

RADAR

Research Archive and Digital Asset Repository

OXFORD
BROOKES
UNIVERSITY

Ulrike Fasbender and Mo Wang

Negative attitudes toward older workers and hiring decisions: Testing the moderating role of decision-makers' core self-evaluations, *Frontiers in Psychology* (2017)

DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02057

This version is available: <https://radar.brookes.ac.uk/radar/items/e67b75c9-b204-4990-a2ce-0642ec93d238/1/>

Available on RADAR: 13.01.2017

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's accepted version.

1 Running Head: HIRING DECISIONS ABOUT OLDER PEOPLE

2

3 Negative Attitudes toward Older Workers and Hiring Decisions:

4 Testing the Moderating Role of Decision Makers' Core Self-evaluations

5

6 Ulrike Fasbender¹ and Mo Wang²

7

8 ¹Oxford Brookes University

9 ²University of Florida

10

11 Authors' Note

12 Ulrike Fasbender, Oxford Brookes University, Centre for Diversity Policy Research
13 and Practice, Oxford, UK; Mo Wang, Department of Management, Warrington College of
14 Business Administration, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA; Mo Wang's work
15 on this article was supported in part by the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the
16 Humanities and Social Sciences and research grants from the National Natural Science
17 Foundation of China (71571118 and Key Program 71132003).

18

19 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ulrike Fasbender,
20 Centre for Diversity Policy Research and Practice, Oxford Brookes University, United
21 Kingdom, Business School, Wheatley Campus, Oxford OX33 1HX, Email:
22 u.fasbender@brookes.ac.uk, Phone: +44 (0)1865 48 5465

1 mechanisms. For example, a field study by Lu, Kao, and Hsieh (2011) showed that positive
2 attitudes toward older workers were positively related to managers' intention to hire older
3 people. Further, experimental research by Krings, Sczesny, and Kluge (2011) revealed that
4 participants, who had more favorable attitudes toward older workers (i.e., high competence)
5 were more likely to suggest an older applicant for a job interview. However, these studies
6 neglect the role that decision-makers' self-concept plays during the hiring process.

7 Taking this into account, we argue that decision-makers' core self-evaluations –
8 defined as a fundamental, bottom-line assessment of one's ability, merit and efficacy (Judge,
9 Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003) – is a positive self-concept and can buffer the impact of
10 negative attitudes toward older workers on decision-makers' avoidance tendencies, which in
11 turn can determine their actual hiring decisions. Although the idea that decision-makers' self-
12 concept and social identity can jointly influence hiring decisions has been highlighted before
13 (Lewis & Sherman, 2003), no study has examined how core self-evaluations may interfere the
14 relationship between negative attitudes toward older workers and avoidance of hiring older
15 people.

16 To address this research gap, we investigate negative attitudes toward older workers in
17 hiring decisions and examine the moderating role of core self-evaluations. In particular, we
18 make two contributions to the literature. First, we explore the process of age discrimination in
19 hiring by disentangling discriminatory attitudes, intentions, and behavior. In particular, we
20 reveal avoidance tendencies as a mediator between negative attitudes toward older workers
21 and hiring decision. Second, we test the moderating role of decision-makers' core self-
22 evaluations in buffering the negative impact of age-related negative attitudes in the
23 workplace. As most research demonstrates the problem of discriminatory behavior rather than
24 to facilitate its prevention, identifying potential moderators is essential in challenging age
25 discrimination in hiring. As a result, our study has important implications to organizational

1 practice in terms of training and development of decision-makers with regard to their self-
2 concept.

3 **Theoretical Background**

4 **Hiring Decisions about Older People**

5 Because chances of being hired are lower for older people, researchers have been
6 searching for potential factors and circumstances to counter disadvantages that older people
7 have to face in hiring. Previous research has mainly investigated environmental circumstances
8 influencing employers' hiring decisions about older people (Earl, Taylor, & McLoughlin,
9 2015). As such, scholars have indicated that experienced difficulties in recruiting or labor
10 shortages in general are likely to facilitate hiring older people (Taylor, McLoughlin, Brooke,
11 Di Biase, & Steinberg, 2013). On the other hand, high cost pressure is likely to lower older
12 people's hiring chances as that has been found to lower the probabilities for older workers to
13 receive training and development (e.g., Erber & Danker, 1995; Loretto & White, 2006). Also,
14 legal approaches (i.e., stronger age discrimination laws at the state level) aiming at improving
15 equal opportunities for younger and older people have been found to be rather dysfunctional
16 for older people in times of low labor demands (i.e., economic recession) (Neumark &
17 Button, 2014). Therefore, research needs to continue its search for relevant factors underlying
18 hiring decisions about older people. In the current study, we investigate negative attitudes
19 toward older workers in hiring decisions and highlight the moderating role of core self-
20 evaluations. Based on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and the core self-
21 approach (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997), we argue that hiring decisions are not only about
22 finding the most suitable candidate for a certain job vacancy, but also about one's internal
23 evaluation of the potential consequences of the hiring decision for one's self-concept.

