

1-1-1985

A Study Of Age Discrimination In Job Hiring

Kim M. Beystehner

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Home Economics](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Beystehner, Kim M., "A Study Of Age Discrimination In Job Hiring" (1985). *Masters Theses*. 437.
<http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/437>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

LB
1861
.C57x
F3
1985
B49
copy 2

A STUDY OF AGE DISCRIMINATION
IN JOB HIRING

KIM M. BEYSTEHNER

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

8/9/85

Date

Kim M. Bergstrom

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

A STUDY OF AGE DISCRIMINATION

IN JOB HIRING
(TITLE)

BY

KIM M. BEYSTEHNER

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1985
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

7/19/85
DATE

Paul E. Paul
ADVISER

7/29/85
DATE

Gary L. Holt
COMMITTEE MEMBER

8/9/85
DATE

Joyce Crouse
COMMITTEE MEMBER

8/9/85
DATE

Joyce Crouse
DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

A STUDY OF AGE
DISCRIMINATION IN JOB HIRING

BY

KIM M. BEYSTEHNER
B.A. EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, 1984

ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree of Master of Arts in Gerontology at the
Graduate School of Eastern Illinois University

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1985

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if age discrimination exists despite the passage of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) (1969). Resumes were prepared which varied on the dimensions of age (i.e. either middle-aged or old) and quality (either highly qualified or poorly qualified). They were distributed to thirty-six (36) graduate students of business at a midwestern state university along with a set of job requirements. Subjects were asked to rate each applicant on a scale from one to ten based upon this information. Results indicated no significant difference between ratings for the middle-aged and old applicants. Findings suggest that ratings were based solely on resume quality. The implications of the results and suggestions for future research in this area were discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my advisor, Dr. Paul Panek, for his time and guidance in helping me complete my thesis. It was his constant support which made this paper possible. I would also like to thank Dr. Edward Marlow, Dr. Robert Meier, and Dr. Foster Rinefort for allowing me to use their students as subjects, Dr. John Rearden for his help in the data analysis and Dr. Joyce Crouse and Dr. Gary Holt for serving on my thesis committee.

I wish to express my appreciation and affection to my family and friends. It was their love, support and reassurance which helped to make the completion of this paper a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Introduction	1
Review of literature	5
Age Discrimination in Employment Act.	5
Employment trends and establishing age discrimination.	8
Programs and activities to aid older workers. . .	11
Purpose	14
Method	15
Subjects.	15
Instrument.	15
Procedure	16
Results.	18
Table 1	20
Table 2	21
Discussion	22
References	26
Appendix A	30
Appendix B	33
Appendix C	34

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Division of resume combinations into groups and ratings received for each resume.	20
2	Results of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).	21

Chapter I

Introduction

In recent years, discrimination on the basis of race and sex has received much attention (Drevenstedt, 1981; Fugita, Panek, Balascoe, & Newman, 1977; Kasschau, 1977; Panek, Dietzman, Burkholder, Speroff, & Haude, 1976; Rosen & Jerdee, 1975), but as the population age 65 and over continues to grow, age discrimination becomes more of a threat. In fact, as reported by Butler (1969) and others, many older adults experience a type of prejudice referred to as "age-ism." In 1983, the older population numbered 27.4 million and represented 11.7 percent of the total U.S. population ("A Profile," 1984; "USA Statistics," 1984). One in nine Americans is 65 years of age or older (McConnell, 1983) and is, therefore, a target for age discrimination in all areas, especially in the quest for employment. In 1984 only 18.8 percent of men in this age group were employed and only 8.2 percent of women in this same age group were employed.

