

2023

## The impact of belief in a just world and social dominance orientation on reactions to pay inequities

Sydney Rae Dhue

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.emich.edu/honors>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Dhue, Sydney Rae, "The impact of belief in a just world and social dominance orientation on reactions to pay inequities" (2023). *Senior Honors Theses and Projects*. 786.  
<https://commons.emich.edu/honors/786>

This Open Access Senior Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Honors Theses and Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact [lib-ir@emich.edu](mailto:lib-ir@emich.edu).

---

# The impact of belief in a just world and social dominance orientation on reactions to pay inequities

## Abstract

Prior work has examined how racial prejudice can lead to the acceptance of unjust pay toward women and minorities. Other work has found that people who are high in the belief in a just world (BJW) often accept the outcome of events and situations despite differences in outcomes for certain individuals or groups. This research examined if BJW and social dominance orientation (SDO) contributes to the acceptance of pay discrimination toward African Americans. In the research participants read a description of a job applicant and an offer of employment toward that applicant. For the description, participants received explicit information that the application is either Black or White. Additionally, as part of the job offer, participants received explicit information that the applicant is being offered 20% less, or 20% more than the median salary for their position. Assignment to applicant race and pay offered was conducted with random assignment resulting in 4 groups of participants (those who read of a Black applicant with higher pay; those who read of a Black applicant with lower pay; those who read of a White applicant with higher pay; those who read of a White applicant with lower pay). Afterwards, participants were required to evaluate if they would advise the applicant to accept or reject the job offer, or if they would themselves accept/reject it, on Likert scales. Participant then completed two scales that correlate with differential treatment of people and groups, the social dominance orientation scale (a 16-item scale) and the belief in a just world scale (an 8-item scale). The results indicated that SDO and BJW had no effect on data, meaning SDO and BJW largely did not correlate with the outcomes.

## Degree Type

Open Access Senior Honors Thesis

## Department or School

Psychology

## First Advisor

Rusty McIntyre, Ph.D.

## Second Advisor

Natalie Dove, Ph.D.

## Third Advisor

Ann R. Eisenberg, Ph.D.

## Subject Categories

Psychology

THE IMPACT OF BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD AND SOCIAL DOMINANCE  
ORIENTATION ON REACTIONS TO PAY INEQUITIES

By

Sydney Rae Dhue

A Senior Project Submitted to the

Eastern Michigan University

Honors College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Graduation

with Departmental Honors in Psychology

Approved in Ypsilanti, MI on April 20, 2023

Project Advisor:	Rusty McIntyre, Ph.D.
Departmental Honors Advisor:	Rusty McIntyre, Ph.D.
Department Head/School Director:	Natalie Dove, Ph.D.
Dean of The Honors College:	Ann R. Eisenberg, Ph.D.

**Table of Contents**

Abstract.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Literature Review.....	5
Racial Inequality.....	5
Belief in a Just World.....	8
Social Dominance Orientation.....	11
Hypothesis.....	13
Methods.....	14
Results.....	17
Discussion.....	22
Notes.....	27
References.....	28
Appendix A.....	33
Appendix B.....	35
Appendix C.....	36
Appendix D.....	50

**Abstract**

Prior work has examined how racial prejudice can lead to the acceptance of unjust pay toward women and minorities. Other work has found that people who are high in the belief in a just world (BJW) often accept the outcome of events and situations despite differences in outcomes for certain individuals or groups. This research examined if BJW and social dominance orientation (SDO) contributes to the acceptance of pay discrimination toward African Americans. In the research participants read a description of a job applicant and an offer of employment toward that applicant. For the description, participants received explicit information that the application is either Black or White. Additionally, as part of the job offer, participants received explicit information that the applicant is being offered 20% less, or 20% more than the median salary for their position. Assignment to applicant race and pay offered was conducted with random assignment resulting in 4 groups of participants (those who read of a Black applicant with higher pay; those who read of a Black applicant with lower pay; those who read of a White applicant with higher pay; those who read of a White applicant with lower pay). Afterwards, participants were required to evaluate if they would advise the applicant to accept or reject the job offer, or if they would themselves accept/reject it, on Likert scales. Participant then completed two scales that correlate with differential treatment of people and groups, the social dominance orientation scale (a 16-item scale) and the belief in a just world scale (an 8-item scale). The results indicated that SDO and BJW had no effect on data, meaning SDO and BJW largely did not correlate with the outcomes.

## **The Impact of Belief in A Just World and Social Dominance Orientation on Reactions to Pay Inequities**

Pay Inequities have persisted within the American economic system for decades leading to a substantial impact on minority communities. Throughout history many measures have been taken to diminish the presence of unequal pay in America but, in many instances, minorities are still not offered the same pay and or opportunities as their white peers. Inequality can be observed early within hiring decisions starting with a black applicant applying for a position they are qualified for, but ultimately do not receive a job offer. In many instances someone who has equal qualification, but a different ethnic background receives a call back instead. This is a sequence of events that takes place quite often for black job applicants. Black applicants with credible professional backgrounds, sufficient education, and adequate experience are half as likely when compared to white applicants to receive a call back for a job (Pager et. Al, 2009). In other cases, organizations may hire black applicants but harbor prejudice within their memory regarding the applicant (Frazer and Wiersma, 2001). These occurrences illustrate the injustices committed against black applicants which in turn cause these application experiences to vary greatly from the application experiences of white Americans. Renna and King (2007) conducted a study evaluating the wage discrimination between white and black males within their first five years of completing their degree, it was found that for the first job out of school the wage gap between the two races was 35%, and after the fifth year the unexplained wage gap decreases to 13%. It can be argued that black applicants are disadvantaged from the start of their professional journey post education. Wage returns in accordance with promotions for black men are approximately 48 percent of the wage returns earned by white males (Tripp & Fadlon, 2020).

Past research findings postulate that there is a definite presence of pay inequities within industries, and black men are being compensated at a disproportionately lower rate. The findings from past research also highlight the undeniable influence that race has on the likelihood of an individual to receive a potential position. Many would argue that discrimination in hiring practices has decreased over the years with the establishment of standards to institute fairness but that is not completely true. Quillian et al. (2017) found that there have been no significant alterations to the amount of discrimination exercised against African Americans since 1989. Within past research it has also been found that majority applicants receive over 50% more callbacks than minority job candidates, and majority applicants are extended 145% more job offers than their minority counterpart (Quillian et al., 2020). Within these findings it has once again the presence of discrimination in hiring practices can still be observed. Despite the acknowledgement and efforts to mitigate discrimination no recognizable advancements have been made. The same phenomenon persists when considering unequal pay, it is vital to evaluate the components that contribute to the obstinance of discrimination in the hiring and job offer process. Many speculate whether the extent to which people are sensitive to the pay offered to people of color, may that be for the better or worse, contribute to the probability that they will accept elements of discrimination in hiring. It is equally important to consider to what extent does a system of justification contribute to the differences in the sensitivity expressed to pay being offered to people of color.

When assessing the wage discrimination experienced by black men it was found that despite generating equal performance ratings as white peers there was an increase in racial wage

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

differences opposed to a decrease, establishing that the wage gap seen in labor is not a result of a skill gap but in contrast a blatant representation of discrimination in the labor market (Coleman, 2003). This research asserts that the justifications of wage discrimination when evaluating skills are not completely valid. This study furthermore highlights that the reasoning for discrimination spans beyond simple justifications rooted in the analyses of applicant ability and performance. The assertion is made that there are additional concepts that equate to discrimination. This research will take in account the outlooks, underlying beliefs, and perceptions associated with the amount of pay offered to people of color. Present research will also work to determine and assess how certain structures of rationale play a role in the differences of sensitivity to a person of color receiving either more or less money for a job.