24 **Negative Attitudes toward Older Workers and Hiring Decisions**

25 According to the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), behavior (i.e., the hiring
26 decision) is determined by intention (i.e., the hiring intention) as the most proximal predictor,

1 which in turn is entirely influenced by attitudes, norms and perceived behavioral control
2 toward the behavior. Ajzen's theory of planned behavior is a well-established conceptual
3 framework that has been frequently used to explain hiring decisions about members of
4 discriminated groups (e.g., Ang, Ramayah, & Amin, 2015; Araten-Bergman, 2016; Lu et al.,
5 2011). In particular, attitudes (i.e., negative attitudes toward older workers) have been
6 highlighted as important mechanism to influence the decision-making process of hiring older
7 people (e.g., Posthuma & Campion, 2009; Truxillo et al., 2015).

8 In the hiring context, attitude reflects decision-makers' affective or cognitive
9 evaluation of the hiring targets (e.g., older people). For example, one decision-maker may
10 think older workers are harder to train for jobs; whereas another might believe older people
11 are more dependable at work (Fasbender, 2016). Further, it is assumed that one's positive
12 attitudes lead to approach, whereas one's negative attitudes lead to avoid certain behaviors,
13 such as hiring older people. This notion is partly supported by Lu et al. (2011), who found
14 that managers' positive attitudes toward older workers were positively related to their
15 intention to hire older people as opposed to avoid hiring them. Avoidance of hiring older
16 people can be conceptualized as the intention not to hire older people, which eventually leads
17 to an actual decision of not hiring a particular older person. Meta-analytical findings reveal
18 that negative attitudes are more powerful in predicting important behavioral outcomes than
19 positive attitudes do (Meisner, 2012). We therefore propose that negative attitudes toward
20 older workers are likely to increase decision-makers' avoidance tendencies of hiring older
21 people. In turn, it is likely that avoidance tendencies result in actual behavior, such as
22 selecting younger candidates instead of equally qualified older candidate in the hiring
23 situation. To sum up, our first two hypotheses read:

24 *H1: Negative attitudes toward older workers are positively related to avoidance of*
25 *hiring older people.*

1 *H2: Avoidance of hiring older people is negatively related to the likelihood of*
2 *selecting the equally qualified oldest candidate in the hiring situation.*

3 Having introduced avoidance tendencies as the underlying mechanism, we draw a link
4 between negative attitudes toward older workers and selecting the oldest candidate in the
5 hiring situation. Taking Hypotheses 1 and 2 together, we assume that there is a negative
6 relationship between negative attitudes toward older workers and selection likelihood, which
7 is expected to be mediated by avoidance of hiring older people. Previous research partly
8 supports this notion. Early research by Perry, Kulik, and Bourhis (1996) found that bias
9 against older workers was related to lower evaluation of an older applicant among business
10 students. Similarly, Krings et al. (2011) showed that biased beliefs about older workers led to
11 age discrimination at selection among business students and also among HR professionals.
12 These studies point at a negative relationship between negative attitudes toward older workers
13 and selection likelihood. However, based on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), we
14 argue that the hiring decision is not directly undertaken but intended prior to the actual
15 decision. Thus, we propose an indirect effect of negative attitudes toward older workers and
16 selection likelihood via avoidance of hiring older people.

17 *H3: There is a negative relationship between negative attitudes toward older workers*
18 *and the likelihood of selecting the equally qualified oldest candidate in the hiring*
19 *situation, which is mediated by avoidance of hiring older people.*

20 **Core Self-evaluations as Moderator**

21 Core self-evaluations can be defined as a positive self-concept referring to basic
22 conclusions that individuals hold about themselves (Judge & Bono, 2001). Initially, Judge,
23 Locke, and Durham (1997) have introduced core self-evaluations as a superordinate construct
24 capturing self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability
25 traits. Based on Cattell's personality theory (1965), these traits were identified following three
26 important criteria: evaluation-focus, fundamentality, and scope. Of the four traits, self-esteem

1 has been described as “the most fundamental manifestation of core self-evaluations as it
2 represents the overall value that one places on oneself as a person” (Judge & Bono, 2001, p.
3 80). Further, generalized self-efficacy constitutes one’s ability to perform, cope, and be
4 successful; internal locus of control reflects the belief of being able to control a broad array of
5 factors in one’s live; and finally, high emotional stability (vs. low neuroticism) refers to being
6 confident, secure and steady (Judge & Bono, 2001). Since its initial introduction, there has
7 been a substantial amount of evidence supporting the construct validity of core self-
8 evaluations (e.g., Gardner & Pierce, 2009; Judge et al., 2003; Stumpp, Muck, Hülshager,
9 Judge, & Maier, 2010). Besides, core self-evaluations have been found to be powerful in
10 predicting a range of important work-related outcomes. Results of a meta-analysis by Chang,
11 Ferris, Johnson, Rosen, and Tan (2012) suggest that core self-evaluations hold positive
12 relationships with job satisfaction ($\rho = .36$), goal commitment ($\rho = .42$), intrinsic motivation
13 ($\rho = .33$), task performance ($\rho = .19$) and organizational citizenship behaviors ($\rho = .23$) but
14 negative relationships with turnover intentions ($\rho = -.26$) and counterproductive work
15 behavior ($\rho = -.17$).

