiar with the needs of the organization – both presently and as it strides into the future. I have the necessary skills and industry expertise to lead this change initiative and meet these needs. I am completely confident that I can direct this project successfully and continue to grow as the organization transforms. Then, after the transformation, I will lead the organization toward continued, long-term success.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Qualified and Warm

I am passionate about working with others to find new and innovative ways to help the organization grow and improve. In my current role, I am responsible for figuring out how the organization can function more efficiently and see improvements on ROI year over year. Most recently, I have led projects that have saved the organization over $125,000 in purchasing costs and have increased the organization’s overall efficiency by over 25%.

There are several reasons why I believe am the best candidate to help lead this major organizational change initiative. Firstly, I have been with BDE for over ten wonderful years. During my time here, I have collaborated both with my team and across functions to improve operational processes and save money for the organization. We have accomplished all of this while increasing employee engagement and retention.

Additionally, I have over seventeen years of experience in operations. I am knowledgeable about the industry, and I am aware of the challenges that BDE will face during the transformation. In particular, I know the transition will be difficult for many employees – especially those who have been with the organization a long time. I will work with other leaders to find ways to help these employees feel more comfortable and committed to the change.

Finally, I am deeply familiar with the needs of the organization – both presently and as it strides into the future. I believe I have the necessary skills and industry expertise to help lead this change initiative and meet these needs. I am optimistic that I can direct this project successfully and continue to grow as the organization transforms. After the transformation, I hope to lead the organization toward continued, long-term success.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Qualified, Dominant, and Warm

I am dedicated to finding new and innovative ways to help the organization grow and improve. In my current role, I am responsible for figuring out how the organization can function more efficiently and see improvements on ROI year over year. Most recently, I have led projects that have saved the organization over $125,000 in purchasing costs and have increased the organization’s overall efficiency by over 25%.

There are numerous reasons why I am clearly the best candidate to lead this major organizational change initiative. Firstly, I have been with BDE for over ten wonderful years. During my time here, I have worked tirelessly both with my team and across functions to improve operational processes and save money for the organization. We have accomplished all of this while increasing employee engagement and retention.

Additionally, I have over seventeen years of experience in operations. I am knowledgeable about the industry, and I am aware of the challenges that BDE will face during the transformation. In particular, I know the transition will be difficult for many employees – especially those who have been with the organization a long time. I will work with other leaders to find ways to help these employees comply with the change.

Finally, I am deeply familiar with the needs of the organization – both presently and as it strides into the future. I believe I have the necessary skills and industry expertise to lead this change initiative and meet these needs. I am confident that I can direct this project successfully and continue to grow as the organization transforms. After the transformation, I hope to lead the organization toward continued, long-term success.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Q: What are your goals (both short-term and long-term)?

- **Qualified:** I’m very curious, so I plan to keep learning as much as possible about operations, so I can help the company improve. I want to help the organization advance their operations strategies so we can reduce costs while increasing efficiency. There are also some cutting edge forecasting techniques that may be beneficial for BDE. We could utilize some of those techniques to better inform the operations department and improve our processes going forward. Finally, I am interested in working with both the operations team and across functions so we can produce stronger results year over year.

- **Qualified and Dominant:** I’m very curious, so I plan to keep learning as much as possible about operations, so I can maintain the company’s growth. I’m also a very ambitious person, so I plan to keep climbing up the ranks until I ultimately become CEO. I want to push the organization improve their operations strategies so we can reduce costs while increasing efficiency. There are also some cutting edge forecasting techniques that may be beneficial for BDE. We could utilize some of those techniques to better inform the operations department and improve our processes going forward. Finally, I am interested in continuing to push myself so I can produce stronger results year over year.

- **Qualified and Warm:** I’m very curious, so I plan to keep learning as much as possible about operations, so I can continue to help the company improve. I’m also very collaborative person, so I would like to continue working with and developing our exceptional team. I want to help the organization improve their operations strategies so we can reduce costs while increasing efficiency. There are also some cutting edge forecasting techniques that may be beneficial for BDE. We could utilize some of those
techniques to better inform the operations department and improve our processes going forward. Finally, I am interested in developing and mentoring members of the operations team so they can work better together year over year.