The roots of age discrimination in employment practices can be traced to the late 1800's in the United States ("Developments in Aging," 1984). Such discrimination has been found in employment practices at all levels of skill and income and in both the public and private sector (Sanders, 1982). Age discrimination in

employment has manifested itself in several ways, including: (a) preference for youthful applicants in jobs for which age cannot be shown to be a valid performance factor; (b) discharge of employees at a certain age or under conditions that were not acknowledged at the time of initial employment; (c) limiting promotion opportunities to younger persons; and (d) denial of equal opportunity for professional school or job-training openings to non-youth applicants. Studies show that once older workers become unemployed, they have greater difficulty obtaining re-employment than younger counterparts (McConnell, 1983; Northrup, 1980, Sheppard, 1970.) The general public also believes in the existence of age discrimination in employment. In a nationwide survey, Harris and Associates (1981) found that eight out of ten Americans believe that most employers discriminate against older people and make it difficult for them to find work. In a survey of 552 employers, Mercer (1981) found that 61 percent believed older workers were discriminated against in the employment marketplace. The practice of denying training or employment to persons in their 40s or 50s represents one of the most pervasive and potentially destructive denials of human rights facing our society.

Why are older workers not being hired? The major reasons given by employers are: (a) concern that there

is a significant physical decline which lowers older workers' productivity; (b) that they are more difficult to train; (c) that employers may suffer a penalty in terms of increased pension and insurance costs; and (d) that the older worker is not as adaptable and flexible (Barron, 1971; Drevenstedt, 1981; Sheblak, 1969). When employers were interviewed, however, there was some agreement that older workers are more stable and dependable and do not require as much supervision. They also stated that older workers learn about as fast as younger workers (Sheblak, 1969). A study conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor found that differences in output between workers at various levels are largely insignificant, and that capability for superior performance is not restricted at any particular age group ("Ability is Ageless," 1960). These findings suggest that age does not inhibit productivity. In fact, no statistical evidence has been found which supports poorer performance or productivity with increasing age ("Developments in Aging," 1984). Another study found that older adults are less rigid than younger adults (Panek, Stoner, & Beystehner, 1983). These results imply that older workers would be more adaptable and flexible than younger workers. It would seem that such findings serve to enhance the hiring opportunities of older workers. Unfortunately, however, such has not been the

case. Despite arguments promoting the civil rights of older workers, protection against age discrimination remains incomplete and somewhat ineffectual ("Developments in Aging," 1984).

Chapter II

Review of Literature

This review discusses the development of legislation which is designed to prohibit discrimination in employment based upon age. The impact of this legislation, its enforcement, and programs designed to aid older workers will also be discussed.

Age Discrimination in Employment Act

In 1967, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) was passed by Congress in an attempt to eliminate age discrimination in employment. The ADEA was enacted to promote employment of older persons based on ability rather than age; to prohibit arbitrary age discrimination in employment; and to help employers and workers find ways of meeting problems arising from the impact of age on employment ("Developments in Aging," 1984). The Act was amended in 1974, 1978, and again in 1982. The ADEA was based on several premises, which include: that the older workers' group was a growing one which was having increasing difficulty in finding and maintaining employment; that, when unemployed, persons of this age group remained unemployed longer than individuals of other age groups; and that these problems were attributable to company employment policies (McConnell, 1983; Northrup, 1980). The purpose of the ADEA was the

outlawing of discrimination based upon age, confined to those at least 40 years and under 65 years of age (Northrup, 1980). In 1978, amendments were added to the ADEA which changed the age from 65 to 70 at which private sector employees can be compelled to retire, and removed mandatory retirement age limits altogether for Federal Government employees. The amendments also invalidated provisions in pension and retirement plans in both the private and public sectors that allowed for the involuntary retirement of employees covered under the ADEA (McConnel, 1983; Sander, 1982). The 1982 amendment requires employers to keep their over 65 employees on the company health plan rather than requiring Medicare to take over the responsibility for health costs ("Developments in Aging," 1984).