16 Despite its importance for individuals’ work-related outcomes, research has so far
17 neglected the impact of core-self evaluations on others in the workplace. Particularly, it is
18 unknown to what extent decision-makers’ core self-evaluations are related to hiring older
19 people. Addressing the decision-maker perspective, we argue that as people often derive some
20 aspects of their self-concept from the groups they belong to (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), they are
21 motivated to achieve self-enhancement and self-esteem by developing a positive
22 distinctiveness between the ingroup and outgroup (i.e., the self-esteem hypothesis; Abrams &
23 Hogg, 2010). As such, decision-making is influenced by people’s motivation to maximize
24 their positive self-concept. In order to maintain a positive self-concept, people are keen on
25 seeing their ingroup members in the most favorable light possible, whereas outgroup members
26 are perceived as a potential threat to one’s self. Core self-evaluations can function as a source

1 of self-protection against external threats (Judge et al., 1997). Therefore, the perceived threat
2 from outgroup members in a hiring decision is likely to be higher for people with low core
3 self-evaluations. In other words, people with low core self-evaluations are particularly
4 vulnerable to discriminate against outgroup members in making hiring decisions when
5 holding negative attitudes toward them, whereas people with high self-evaluations are less
6 vulnerable.

7 Previous research has mainly addressed the impact of self-esteem on discriminatory
8 behavior. A meta-analysis revealed that both low and high self-esteem individuals tend to
9 hold ingroup bias (Aberson, College, Healy, & Romero, 2000). There is also research
10 showing that emotional stability may impact managers' hiring decisions about members of
11 discriminated groups (i.e., comparing native and immigrant job candidates) (Horverak,
12 Sandal, Bye, & Pallesen, 2013). Core self-evaluations as a superordinate construct consisting
13 of self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability can be regarded as the
14 baseline for any self-categorization process. We therefore argue that decision-makers' core
15 self-evaluations can buffer the impact of negative attitudes toward older workers on decision-
16 makers' avoidance tendencies, which in turn determine their actual hiring decisions. To sum
17 up, our fourth hypothesis reads:

18 *H4: Core self-evaluations moderate the relationship between negative attitudes*
19 *toward older workers and avoidance of hiring older people in a way that the positive*
20 *relationship is weaker when core self-evaluations are high (vs. low).*

21

22

Method

23

Design, Sample and Procedure

24

We used a structured online questionnaire and a vignette study to collect the data.

25

A vignette study was designed to understand to what extent the hiring decisions may be

26

influenced by applicants' age as a proxy for discriminatory behavior. Vignette methodology

1 has been described as a systematic approach in achieving both internal and external validity
2 (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). In the current study, participants were given a job description for
3 a managerial position vacancy for a fictitious company and were required to choose the best
4 candidate based on their Curriculum Vitae (CV) for this vacancy. Three candidates' CVs were
5 designed to indicate equivalent work experience in a series of pilot studies (see Materials and
6 Piloting below), but the candidates' ages were varied (i.e., 38, 49, and 60 years). Participants
7 were then asked to prioritize CVs for hiring. Whether the participant selected the 60-year old
8 candidate for the vacancy constituted the dependent variable in this study.

9 Potential participants living in the United States were invited to take part using a
10 professional research platform (i.e., Call For Participants), where they were offered gift
11 voucher as compensation for their participation. As with other online crowdsourcing
12 mechanisms (i.e., Amazon's Mechanical Turk), the data obtained can be regarded as reliable
13 as the data collected via traditional methods (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011).
14 Participants were included if they currently worked in human resource management and had
15 hiring power on their jobs. In other words, our sample contains human resource managers
16 dealing with hiring decisions on a daily basis. Also, we checked the amount of time that
17 participants spent on the task and eliminated participants who spent very little time to
18 complete the study in order to ensure sufficient data quality. In total, 165 participants
19 completed the study across different industries ranging from industrial goods to technology,
20 media and telecommunications. Of these, 51 participants were excluded because they reported
21 to have no hiring power at work. Another 12 participants were excluded because they spent
22 very little time to complete the study. Overall, the final sample consisted of 102 participants
23 of which 64 (62.7%) were male and 87 (85.3%) held a higher education degree. Participants'
24 ages ranged from 22 to 52 years, with a mean age of 36.10 years ($SD = 6.64$). Of the excluded
25 participants, 35 (55.56%) were male and 48 (76.19 %) held a higher education degree; the
26 percentage of participants did not statistically differ from the percentage of participants in the

1 final sample (sex: $\chi^2 [1, N = 165] = 0.84, p = .36$; education: $\chi^2 [1, N = 165] = 2.17, p = .14$).
2 Further, they were a bit younger compared to participants of the final sample ($t[163] = 2.93, p$
3 $< .01$); their ages ranged from 25 to 46 with a mean age of 33.19 years ($SD = 5.37$).