## Racial Inequality

There has been plentiful research highlighting the prevalence of racial inequality in past and present-day America. The current state of Black-white wealth inequality spans beyond the conventional day to day representations of earning disparities but instead also include more historic undertones. It is acknowledged that the imbalance of white and black wealth can be dated all the way back to the issuance of the emancipation proclamation (Kirk, 2007). This finding asserts the idea that American has been plagued with wealth inequality for over a hundred years, consequentially wealth has been distributed in a disproportionate manner equating to many of the representations of wealth disparities

The wage gap in America can be traced as far back as 1950 (Council of Economic Advisers, 1998). Despite the noticeable decline of racial pay gaps from 1970 to 1980, the gaps began to reduce at a slower rate up until 2000 where the trends reversed, leading to an increase to racial gaps (Mandel & Semyonov, 2016). The statistics behind wage discrepancies can be further acknowledged in the survey conducted by “PayScale” between January 2017 and February 2019. Within this survey it was found that a black man earns 87 cents for every dollar earned by a white man. In comparable research conducted by the census bureau in 2020 it was concluded that, Black women earn 64 cents for every \$1 earned by white non-Hispanic men. In the study

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

carried out by the U.S Census, wage discrepancies were highlighted, thus acknowledging that women make less than any minority. The national research conducted asserts that there are apparent wage gaps between minorities and their white counterparts in their respective professions. Although it is important to understand the historical context of racial wealth inequality, past research also showcases the significant negative impact that racial disparities have on minority communities in America specifically in workplace settings. White men are hired at disproportionate rate than white men. These manifestations of racial inequality can be linked to perceptions exhibited in application reviewal. McConahay (1983) found that when a job candidate was black, Modern Racism Scale scores indicated a negative correlation with hiring evaluations specifically in a negative context. It is made obvious through research findings that racial inequality in workplace settings impact more than only monetary elements. When considering the impact of racial inequality is important to note that it is not only limited to intentional application of unfairness. Davidai and Walker (2021), found that Americans often make the mistake of miscalculating the racial gaps when referencing mobility, believing that underprivileged Black Americans are more likely to advance economically then they actually are. With this research. Racial inequality and pay inequities within workplaces in are not evaluated using the proper lenses, allowing for false conclusions to be drawn.

Although there are statistical data to support the presence of wage discrepancies between majorities compared to minorities and women, there are still potential instances of valid reasoning behind how wage gaps are fostered. Nonetheless, despite seemingly reasonable explanations as to why pay inequities exist. There are still many questions that remain. Are pay inequities normalized in America? Of these, beliefs in a just world and social dominance come into focus. With each of these concepts' individuals might hold some form of differential



## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

reasoning as to why gaps in pay might or should exist. For those higher in the belief in a just world, this reasoning might include thoughts of effort or actions to elucidate the deservingness of an individual as it pertains to their earned pay (Lerner and Miller, 1978). For those higher in social dominance, this reasoning might be that differences in pay are structured in the world and are seen as legitimate to maintain the assumed proper social and economic hierarchies. This present research furthermore examines how these beliefs might contribute to the acceptance of pay gaps that might occur for work, and whether the gaps are correlated with the race of the wage earner.

### **Belief in a Just Word**

The Belief in a Just word (BJW) is recognized as the belief that one will receive the things one will receive the things that they earn and consequently individuals will earn what they receive (Lerner and Miller, 1978). Through experimental study there were many assertions made about the bias observed in many environments. Additionally, BJW asserts that individuals need to believe in a just world to deal with witnessed or experienced injustice, helplessness, and insecurity (Lerner and Miller, 1978). Lerner and Miller established many of the essential precedents surrounding BJW. Bias is not a sectional concept/ construct it can be observed in plentiful environments. The influence of bias makes itself especially apparent in circumstances that alter the experience of an individual based on their demographic. Victims of injustice sometimes are viewed as people who derived exactly what happened to them, whereas certain outlooks have supported this phenomenon Harvey et al. (2014) found that individuals with higher BJW participated in more victim derogation than people who were lower in a belief in a just world. Despite the consideration of bias posed towards people there are many instances in which individuals are mistreated largely due to beliefs. In the work of Hafer and colleagues

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

(2022) participants were presented with a story task that included information about a protagonist demonstrating good or bad behavior which later would generate either a good or bad outcome. Hafer et al. (2022), found that there was a correlation between BJW and early event-related potentials (ERP) responses. This research asserts that when prompted with information surrounding the deservingness of people, individuals can quickly make judgments when they determine that someone is deserving of a particular outcome. This finding also translates to the concept of BJW, when someone is granted something, or a favorable result people are quick to think that they deserve all that they have received. This research finding relates to the processes that surround pay inequality. When considering the hiring process for employment many criteria need to be evaluated to find out if someone is a good fit for a position, whether they have the proper experience, education, personality but, based on the information known through the belief in a just world deservingness is also a criterion that is explored. When someone who maintains a high belief is prompted with information about people they can make more timely decisions about those people, albeit they will be more heavily influenced by concepts of deservingness (Hafer et. al, 2022). This finding could also apply to circumstances where job candidates are reviewed for a position, individuals who have higher BJW may have the ability to make quick decisions surrounding the candidate's deservingness. The belief in a Just World in certain cases acts as a potential justification of racial inequality. In these cases, people blamed for the treatment they receive in essence people are condemned for being discriminated against. The apparent representation of bias can be seen in varying fields, one being healthcare. When referencing health discrimination and how it pertains to a Belief in a Just World, the work of Hagiwara et al., (2015) inspected whether a person's belief in just word would act as a measure of prediction when evaluating each person's individualistic variations in

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

both resilience and vulnerability to the adverse health effects of discrimination. Hagiwara et al., (2015) found that black participants who maintained high measures of a belief in just world, reported encountering notable levels of discrimination. Black people who believe that the world is a fair place are more inclined to experience heightened risk for discriminatory treatment. Researchers also found that blacks who maintained strong confidence in the belief in a just world were more inclined than other Blacks to suffer from a larger number of chronic illnesses, and higher blood pressure (Hagiwara et al., 2015). It can be said that individuals with a heightened affinity in association with the Belief in a Just world are conditioned to an extent to experience the outcomes that are in line with varying levels of discrimination. This concept can also be applied to workplace inequality, if one maintains a high belief in a just world, they can be more willing to experience the negative ramifications of discrimination which in the workplace can encompass many components, some being limited ability to promote, decreased growth opportunities, and even lesser wages than equally qualified peers. Oldmeadow and Fisk (2007) found that participants with a high BJW were more likely than those of low BJW to observe a high-status target as more competent. This form of bias can be potentially manifest as hiring managers are reading over job applicants potentially deeming those who are white with a more affluent background as appearing to be more competent considering their seemingly high-status presentation. Within working industries competence is largely evaluated when attempting to determine if someone is qualified for a position. The marginalization of an applicant's competence can greatly affect the pay offered to an individual. Frank et al. (2015) found that individuals who maintain high BJW showed preference to less- retributive systems of compensation. Compensation is an important component of working a job, unfortunately in many cases certain people are not compensated in accordance with what they actually serve

### Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

which introduces the idea that there are factors that introduce the presence of bias i.e. Belief in a just world. Although high BJW appears to elicit a heightened partiality towards certain privileged individuals, groups who maintain low BJW beliefs support the opposite. Wilkins et al. (2014) found that after controlling for variables such as race, sex, and political beliefs, people who low in BJW showcased more support for preferential hiring programs catered to African Americans and women. In certain instances, people whose beliefs are not vested in concepts that people deserve what that receive, they are more apt to consider additional variables that contribute to disadvantaged groups current positions. The belief in a just world opens the door for potential justifications of inequality for people who do not fall under the umbrella of deservingness, leading to major psychological and societal implications.