Section IV of the ADEA states: (a) it is unlawful for an employer to take any personnel action involving an individual in the protected age group because of the individual's age; (b) employment agencies must remove all age criteria from their activities pertaining to employment, i.e., listing job vacancies with age qualifications, failing to refer an applicant to prospective employers because of age, advertising for young applicants, etc.; and (c) labor unions must provide equal representation to persons in the protected age class in all aspects of their operation, including hiring

hall, membership, disciplinary action, and other activities under the organizations control. The ADEA also provides protection to employers by stating that it is not unlawful for employers to base personnel decisions on age, where age is a bona fide occupational qualification (BFOQ) reasonably necessary to the normal operations of the particular business (Faley, Kleiman, & Lengnick-Hall, 1984; McConnell, 1983; Northrup, 1980). Employers are also protected against personnel decisions which result in age differentials where the decisions are based on reasonable factors other than age (FOA). An employer using the BFOQ defense admits that their personnel decisions were made on the basis of age, but attempts to justify them by showing that the decisions were reasonably necessary to normal business operations. An employer raising the FOA defense proports that their actions were based on some factor other than age (Faley, et al., 1984). The executive exemption also protects employers from charges of age discrimination. This exemption states that an executive or high-ranking policymaking employee in the private sector which is entitled to annual private retirement benefits of at least \$44,000 could be compulsorily retired at age 65, simply because of age. This exemption is designed to allow turnover at the top levels of an organization ("Developments in Aging," 1984).

Employment Trends and Establishing Age Discrimination

In the ten years after the passage of the ADEA, labor force participation for older males declined and unemployment rates tended to increase slightly (Northrup, 1980). During this same time period, the older workers' long term unemployment rates dropped slightly in relation to younger counterparts, and the increase in unemployment rates for older workers was less than that of younger workers. The question arises as to whether these differences were due to the passage of the ADEA.

The answer to that question is doubtful since there has been a dramatic increase in the number of employment-related age discrimination complaints filed with state and federal agencies (Faley, et al., 1984). In fiscal year 1979, over 5,000 complaints were filed. In 1980, the total rose to over 11,000; over 15,000 were filed in 1981; in 1982 the number rose to 19,187. This number continues to increase yearly. ("Developments in Aging," 1984).

As the number of complaints has skyrocketed, so has the number of age-related lawsuits filed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). From 16 in 1979, the number rose to 89 in 1981 (Faley, et al., 1984). The EEOC was able to help claimants gain over 23 million dollars in awards during its first two years, as the federal agency responsible for handling age

discrimination complaints.

In order to establish age discrimination, the plaintiff must establish a prima facie showing in an ADEA suit which establishes the likelihood that an employment decision was based upon the employee's age (Faley et al., 1984). There are two ways a plaintiff can establish a prima facie showing. The first is disparate treatment. Under this theory, the plaintiff must show that the discrimination was intentional. If the plaintiff is able to show that the employer purposefully applied terms or conditions of employment which led to less favorable employment consequences for older workers, then a case of disparate treatment emerges. Disparate treatment may be shown by either direct or indirect evidence of intent. Direct evidence in ADEA cases includes organizational policies or procedures in which the employer openly admits treating older workers differently. Mandatory retirement or the refusal to hire individuals over a certain age are examples of direct evidence.

Indirect evidence is evidence of intent by inference. Three strategies for inferring intent from indirect evidence have been used in ADEA cases. The first provides statements by the employer that imply age was a factor in the adverse employment decision.

A second strategy for inferring intent is based on the McDonnell Douglas test which was developed in context

of suits under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This test emerged as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green (1973). In order to establish a prima facie case of discrimination under this test, plaintiffs must prove that (1) they are a member of the protected age group; (2) adverse employment action was taken against them (for example, discharge, demotion, failure to hire); (3) they were replaced by a person outside the protected group; and (4) they were qualified for the position for which they were replaced.

The final indirect strategy involves the use of statistical evidence. Here, the plaintiff submits statistical evidence that those treated less favorably are significantly older than those treated favorably.

The second theory which may be used by the plaintiff to establish a prima facie showing is disparate impact. Here, the plaintiff need not show direct or indirect evidence of intent. Only a showing of the differential consequences of employer actions is necessary. For example, if the plaintiff is able to show a statistically significant difference between the number of old and young employees laid off during a reduction-in-force, then sufficient evidence would be presented for a prima facie showing according to the disparate impact theory.

Several cases exist which provide examples of both disparate treatment and disparate impact (Anderson v. Savage Laboratories Inc., 1981; Giller v. Markham, 1981; Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 1971; Lovelace v. Sherwin-William Co., 1982; Oscar Mayer Co. v. Evans, 1979; Price v. Maryland Casualty Co., 1977). These and many other ADEA cases exist which serve to exacerbate the problem many older workers face in seeking employment.

Programs and Activities to Aid Older Workers

Despite the passage of the ADEA, age discrimination continues to manifest itself in the employment circuit. In an attempt to eliminate such discrimination, the Department of Labor's (DOL's) Employment and Training Administration (ETA) has developed several programs which are designed to aid older workers when seeking re-employment ("Developments in Aging," 1984).

The first of these programs is the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) which is authorized by title V of the Older Americans Act. SCSEP employs low-income persons age 55 or older in a wide variety of part-time community service activities. Program participants work an average of twenty hours per week in activities such as health care, nutrition, home repair and weatherization programs, and in beautification, fire prevention, conservation, and restoration efforts. Participants in the program also receive personal and job

related counseling, annual physical examinations, job training, and many even receive referral for regular full-time employment.

In fiscal year 1983, SCSEP provided a total of 62,500 job opportunities to persons age 60 or older. In fact, three-fourths of the participants were age 65 or older. Over 80 percent of these individuals had a family income below the poverty level.

A second program developed by ETA is the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) which became fully operational on October 1, 1983. JTPA provides job training and related assistance to economically disadvantaged persons, dislocated workers, and others who face significant employment barriers. Movement of trainees into permanent, self-sustaining employment is JTPA's ultimate goal. Funding for JTPA is provided through a title II-A grant and authorizes a wide range of training activities to prepare economically disadvantaged youth and adults for employment in the labor force. Section 124 of JTPA requires that three percent of the title II-A allotment of each state be set aside for the training and placement of older persons in employment opportunities. Only economically disadvantaged individuals who are age 55 or older are eligible for this provision. From JTPA's onset in October through June 30, 1984, approximately 3,500 individuals age 55 and over

participated in the program.

Finally, the Federal-State Employment Service System has also aided older persons in securing employment. The national system of public employment offices offers employment assistance to all jobseekers, including middle-aged and older individuals. Job placement, employment counseling, occupational testing, job development, job search assistance, labor market information, and referral to training and employment programs administered by State and local governments are the services offered through employment offices. As of June 30, 1984, State employment service agencies placed approximately 375,800 individuals age 40 and over. In fact, approximately 102,700 of these individuals were age 55 and older.

In addition to offering services to older workers seeking employment, extensive research has been conducted which outlines issues related to retirement decisions and income. Areas of research include patterns of retirement and economic well-being in retirement, plus psychological and physical effects of retirement. A description of full-time work beyond retirement age and employee benefit plans are also available.

The beginning of age discrimination in employment has been traced back to the late 1800's. In an attempt to protect the civil rights of the older worker, the Age

Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) was passed by Congress in 1967. This Act prohibits discrimination based on age and protects those at least 40 years and under 70 years of age. Despite legal protection the number of age discrimination complaints and lawsuits has continued to grow. For this reason, programs and services have been developed by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration which are designed to aid the older worker in gaining employment.

Purpose

The purpose of the present study is to ascertain if age discrimination continues to manifest itself in employment despite the passage of an Act which clearly prohibits such discrimination. Subjects will be asked to rate applicants who vary on age and qualifications according to information supplied in resumes.

Chapter III

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 36 graduate students enrolled in graduate courses which were required for the attainment of a Master of Business Administration. All subjects were chosen from a midwestern state university.

Instrument

Two resumes were prepared which represented two different individuals who were applying for the job of Manager of Electronic Data Processing Analyst. One resume represented a highly qualified individual (see Appendix A) and the second resume represented a poorly qualified individual (see Appendix B). Each individual was assigned either an age of 40 or an age of 50. Age 40 was chosen to represent the middle-aged worker because approximately 95 percent of individuals between the ages of 35 and 44 are employed (Atchley, 1985), suggesting that labor force participation is relatively high for those individuals 40 years of age. For both men and women, however, labor force participation begins to decline at age 50. Therefore, age 50 was chosen to represent the old applicant since it appears that discrimination may begin at this age. A rating sheet including instructions also accompanied each set of resumes (see Appendix C).

A preliminary rating session was conducted using 29 undergraduate students enrolled in an upper-division business course at a midwestern state university. The pilot rating session was performed to assure that the two resumes were clearly distinguishable according to the applicants' qualifications. Age was omitted from the pilot resumes to avoid any confounding on the basis of age. A correlated t-test was computed using the ratings of the two pilot resumes. A significant difference between the two resume qualities was found (t (28) = 4.91, p < .001). After the pilot rating, age was randomly added to each of the two resumes. Each applicant was alternately assigned an age of 40 or 50.

Procedure

A package containing a rating sheet and two resumes was distributed to each of the 36 subjects. Each subject randomly received a combination of an old, highly qualified applicant and an old, poorly qualified applicant; an old, highly qualified applicant and a middle-aged, poorly qualified applicant; a middle-aged, highly qualified applicant and a middle-aged, poorly qualified applicant; or a middle-aged, highly qualified applicant and an old, poorly qualified applicant. After distribution, job requirements, which were education and experience in management, as well as training in data processing and computer technology, were read to the

class. Each subject was then asked to rate each applicant on a scale from one to ten, according to these requirements and judging by the information supplied in each resume. A rating of one indicated least qualified, and a rating of ten indicated most qualified.

Chapter IV

Results

Before analysis could be performed, the resumes were divided into groups according to age and quality combinations. Table 1 shows the group divisions and the ratings given to each resume by each subject. Group 1 was comprised of middle-aged highly qualified and middle-aged, poorly qualified individuals. The combination of middle-aged, highly qualified and old, poorly qualified individuals formed Group 2. Group 3 represented the old, highly qualified and middle-aged, poorly qualified individuals combination. The final group consisted of resumes for the old, highly qualified and old, poorly qualified individuals. Division into groups allowed for an analysis of the relationship between resume quality, age, and rating. Each group contained nine subjects who each rated two resumes, giving a total of eighteen ratings per group.

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was computed using group and resume quality (type) as independent variables and ratings as the dependent variable. These results can be found in Table 2. A significant main effect was found for resume quality, $F(1,32)=74.702$, $p < .001$. The main effect for group and the interactions of rating X group, group X type and rating X type/group were not significant ($p > .05$).

The present findings suggest that age discrimination does not exist in job hiring when college students, who, after attaining their degree, will perform personnel selection, are asked to make a hiring decision. Not only is age viewed as an insignificant indicator of job performance, but the interaction of age and resume quality is also seen as insignificant. That is, there was no significant difference in ratings for each resume despite the age of the applicant. The only attribute which contributed significantly to the selection decision was the applicant's qualifications, without regard for age.

Table 1

Ratings		
Group (n=9)	Resume A	Resume B
1	9	6
	7	5
	9	1
	10	6
	6	7
	9	1
	10	2
	8	5
	10	4
2	8	3
	8	4
	10	1
	9	5
	9	6
	8	5
	9	7
	9	6
	9	2
3	6	4
	9	7
	9	8
	9	5
	8	4
	6	4
	7	4
	8	2
	5	8
4	10	1
	8	8
	8	5
	8	4
	8	3
	8	3
	8	3
	10	8
	7	5

Table 2

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Type	1	260.681	260.681	74.702 *
Age	3	0.708	0.236	0.088
Type X Age	3	14.153	4.718	1.352
Subject X Age	32	86.111	2.691	
Subject X Type/Age	32	111.667	3.490	
Total	71			

* $p < .001$

Chapter V

Discussion

The present findings are encouraging as the attempt to eliminate age discrimination continues. The study strongly indicates that since the passage of the ADEA, age discrimination in job hiring has decreased. The applicant's job qualifications appear to be the major factors affecting a choice between two applicants. No regard is given to age.