- **Qualified, Dominant, and Warm**: I’m very curious, so I plan to keep learning as much as possible about operations so I can maintain the company’s growth. I’m also a very ambitious person, so I plan to keep climbing the ranks until I ultimately become CEO. I want to help the organization improve their operations strategies so we can reduce costs while increasing efficiency. There are also some cutting edge forecasting techniques that may be beneficial for BDE. We could utilize some of those techniques to better inform the operations department and improve our processes going forward. Finally, I am interested in pushing myself and the operations team so we can produce stronger results year over year.

Q: Can you describe several projects you worked on recently? What did they involve?

- **Qualified**: I have worked on many interesting projects during my time at BDE; however, I will pick two to highlight. I helped lead a project that focused on streamlining organizational processes, which increased overall organizational efficiency by 25% last year. Additionally, I worked with HR on a project that focused on employee development and recognition, and this led to an increase in employee engagement by 30% and an increase in employee productivity by 20%.

- **Qualified and Dominant**: I am very proud of all of my accomplishments during my time at BDE; however, I will pick two to highlight. Through my initiative and hard work, I led a project that focused on streamlining organizational processes, which increased overall organizational efficiency by 25% last year. Additionally, I got HR involved in one of my
projects focusing on employee development and recognition, and this project led to a 30% increase in employee engagement and a 20% increase in employee productivity.

- **Qualified and Warm**: I have worked on many interesting projects with some of the most incredible people during my time at BDE; however, I will pick two to highlight. With the help of my team, I led a project that focused on streamlining organizational processes, which increased overall organizational efficiency by 25%. Additionally, I partnered with the HR team on a project that focused on employee development and recognition, and this project led to a 20% increase in employee engagement and a 30% increase in employee productivity.

- **Qualified, Dominant, and Warm**: I am very proud all of my accomplishments during my time at BDE, and I am happy to have worked with some of the best people in the industry; however, I will pick two projects to highlight. I led my team on a project that focused on streamlining organizational processes, which increased overall organizational efficiency by 25%. Additionally, I partnered with the HR team on one of my projects focusing on employee development and recognition, and this project led to a 30% increase in employee engagement and a 20% increase in employee productivity.

Q: What are your strengths?

- **Qualified**: I am dedicated to my work, and I am focused and energetic. I hold myself and others to high standards. I remain calm under pressure and can maneuver through stressful or chaotic situations relatively well. I can be strategically oriented, while maintaining a focus on the details. I also speak candidly to people. I think constructive criticism can be necessary to help people improve and work to their fullest potential. That might seem obvious, but I think feedback is very important – especially in the workplace.
- **Qualified and Dominant**: I am very dedicated to my work, I am tough, I am energetic, and I am determined to get ahead. I hold myself to very high standards, and I expect those around me to live up to them. I remain focused under pressure and can maneuver through stressful or chaotic situations with ease. I can be very strategically oriented, while maintaining a sharp focus on the details. I also speak candidly to people, even when the feedback is critical. Harsh feedback is often necessary to help people improve and work to their fullest potential. That might seem callous, but I think people shouldn’t be so sensitive – not in the workplace.

- **Qualified and Warm**: I am dedicated to my work, I am friendly and supportive, I am energetic, and I want to help people get ahead. I hold myself and others to very high standards, and I believe those around me can live up to them. I remain calm under pressure and can maneuver through stressful or chaotic situations with ease. I can be very strategically oriented, while maintaining a sharp focus on the details. I also speak to people in a considerate and sincere manner, especially when the feedback is critical. While critical feedback is important, I think an abundance of positive feedback is necessary to help people feel empowered and work to their fullest potential. That might seem soft, but I think people should be more positive – especially in the workplace.