4 **Materials and Piloting**

5 Following the procedure of Derous, Ryan, and Nguyen (2012), two pilot studies were
6 conducted to ensure the equivalence of the templates used as study material. Three templates
7 were designed so that work experience over the last ten years shown on the CV corresponds
8 to the job description used in the main study. The work experience was matched to the job
9 description based on information available on common job search platforms (e.g., Indeed and
10 Monster). A priori power analysis (calculated in G*Power) revealed a sample size of at least
11 42 participants to detect a small to medium effect ($f = .20$) for the one-way repeated measures
12 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with a test power of 80 %. Participants of the pilot samples
13 were recruited via the same professional research platform (i.e., Call For Participants) used in
14 the main study. The initial pilot sample of 50 participants evaluated the different templates
15 presented according to the job description. Participants have been asked to evaluate the
16 person-job fit with five items on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all* to 7 = *extremely*).
17 One example item was: "Candidate [X] is qualified for this job." One-way repeated measures
18 analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed significant differences between the three templates
19 ($F(1.71, 83.83) = 6.54, p < .01$). Post hoc tests were conducted to compare all pairs of
20 templates. Results of pairwise t-tests showed that the templates were slightly different from
21 each other as there were significant differences between one template with the other two
22 (Template 2: $M=6.01, SD=.70$ and Template 1: $M= 6.24, SD=.64, t(49) = 2.01, p < .05$;
23 Template 2 and Template 3: $M=6.38, SD=.70, t(49) = -3.31, p < .01$). Therefore, the
24 templates were revised and tested for a second time. To revise the templates, the work
25 experience presented was again carefully matched to the job description. Further, more
26 attention was paid to small differences in language use. The second pilot sample consisted of

1 42 participants. This time, results of the one-way repeated measures ANOVA did not show
2 significant differences between the templates (Template 1: $M=6.03$, $SD=.72$; Template 2:
3 $M=6.02$, $SD=.83$; Template 3: $M=6.03$, $SD=.87$, $F(2, 82) = .02$, $p = .98$); these templates were
4 used in the main study.

5 **Measures**

6 **Negative attitudes toward older workers.** Participants' negative attitudes toward
7 older workers were measured by the means of their responses to the negatively framed items
8 of the Beliefs about Older Workers Questionnaire from Hassell and Perrewe (1995).
9 Respondents rated the degree to which they were holding negative beliefs about older people
10 in the work context on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly*
11 *agree*). One example item was: "Most older workers cannot keep up with the speed of modern
12 industry." The 15 items yielded a good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .88$) in this study.

13 **Core self-evaluations.** Core self-evaluations were measured by the means of the Core
14 Self-Evaluations Scale (Judge et al., 2003). Respondents rated their endorsement to several
15 statements about themselves on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7
16 (*strongly agree*). One example item was: "I am confident I get the success I deserve in life."
17 The scale yielded an acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$) in this study.

18 **Avoidance of hiring older people.** Avoidance of hiring older people was measured
19 by the means of three items adapted from Hutchison, Fox, Laas, Matharu, and Urzi (2010).
20 Respondents rated the degree they were avoiding to hire older people if they can on a 5-point
21 scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The three items were: "If I had
22 a choice I would rather not hire an older person.", "If I can avoid hiring older people, I do.",
23 and "I would want to avoid hiring an older person." The scale yielded a good internal
24 consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$) in this study.

25 **Selection of the oldest candidate.** Selection of the oldest candidate was measured
26 with one item related to the task of prioritizing applicants' CVs for hiring. The responses to

1 this task were coded as a dichotomous variable (i.e., 0 = *not selecting the oldest candidate*; 1
2 = *selecting the oldest candidate*). Because the different CVs were tested for equivalence with
3 regard to applicants' work experience (see Materials and Piloting above), not selecting the
4 oldest candidate serves as a proxy for discriminatory behavior. Of the 102 participants, 25
5 participants (24.5%) ranked the oldest candidate to be the most suitable person for the
6 described job vacancy, which is below the chance level (33.3%) if no discrimination was
7 present.

8 **Control variables.** As the outcome variable may be affected by participants' age, sex,
9 and education, we included these variables as covariates in the analyses. In addition, we
10 controlled for social desirability using a 13-item scale (Reynolds, 1982) to provide a more
11 conservative examination of the hypothesized relationships and to gauge the extent to which
12 our results might be biased by common method bias (Wang, Burlacu, Truxillo, James, & Yao,
13 2015).

14 Results

15 Preliminary Analysis

16 The descriptive statistics and correlations of all study variables are shown in Table 1.
17 Avoidance of hiring older people was positively correlated with negative attitudes toward
18 older workers ($r = .62, p < .01$) providing initial support for Hypothesis 1. Further, negative
19 attitudes toward older workers were negatively related to participants' age ($r = -.25, p < .05$)
20 and to core self-evaluations ($r = -.27, p < .01$). Correlations with sex, education, and social
21 desirability were weaker and not significant. Selection of the oldest candidate was negatively
22 related to avoidance of hiring older people ($r = -.16, p < .10$), providing initial support for
23 Hypothesis 2. Given the low base rate of selecting the oldest candidate, this relationship can
24 be regarded as quite substantial. Correlations with selection of the oldest candidate were
25 weaker (and not statistically significant) for age, sex, education, social desirability, core self-
26 evaluations, and negative attitudes toward older workers.