### Social Dominance Orientation

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) developed from the Social Dominance Theory is recognized as one's partiality towards inequality within specific social groups (Pratto et al., 1994). Past research on SDO has established many of the precedents essential to understanding how individual outlooks on group hierarchies. Prior work has also worked to clearly access how one gauges the privileges and opportunities that should be granted to groups based on the conditions of equality or inequality. Group-based hierarchies are components maintained within each society, these groups can be organized by religion, gender, social economic status, gender, and other social groups that span beyond the "conventional" groupings. When referencing the social dominance theory, there are apparent differences between groups. Men often showcase a greater affinity for social dominance than women (Batalha et al., 2011). People who are high in SDO seek positions that enable them to increase their hierarchical position, and individuals who are low SDO seek positions that diminish their hierarchical positions. Pratto and Colleague

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

(1994) found that SDO was greatly associated with the beliefs in several hierarchy-legitimizing beliefs, but most decidedly anti-Black racism and nationalism. The perception of black people is largely related to social dominance. The findings of this study correlates immensely to the pay inequalities recognized in American culture. Within American society certain people are deemed as ranking higher and there are individuals who rank lower on the hierarchy. The social hierarchy acknowledged in the social dominance theory endorses this outlook immensely.

These hierarchies in society works to explain why people of more status believe that they should be offered more pay or more opportunities while consequentially people belonging to groups of lesser status may that be based on race and ethnicity desire lesser pay. This outlook is especially important when evaluating how minorities have earned notably less than white Americans who are perceived as maintaining higher hierarchical ranks that are consider more superior. Individuals who support elitism (i.e., scoring high in social dominance orientation) displayed partiality towards white job candidates while those who support egalitarianism (i.e., scoring low in social dominance orientation) showed predilection towards black candidates (Reynolds et. al, 2021). Comparably, Dupree & Torrez (2021) found that white evaluators rated white male applicants as more suitable for hierarchy- maintaining roles. Based on the customs of social hierarchy someone might be considered as more qualified for a position based on their group within society which also equates to the increased latitude afforded to someone who is deemed as higher on the hierarchy opposed to someone that is not viewed in the same way.

Belvins & Todd (2021) conducted a study using data generated from the U.S Census to investigate the prognosis of White privilege through the exploration of both from an individualistic and community standpoint. The white men showcase substantial SDO and heightened support for social hierarchy (Belvin & Todd, 2021). It can be said based on the

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

desired interest of preserving social hierarchies' white men may reject occurrences that could threaten hierarchies and fail to acknowledge instances of injustice. Belvin & Todd (2021) found that larger income inequality correlated with heightened white privilege awareness while in contrast heightened white racial homogeneity was linked to lower white privilege awareness. White privilege is acknowledged by many as a built-in advantage that allows for improved advancement in many different environments, one of those environments undoubtedly being industry. The demonstration of white privilege in working environments can include an increased possibility interview callback, faster promotions, dismissal of poor performance and in many cases heightened pay in comparison to their peers. The acknowledgement of the white privilege maintained in workplaces by black Americans could surely equate to the SDO expressed specifically when associated with employment. Rosenbalt (2012) discovered that people who maintain high SDO, have a decreased likelihood of being aware of corruption. This finding can be observed in workplace settings through certain high status individuals ignoring representations of apparent mistreatment of black people due to the internal desire to advance i.e., discrimination, and promotion opportunities. In line external views associated with hierarchies, Internal views also influence the magnitude in which group differences are perpetuated.

If one views themselves as lower on the social hierarchy then they will also believe that their proposed opportunities are in line with their perceived social status despite other considerable variables. These are the instances in which someone could fall victim to injustice, especially when being offered salary for a position. The important implications of SDO as it relates to the extension of opportunities surrounding employment are immense, thus highlighting the importance of exploration.

### **Aims and Hypotheses**

The goal of the present study is to evaluate the impact of the Belief in a Just World as well as Social Dominance Orientation on the pay offered to job applicants. Within the study it is evaluated whether each of these factors increase the likelihood of an individual to encourage someone to take a job position or not take a job position. In this study I hypothesized that people would be more inclined to advise a candidate to take a job that offered higher pay opposed to lower pay initially ignoring factors such as SDO and BJW, and participants' race. It was also hypothesized that participants Belief in a Just world would be related to how strongly they advised either a black applicant to accept a low or high paying job. Meaning, When BJW was high participants would be more inclined to give strong advice to take a job whether the offer was high or low pay. In contrast, it was hypothesized that when the BJW was low participants would be more inclined to give strong advice to higher paying jobs and reject the lower paying job.

When taking in account the impact of social dominance orientation within the study, it is hypothesized that SDO I correlate to participants advise on whether the black application should accept a job whether low or high. It was also hypothesized that when SDO was high participants would show preference towards the white applicant opposed to the black applicant. Lastly It was hypothesized that when SDO was low race would not affect the decisions made regarding advice to the applicant.

### **Method**

#### **Participants**

The participants for this study consisted of 145 students. Participants were recruited from students currently attending Eastern Michigan University. Eligibility requirements for the study included potential participants being at least 18 years of age, and able to provide an informed consent. White study participants made up 66.0% of the sample, 5.3% of the participants stated they were Black. 5.3% of participants stated they were, 4% Identified as other, 2% elected not to disclose their race, and 7.3 % of the sample identified as biracial. Males made up 18.7% of the

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

sample, Females made up 78.7, 2% of participants described themselves as non-binary/ third gender, and .7% of participants preferred not to divulge their gender. Participants after meeting eligibility requirements were informed of important information about the study, risks of participating in the study, benefits of participating in the study, confidentiality information, and data collection measures. Lastly participants were required to provide a statement of consent to proceed in study participation.

### Measures

#### *Belief in a Just World*

Belief in a Just world was measured using a scale adopted from Lucas et al.'s (2011) Procedural Distributed Just World scale. The BJW scale is composed of questions that were 8-items across two factors using 7-point ratings labeled 1 to 7 (1= strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The BJW was created to take in account the extent to which individuals believe in a just world, specifically that the world is an equitable place where individuals get the things that they deserve (Lucas et al., 2011). The BJW measure determines the perception of justice towards oneself as well as justice for others.

#### *Social Dominance Orientation*

Social Dominance Orientation was evaluated using a 7-item scale adopted from the social dominance orientation scale (Pratto et al., 1994). Questions were 16- items across one factor using 7-point ratings labeled 1 to 7 (1= strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The SDO scale was created to evaluate the extent to which someone maintains partiality towards upholding inequality within social groups.

### Procedures

The online study was administered through the Qualtrics system after receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. Participants were then required to complete an informed consent (see Appendix A). Upon reading the informed consent, participants were then requested to electronically annotate that they do in fact extend their consent. Participants who provided their informed consent were then supplied with study information outlining what the present study would examine (see Appendix A). Study participants were then provided character descriptions of a prospective applicant. The applicant description included applicant race, age, university affiliation, organization involvement, and additional job readiness information (see Appendix B). Half of study participants received an applicant description in which the protagonist was described as African- American, the other half received an applicant description in which the protagonist was described as Caucasian. The only differences that remained between the two-character descriptions were protagonist race and the University of attendance for each protagonist, all other details remained the same.

Afterwards, participants were then prompted to read a job offer letter that was extended to the protagonist. Information posed to participants within the job offer letter included, Company Name, Job tasks, job expectations, expected start date, offered salary, position salary range and benefits information (see Appendix C). Half of the participants were given a job offer letter in which the salary offered was \$40,000; the other half of the participants read an offer letter where the salary offered was \$60,000. Within the job offer letter participants were informed that the salary range for the position was from \$40,000-60,000.

Immediately after reading the job off letter participants were asked to answer questions about the candidate, the job offer extended to the candidate, and their advice to the candidate. 14 questions were asked using Likert style anchors (1= strongly disagree to 10 strongly agree). Next participants were asked 4 questions that evaluated to what extent



## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

did aspects about the applicant contribute to his offer (e.g., experience, training, education, and race) on a 10-point Likert style items (1 = strongly disagree, 10 = strongly agree).

After rating their perceptions participants were evaluated on the Belief in a Just World Scale. Participants were asked to answer questions that gauged their perception of fairness as it relates to others (e.g., I feel that people generally earn the rewards and punishment that they get in this world) on a 7-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree). Next, Participants were required to complete a second Belief in a just world scale that assessed participants perception of fairness with the respect to themselves (e.g., I feel that I generally earn the rewards and punishments that I get in this world) on a 7-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree)

Next, Participants were encouraged to complete the social dominance orientation scale. The scale was made up of 16-items that evaluated the extent to which participants believe that level of social hierarchy and or group differences should be maintained (e.g., some groups of people must be kept in their place) rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree).

Participants were then asked to complete a series of demographic questions including race, age, gender, employment status, marital status, political affiliation, major, and amount of credit hours completed (see Appendix D).

Finally, all participants were provided with a formal study debriefing statement that clearly detailed the true nature of the research (see Appendix D).

## Results

Scores on the post applicant job offer survey were grouped according to the types of items on the scale, and how a principal components analysis identified groups of items. That analysis found three factors that accounted for 66% of the variance on the 14 items. The first factor included 10 items that focused on advice to take the job, the second factor was for items concerning issues with the job, and the last factor had other items dealing with a lack of qualifications. As such, three factor scores were created that were average scores on advice to the candidate to accept the job, that there may be an issue with the job, and that the job is one where you might be underqualified.

The advice to accept the job was first compared in a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the effects of candidate race and pay offered as fixed factors. That analysis found no main effect of protagonist race,  $F(1, 147) = .11, p = .741$ , but there was a main effect of pay

### Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

offered,  $F(1, 147) = 12.42, p < .001$ . That effect occurred because participants gave much more accepting advice when the pay was higher ( $M = 6.85$ ) as compared to when it was lower ( $M = 5.74$ ). That effect was qualified by a significant protagonist race X pay offered interaction,  $F(1, 147) = 7.70, p = .006$ . Simple main effect tests showed there was no difference on the lower pay conditions for either black or white protagonist, but there was a difference when in the higher pay conditions such that the black protagonist was given stronger advice ( $M = 7.21$ ) than was the white protagonist ( $M = 6.34$ ). Additionally, the simple main effect for protagonist race was also conducted. That test found that participants gave stronger advice toward the black protagonist when the pay was high ( $M = 7.21$ ) than when it was low ( $M = 5.43$ ), but no differences were found for pay differences for the white protagonist. As can be seen in Table X. that interaction occurred because participants who read about a Black protagonist gave him much more positive advice to accept the job when the pay was high, as compared to when the pay was low, or as compared to a White protagonist.

Table 1.

*Mean advice given to applicants to accept a job when pay and applicant race varied.*

	Black Applicant	White Applicant
Lower Pay	5.43	6.12
Higher Pay	7.21	6.34

Next, a two-way ANOVA was also conducted on if participants felt that they should advise the protagonist about potential issues with the job (Brief descriptor of each item e.g. you or others would be treated differently). Comparing this advice across protagonist race X pay offered found only a main effect for the pay offered,  $F(1, 147) = 4.64, p = .033$ . That effect occurred, because participants saw fewer problems with the job for applicants offered higher pay

### Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

( $M = 3.50$ ) than lower pay ( $M = 4.17$ ). There was no effect for protagonist race ( $F < 1$ ) and no interaction ( $F < 1$ ).

Table 2.

*Mean advice that there may be an issue with the job when pay and applicant race varied.*

	Black Applicant	White Applicant
Lower Pay	4.38	3.92
Higher Pay	3.50	3.50

For the last judgment about the job (giving extra advice), the ANOVA found no defect for pay offered,  $F(1,147) = 1.80$ ,  $p = .18$ , no effect for protagonist race,  $F(1, 147) = .206$ ,  $p = .651$  and no significant interaction,  $F(1,147) = .013$ ,  $p = .911$

In this research the primary focus was on whether or not belief in a just world and social dominance orientation would influence how participants understood the scenario and how they would respond. As such, similar analyses as above were conducted on each of these potential influences as covariates on the advice given.

### ***The Influence of Belief in a Just World (BJW)***

It was hypothesized that participants Belief in a Just world would be related to how strongly they advised either a black applicant to accept a low or high paying job. One way to examine this effect would be to first look at whether or not Total BJW score covaries the ANOVA results above. In the first factorial Analysis of Co-variance (ANCOVA) on advice to accept the job, it was found that Total BJW was a significant covariate,  $F(1, 145) = 20.73$ ,  $p < .001$ , however, the observed differences above remained similar. There still was a main effect for pay offered,  $F(1,145) = 8.84$ ,  $p = .003$ , no main effect for protagonist race,  $F(1,145) = .126$ ,  $p =$

### Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

.723, and again a significant interaction,  $F(1, 145) = 9.83, p = .002$ . Thus, belief in a just world did not have an effect on how participants judged the pay offered, or the protagonist in the essays.<sup>1</sup>

For the main factors of protagonist race and pay offered, only a main effect on the issues with the job variable was found for the pay that was offered as noted above. In order to examine if Belief in a Just World affected these outcomes, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted, where belief in a just world total served a covariate, and the factors of protagonist race and pay offered served as factorial variables for the outcome of issues with the job. For that ANOCOVA, however, the covariate effect for Belief in a Just World Total was not significant,  $F(1, 145) = 2.62, p = .108$ . Only a main effect for pay offered when belief in a just world was used as a covariate was significant,  $F(1, 145) = 6.77, p = .01$ .<sup>2</sup>

Finally, for the extra advice that participants indicated they would give to the applicant, Total BJW was again introduced as a covariate and that covariate was significant,  $F(1,145) = 8.44, p=.004$ . However, again only the main effect of the amount of pay offered was significant,  $F(1,45) = 4.05, p = .046$ .<sup>3</sup>

The results from conducting an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) on the factors accept the job, issue with the job, extra advice, while using the Belief in a Just World total as a covariate showcased that the Belief in a Just world total did not influence the outcomes. The results also indicated that the BJW total did not affect the prediction of outcomes by protagonist race, or the pay offered.

### ***The Influence of Social Dominance Orientation***

It was theorized that Social Dominance orientation would correlate to the participants' suggestions of accepting a position reflecting either a high or lower pay when considering the

### Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

black applicant. To evaluate this effect, the scores on the SDO were totaled to gain a total social Dominance Orientation score (SDO-Total). Then, SDO- Total scores were evaluated to determine if the score covaried the ANOVA results listed earlier in the results. Within the first factorial Analysis of Co-variance (ANCOVA) on advice to accept the job, it was found that Total SDO was a not significant covariate,  $F(1,145) = .72, p = .40$ . There was a main effect observed for pay offered,  $F(1,145) = 11.64, p <.001$ , no effect for protagonist race ,  $F(1,145) = .132, p = .717$ , and again there was significant interaction,  $F(1,145) = 7.80, p = .006$ . Therefore, social dominance orientation did not influence how participants judged the pay offered, or the protagonist in the essays.<sup>4</sup>

When considering main factors of protagonist race and pay offered, the only main effect observed for issues with job was found for the pay that was offered as previously mentioned. To thoroughly evaluate the influence of SDO influenced the outcomes, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted, social dominance orientation acted as a covariate, and the factors of protagonist race and pay offered acted as factorial variables for the outcome of issues with the job. For that ANOCOVA, however, the covariate effect for Social Dominance Orientation Total was not significant,  $F(1, 145) = 1.48, p = .226$ . The only main affect that showcased significance was when evaluating pay offered when SDO was used as a covariate,  $F(1, 145) = 5.45, p = .021$ <sup>5</sup>

Lastly, when taking in account the extra advice that participants stated they would provide the applicant, Total SDO was provided as a covariate once again, proving to be not significant,  $F(1,145) = 3.17, p=.08$ <sup>6</sup>. There weren't any other significant main affects observed.

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Based on the results, SDO total did not have an impact on the outcomes or affect the how the projections were made surrounding protagonist race or pay offered. SDO totals did not produce any significance when being posed as a covariate.

### **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine how the belief in a just world as well as social dominance orientation influence reactions towards pay inequities that impact a specific race. It was hypothesized that participants would advise a candidate to take a job offer reflecting higher pay opposed to one reflecting lower pay initially ignoring factors such as SDO, BJW, and participant race. This proposed hypothesis was supported through the data, participants offered more advice encouraging the applicant to take the job when the offered pay was high opposed to when the offered pay was low. This data finding is consistent with many standard societal beliefs. It is quite conventional for someone to encourage a friend, family member or even a stranger to accept a job where they will be compensated a higher wage. Considering the sample was composed of college students, study participants could have been operating under the pretense that a \$60,000 salary proposition was a very good compensation amount for an entry-level job right out of college. The average starting salary for students who graduated in 2022 is reported to be around \$55,000 (McCain, 2023). This is a major increase from 2008 where the average salary for male marketing graduates was \$40,841 (Gilbreath, 2010). Considering the present average salary for college graduates the \$60,000 proposition was 5,000 more than the national average thus, making it a favorable salary. Obvious preference towards higher pay jobs

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

could be linked to other internal factors. Terpstra (1983) found that individuals are more disposed to accept a job with a high or medium salary opposed to a job with a low salary. The findings of that past research study are supported through present work. Manipulation of pay was quite clear to participants potentially contributing to the blatant support of a position offering more money. Hartman & Slapničar, (2012) found that procedural justice is a more reliable predictor of justice in circumstances where pay transparency is low, and distributive justice is a more accurate predictor of intrinsic motivation when pay transparency is high. This research asserts that when people are fully aware of the amount of money another person is making there are certain inducements i.e., intrinsic motivation to allocate fairness. Despite the obvious prevalence of BJW and SDO within the world, the results of the study indicated that BJW and SDO had no significant effect on the data generated from the study. This finding could be due to many things, one being that study participants did not want to be perceived as prejudice. Sue (2013) found that in many cases when conversations or topics surrounding race and potential racism arise, white people become uncomfortable and quite cautious in what they communicate. This finding correlates to the present research greatly, if participants were afraid to disclose the “wrong” information they would be careful about the potential bias they would exude.

Additionally, data collected showcased that participants were far more likely to provide advice if the black applicant was offered a higher paying job but, in contrast, participants were less likely to provide advice on the job if the black applicant was offered a lower paying job. Study results could be attributed to the outlook adopted by some individuals when interacting with groups that are regularly stigmatized and discriminated against. It can be speculated that there might be a conscious effort to help certain groups and correct injustices when considering the constant disadvantages that certain groups experience. Weeks (2002) conducted a study

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

evaluating discrimination in selection in selection interviews, it was found that prejudice intensity notably impacted trait ratings of applicants and questions posed about applicant's qualifications and competence. Additionally, prejudice interacted with culpability (guilt feelings) and cognitive load to predict hiring decisions (Weeks, 2002). Lastly, it was found that when participants felt the pressure of cognitive load, low prejudiced participants who felt compunction were more likely to hire the black applicant (Weeks, 2002). This finding supports the assertion that individuals who come from groups that experience minimal discrimination in some cases are inclined to show favor towards people who regularly experience negative bias. Hence, the increased advice provided to the black applicant when the pay offered was high. Kirgios et. al (2022) conducted a study that evaluated the benefit of someone explicitly stating their minority identity, researchers found that when racial minorities mentioned their demographic background politicians 24.4% and 79.6% more often (Kirgios et. al, 2020). Based on this data when people are aware of a stigmatized group that are more willing to extend help. This display of helping behavior can be linked to the outcomes of the present study. When the participants acknowledged the race of the applicant, they could have been disposed to assist in any way possible.

### **Limitations of the Current Study**

Although there were many apparent strengths of the study it would be negligent to not acknowledge the limitations observed within the study as well. The principal limitation of the study was a methodical constraint. Applicants that were introduced to study participants were not evaluated in a comparative way. The application descriptions were introduced as only one-character to readers opposed to two characters. Essentially, participants were asked to provide advice on one candidate and whether they should take a job opposed to evaluating how



## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

two candidates matched up to one another. If two candidates had been presented to readers, there could have been a heightened possibility for internal bias from readers to be elicited. Within the current study readers were only required to evaluate one candidate, not considering how this candidate specifically compared to another individual with a different racial background. It can be said that within the present design the nuances of discriminatory measures were not able to be completely evaluated. Study design should have included participants making judgements for both a white and black applicant. An additional limitation of the study is the demographics of the sample. This study was largely composed of white, college educated individuals, and female participants. Due to this limited sample, it was difficult to assess the extent to which other demographics were affected as it relates to SDO and BJW which limited the potential generalizability of results. Lastly, that the sample was composed of college students in many instances it is difficult to assess the presence of prejudice within this group. This could be due to many contributing factors. Colleges in general are quite diverse places. It has been proposed that individuals who have completed more courses related to human differences display a more notable improvement in racial attitude (Radloff, 2010). At many universities including the university participants were recruited to require learning beyond the classroom and exposure to perspective of Diversity as a graduation requirement. The elements as well as the immersive environment of college could have contributed to the lack of representations of bias within the sample.

## **Conclusion**

Throughout this presence research study, there were many measures taken to assess the impact of SDO and BJW. This was done by observing how people make decisions about the opportunities extended to individuals, specifically differences of responsiveness to a person of color receiving either more or less money for a job. Through this study it was discovered that although SDO and BJW did not directly influence the support of rejection of either a higher paying or lower paying job. Interestingly, it was also found that study participants were more

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

inclined to offer advice to black applicants if the salary offered was high opposed to low, and in contrast less likely to provide advice to the black applicant if the offered pay was low.

In conclusion, in this study we attempted to understand more about the perceptions associated with how people are viewed in society either deserving or undeserving of outcomes. We also wanted to gauge how internal beliefs correlate with discrimination contribute to outlooks on salary allocation. Further research needs to fully evaluate the relationship between SDO and BJW, specifically how each of these factors independently alter the perceptions of job applicants. This information could equip the hiring profession with information surrounding the potential personal biases maintained by individuals, allow for the creation of anti-discriminatory training measures, and potential development measures to minimize marginalization of minority candidates in hiring settings.

**Notes**

1. The effect of a belief in a just world total, was also examined using multiple regression procedures. Those analyses indicated that BJW had no systematic effect on the accept the job reports that participants expressed
2. The effect of a belief in a just world total, was also examined using multiple regression procedures. Those analyses indicated that BJW had no systematic effect on the issues with the job reports that participants expressed.
3. The effect of a belief in a just world total, was also examined using multiple regression procedures. Those analyses indicated that BJW had no systematic effect on extra advice with the job reports that participants expressed.
4. The effect of the social dominance orientation total was also examined using multiple regression procedures. Those analyses indicated that SDO had no systematic effect on the accept the job reports that participants expressed
5. The effect of the social dominance orientation total was also examined using multiple regression procedures. Those analyses indicated that SDO had no systematic effect on the issues with the job reports that participants expressed.
6. The effect of the social dominance orientation total was also examined using multiple regression procedures. Those analyses indicated that SDO had no systematic effect on extra advice with the job reports that participants expressed.
- 7.

### References

- Batalha, L., Reynolds, K. J., & Newbigin, C. A. (2011). All else being equal: Are men always higher in social dominance orientation than women? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*(6), 796-806. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.829>
- Black Women & The Pay Gap*. AAUW. (2022, September 20). Retrieved November 2, 2022, from <https://www.aauw.org/resources/article/black-women-and-the-pay-gap/>
- Blevins, E. J., & Todd, N. R. (2021). Remembering where we're from: Community- and individual level predictors of college students' White privilege awareness. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 70*(1-2), 60-74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12572>
- Bleiweis, R. (2022, October 27). *Quick facts about the gender wage gap*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved November 2, 2022, from <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/quick-facts-gender-wage-gap/>
- Carruthers, C. K., & Wanamaker, M. H. (2017). Separate and Unequal in the Labor Market: Human Capital and the Jim Crow Wage Gap. *Journal of Labor Economics, 35*(3), 655-696. <http://ezproxy.emich.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/separate-unequal-labor-market-human-capital-jim/docview/1945121690/se-2>
- Coleman, M. G. (2003). Job Skill and Black Male Wage Discrimination. *Social Science Quarterly, 84*(4), 892-905. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0038-4941.2003.08404007.x>
- Council of Economic Advisers (U.S.). (1998). *Explaining Trends in the Gender Wage Gap*. Executive Office of the President, Council of Economic Advisers, 1998.

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Davidai, S., & Walker, J. (2021). Americans Misperceive Racial Disparities in Economic Mobility. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, 48(5), 793-806.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672211024115>

Dupree, C. H., & Torrez, B. (2021). Hierarchy profiling: How and why a job's perceived impact on inequality affects racial hiring evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 96, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104185>

Frank, D. H., Wertenbroch, K., & Maddux, W. W. (2015). Performance pay or redistribution? Cultural differences in just-world beliefs and preferences for wage inequality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 130, 160-170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2015.04.001>

Frazer, R. A. & Wiersma, U. J. (2001). Prejudice versus discrimination in the employment interview: We may hire equally, but our memories harbour prejudice. *Human Relations*, 54(2), 173-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726701542002>

Gilbreath, K. (2010). Starting Salaries of College Graduates: An Analysis of the 1998-2008 Era. *Journal of Legal Economics*, 16(2), 123-132. <http://ezproxy.emich.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/starting-salaries-college-graduates-analysis-1998/docview/366885367/se-2>

Hafer, C. L., Weissflog, M., Drolet, C. E., & Segalowitz, S. J. (2022). The relation between belief in a just world and early processing of deserved and undeserved outcomes: An ERP study. *Social Sciences*, 17(2), 95-116.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2022.2038262>

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Hagiwara, N., Alderson, C. J., & McCauley, J. M. (2015). “We get what we deserve”: the belief in a just world and its health consequences for Blacks. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*,

38, 912-921. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-015-9652-3>

Hartmann, F., & Slapničar, S. (2012). Pay fairness and intrinsic motivation: The role of pay transparency. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(20),

4283-4300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.664962>

Harvey, A.J., Callan, M.J. Mathew, W. J. (2014). How Much does Effortful Thinking Underlie Observers’ reactions to Victimization? *Social Justice Research*, 27(6), 175-208 APA.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-014-0209-3>.

Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D. T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85(5),

1030–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.85.5.1030>

Mandel, & Semyonov, M. (2016). Going Back in Time? Gender Differences in Trends and Sources of the Racial Pay Gap, 1970 to 2010. *American Sociological Review*, 81(5),

1039–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416662958>

McCain, A. (2023). 35+ college grad earnings statistics [2023]: Average starting salary out of college. *Zippia*.

[https://www.zippia.com/advice/average-starting-salary-out-of-college-statistics/#:~:text=](https://www.zippia.com/advice/average-starting-salary-out-of-college-statistics/#:~:text=The%20average%20starting%20salary%20for%20workers%20who%20graduated%20college%20in,graduates%20from%202015%20to%202018.)

[The%20average%20starting%20salary%20for%20workers%20who%20graduated%20college%20in,graduates%20from%202015%20to%202018.](https://www.zippia.com/advice/average-starting-salary-out-of-college-statistics/#:~:text=The%20average%20starting%20salary%20for%20workers%20who%20graduated%20college%20in,graduates%20from%202015%20to%202018.)

McConahay. (1983). Modern Racism and Modern Discrimination. *Personality & Social*

*Psychology Bulletin*, 9(4), 551–558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167283094004>

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Miller, S. (2020, August 7). *Black workers still earn less than their white counterparts*. SHRM.

Retrieved November 2, 2022, from

<https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/compensation/pages/racial-wage-gaps-persistence-poses-challenge.aspx>

Pager, D., Western, B., & Bonikowski, B. (2009). Discrimination in a low-wage labor market: A field experiment. *American Sociological Review*, 74(5), 777-799.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400505>

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>

Pullen, E., Fischer, M. W., Morse, G., Garabrant, J., Salyers, M. P., & Rollins, A. L. (2023).

Racial disparities in the workplace: The impact of isolation on perceived organizational support and job satisfaction. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 46(1), 45–52.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/prj0000543>

Quillian, L., Lee, J. J., & Oliver, M. (2020). Evidence from Field Experiments in Hiring Shows Substantial Additional Racial Discrimination after the Callback. *Social Forces*, 99(2), 732–759. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soaa026>

Quillian, L., Pager, D., Hexel, O., & Midtbøen, A. (2017). Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(41).

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706255114>

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

- Radloff, T. D. L. (2010). College students' perceptions of equal opportunity for African Americans and race-based policy: Do diversity course requirements make a difference? *College Student Journal*, 44 (2), 558-564.
- Renna, F., & King, R. (2007). The Impact of Racial Discrimination on the Early Career Outcomes of Young Men. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 35(3), 269-278.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11293-007-9070-1>.
- Reynolds, T., Zhu, L., Aquino, K., & Strojcek, B. (2021). Dual pathways to bias: Evaluators' ideology and independently predict racial discrimination in hiring contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(4), 624-641. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000804>
- Rosenblatt, V. (2012). Hierarchies, power inequalities, and organizational corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(2), 237-251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1204-y>
- Tripp, S. and Fadlon, Y. (2020) . Promotions and Race: An Analysis of Wage Returns and Job Satisfaction. *Labour*, 34(2), 176-190.  
<https://doiorg.ezproxy.emich.edu/10.1111/labr.12169>
- Weeks, K. P. (2002). *Levels of prejudice and motivation as explanations for race discrimination in selection interviews* Available from APA PsycInfo®. (619963669; 2002-95021-121).  
<http://ezproxy.emich.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/levels-prejudice-motivation-as-explanations-race/docview/619963669/se-2>
- White, T. K. (2007). Initial conditions at emancipation: the long-run effect on black-white wealth and earnings inequality. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 31(10), 3370-3395.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2006.12.001>



Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Wilkins, V. M., & Wenger, J. B. (2014). Belief in a Just World and Attitudes toward Affirmative Action. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(3), 325-343. <https://doi.org.ezproxy.emich.edu/10.1111/psj.12063>

## Appendix A

### Informed Consent

#### Invitation to participate in research

You are invited to participate in a research study. In order to participate, you must be 18 years old and be able to consent to participate on your own. Participation in research is voluntary. Please ask any questions you have about participation in this study by emailing Dr. Rusty McIntyre at [rmcinty4@emich.edu](mailto:rmcinty4@emich.edu).

#### Important information about this study

Participation in this study involves:

Reading over workplace qualifications, offers of employment, and various rating scales.

#### Risks of this study

Although no physical or psychological risks are anticipated it is possible as part of the research process that you might feel anxious (e.g., from having your behavior observed). If you feel that the study increases your anxiety you may withdraw from the study without any penalties (doing so, however, forfeits any earned research credits from this study). The investigator will protect your confidentiality by making sure all your responses remain de-identified (that is no personal information about you such as your name or email address will be connected to your responses). All research and data collected will be stored on a password protect computer or digital drive account.

#### Participation

Participation in this research is voluntary. You do not have to participate, and if you decide to participate, you can stop at any time.

#### What is this study about?

This research examines how job offer letters should be perceived given candidate qualifications and how these perceptions are moderated by individual differences factors. This study is being conducted at Eastern Michigan University. These materials are experimental in nature and some differences in experimental treatments will occur. As you may know, in some research the procedures are straightforward and provide participants with a high degree of face validity. You may also be aware that some research may involve some degree of deception concerning the purposes of the study, the design of the study, and even what the specific instruments measure. As such, this is one of those latter studies. Please realize, however, any use of deception will be fully disclosed upon completion of the experimental session. The study will last approximately 30 minutes (approximately) and will require only one session.

#### What types of data will be collected?

We will collect data about you including your race, gender identification, sexuality. What are the expected risks for participation? There are no expected physical or psychological risks to participation. The primary risk of participation in this study is a potential loss of

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

confidentiality. Your information, as part of this study, will be collected using an online research website (Qualtrics) and all information within that system is only accessible by the researchers involved in this study.

### Are there any benefits to participating?

You will not directly benefit from participating in this research. Benefits to society include understanding how different groups of people respond to different test information in terms of outcome and attitudes.

### How will my information be kept confidential?

We plan to publish the results of this study. We will not publish any information that can identify you. No personal information about you (e.g., name, id, email) will be included in the publication. We will keep your information confidential by keeping your responses on these materials separated from your last name and email address by using a yoked-survey procedure (after completing the measures, you will activate a link to a second survey that records you last name and email, but there is no way to identify your responses in the first part of the study from the second survey). Your information will be stored in a that only the researchers have access to. That storage will not include your name or email address. Those responses will only be used to award research credits for completion of the study. We will store your information for at least five years after this project ends, but we may store your information indefinitely. We will make every effort to keep your information confidential, however, we cannot guarantee confidentiality. The principal investigator and the research team will have access to the information you provide for research purposes only. Other groups may have access to your research information for quality control or safety purposes. These groups include the University Human Subjects Review Committee, the Office of Research Development, the sponsor of the research, or federal and state agencies that oversee the review of research, including the Office for Human Research Protections and the Food and Drug Administration. The University Human Subjects Review Committee reviews research for the safety and protection of people who participate in research studies.

### Storing study information for future use

We WILL store your information to study in the future. Your information will be labeled with a code and not your name. Your information will be stored in a password-protected or locked file and will be stored indefinitely. We may share your information with other researchers without asking for your permission, but the shared information will never contain information that could identify you. We will send your de-identified information by email and only upon request.

### What are the alternatives to participation?

The alternative is not to participate. You do not have to participate in this research study to earn course credit. If you choose not to participate, your instructor will inform you of alternate ways to obtain course credit.

### Are there any costs to participation?

Participation will not cost you anything. Will I be paid for participation? You will not be paid

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

to participate in this research study. You will receive .5 hours of course credit if you complete this study. If you do not complete this study, you will not earn that credit.

### Study contact information

If you have any questions about the research, you can contact Dr. Rusty McIntyre, at [rmcinty4@emich.edu](mailto:rmcinty4@emich.edu) or by phone at 734.487.2406 (or by cell 734.536.4105). For questions about your rights as a research subject, contact the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee at [human.subjects@emich.edu](mailto:human.subjects@emich.edu) or by phone at 734-487-3090. For questions about your rights as a research subject, contact the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee at [human.subjects@emich.edu](mailto:human.subjects@emich.edu) or by phone at 734-487-3090.

### Voluntary participation

Participation in this research study is your choice. You may refuse to participate at any time, even after signing this form, without repercussion. You may choose to leave the study at any time without repercussion. If you leave the study, the information you provided will be kept confidential. You may request, in writing, that your identifiable information be destroyed. However, we cannot destroy any information that has already been published.

### Statement of Consent

I have read this form. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and am satisfied with the answers I received.

- I give my consent to participate in this research study. (1)
- I do not consent and will stop with participating now (2)

---

## Appendix B

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Please read carefully.

This research examines how well people can match a job applicants' qualifications with the position that is offered to them.

On the next page you will receive a description of a job candidate who has applied for an advertised position with the Google Corporation.

As you read the information about the candidate, please attempt to form a mental picture of what this person is like (e.g., what do they look like, would you hang out with this person). Also, try to form a concrete evaluation of this person's qualifications and judge how well this person is suited for the position they had applied for.

Wht1 Born in San Diego California, Johnathon Wright is a 22-year male. Johnathon Wright is recent college graduate from North Carolina State University (NCSU), who identifies as a Caucasian male. In his time at NCSU he was able to obtain a marketing degree with highest University Honors. During his time at NCSU, he was involved in many student Organizations. He influenced organizations on campus such as the American Marketing Association, Student Government, and the NCSU Diversity and Inclusion Group. Johnathon Wright in his academic career also managed to obtain presidential standing of the Marketing organization. Within his time at NCSU his professors and peers regarded him as Hardworking, Resilient, and Honest. Wright has inhabited many jobs relevant internships at Google, Facebook and Dell Technologies. The references from his past employment history recognized him as a very valuable asset to their organization, receiving high remarks. Overall, this candidate is highly equipped for many entry level positions in the marketing industry.

---

Blk1 Born in San Diego California, Johnathon Wright is a 22-year male. Johnathon Wright is recent college graduate from Howard University, who identifies as an African-American male. In his time at Howard University he was able to obtain a marketing degree with highest University Honors. During his time at Howard, he was involved in many student Organizations. He influenced organizations on campus such as the American Marketing Association, Student Government, and the Howard Diversity and Inclusion Group. Johnathon Wright in his academic career also managed to obtain presidential standing of the Marketing organization. Within his time at Howard his professors and peers regarded him as Hardworking, Resilient, and Honest. Wright has inhabited many jobs relevant internships at Google, Facebook and Dell Technologies. The references from his past employment history recognized him as a very valuable asset to their organization, receiving high remarks. Overall, this candidate is highly equipped for many entry level positions in the marketing industry.

**Appendix C**

On the next page you will be examining the job offer letter that was extended to the candidate that you just read about. Try to evaluate how good of a fit this offer is for this candidate.

Dear Mr. Johnathan Wright,

40931 Striker Street  
Ann Arbor, MI, 48104

RE: Offer of employment

We have reviewed notes from the hiring manager-and- Google Industries is pleased to offer you the position of Marketing Coordinator.

If you choose to accept, you will be tasked with assisting the marketing team with research planning and analysis. Duties could include competitive analysis, sales forecasting, media placement, campaign implementation and compiling reports You will report to Marketing Director Frank Russo. Your starting day will be May 1, 2022.

The starting salary is \$40,000 per year, paid on a weekly basis. In order to make an informed decision, The pay rates for this position range from \$40,000-60,000. In addition, our company offers full medical coverage available through HMO plans. For additional details please visit, <http://www.googleemployment/HRBenefits.com/>).Our company also offers three weeks of paid vacation time that is increased over your tenure with the company.

To formally accept this offer, please sign the attached document and return it to us. We will be in touch with further details.

Sincerely, Bob Smith HR Hiring Manager Google Industries

---

Dear Mr. Johnathan Wright,

40931 Striker Street  
Ann Arbor, MI, 48104

RE: Offer of employment

We have reviewed notes from the hiring manager-and- Google Industries is pleased to offer





















## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

have the  
same  
chance in  
life. (15)  
Group  
equality  
should be  
our ideal.  
(16)



End of Block: SDO

---

Start of Block: Demographics

### Appendix D

Q12 Choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be

- White or Caucasian (1)
  - Black or African American (2)
  - American Indian/Native American or Alaska Native (3)
  - Asian (4)
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (5)
  - Other (6)
  - Prefer not to say (7)
-



## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Q13 How old are you?

- Under 18 (1)
- 18-24 years old (2)
- 25-34 years old (3)
- 35-44 years old (4)
- 45-54 years old (5)
- 55-64 years old (6)
- 65+ years old (7)
- 

Q14 How do you describe yourself?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Non-binary / third gender (3)
- Prefer to self-describe (4) \_\_\_\_\_
- Prefer not to say (5)
-

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Q15 What best describes your employment status over the last three months?

- Working full-time (1)
  - Working part-time (2)
  - Unemployed and looking for work (3)
  - A homemaker or stay-at-home parent (4)
  - Student (5)
  - Retired (6)
  - Other (7)
- 

Q16 What is your current marital status?

- Married (1)
  - Living with a partner (2)
  - Widowed (3)
  - Divorced/Separated (4)
  - Never been married (5)
-

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

Q17 What is your political affiliation?

- Democrat (1)
  - Independent (2)
  - Republican (3)
  - Other (4)
  - Care not to say (5)
- 

Q18 What is your current major (list only 1)?

---

Q19 How many credit hours have you completed?

- 0-24 (1)
- 25-50 (2)
- 51-75 (3)
- 76-100 (4)
- 101-124 (5)
- More than 124 (6)

End of Block: Demographics

---

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

### Start of Block: Debrief

Q20 Debriefing Statement (Please read).

Thank you for participating in this study! We hope you enjoyed the experience. This form provides background about our research to help you learn more about why we are doing this study. Please feel free to ask any questions or to comment on any aspect of the study by emailing the faculty advisor for this project, Dr. Rusty McIntyre, at [rmcinty4@emich.edu](mailto:rmcinty4@emich.edu).

At the beginning of this study, you were told that the purpose was to gain a better understanding of how information plays a role in job offer situations and on your perceptions of those offers given candidate qualifications. As you may know, some studies use deception in situations where there is no other way to conduct the experiment without a level of bias. We are very sorry to say that the current study did involve deception. It was necessary to use deception because, had participants known the true nature of the study, responses would have been likely to change. Specifically, we were examining how participants would perceive the job offer letters for candidates who were either White or were People of Color. Moreover, we were also interested in your responses about fairness and about group stratification within society.

The purpose of this study is to investigate if candidate race impacted the extent to which participants agreed that a low offer or a high offer would be advisable for that candidate. Additionally, we expected that for those people who believe that social stratification in society is desirable, that these people would be more willing to advise a minority candidate to take a lower offer than that for White candidates. We also believed that for people who see the world as a just a fair place, that they would be more likely to advise candidates to take lower pay as compared to people who do not see the world as fair. Admittedly, if there had been a different way to study these processes we would have engaged in those processes. As such, we hope that you will keep the details of this study confidential if any friends or classmates may inquire about it. It is important to note that sometimes people can feel a bit upset, anxious, or even distressed when completing research of this nature. If you feel that you are upset, or would feel better speaking to someone please consider contacting either the Primary Investigator (Rusty McIntyre, at 734 536-4105; [rmcinty4@emich.edu](mailto:rmcinty4@emich.edu)) or contacting the professionals at the Counseling and Psychological Services Center (CAPS) at 734 487-1118; [counseling.services@emich.edu](mailto:counseling.services@emich.edu); or going there directly at 1075 N. Huron River Drive (CAPS is in the new buildings at the North end of EMU's main campus).

The data from this study will be presented in groups in research journals, however we want to assure you that no identifying information will be used. All data will be kept secure, only to be analyzed by trained researchers. Nonetheless, if you feel uncomfortable with this study, your participation in this is still voluntary. If you wish, you may withdraw after reading this debriefing form, at which point all records of your participation will be destroyed. You will not be penalized if you withdraw. You can also feel free to contact the investigator with any further questions. Investigator Contact Number/Email: Rusty McIntyre (734)536-4105 [rmcinty4@emich.edu](mailto:rmcinty4@emich.edu) If you

## Social Thinking and Pay Inequities

want more information about your rights as a participant or want to report a research-related harm, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at (734) 487-3090.

End of Block: Debrief

---

Start of Block: Data use and Credit Questions

Q21 I wish to earn SONA research credit:

Yes (1)

No (2)

End of Block: Data use and Credit Questions

---