- **Qualified, Dominant, and Warm**: I am dedicated to my work, I am focused on maintaining positive relationships, I am energetic, and I am determined to get ahead. I hold myself to very high standards, and I expect those around me to live up to them. I remain focused under pressure and can maneuver through stressful or chaotic situations with ease. I can be very strategically oriented, while maintaining a sharp focus on the details. I also speak candidly to people, even when the feedback is critical. I think
constructive criticism can be necessary to help people improve and work to their fullest potential. That might seem obvious, but I think feedback is very important – especially in the workplace.

Q: What are your areas for improvement?

- **Qualified**: Some people might say I’m too much of a perfectionist, which may frustrate some people. However, I push for high standards because I believe my team can be the best, and I want to motivate them to always strive for more.

- **Qualified and Dominant**: Some people might say I’m too opinionated. I am not afraid to speak my mind, which might be alarming to some. I may also push my team too hard to get results, which can lead to some burnout along the way. However, I do so because I know my team can be the best and want to motivate them to always strive for more.

- **Qualified and Warm**: Some people might say I can be too nice. I try to focus on the positive, which might be difficult for some. I may also work too hard to maintain harmony, which can lead to some issues along the way. However, I do so because I believe my team can be the best and want to encourage them to always work together as they strive for more.

- **Qualified, Dominant, and Warm**: Depending on the situation, some people might say I’m too opinionated. I can focus on the positive, but I’m not afraid to speak my mind. While I like maintaining harmony, I can also push my team very hard to get results, which may lead to some burnout along the way. However, I do so because I believe my team can be the best and want to motivate them to always strive for more.

Q: What are you most proud of?
- **Qualified**: I am most proud of my ability to work hard and achieve results. I’ve stayed focused on learning as much as possible about operations, and I’ve used that knowledge to help improve our performance.

- **Qualified and Dominant**: I am most proud of my determination and focus, along with my ability to get results. I’ve stayed focused on my ambitious goals throughout my career, and I’ve achieved success because I work hard and don’t tolerate anything less than the best from myself or those around me.

- **Qualified and Warm**: I am most proud of my ability to work hard while coordinating with others to get results. I’ve stayed focused on the people I work with and our shared goals throughout my career. We’ve achieved success because I work hard with my team and support them in any way I can, while expecting the best from myself and those around me.

- **Qualified, Dominant, and Warm**: I am most proud of my determination and my focus, along with my ability to get results. I’ve stayed focused on my own ambitious goals and the goals of my team throughout my career. I’ve achieved success because I work hard and expect nothing but the best from myself and those around me.

Q: How would your colleagues describe you?

- **Qualified**: They would say I’m conscientious and reliable. They would probably also say I have the ability to help the operations team and the organization as a whole achieve success. Finally, they would say I am knowledgeable about my field.

- **Qualified and Dominant**: They would say I am tough and demanding, but fair. They would also say I have the ability to make the operations team and the organization
successful. Finally, they would say I am confident, decisive, and that I hold people accountable.

- **Qualified and Warm:** They would say I am outgoing and warm. They would also say I have the ability to help the operations team and the organization as a whole achieve success. Finally, they would say I am supportive, considerate, and easy to work with.

- **Qualified, Dominant, and Warm:** They would say I can be tough and demanding, but also considerate and fair. They would also say I have the ability to help the operations team and the organization as a whole achieve success. Finally, they would say I am confident, decisive, thoughtful, and supportive.
Appendix D: Manipulation Check

Candidate information

- What is the candidate’s name? [Response options differed depending on condition.]
  - Brad Davis {Anna Davis}
  - Andrew Davis {Brenda Davis}
  - Brad Wong {Anna Wong}
  - Andrew Wong {Brenda Wong}

- What gender do you think the candidate is?
  - Male
  - Female

- What race do you think the candidate is?
  - White, non-Hispanic
  - Hispanic
  - Black or African American
  - Asian American / Pacific Islander
  - Native American

Role information

- What is the role for which you are considering this candidate?
  - Director of Sales
  - Leader of a major change project
  - Administrative assistant for the CEO
  - VP of Marketing
Qualification

- The candidate is qualified for this leadership role. [Reverse coded]
  - Strongly agree
  - Agree
  - Slightly agree
  - Slightly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Strongly disagree

- This candidate is well-suited for this leadership role.