1 Hypothesis Testing

2 To investigate the hypothesized relationships between negative attitudes toward older
3 workers, core self-evaluations, avoidance of hiring older people, and selecting the oldest
4 candidate, we used path analysis to analyze the data. In Mplus 7.31 (Muthén & Muthén,
5 2015), we applied robust maximum likelihood estimator (MLR) and logistic link function
6 because the dependent variable (i.e., selection of the oldest candidate) was dichotomous in
7 nature (Yuan & Bentler, 2008). We tested our hypotheses by including all variables and
8 hypothesized effects simultaneously in the model. We then compared the partial against the
9 full mediation model (the partial mediation model has a direct effect from negative attitudes
10 toward older workers to the dependent variable). The fit indices for the two models are
11 presented in Table 2. Due to the use of MLR estimator, chi-square based fit indices are not
12 available to evaluate model fit. Therefore, we rely on information criteria (i.e., Akaike
13 Information Criterion [AIC], Bayesian Information Criterion [BIC], and Sample-size
14 Adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion [SABIC]) to determine which model fit to the data
15 better while being parsimonious (Preacher, Cai, & MacCallum, 2007). Lower values of AIC,
16 BIC, and SABIC indicate the most optimal balance between model fit and parsimony. The
17 results indicated that the hypothesized full mediation model had lower values of AIC, BIC,
18 and SABIC as compared to the partial mediation model and can therefore be considered as the
19 most parsimonious and better-fitting model. The estimated path model showing relationships
20 between control variables, negative attitudes toward older workers, core self-evaluations,
21 avoidance of hiring older people, and selecting the oldest candidate is presented in Figure 1.
22 With regard to the control variables, only age was negatively related to avoidance of hiring
23 older people ($\gamma = -.03, p < .01$), indicating that older decision-makers reported lower
24 avoidance tendencies toward hiring older people.

25 Hypotheses 1-3 addressed the relationships between negative attitudes toward older
26 workers and selection of the oldest candidate. The path coefficients suggested that negative

1 attitudes toward older workers were positively related to avoidance of hiring older people ($\gamma =$
2 $.89, p < .01$), supporting Hypothesis 1. This indicates that decision-makers, who reported
3 more negative attitudes toward older workers, were more likely to avoid hiring them. In turn,
4 avoidance of hiring older people was negatively related to selecting the oldest candidate ($\gamma = -$
5 $.49, p < .05, OR = 0.61$). This result supports Hypothesis 2 and indicates that decision-makers,
6 who reported one-unit higher avoidance tendencies toward hiring older people, were 0.61
7 times less likely to select the oldest candidate in this study. With regard to the relationship
8 between negative attitudes toward older workers and selecting the oldest candidate, the
9 compound coefficient suggested that there was a negative indirect effect via avoidance of
10 hiring older people (*indirect effect* = $-.44, p < .05$). This result supports Hypothesis 3 and
11 indicates that there was a negative relationship between negative attitudes toward older
12 workers and selecting the oldest candidate, which is mediated by decision-makers' avoidance
13 of hiring older people.

14 Hypotheses 4 addressed the moderating role of core self-evaluations. The estimated
15 coefficients showed that core self-evaluations moderated the relationship between negative
16 attitudes toward older workers and avoidance of hiring them ($\gamma = -.33, p < .05$). Simple slope
17 analysis revealed that the positive relationship was weaker when core self-evaluations were
18 high (*simple slope* = $0.63, z = 3.93, p < .01$) than when core self-evaluations were low (*simple*
19 *slope* = $1.16, z = 7.20, p < .01$). As can be seen in Figure 2, high (vs. low) core self-
20 evaluations buffered the positive relationship between negative attitudes toward older workers
21 and avoidance of hiring older people, supporting Hypothesis 4.

22 Discussion

23 The aim of the current study was to investigate the impact of negative attitudes toward
24 older workers on hiring decisions and to examine the moderating role of decision-makers'
25 core self-evaluations. We tested our hypotheses based on a structured online questionnaire
26 and a vignette study using a sample of 102 decision-makers with hiring power across different

1 industries. Results of the vignette study revealed that only 24.5% of participants ranked the
2 oldest candidate to be the most suitable person for a given job vacancy, which is below the
3 chance level of 33.3%. The selection likelihood can be regarded as a proxy for discriminatory
4 behavior because the three candidates were equally qualified.

5 We found that negative attitudes toward older workers were positively related to
6 avoidance of hiring older people, which in turn was negatively related to the likelihood to
7 select the oldest candidate. Further, the present study revealed an indirect effect of negative
8 attitudes toward older workers and selection likelihood via avoidance of hiring older people.
9 Consistent with the literature on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and hiring
10 decisions about members of discriminated groups (e.g., Ang et al., 2015; Araten-Bergman,
11 2016; Krings et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2011; Perry et al., 1996), these findings confirm that
12 negative attitudes toward older workers as hiring subjects lead to avoidance tendencies, which
13 in turn result in an actual decision not to hire older people.

14 Moreover, the current study revealed the moderating role of decision-makers' core
15 self-evaluations in hiring decisions about older people. As predicted, we found that core self-
16 evaluations buffered the relationship between negative attitudes toward older workers and
17 avoidance of hiring older people. In line with the literature on self-concept, social identity and
18 hiring decisions (Lewis & Sherman, 2003), this finding highlights decision-makers' core self-
19 evaluations as a relevant mechanism in challenging age discrimination in hiring. As older
20 people can be a threat to younger and middle-aged decision-makers' self-concept, people with
21 low core self-evaluations are particularly susceptible to discriminate against others when
22 holding negative attitudes toward them, whereas people with high self-evaluations are less
23 susceptible to discriminate against others during hiring decisions. Thus, decision-makers'
24 high (vs. low) core self-evaluations can reduce the impact of negative attitudes toward older
25 workers on decision-makers' avoidance tendencies, which in turn determine their actual
26 hiring decisions.

1 **Theoretical and Practical Implications**

2 The findings of the current study extend previous research on hiring decisions about
3 older people and offer relevant theoretical and practical implications. With regard to theory,
4 we extend previous knowledge on age discrimination in hiring by disentangling
5 discriminatory attitudes, intentions, and actual decision-making. Although negative attitudes
6 toward older workers are thought to underlie discriminatory behaviors such as lower hiring
7 rates for equally qualified older (vs. young and middle-aged) job applicants, they have not
8 received much attention in organizational research on hiring bias (Finkelstein & Farrell, 2007;
9 Shore & Goldberg, 2005). Numerous studies have investigated the existence of negative
10 attitudes toward older workers (Posthuma & Campion, 2009) but very few studies show the
11 direct link to hiring decisions and its underlying mechanisms. The present study confirms the
12 previous notion that hiring decisions about older people are intended before the actual
13 decision is made and that this hiring intention (i.e., avoidance vs. approach tendency) is
14 strongly influenced by decision-makers' negative attitudes toward older workers as hiring
15 subject.

16 Moreover, the present study highlights that hiring decisions are not only about finding
17 the most suitable candidate for a certain job vacancy but also about protecting one's self-
18 concept. Most notably, our findings shed light on the moderating role of decision-makers'
19 core self-evaluations. In particular, we reveal that decision-makers' core self-evaluations can
20 buffer the impact of negative attitudes toward older workers on decision-makers' avoidance
21 tendencies, which in turn determine their actual hiring decisions. This supports the previous
22 notion that decision-making is influenced by people's motivation to maximize their positive
23 self-concept (Lewis & Sherman, 2003). In general, people are keen on seeing their ingroup
24 members in the most favorable light possible, whereas outgroup members are perceived as a
25 potential threat to one's self. This potential threat is stronger for people with low (vs. high)
26 core self-evaluations. In hiring, decision-makers with low core self-evaluations are therefore

1 more susceptible to discriminate against older people when holding negative attitudes toward
2 them as compared to decision-makers with high core self-evaluations. Future studies need to
3 replicate our study findings in order to consolidate theoretical implications about the
4 moderating role of decision-makers' core self-evaluations.

5 With regard to practice, the current study contributes to the improvement of diversity
6 management strategies in organizations facilitating age-balanced hiring practices. To begin
7 with, organizations need to tackle the issue of often existing negative attitudes toward older
8 workers. As such, negative attitudes toward older workers should be reduced and positive
9 attitudes toward older workers should be encouraged, for instance, by shaping a positive age
10 climate and an age-friendly organizational culture leading to an appreciation of age diversity
11 at work. Previous research has shown that intergenerational contact may be able to facilitate
12 positive views toward older people at work (Henry, Zacher, & Desmette, 2015; Iweins,
13 Desmette, Yzerbyt, & Stinglhamber, 2013). In the workplace, regular and high quality
14 exchange among decision-makers with different ages may be therefore effective in
15 transforming negative attitudes into positive views toward older workers.

16 Another angle to look at age-balanced hiring practices, is to focus on decision-makers'
17 self-concept. Because hiring decisions are not only about the hiring subject but also about the
18 decision-maker, it is important to ensure that decision-makers carry positive basic conclusions
19 about themselves reducing the risk of being vulnerable for discriminatory mechanisms in
20 hiring. This may be achieved by selecting or promoting decision-makers based on their core
21 self-evaluations. However, Chang et al. (2012) point out that "researchers and practitioners
22 must ascertain whether the use of CSE [core self-evaluations] leads to adverse impact" (p.
23 114), before using such measures for staffing. An alternative may be to train decision-makers'
24 core self-evaluations. Although core self-evaluations are defined as a superordinate construct
25 capturing self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability traits
26 (i.e., stable characteristics), it is almost certain that core self-evaluations are malleable and can

1 change over time. For instance, research has reported changes in self-esteem (Orth,
2 Trzesniewski, & Robins, 2010), self-efficacy (e.g., West, Bagwell, & Dark-Freudeman, 2008)
3 and emotional stability traits (Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006) over time. Thus,
4 workplace interventions (e.g., personal training and development activities) may be able to
5 enhance core self-evaluations among decision-makers and in turn support positive
6 organizational outcomes. Further research is needed to assess the effectiveness of these
7 interventions and to estimate to what extent core self-evaluations can be changed in the
8 workplace.

9 **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

10 Notwithstanding the theoretical and practical implications of our findings, we address
11 the limitations of this research and highlight directions for future research. First, the cross-
12 sectional design does not allow for causal inferences. In fact, it is possible that the
13 relationships between negative attitudes toward older workers, decision-makers' core self-
14 evaluations and hiring decisions about older people are bi-directional. However, the possible
15 reverse causation cannot explain the interaction effect between negative attitudes toward older
16 workers and decision-makers' core self-evaluations on hiring decisions about older people.
17 Nevertheless, future studies should adopt longitudinal and (quasi-)experimental research
18 designs to allow for more conclusive findings.

19 Second, given that our study variables were assessed via self-reported data, common-
20 method bias could be a concern. However, we controlled for social desirability in our
21 analyses, which had a rather low correlation with avoidance of hiring older people as mediator
22 ($r = -.17$) and selecting the oldest candidate as outcome variable ($r = -.07$). Also, in our final
23 path model, social desirability has not been found to significantly predict the mediator or the
24 outcome variable. This partly reduces the concern for common-method bias, as the
25 covariation of social desirability and self-reported data represents a rather small systematic

1 error variance explained by the common rating source (Smith & Ellingson, 2002; Wang et al.,
2 2015).