If, in fact, age does not influence the job hiring decision, why do state and federal agencies continue to receive an increasing number of complaints concerning age discrimination in employment? Perhaps the passage of the ADEA is the major factor influencing such an increase. Prior to the passage of the ADEA, no law existed which prohibited discriminating against employees on the basis of age. The enactment of the ADEA provided legal protection for employees who felt they were discriminated against because of age. As a result, complaints and/or lawsuits would prove to be a fruitless attempt. The ADEA provided the grounds to make such appeals legally sound. An employment-related complaint or lawsuit could now provide claimants with the awards they rightly deserve.

Perhaps age discrimination in job hiring has not decreased since the passage of the ADEA and, therefore,

the number of complaints and lawsuits have increased. Although the present study found that the decision of personnel selection was not influenced by age, such findings may be a reflection of the experimental design used. The results clearly show that the hiring decision was based on applicant qualifications. Perhaps the use of two applicants who were so clearly distinguishable with regard to qualifications, left the rater with no choice except the obvious. That is, the only decision which could be made would be to hire the highly qualified individual, regardless of age.

The absence of age discrimination in the present study may also be a reflection of an inadequate age difference between the two applicants. A ten year age difference may not be viewed as a threat to employee productivity. Both applicants may have been viewed as middle-aged or old, depending on the rater's own judgement of age.

In an attempt to eliminate uncertainties due to qualifications and age difference, the use of a Latin Square design may be more appropriate. The present study was unable to use such a design due to the availability of only a small sample size. Since the Latin Square design would allow one to use a greater number of levels of resume quality and age, a large number of subjects would be needed in order to distribute all possible

combinations. Had this been possible, three levels of quality and age could have been used as opposed to two levels of each. For example, three levels of qualifications may be poor qualifications, average qualifications, and above average qualifications. In addition, age could be divided into young, middle-aged, and old with a greater difference between each level. These changes would allow for a more evenly balanced design as opposed to the abrupt degrees presented in the current design. As a result, the hiring decision may be influenced by the second factor of age.

One last explanation for the results which were obtained in the present study may be the use of college students as subjects. Perhaps these individuals have not yet formed age biases. Although the age of the students ranged from approximately 22 years to 35 years of age, perhaps the lack of actual personnel selection experience resulted in the absence of age bias. It could be that age bias forms only after participating in direct hiring decisions, and that the subjects in the present study will also form such a bias in future job decisions. As Panek and Merluzzi (1983) reported, it appears that students do not manifest the same forms of bias toward the aged that professionals do. The use of actual personnel supervisors may be more indicative of such a bias.

Whatever the reason for the absence of age discrimination in the present study, it appears that further investigation is needed before a definite conclusion can be reached. Replication of the study, using a larger sample size and, perhaps, some of the changes noted previously, may produce the same results, i.e., the absence of age discrimination. If this is the case, then one may begin to conclude that the rate of age discrimination is decreasing. Perhaps the passage of the ADEA was effective in eliminating age discrimination in the labor force. If, however, similar studies indicate that age discrimination is still in existence, then one may conclude that the previously noted weaknesses of the present study may have contributed significantly to the absence of age discrimination. Until replication of the present study is possible, however, the question of whether age discrimination continues to influence personnel selection will still exist.

References

- Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, 4, 29
U.S.C. 621-634 (1976).
- American Association of Retired Persons. (1984). A
Profile of older Americans. Washington, D.C.:
Author.
- Anderson v. Savage Laboratories, Inc., 675 F.2d 1221
(11th Cir. 1981)
- Atchley, R.C. (1985). Social forces and aging. Belmont,
CA: Wadworth Publishing Company.
- Barron, M.L. (1971). Minority group characteristics of
the aged in American society. In C.B. Vedder
(Ed.), Gerontology: A book of readings (pp.
96-111). Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Butler, R.D. Age-ism: Another form of bigotry. The
Gerontologist, 9, 1969, 243-246.
- Drevenstedt, J. Age bias in the evaluation of
achievement: What determines? Journal of
Gerontology, 36, 1981, 453-454.
- Faley, R.H., Kleiman, L.S., & Lengnick-Hall, M.L. Age
discrimination and personnel psychology: A review
and synthesis of the legal literature with
implications for future research. Personnel
Psychology, 37, 1984, 327-350.

Fugita, S.S., Panek, P.E., Balscoe, L.L., & Newman, I.

Attractiveness, level of accomplishment, sex of rater, and the evaluation of feminine competence. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 8, 1977, 1-11.

Geller v. Markham, 635 F.2d 1027 (2d Cir. 1980).

Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 401 U.S. 424 (1971).

Harris, L., and Associates. (1981). Aging in the eighties: America in transition. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Aging.

Kasschau, P.L. Age and race discrimination reported by middle-age and older persons. Social Forces, 55, 1977, 728-742.

Lovelace v. Sherwin-Williams Co., 681 F.2d 230 (4th Cir. 1982).

McConnell, S.R. (1983). Age discrimination in employment. In H.S. Parnes (Ed.), Policy issues in work and retirement (pp. 159-196). Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

McDonnell Douglas Corp v. Green, 411 U.S. 792 (1973).

Mercer, W.M. (1981). Employer attitudes: Implications of an aging work force. New York, NY: William M. Mercer, Inc.

Northrup, J.P. (1980). Old age, handicapped and Vietnam-era antidiscrimination legislature. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Oscar Mayer Co. v. Evans, 441 U.S. 792 (1973).

Panek, P.E., & Merluzzi, T.V. Influence of client age on counselor trainees' assessment of case material. Teaching of Psychology, 10, 1983, 227-228.

Panek, P.E., Stoner, S.B., & Beystehner, K.M. Behavioral rigidity in young and old adults. The Journal of Psychology, 114 1983, 199-206.

Panek, P.E., Deitchman, R., Burkholder, J.H., Speroff, T., & Haude, R.H. Evaluation of feminine professional competence as a function of level of accomplishment. Psychological Reports, 38, 1976, 875-880.

Price v. Maryland Casualty Co., 561 F.2d 609 (5th Cir. 1977).

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T.H. Effects of employees sex and threatening versus pleading appeals on managerial evaluations of grievances. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 1975, 442-445.

Sander, D. Age discrimination in employment: Counselor responsibilities. Counselor Education and Supervision, 21, 1982, 213-217.

Sheblak, V. The older worker: Employment and training. Training and Development Journal, 23, 1969, 4-8.

Sheppard, H.L. (1970). On age discrimination. In H.L. Sheppard (Ed.), Toward an Industrial Gerontology, (pp. 99-109). Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Special Committee on Aging United States Senate. (1984).

Developments in aging: 1984 volume 1 (S. Rept. 99-5). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Special Committee on Aging United States Senate. (1984).

Developments in aging: 1984 volume 2 - appendixes (S. Rept. 99-5). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (1984). USA statistics in brief. Washington, D.C.: Author. U.S. Department of Labor. (1960). Ability is ageless: A guide to action. Washington, D.C.: Author.

APPENDIX A

Resume of

Resume A

J. L. Glanville
 200 Montgomery Ave. W.
 Philadelphia, PA 19122
 215/622-6070

Occupational Objective A position as Manager of Electronic Data Processing Analysts where my experience and managerial skills can be used to full advantage; a position with challenge and growth potential.

Experience Highlights GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., San Francisco, CA

1981 to Present Manager, Systems Development. Manage department of 42 systems analysts and programmers, including several operations research analysts. Department organized in project groups of 3 to 10 people. Responsible for management consulting services in EDP information systems, operations research, organization, network scheduling and procedures for all functions of the company and its subsidiaries, including Research & Development, Marketing, Manufacturing and Finance.