- This candidate is able to fulfill the requirements of this leadership role.

- This candidate has what it takes to effectively lead the change project.

Warmth

- Women’s prescriptions (adapted from Moss-Racusin et al., 2010)
  - How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)
    - Cooperative
      - Not at all
      - Somewhat
      - Moderately
      - Very
      - Extremely
    - Supportive
    - Friendly
- How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)
  - Assertive
    - Not at all
    - Somewhat
    - Moderately
    - Very
    - Extremely
  - Dominant
  - Bold
  - Self-assured
Appendix E: Dominance Proscriptions

- Dominance proscriptions (adapted from Rudman et al., 2012)
  - How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)
    - Intimidating
      - Not at all
      - Somewhat
      - Moderately
      - Very
      - Extremely
    - Arrogant
    - Controlling
    - Cold toward others

- Leader Antiprototype (adapted from Epitropaki & Martin, 2004)
  - Domineering
  - Pushy
  - Manipulative
  - Loud
  - Conceited
  - Selfish

- Additional adjectives
  - Bossy
  - Overbearing
- Rude
- Harsh
- Abrasive
- Forceful
- Dominating
- Ruthless
- Cynical
Appendix F: Affective Reactions

- What is your general impression of this candidate?
  - Extremely negative
  - Moderately negative
  - Somewhat negative
  - Somewhat positive
  - Moderately positive
  - Extremely positive

- What is your overall reaction toward this candidate?
  - Extremely negative
  - Moderately negative
  - Somewhat negative
  - Somewhat positive
  - Moderately positive
  - Extremely positive

- Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:
  - I want to work with this candidate. [Reverse coded]
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Slightly agree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree
- Adapted from Vescio, Judd, & Kwan (2004)
  - I would like this candidate as my boss. [Reverse coded]
  - It would bother me if this candidate were selected to lead the project.

- Adapted from Hamstra, Van Yperen, Wisse, & Sassenberg (2013)
  - This candidate seems like a likeable person. [Reverse coded]
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Slightly agree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree
  - It would be pleasant to work with this candidate. [Reverse coded]
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Slightly agree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

- Overall, how do you feel toward this candidate?
  - Extremely negatively
  - Moderately negatively
  - Somewhat negatively
  - Somewhat positively
o Moderately positively

o Extremely positively
Appendix G: Leadership Characteristics and Perceived Leadership Capabilities

Leadership Characteristics

- Adapted from Duehr & Bono (2006)

  o How much do you think the candidate engages in the following behaviors?

    ▪ Attends to the needs of others
      • Not at all
      • Somewhat
      • A moderate amount
      • Very much
      • Extremely
    ▪ Considers others’ ideas
    ▪ Has a sense of purpose
    ▪ Listens well
    ▪ Shows appreciation

- Transformational leadership traits (adapted from Duehr & Bono, 2006)

  o How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)

    ▪ Considerate
      • Not at all
      • Somewhat
      • Moderately
      • Very
      • Extremely
- Relationship-Oriented Leadership (adapted from Duehr & Bono, 2006)
  - How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)
    - Fair
    - Inclusive
    - Sociable
    - Tactful

- Leadership prototype (adapted from Epitropaki & Martin, 2004)
  - How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)
    - Intelligent
      - Not at all
      - Somewhat
      - Moderately
      - Very
      - Extremely
- Knowledgeable
- Educated
- Clever
- Helpful
- Motivated
- Dedicated
- Hardworking
- Energetic
- Strong
- Dynamic

- Men’s prescriptions (adapted from Rudman et al., 2012)
  - How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)
    - Career-oriented
    - Competitive

- Other characteristics
  - How ... do you think the candidate is? (Please respond using the characteristics below.)
    - Charismatic
    - Confident
    - Competent

Perceived Leadership Capabilities

- How well do you think this candidate would lead this project?
- How well do you think the candidate would lead the overall organizational transformation?
  - Extremely poorly
  - Very poorly
  - Somewhat poorly
  - Somewhat well
  - Very well
  - Extremely well

- How effective will this candidate be in influencing others?
  - Not at all
  - Slightly
  - Moderately
  - Very
  - Extremely

- How effective will this candidate be in motivating others?
  - Not at all
  - Slightly
- How persuasive do you think this candidate will be as a leader?
  - Not at all
  - Slightly
  - Moderately
  - Very
  - Extremely

- How much would you trust this candidate during times of uncertainty?
  - Not at all
  - Somewhat
  - A moderate amount
  - Very much
  - Extremely

- How confident are you in this candidate’s ability to lead this project?
  - Not at all
  - Somewhat
  - Moderately
  - Very
  - Extremely

- How effective of a leader do you think this candidate will be?
  - Not at all effective
- Adapted from Heilman et al. (2004)
  - How successful do you think this candidate will be in this organization?
    - Not at all successful
    - Somewhat successful
    - Moderately successful
    - Very successful
    - Extremely successful

- Additional questions (adapted from Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997)
  - How likely is it that this candidate will eventually promoted to an executive level leadership position?
    - Not at all likely
    - Somewhat likely
    - Moderately likely
    - Very likely
    - Extremely likely

- This candidate’s leadership would benefit the organization.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Slightly disagree
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

- In the future, this candidate will lead the organization successfully. [Reverse coded]
  - Strongly agree
  - Agree
  - Slightly agree
  - Slightly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Strongly disagree
Appendix H: Attention Checks

- What is the third word in this question: “How many stars are in the American Flag?”

  (Rouse, 2015, p. 305)
  
  o Sky
  o Flower
  o Stars
  o Flag

- Which of the following falls between 371 to 983?

  o 375
  o 991
  o 1607
  o 150

- For this item, please select “Strongly Disagree.”

  o Strongly disagree
  o Slightly disagree
  o Neither agree nor disagree
  o Slightly agree
  o Strongly agree
Appendix I: Social Dominance Orientation (adapted from Pratto et al., 1994)

Which of the following statements do you have a positive or negative feeling towards? Under each object or statement, select one of the following choices: Very positive, positive, slightly positive, slightly negative, negative, very negative. (wording adapted from Pratto et al., 1994)

1. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.
2. Some people are just more worthy than others.
3. This country would be better if we cared less about how equal all people were.
4. Some people are just more deserving than others.
5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.
6. Some people are just inferior to others.
7. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.
8. Increased economic equality.*
9. Increased social equality.*
10. Equality.*
11. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.*
12. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.*
13. We should try to treat one another as equals as much as possible. (All humans should be treated equally).*
14. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.*

*Reverse coded items.
Appendix J: Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

- How old are you?
  - 20-29
  - 30-39
  - 40-49
  - 50-59
  - 60-69
  - 70+

- Which industry do you currently work in?
  - Accounting
  - Advertising
  - Agriculture
  - Automotive
  - Banking
  - Communications
  - Construction
  - Consulting
  - Consumer Products
  - Education
  - Engineering
  - Fashion
  - Financial Services
- At what level is your current position?
  - Entry level
- How long have you been working in a full-time position?
  - 0-5
  - 6-10
  - 11-15
  - 16-20
  - 21-25
  - 26-30
  - 31-35
  - 36-40
  - 40+

- How long have you been in your current role?
  - 0-5
  - 6-10
  - 11-15
  - 16-20
  - 21-25
  - 26-30
  - 31-35
- How many people do you currently manage?
  - 0
  - 1-10
  - 11-20
  - 21-30
  - 31-40
  - 41-50
  - 50+

- What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?
  - Completed some high school
  - High school graduate or equivalent
  - Completed some college
  - Associate’s degree
  - Bachelor’s degree
  - Completed some post-graduate
  - Master’s degree
  - Ph.D., law, or medical degree
  - Other

- Please specify your race/ethnicity:
  - White, non-Hispanic
  - Hispanic
- What is your gender?
  o Male
  o Female
  o Other
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