3 Third, the number of vignettes has been limited to three candidates (i.e., aged 38, 49,
4 60 years), which oversimplifies the hiring decision and therefore may reduce external validity.
5 Future research should replicate our study findings using a larger number of vignettes in order
6 to rule out the potential concern for external validity. Future studies can also vary vignettes by
7 using additional person characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, social status) to
8 understand the intersectionality of social categorizations as previous research has revealed
9 double jeopardy against applicants having a multiple stigmatized background (Derous et al.,
10 2012). In addition, hiring decisions about older people may depend on the job type. For
11 example, previous research has shown that age-related hiring bias may differ in relation to
12 whether the job role is of low or high status (Abrams, Swift, & Drury, 2016). Varying
13 candidates' profiles as well as investigating different types of jobs can help to understand the
14 complex interplay between job candidate, job type, and decision-maker during hiring
15 decisions.

16 Fourth, the present study has mainly focused on the fit between the candidate and the
17 job. Even if a person is hired because of his or her qualifications with regard to the demands
18 of the job, there is no guarantee that this person will fit to the organization. More recent
19 approaches on hiring decision-making emphasize on the importance of person-organization
20 fit, describing the compatibility between employees and the organization, which has been
21 found to predict relevant work attitudes ($\rho = .31$; including job satisfaction and organizational
22 commitment), job performance ($\rho = .15$; including task performance and contextual
23 performance such as organizational citizenship behavior), and turnover ($\rho = .24$), respectively
24 (Arthur Jr., Bell, Villado, & Doverspike, 2006). Given the importance of these outcome
25 variables, future research should investigate the impact of negative attitudes on the decision-
26 making about hiring older people with regard to the varying organizational contexts. Also, it

1 would be worth investigating how shared negative attitudes in the organization (e.g., age
2 discrimination climate; Kunze, Boehm, & Bruch, 2011) influence older workers'
3 employment-related decisions (e.g., withdrawal and early retirement; Griffin, Bayl-Smith, &
4 Hesketh, 2016; Zaniboni, 2015), as well as to what extent the decision-makers' core self-
5 evaluations can moderate these effects.

6 Moreover, the current study leaves some issues unaddressed and suggests directions
7 for further investigation. As this study was tailored toward the cultural environment of the
8 United States, future research needs to replicate our findings in other countries. Particularly, it
9 is relevant to explore whether the link between negative attitudes toward older workers, core
10 self-evaluations, and hiring decisions about older people are generalizable across different
11 cultures. Recently, North and Fiske's (2015) cross-cultural meta-analysis found relevant
12 differences between Eastern and Western cultures regarding their attitudes toward older
13 people, which may be reflected in hiring decisions. Also, the impact of core self-evaluations
14 on hiring decisions is expected to differ across cultures. Some scholars have stated that
15 people's self-concept should be more influential in individualistic than in collectivistic
16 cultures (e.g., Judge & Hurst, 2008; Markus & Kitayama, 1998), yet, Chang and colleagues'
17 (2012) meta-analytical findings suggest that the relationships between employees' core self-
18 evaluations and different work-related outcomes were stronger for collectivistic (vs.
19 individualistic) cultures. Thus, future research ought to consider cultural differences in
20 understanding the relationships between decision-makers' core self-evaluations, their negative
21 attitudes toward older workers, and decisions about hiring them. In addition, future research
22 could explore different moderators as a means to inhibit age discrimination in hiring, such as
23 decision-makers' age group salience, their motivation to respond without prejudice, and
24 organizational values and norms.

25

26

References

- 1
2 Aberson, C. L., College, M., Healy, M., & Romero, V. (2000). Ingroup bias and self-esteem:
3 A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 157–173.
4 <http://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0402>
- 5 Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2010). Social identity and self-categorization. In J. F. Dovidio,
6 M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. E. Book (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Prejudice,*
7 *Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 1–18). London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
8 <http://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200919>
- 9 Abrams, D., Swift, H. J., & Drury, L. (2016). Old and unemployable? How age-based
10 stereotypes affect willingness to hire job candidates. *Journal of Social Issues*, 72, 105–
11 121. <http://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12158>
- 12 Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and
13 implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research*
14 *Methods*, 17, 351–371. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952>
- 15 Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
16 *Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211.
- 17 Albert, R., Escot, L., & Fernández-Cornejo, J. A. (2011). A field experiment to study sex and
18 age discrimination in the Madrid labour market. *International Journal of Human*
19 *Resource Management*, 22, 351–375. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.540160>
- 20 Ang, M. C. H., Ramayah, T., & Amin, H. (2015). A theory of planned behavior perspective
21 on hiring Malaysians with disabilities. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An*
22 *International Journal*, 34, 186–200. <http://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-02-2014-0012>
- 23 Araten-Bergman, T. (2016). Managers' hiring intentions and the actual hiring of qualified
24 workers with disabilities. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27,
25 1510–1530. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1128466>
- 26 Arthur Jr., W., Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., & Doverspike, D. (2006). The use of person-

- 1 organization fit in employment decision making: An assessment of its criterion-related
2 validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 786–801. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021->
3 [9010.91.4.786](http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.786)
- 4 Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new
5 source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*,
6 3–5. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980>
- 7 Cattell, R. B. (1965). *The scientific analysis of personality*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin.
- 8 Chang, C.-H., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Tan, J. A. (2012). Core self-
9 evaluations: A review and evaluation of the literature. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 81–
10 128. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311419661>
- 11 Deros, E., Ryan, A. M., & Nguyen, H.-H. D. (2012). Multiple categorization in resume
12 screening: Examining effects on hiring discrimination against Arab applicants in field
13 and lab settings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*, 544–570.
14 <http://doi.org/10.1002/job>
- 15 Earl, C., Taylor, P., & McLoughlin, C. (2015). Recruitment and selection of older workers. In
16 N. A. Pachana (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Geropsychology* (pp. 1–8). Singapore: Springer.
17 http://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-080-3_13-1
- 18 Erber, J. T., & Danker, D. C. (1995). Forgetting in the workplace: Attributions and
19 recommendations for young and older employees. *Psychology and Aging*, *10*, 565–569.
20 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.10.4.565>
- 21 Fasbender, U. (2016). Stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination towards older workers: A
22 wind of change? In R. Burke, C. Cooper, & A. Antoniou (Eds.), *The Aging Workforce: Individual, Organizational and Societal Challenges* (pp. 159–184). London: Emerald
23 Publishing.
- 24
- 25 Finkelstein, L. M., & Farrell, S. K. (2007). An expanded view of age bias in the workplace. In
26 K. S. Shultz & G. A. Adams (Eds.), *Aging and work in the 21st century* (pp. 73–108).

- 1 Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 2 Finkelstein, L. M., King, E. B., & Voyles, E. C. (2015). Age metastereotyping and cross-age
3 workplace interactions: A meta view of age stereotypes at work. *Work, Aging and*
4 *Retirement, 1*, 26-40.
- 5 Gardner, D. G., & Pierce, J. L. (2009). The Core Self-Evaluation Scale: Further construct
6 validation evidence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 70*, 291–304.
7 <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013164409344505>
- 8 Griffin, B., Bayl-Smith, P., & Hesketh, B. (2016). The longitudinal effects of perceived age
9 discrimination on the job satisfaction and work withdrawal of older employees. *Working,*
10 *Aging and Retirement, 2*, 415-427.
- 11 Gringart, E., & Helmes, E. (2001). Age discrimination in hiring practices against older adults
12 in Western Australia: The case of accounting assistants. *Australasian Journal on Ageing,*
13 *20*, 23–28. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6612.2001.tb00345.x>
- 14 Hassell, B., & Perrewe, P. (1995). An examination of beliefs about older workers: Do
15 stereotypes still exist? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 457–468.
- 16 Henry, H., Zacher, H., & Desmette, D. (2015). Reducing age bias and turnover intentions by
17 enhancing intergenerational contact quality in the workplace: The role of opportunities
18 for generativity and development. *Work, Aging and Retirement, 1*, 243–253.
19 <http://doi.org/10.1093/workar/wav005>
- 20 Horverak, J. G., Sandal, G. M., Bye, H. H., & Pallesen, S. (2013). Managers' selection
21 preferences: The role of prejudice and multicultural personality traits in the assessment
22 of native and immigrant job candidates. *Revue Europeene de Psychologie Appliquee, 63,*
23 *267–275.* <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2013.07.003>
- 24 Hutchison, P., Fox, E., Laas, A. M., Matharu, J., & Urzi, S. (2010). Anxiety, outcome
25 expectancies, and young people's willingness to engage in contact with the elderly.
26 *Educational Gerontology, 36*, 1008–1021. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03601271003723586>

- 1 Iweins, C., Desmette, D., Yzerbyt, V., & Stinglhamber, F. (2013). Ageism at work: The
2 impact of intergenerational contact and organizational multi-age perspective. *European*
3 *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22, 331–346.
4 <http://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.748656>
- 5 Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits--self-esteem,
6 generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability--with job satisfaction
7 and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80–92.
8 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80>
- 9 Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The core self-evaluations scale:
10 Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 303–331.
11 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00152.x>
- 12 Judge, T. A., & Hurst, C. (2008). How the rich (and happy) get richer (and happier):
13 Relationship of core self-evaluations to trajectories in attaining work success. *Journal of*
14 *Applied Psychology*, 93, 849–63. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.849>
- 15 Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job
16 satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19,
17 151–188.
- 18 Krings, F., Sczesny, S., & Kluge, A. (2011). Stereotypical inferences as mediators of age
19 discrimination: The role of competence and warmth. *British Journal of Management*, 22,
20 187–201. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00721.x>
- 21 Kunze, F., Boehm, S. A., & Bruch, H. (2011). Age diversity, age discrimination climate and
22 performance consequences: A cross organizational study. *Journal of Organizational*
23 *Behavior*, 32, 264–290. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.698>
- 24 Lahey, J. N. (2010). International comparison of age discrimination laws. *Research on Aging*,
25 32, 679–697. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0164027510379348>
- 26 Lewis, A. C., & Sherman, S. J. (2003). Hiring you makes me look bad: Social-identity based

- 1 reversals of the ingroup favoritism effect. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*
2 *Processes*, 90, 262–276. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978\(02\)00538-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00538-1)
- 3 Loretto, W., & White, P. (2006). Employers' attitudes, practices and policies towards older
4 workers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16, 313–330.
5 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2006.00013.x>
- 6 Lu, L., