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Abstract - English

Important qualities are evaluated when applicants are selected for a job. Despite that people who are excellently qualified are for some reason sometimes not recruited. Recent studies have demonstrated discrimination against women, when it comes to age and family status, as concerns getting a job. The main purpose of this study was to measure whether family status, age and gender affects the likelihood of getting a job, as well as the effects of these three qualities on the offered salary. It was hypothesized that women aged 37, with children are more likely hired than women aged 27, without children. Likewise, women aged 27, with children are more likely hired than women aged 37, with children. Also, no discrimination against men was to be found. A total of 456 participated and 153 of them had hiring or managerial experience. The study was an experimental survey design. None of the hypotheses were supported. Other results added support for the discrimination against younger women without children. Discrimination against older men and men with children was found, which has not been found before. Further research is needed on this subject.
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Abstract - Icelandic


Lykilhugtök: fjölskylduhagir, aldur, kyn, likur á starfi, laun, starf, mismunun
The Effects of Family Status on Applicants Hiring Likelihood in Iceland

A great deal of the conditions people face everyday, involve performances of a variety of tasks and after finishing them, evaluations and inferences are made about the outcome. Anyhow, it is likely that these evaluations will not only be based on the outcome, rather affected by their qualities, such as gender, age, education, family status and so forth (Adams & Heywood, 2007; Ahmed, Andersson, & Hammarstedt, 2012; Cunningham & Macan, 2007; Foschi & Valenzuela, 2008, 2012; Halpert, Wilson, & Hickman, 1993). Discrimination is said to remain if an identical person were to be treated differently because of his or her qualities, and it has been shown in the past years that discrimination against a variety of groups has been growing (Heckman, 1998). That reflects the main focus of the current research, the evaluation of important qualities when applicants are selected for a job.

We might think a lot of things must be taken into account while choosing the right person for a job, for example, education and experience. However, people who are excellently qualified will sometimes not be recruited for other reasons. It has been shown that if employers find one piece of negative information about an applicant it can lead to rejection (Schmitt, 1976). So, what seems to be affecting hiring decisions?

**Gender and Hiring**

Research has shown gender to be a status attribution (Rashotte & Webster Jr., 2005; Wagner & Berger, 1997). Some studies have examined if the performance of applicants seeking jobs, are evaluated differently for each gender (Foschi, 1996; Steinpreis, Anders, & Ritzke, 1999). Steinpreis, Anders, and Ritzke’s research (1999) was the first study to view the impact of the applicant’s gender on how employers evaluated the curriculum vitae (CV) when hiring an applicant. Results showed that both gender participants preferred to hire the man applicant to the woman applicant
even though both applicants had identical CV’s. These findings indicate that females take part in the gender bias as much as men do.

Recent and similar studies by Foschi and Valenzuela (2008, 2012), on the same subject, showed different results, where no effects were found from participants or the applicants gender. Their prior study showed that participants always preferred the more competent applicant, and in their latter study, applicants were evaluated more competent as their grades were better. According to their studies the gender bias might be decreasing or even vanishing.

**Age and Hiring**

Age is one factor worth considering in terms of hiring possibilities, whereas age discrimination might become threatening at some point in everyone’s life. Daniel and Heywood (2007) examined the recruitment scenario of employees in the United Kingdom and found that older employees experienced age discrimination, but, not the younger ones. Similar results were found in Australia (Adams & Heywood, 2007) and in Germany (Heywood, Jirjahn, & Tsertsvardze, 2010).

An internet study by Eriksson and Lagerström (2012) evaluated whether age affected how often applicants were contacted by companies who received their application. Their results showed that the older the applicants were, the fewer calls they received. Even though the average age of applicants was low (34 years), their education differed, which might have biased their results. A study on the same subject was performed in the French financial market and revealed that 25 year old, single and childless men applicants were invited more often to interviews than women applicants (Duguet & Petit, 2004). However, this inequality was reversed when applicants aged 37 were compared. Single and childless women were more likely of getting an interview than men. When applicants aged 37, married with 3 children
were compared, no gender discrimination was found. The possible reason for this could be, that single and childless women aged 37, have a lower probability of pregnancy than single and childless women aged 25.

Family Status and Hiring

In today’s society the number of women in the job market has been increasing considerably. It is estimated that three-quarters of women in the job market are likely to have at least one child while employed, and some women are already pregnant when they apply (Cleveland, Stockdale, & Murphy, 2000). That implies that women as well as men will need to take maternity leave with their newborn baby, which might put their employer in a difficult position. Evidence for the pregnancy discrimination can be found in the literature (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004; Cunningham & Macan, 2007; Halpert et al., 1993), even though maternity leave and pregnancy are protected attributions in many countries (McCabe & Robinson, 2012).