GECO emphasizes use of the computer in Research and Development and Marketing, in addition to Business Information Systems of Financial and Manufacturing application. Approach has been responsive to managers' requests for information.

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., San Francisco, CA

1979 to 1981 Marketing Development Program Trainee. Attended an intensive training program in computer technology and sales techniques and presentations. Had practical field experience at a General Electric customer site in developing on accounts receivable computer application highly approved by top management. Site tasks included flowcharting, programming, documenting and selling top management on our system. Made GE-115 demonstrations for our computer salesmen.

SOCONY MOBIL OIL COMPANY, New York, NY

Resume of J.L. Glanville (cont.)

1978 to 1979 Price and Billing Clerk. Prepared invoices to international and domestic affiliates, the United States Government, and domestic customers for crude and refined oil products. Originated all allowances, credits, and commissions applicable to the invoices. Assisted in the various details involved in the preparation of the company Profit and Loss Statement.

ERNST & ERNST, Denver, CO

1977 to 1978 Junior Accountant (auditor). Assisted in the compilation of information for expressing an opinion on financial statements, and assisted in the tax returns for individuals, partnerships and corporations.

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., New York, NY

1976 to 1977 Contract Administration Supervisor and Instructor. Personally planned, structured and developed a full time, 3 week course in Contract Administration, including creation of syllabus, text material, lecture outlines, case problems, visual and other teaching aids. Embodied coverage in contract law, cost principles, program evaluation and review techniques, critical path methods, learning curve techniques, modifications, terminations and other related subjects. Graduated over 100 contract supervisors yearly.

Education Drexel Institute of Technology, BS Degree in Business Administration, 1963. Temple University, MBA Degree in Industrial Management, 1973. SK&F Management Training Program, 2 weeks, given to key managers by outside consultants, 1976. IBM course in Advanced System Design, 1410/1401 programming, S/360, operating system, COBOL. Several other graduate level courses and seminars.

Personal Interests Camping, snow and water skiing, tennis, bicycle riding, and photography.

Outside Interest Membership Chairman - Data Processing Management Association, North Bay Counties Chapter.

Resume of J.L. Glanville (cont.)

Personal
Data

Born: February 24, 1945
Height: 5 feet 8 inches
Weight: 145 lbs.
Health: Excellent
Status: Married - four children
Hobbies: Music, racquetball, tennis
Residence: Will relocate

References Will be furnished on request

November 1984

APPENDIX B

Resume of

Resume B

R. W. Angell
80 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Occupational Objective A position as Manager of Electronic Data Processing Analysts where my experience and managerial skills can be used to full advantage; a position with challenge and growth potential.

Experience Highlights DATA PROCESSING INFORMATION SERVICE,
Chicago, IL

Part-time Data Processing Assistant. Worked in and different departments of company until I became general assistant in this major installation with all types of equipment and computers. Able to handle many different projects as contracted.

Education University of Chicago. BS Degree in Industrial Management, June 1970. Undergraduate course in industrial management designed for students who combine aptitude for science and engineering, with effective administrative qualities. Emphasis on analysis of business problems and on understanding managerial principles. Senior Thesis "Programming in Business Management." Ranked in upper sixth in graduating class of 250. College expenses financed through family allowance.

Personal Interests Interested in politics, member of local political club. Helping in community welfare organizations, and art collecting.

Outside Interests Data Processing Management Association, Park Ridge, IL.

Personal Data Born: March 7, 1935
Height: 5 feet 6 inches
Weight: 136 lbs.
Health: Excellent health
Status: Single
Hobbies: Tennis, and raquetball
Residence: Will relocate

References Will be furnished on request.

APPENDIX C

Each of the applicants are applying for the job of Manager of Electronic Data Processing Analysts. This job requires education and experience in management, as well as training in data processing and computer technology.

According to these requirements, rate each of the applicants from 1 to 10 (1 = least qualified, 10 = most qualified), judging by the information supplied in the resume.

RESUME A: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

RESUME B: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10