The first study to show remarkable and meaningful evidence for the so-called motherhood penalty was done by Correll, Benard, and Paik (2007). They found that mothers were evaluated less qualified and offered less starting salary, than women without children. Being a father, on the other hand, was never a disadvantage, and was sometimes in their favor. They were seen as being more committed to their jobs than men without children and were also offered higher starting salary. Interesting results showed that childless women were more likely to be hired than childless men, but, were not offered a higher salary than childless men.

A research by Petit (2007) examined if age and family status in the French financial market affected the gender gap and the possibility of getting a job and tenure. Six different applicants with similar but not identical CV’s were used. They were 25 or 37 years, both single and childless, or 37 years and married with 3
children. They either applied for an advertisement or a managerial job, for low- or high-skilled employees. Results from this study were highly similar to the results from the previously discussed study by Duguet and Petit (2004). Again, gender gap for the hiring discrimination was only found against single and childless women aged 25 seeking a high skilled managerial job, whereas younger men applicants were more likely to be invited to an interview and were preferred to younger women applicants in getting tenure. No discrimination was found among those aged 37 with or without children. These results also show the age discrimination, women aged 25 are facing. Petit’s study (2007) should have examined applicants aged 25, married, with 3 children to be able to compare against the same age group without children. Possible reasons for this discrimination could be the high probability of pregnancy, which interrupts their careers while taking maternity leave. Also, the cost of maternity leave for companies in France is high, and therefore, higher for highly paid jobs. Employers might think of the high wage cost their companies need to pay, and hence prefer to recruit the older applicant who is unlikely to go on maternity leave. Therefore, the future family status for women might be affected by their age. In France the fertility rate for women aged 35-39 was only 50%, while it was more than double, or 130% for women aged 25-29 (Doisneau, 2011).

The main purpose of this study was to examine whether having children or not, affects the likelihood of getting a job in Iceland. A study on this specific topic has not been done in Iceland, at least not to the author’s knowledge. Some of the studies previously discussed have shown remarkable evidence for the pregnancy and age discrimination. However, pregnancy is shown to face even more discrimination than age. Therefore, an important question is, whether being young without children after graduation reduces the chance of getting a job? Recent studies on gender also showed
that discrimination against women is vanishing (Foschi & Valenzuela, 2012), however, women still seem to be facing pregnancy discrimination. On the other hand, being a father has been shown to be a positive factor. This study will be focusing on Icelandic people aged 27 or 37, without or with two children, with the same education and experience. The reason for choosing this particular age is mainly because it is possible to be 27 years, have a Master’s degree and still be a parent of two children. If the age 25 were to be chosen, it would be questionable if many people have finished a Master’s degree and also have two children. People aged 37 are still likely to have children even though their fertility has decreased, however, this age will nonetheless be seen as a stability of a family situation. It will also give important information on which quality, age or family status, is stronger when it comes to getting a job.

According to previous studies it was hypothesized that women aged 37 with two children, have better chance of being hired for a job than women aged 27 with no children. Likewise, women aged 27 with two children will, on the other hand have a higher likelihood of getting a job than women aged 37 with two children. Males will not face discrimination, for neither age nor family status quality.

Method

Participants

A total of 456 participants partook in the study. Participants were either students or employed Icelanders who came from a transport company and a bank in Iceland, and a convenience sample was used. Of these participants, 404 answered the question about their age, and 253 (62.6%) of them were between the ages of 21 and 30. Answers about their gender were received from 405 participants (265 females and 140 males) and the same number of participants answered the question about their hiring or managerial experience. Thereof, 252 participants (62.2%) did not have any
experience, whereas 153 (37.8%) had either hiring or managerial experience, or both. All participants had to be able to read Icelandic to take part in the study and they did not receive any compensation for their participation.

**Design and Measures**

The study was an experimental survey design. Eight independent variables and four dependent variables were examined to be able to test the research hypotheses. For clarification, the words male and female are used in the text when describing the participant’s gender, but man and woman when describing the applicant’s gender.

**Variables.** Four of the independent variables were experimental (family status, age and gender of fictitious applicants, and type of job applied for) that were used for the survey CV’s. Each of the experimental variables consisted of two levels and, therefore, a factorial experiment with 16 combinations in total was defined. That resulted in a 2x2x2x2 mixed factorial design, with one repeated variable (type of job) and three between subject variables. Further details of the design are listed in Table 1. Age consisted of 27 years or 37 years and family status of no children or two children. Type of job consisted of a sales job or a managerial job.

Table 1

*Mean Number of Participants Who Got each Version of the CV’s, for both a Sales and a Managerial Job*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Children</th>
<th></th>
<th>Two Children</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Years</td>
<td>37 Years</td>
<td>27 Years</td>
<td>37 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four other independent variables were demographic (gender, age, experience and salary of participants). The experience variable consisted of four
levels: No hiring or managerial experience, hiring experience, managerial experience, and both hiring and managerial experience. The dependent variables were four: Hiring likelihood and offered salary, for both a sales job and a managerial job. The hiring likelihood scale was from 0 (very unlikely) to 10 (very likely). Participants were able to put in any amount of salary they wanted to offer the applicants.

**Introduction letter.** An introduction letter was presented before participants began the survey. In it was information about the survey and that all questions were optional and answers untraceable.

**Curriculum vitæ (CV).** Each participant’s survey displayed CV’s from two different applicants. The former applicant was applying for a sales job and the latter for a managerial job. Sixteen different compositions of CV’s were used, eight for a sales job and eight for a managerial job. The basic information for a sales job, education and experience, was always the same, however, the combination of family status, age and gender always differed. The same goes for a managerial job (see one composition of a CV for a sales job in Appendix A, and one for a managerial job in Appendix B). As the compositions of CV’s were a total of 16 and each participant got two CV’s in each survey, it resulted in a total of eight different survey versions. Each participant only got one version of each survey and it was systematically randomized what each participant got. That is, the first participant to take the survey got version A, the second participant got version B and so forth.

**Questionnaire.** A questionnaire that included a total of eight questions was completed by each participant, which took around 4-5 minutes to answer (the full questionnaire is listed in Appendix C). It included issues such as, the hiring likelihood and offered salary for each applicant, after reading their CV. Background data such as gender, age, salary, hiring or managerial experience of participants, was also gathered.
**Procedure**

Participants took part through a survey link that was posted on Facebook and included in an e-mail that was sent to several companies in Iceland, where people were asked for their participation in the study. The online survey program, Question Pro, was used to collect all data. The survey was open from March 26th till April 1st 2014. The general purpose of the study was introduced in the e-mail invitation, as well as in the survey introduction letter, however the specific purpose of the experiment was not revealed. Participants were told all questions were optional and they could quit the survey anytime they wanted. They were also told that all answers would be untraceable and data would be deleted as soon as it had been moved to the statistical program, SPSS. That was done to make sure no information could be linked to certain e-mails. Participants had to read through two different CV’s and thereafter answer a questionnaire. After finishing the questionnaire, they were thanked for their involvement in the study.

**Data Analysis**

The SPSS program was used for statistical analyses and tables and figures were designed in Word and Excel. Descriptive statistics were conducted to assemble information about participants’ characteristics as well as to see the mean, standard deviations and number of participants, of the hiring likelihood and offered salary for both a sales and a managerial job. Factorial ANOVA was conducted to analyse the main and interaction effects of the experimental variables (age, gender and family status of fictitious applicants, and type of job applied for) and demographic variables of the participants (age, gender, experience and salary), on the dependent variables (hiring likelihood and offered salary). Factorial ANOVA was used to determine the two and three-way interaction effects between the demographic and experimental
variables on the dependent variables. The $p$-value was .05 or less for the results to be accepted as significant by using one-tailed test. For some variables, the $p$-value was accepted as significant by using two-tailed test.

**Results**

Two dependent variables concerned rating hiring likelihood for a sales job ($M = 7.2; SD = 1.8; N = 456$) and for a managerial job ($M = 8.3; SD = 1.4; N = 416$). Sales job applicants got about 1 lower rating than applicants seeking a managerial job. According to Figure 1, most of the participants, or 53.7%, rated applicants seeking a sales job on the hiring likelihood 7-8. Managerial job applicants, on the other hand, were rated on the hiring likelihood 8-9, by 59.1% of the participants. Applicants seeking a sales job got 6 or lower rating from 27.2% of the participants, however, only 9.4% of the participants rated managerial job applicants the same.

![Figure 1. Proportion of participants rating hiring likelihood, for applicants seeking a sales or a managerial job.](image)

*Note.* Possible range for hiring likelihood was 0-10.

Offering salary for a sales job ($M = 402,619; SD = 105,186; N = 436$) and for a managerial job ($M = 525,645; SD = 144,867; N = 409$) were the other two dependent
variables. Managerial job applicants were offered on average ISK 123,026 higher monthly salary than sales job applicants. Figure 2 shows monthly salary that participants offered applicants either applying for a sales job or a managerial job. About 78% of the participants offered applicants seeking a sales job a monthly salary ranging ISK 300,000-499,999. Only 6.4% of the participants offered sales job applicants a salary of ISK 600,000 or higher, and just 5.7% offered a salary lower than ISK 300,000. More distribution was for applicants’ monthly salary for a managerial job. Most of the participants, or 54.8%, offered applicants salary ranging ISK 400,000-599,999, and 33.2% offered applicants a salary of ISK 600,000 or higher. Only 12% offered managerial job applicants a salary lower than ISK 400,000.

Figure 2. Proportion of participants who offered a monthly salary to applicants, who were either applying for a sales or a managerial job.

The effects of the experimental variables, age, gender and family status of fictitious job applicants, on the likelihood of hiring for both a sales and a managerial job are listed in Table 2. Gender affected how participants rated applicants for both a sales and a managerial job, irrespective of their age or family status. That is, women
Table 2

*Applicants Characteristics, and Means and Standard Deviations of Hiring Likelihood Given by Participants, for Applicants Seeking a Sales or a Managerial Job*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sales Job</th>
<th>Managerial Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Children</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Possible range for hiring likelihood was 0-10.

applicants were offered higher likelihood rating than men applicants. The effects of
gender on hiring likelihood were significant for a managerial job, $F(1, 405) = 14.66, p < .001$, and nearly significant for a sales job, $F(1, 445) = 3.54, p = .06$. However, it
did not depend on the age or family status of applicants, how much likelihood rating
they were given by participants for neither a sales nor a managerial job and none of
these effects were found significant ($p > .05$).

In Table 3 are shown the effects of gender, age, and family status of fictitious
applicants, on salary offered by participants for both a sales and a managerial job. The
older the applicants were who applied for a sales job, the higher salary they were
offered. However, for a managerial job, age did not affect how high salary
participants offered applicants. The effects for a sales job were only found significant
for age, $F(1, 426) = 5.268, p = .022$. For a managerial job, age, gender or family status
of applicants did not affect how much salary was offered.
Table 3

*Applicants Characteristics, and Means and Standard Deviations of Offered Salary Given by Participants, for Applicants Seeking a Sales or a Managerial Job*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sales Job</th>
<th>Managerial Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>383,966</td>
<td>87,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>406,909</td>
<td>108,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>390,556</td>
<td>115,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>413,019</td>
<td>107,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Children</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>392,145</td>
<td>79,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>417,157</td>
<td>108,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>395,385</td>
<td>97,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>417,414</td>
<td>121,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Salary is given in ISK.*

The main hypotheses were tested by a three-way interaction between the experimental variables (age, gender and family status) on the applicant’s hiring likelihood, and the offered salary. This interaction was not significant ($p > .05$). In addition, only one, two-way interaction of the experimental variables on hiring likelihood and salary was significant ($p < .05$). This interaction was between the applicant’s age and family status on offered salary for a managerial job and is shown in Figure 3. Younger applicants with children were offered higher salary than older applicants with children. This was reversed when applicants had no children, then older applicants were offered a slightly higher salary than younger applicants without children. This interaction effect was almost significant at the .05 level, $F(1, 398) = 3.690, p = .055$.

**Interaction of experimental and background variables**

The effects of the background variables of the participants, on the dependent
Figure 3. Salary offered by participants for a managerial job, either for applicants who were 27 or 37 years, with or without children.

variables are presented in this section. It can be seen in Figure 4 that female participants rated applicants with or without children who were applying for a sales job, just about the same. Males, on the other hand, were much likelier to hire an applicant with children than an applicant without children, as they rated them higher.

Figure 4. Hiring likelihood of applicants with or without children who applied for a sales job, and were rated either by a male or a female participant.
than applicants without children. This interaction between the applicant’s family status and the participant’s age on hiring likelihood for a sales job was statistically significant, $F(1, 394) = 4.478, p = .035$.

Three-way interaction of applicant’s gender and family status, and hiring and managerial experience of participants, on hiring likelihood for a managerial job, can be seen in Figures 5 and 6. Participants without experience rated men applicants with or without children, almost the same, but rated women applicants slightly differently, favoring applicants without children (Figure 5). Participants with experience, on the other hand, rated women applicants with children higher than applicants without children (Figure 6). Women and men applicants without children got the same rating from participants with experience, while women with children got much higher likelihood rating than men with children. This three-way interaction was significant, $F(1, 394) = 4.851, p = .028$.

![Figure 5](image_url)

*Figure 5.* Participants without hiring or managerial experience rated hiring likelihood for either men or women applicants with or without children who applied for a managerial job.
Figure 6. Participants with hiring or managerial experience rated hiring likelihood for either men or women applicants with or without children who applied for a managerial job.

Figures 7 and 8 show a three-way interaction between the applicant’s age and gender, and participant’s hiring and managerial experience, on hiring likelihood for a sales job. Participants without experience seem to prefer hiring younger to older applicants, which goes for both genders (Figure 7). However, there was more difference for women applicants. Participants with experience showed another trend and rated older women much higher than they rated younger women and both ages of men (Figure 8). This three-way interaction was almost significant at the .05 level, $F(1, 394) = 3.66, p = .056$.

The same three-way interaction as in Figures 7 and 8 are shown in Figures 9 and 10 for a managerial job. Participants without experience rated younger women higher than older women (Figure 9), however, participants with experience rated women of both ages similarly (Figure 10). Participants without experience rated older men applicants higher than younger men (Figure 9). That was reversed when participants with experience rated, they preferred hiring younger men to older men.
Figure 7. Hiring likelihood rated by participants without hiring or managerial experience for a sales job, either for men or women applicants who were 27 or 37 years old.

Figure 8. Hiring likelihood rated by participants with hiring or managerial experience for a sales job, either for men or women applicants who were 27 or 37 years old.

(Figure 10). This three-way interaction was significant, $F(1, 394) = 4.036, p = .045$.

Interaction between applicant’s age and participant’s hiring or managerial experience, on hiring likelihood for a sales job, can be seen in Figure 11. Participants
DOES FAMILY STATUS AFFECT HIRING LIKELIHOOD?

Figure 9. Participants without hiring or managerial experience rated hiring likelihood for a managerial job, either for men or women applicants, who were 27 or 37 years old.

Figure 10. Participants with hiring or managerial experience rated hiring likelihood for a managerial job, either for men or women applicants, who were 27 or 37 years old.

without experience prefer hiring younger applicants to older applicants. This was reversed for participants with experience. This interaction effect was statistically significant, $F(1, 394) = 4.529, p = .034.$
Figure 11. Hiring likelihood for applicants either 27 or 37 years, for a sales job, rated by participants with or without any hiring or managerial experience.

Figure 12 shows that participant’s without experience offered younger applicants a higher salary than older applicants. This was reversed for participants with experience, whereas they offered older applicants a higher salary than younger applicants. This interaction between the applicant’s age and the participant’s hiring or managerial experience, on a salary offered by participants for a managerial job, was

Figure 12. Salary offered by participants with or without hiring or managerial experience, for applicants seeking a managerial job, either 27 or 37 years of age.
Does family status affect hiring likelihood?  

Three-way interaction for a sales job, between applicant’s gender and age on hiring likelihood rated either by female or male participants, is shown in Figures 13 and 14. Female participants rated older women applicants higher than younger women applicants (Figure 13), however, male participants rated younger women applicants higher than older women applicants (Figure 14). This actually is reversed for men.
applicants. Female participants rated younger men applicants higher than older men applicants (Figure 13). Older men applicants got, on the other hand, a higher rating than younger men applicants from male participants (Figure 14). This three-way interaction was statistically significant, \( F(1, 394) = 4.445, p = .036 \).

Figures 15 and 16 show a three-way interaction for a managerial job between the applicant’s age and gender on a salary offered either by female or male participants. Female participants offered younger women applicants the highest salary (Figure 15), the older women applicants were the lower salary they got offered. Men applicants got offered a slightly higher salary the older they were by female participants. It is worth pointing out that this interaction was in a different direction for hiring likelihood (Figure 13). Males offered younger men applicants the highest salary (Figure 16). They offered female applicants a slightly higher salary the older they were, and older women applicants got offered a higher salary than older men applicants. This three-way interaction was almost significant at the .05 level, \( F(1, 388) = 3.088, p = .08 \).

![Figure 15](image)

*Figure 15.* Salary offered by female participant for a managerial job, for either men or women applicants who were 27 or 37 years of age.
Figure 16. Salary offered by male participant for a managerial job, for either men or women applicants who were 27 or 37 years of age.

Discussion

The main purpose of the present study was to examine the effects of the applicant’s family status on the hiring likelihood for both a sales and a managerial job. The purpose was also to examine the effects of gender and age, on the hiring likelihood and the effects of these three qualities on offered salary for both jobs.

None of the research hypotheses were supported. Nonetheless, results for a sales job showed that males were more likely to hire an applicant with children, than an applicant without children, while females rated both applicants similarly. Furthermore, results for a managerial job showed that participants with experience rated women applicants with children much higher than men applicants with children and both gender applicants without children. The participants without experience rated both gender applicants, with or without children very similarly. These findings raise the possibility of a discrimination against people without children, especially women. These results are, therefore, mainly in line with Duguet and Petit studies (2004; 2007) that found support for the age discrimination, young women without children have been facing, and are further support for their findings. However, it is
possible that male rather than female employers do think more of it as an advantage to hire people with children, instead of people without children, because they are not as likely to go on maternity leave in the future. In fact, studies have shown evidence that employers do see maternity leave as a disadvantage (Cuddy et al., 2004; Cunningham & Macan, 2007; Halpert et al., 1993). People with experience might be thinking that it could be to their advantage, to hire women with children, rather than women without children. Especially as the number of women in the job market has been increasing in recent years, and previous studies have found that three quarters of these women are likely to have at least one child while employed (Cleveland et al., 2000).

Moreover, participants without experience rated younger applicants seeking a sales job, higher than older applicants, and that applied to both genders. A similar trend was found for applicants seeking a managerial job, where younger women were rated higher than older women. Older men, however, were rated higher than younger men. These results coincide with prior studies that showed support for the discrimination older people have been facing (Adams & Heywood, 2007; Daniel & Heywood, 2007; Eriksson & Lagerström, 2012; Heywood et al., 2010). Participants with experience showed a different trend, where older women seeking both jobs were rated the highest. However, the same participants rated younger men higher than older men for both jobs. These findings are again consistent with previously discussed studies (Duguet & Petit, 2004; Petit, 2007) and show the same trend as for the relation of the applicant’s family status and gender when participants with experience rated, but these findings were independent of the applicants age. That is, in both cases, older women or women with children got the highest likelihood rating of all applicants, but older men or men with children got the lowest rating. This raises the question if men today are facing age and family discrimination, in a different direction to women?
Additionally, women applicants were offered a higher likelihood rating than men applicants for both jobs, which is not in line with prior studies, which showed support for the discrimination against women (Rashotte & Webster Jr., 2005; Steinpreis et al., 1999; Wagner & Berger, 1997). On the other hand, Foschi and Valenzuela’s (2008, 2012) studies found no effects for the gender discrimination and pointed out that the gender discrimination against women, might be decreasing or even vanishing. Furthermore, according to these results, the gender discrimination that prior studies found evidence for, might be going in the opposite direction, that is, men might be starting to face gender discrimination and not women.

When a salary was offered to applicants seeking a managerial job, younger applicants with children got a higher salary than both older applicants with children and applicants without children of both ages. However, older applicants without children were offered a slightly higher salary than younger applicants without children. These results are contrary to the results obtained by Corell, Benard, and Paik (2007) who found that mothers were offered lower starting salaries than women without children. Possible explanations could be that employers might prefer hiring younger people to older people as some prior studies have found support for (Adams & Heywood, 2007; Daniel & Heywood, 2007; Eriksson & Lagerström, 2012; Heywood et al., 2010). Nonetheless, when it comes to women without children, employers prefer hiring older women (Duguet & Petit, 2004; Petit, 2007), because maternity costs for many companies is high. Thus, if younger women already have children and do seek a managerial job, employers might be more willing to pay them slightly higher salary, because they would rather want to hire younger and fresh people and people who are less likely to go on maternity leave.
A noteworthy finding from this study is that when applicants sought a sales job, the female participants preferred hiring older women to younger women and rated them the highest of all participants. On the other hand, they preferred hiring younger men to older men. When the same participants offered a salary to applicants seeking a managerial job, a relation in a different direction was found, that is, female participants offered younger women applicants the highest salary of all applicants, and the older they were, the lower salary they were offered. Men applicants, on the other hand, were offered a slightly higher salary the older they were. This was reversed when male participants rated, but they rated younger women higher than older women, and older men higher than younger men. Here, it went also in the opposite direction when the same male participants offered the applicants a salary for a managerial job. Women were offered a slightly higher salary the older they were. Younger men applicants got offered the highest salary of all participants, and the older they were the lower salary they were offered. Both genders might be thinking of the advantage of having younger people of both genders at work and having older people that match their own gender. Why could that be, and why does it not apply to their offered salary? This raises the question if both genders could be thinking of this as an opportunity for a partner selection? That is, having less competition at work from the same gender group, by rather choosing older people of their own gender, and younger people of their opposite gender.

The major strengths of the study were the experimental survey design, as well as that many experimental variables were tested. Likewise, all applicants in the study who sought the same job had exactly the same education and very similar experience. That is, both older and younger applicants had the same experience, and had very similar experience that applied to their education. Another strength was that one-third
of the participants had hiring or managerial experience which made it possible to measure decisions made by participants with experience, against those made by participants without experience.

Some limitations of the study need to be addressed. The proportion of females that took part in the study was around 65% and might have biased the total results, since the genders appear to have different views on the questions raised. In addition, it was not possible to examine the response rate, as the survey was put on Facebook and sent via e-mail to companies in Iceland. People did share the link on their Facebook wall or forwarded the link via e-mail to other people in their company. Even though it is a strength to have both participants with or without hiring or managerial experience, it would have given more reliable results if the number of participants with experience would have been similar to those without experience.

Despite the above limitations, the results of the present study add to the literature support for the discrimination against younger women without children. Prior studies have not shown evidence before, for who is taking part in this discrimination, however, present findings show that males and people with experience are those who do take part. In addition, the most interesting results from this study indicate that the discrimination against women might have been reversed. It was found more likely for older women with children than equally qualified older men with children to get both jobs. Based on these findings, further research on this subject is, however, needed, because prior studies have only been showing results for the discrimination against women but not against men.
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Appendix A

CV for a sales job:

Guðmundur Ólafsson
Aldur 37 ára
Heimili: Eggertsgata 50, 101 Reykjavík

Menntun:
Haustönn 2010 - Vorönn 2014: Mun útskrifast með BSc í viðskiptafræði frá Háskóla Íslands
Haustönn 1993 - Vorönn 1997: Stúdent frá Verzlunarskóla Íslands

Starfsferill:
Sumur 2011 - 2013: Þjónustufulltrúi í Íslandsbanka
Sumar 2005 - Sumar 2010: Þjónustufulltrúi í Íslandsbanka
Sumar 1996 - Vor 2005: Gjaldkeri í Íslandsbanka
Sumur 1994 - 1996: Afgreiðslustarf í Sambíóum

Fjölskylduhagir:
Maki: Ég er í sambúð með Jóhönnu Einarsdóttur
Börn: Anna Dís 7 ára, Ólafur Einar 5 ára

Tungumál:
Íslenska: Mjög góð
Enska: Mjög góð
Danska: Mjög góð

Tölvukunnátta:
Mjög góð kunnatí bæði á Word og Excel

Áhugasvið:
Hef mikinn áhuga á markaðsfraði og allþjóðaviðskiptum

Annað:
Frá byrjun vorannar 2012 til loka haustannar 2012 var ég í skiptinámi í viðskiptafræði í Copenhagen Business School (CBS) og fluttum við fjölskyldan saman út í eitt jár. Sumarið 2012 ákváðum við að nota til að ferðast um Evrópu áður en skólinn hæfist aftur um haustið. Ég gat ekki útskrifast á réttum tíma úr Háskóla Íslands út af skiptináminu en sú reynsla er mér afar dýrmæt og hefði ég ekki vilja sleppa henni. Ég lærði þar að auki dönsku og ensku mjög vel. Nú langar mig hins vegar að næla mér í starfsreynslu tengda náminu, áður en ég held af stað í frekara nám. Ég tel líklegt að það verði eitt hvað tengt allþjóðaviðskiptum eða markaðsfraði.
Appendix B

CV for a managerial job:

Guðrún Pétursdóttir
Aldur 27 ára
Heimili: Bárugata 70, 101 Reykjavík

Menntun:
Haustönn 2012 – Vorönn 2014: Mun útskrifast með MBA frá Háskóla Íslands
Haustönn 2007 - Vorönn 2010: BSc í rekstrarverkfræði frá Háskólanum í Reykjavík
Haustönn 2003 - Vorönn 2007: Stúdent frá Menntaskólanum í Reykjavík

Starfsferill:
Haustönn 2012 - Ötímabundið: Starfa hjá Ístak samhliða MBA námi
Sumar 2010 - Sumar 2012: Ístak – Tilboðsgerð og eftirlit
Sumrin 2008 - 2009: Ístak – Verkstjóri

Fjölskylduhagir:
Maki: Ég er í sambúð með Sigurði Jónssyni
Börn: Engin

Tungumál:
Íslenska: Mjög góð
Enska: Mjög góð
Spænska: Mjög góð

Tölvukunnatöta:

Áhugasvið:
Ég hef mikinn áhuga á stjórnun og bý yfir miklum leiðtogahæfileikum.

Annað:
Þegar ég var 6-8 ára bjó ég á Spáni, þar sem foreldrar mínir voru við nám. Við fluttum í framhaldini af því til Englands og bjuggum þar í eitt ár aður en við fluttum aftir til Íslands. Ég er því reipprenndi á íslensku, ensku og spænsku. Eftir að hafa útskrifast með BSc í rekstrarverkfræði starfaði ég hjá Ístak við tilboðsgerð og eftirlit. Eftir tveggja ára starfa bauðst mér að fara í MBA námi og hef ég unnið samhliða námi hjá sama fyrirtæki.
Appendix C

The questionnaire:

Ég vil biðja þig fyrst um að kynna þér vel eftirfarandi ferilskrá. Hún er frá einum af fimm umsækjendum sem komust í áframhaldandi viðtöl um söllustarf hjá auglýsingaskráfstofunni Lexa. Lexa er ungt og vaxandi fyrirtæki og vill tryggja að fagmennska sé ávallt höfði í fyrirrúmi. Lexa leitast því eftir góðum starfskröftum sem eru liklegir til að sinna starfí sínu vel. Það er í þinum höndum að meta eftirfarandi ferilskrá. Lestu hana vel yfir og í framhaldi væri frábært ef þú gætir svarað örfáum spurningum sem fylgja í kjölfarið.

1. Á kvarðanum 0-10, hversu líklegt eða ólíklegt er að þú myndir ráða

Guðmund Ólafsson/Jóhönnu Einarsdóttur til starfa?

a. 10 – afar líklegt
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1
k. 0 - afar ólíklegt

2. Hvað myndir þú bjóða Guðmundi Ólafssyni/Jóhönnu Einarsdóttur í laun á mánuði yrðu hann/hún ráðinn/ráðin?

Sláðu inn launatölú án punkts eða kommu: ____________________________

Því næst vil ég biðja þig um að kynna þér ferilskrá hjá umsækjanda sem var jafnframt einn af fimm umsækjendum sem komust í áframhaldandi viðtöl um stöðu framleiðslustjóra hjá útflutningsfyrirtækinu Satco. Satco er rótgróið og allþjóðlegt fyrirtæki og hjá því starfa yfir 5000 manns um allan heim. Satco leggur áherslu á gæði og áreiðanleika og vill hafa duglegt og afkastamikið fólk í vinnu hjá sér. Satco yrói þér þakklátt ef þú gætir gefið þér tima í að lesa ferilskrá umsækjandans vel yfir og
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hjálpað til við að velja hver þeirra skuli hljóta starfið, með að svara tveimur spurningum um hann.

3. Á kvarðanum 0-10, hversu líklegt eða ólíklegt er að þú myndir ráða Sigurð Jónsson/Guðrún Pétursdóttur til starfa?
   a. 10 – Afar líklegt
   b. 9
   c. 8
   d. 7
   e. 6
   f. 5
   g. 4
   h. 3
   i. 2
   j. 1 – Afar ólíklegt

4. Hvað myndir þú bjóða Sigurði Jónssyni/Guðrúnu Pétursdóttur í laun á mánuði yrði hann/hún ráðinn/ráðin?
   Sláðu inn launatölú án punkts eða kommu:____________________________

Að lokum eru hér fjórar spurningar um bakgrunn þínn sem einvörðungu verða notaðar við úrvinnslu á niðurstöðum. Hvergi er hægt að rekja svör til einstaklinga.

5. Hver er aldur þínn?
   a. 20 ára eða yngri
   b. 21-30 ára
   c. 31-40 ára
   d. 41-50 ára
   e. 51-60 ára
   f. 61 árs eða eldri

6. Ertu kona eða karl?
   a. Kona
   b. Karl

7. Hefur þú stjórnunar- eða ráðningarreynslu?
a. Stjórnumarreynslu
b. Ráðningarreynslu
c. Bæði stjórnunar- og ráðningarreynslu
d. Hvorki stjórnunar- né ráðningarreynslu

8. Hver eru mánaðarlauðin að jafnaði fyrir skatta?
   a. Lægri en 300.000 kr.
   b. 300.000-399.999 kr.
   c. 400.000-499.999 kr.
   d. 500.000-599.999 kr.
   e. 600.000-699.999 kr.
   f. 700.000-799.999 kr.
   g. 800.000 kr. eða hærri

Þakka þér kærliga fyrir þátttökuna, hún er mér mikils vörð!
Eigðu góðan dag/gott kvöld!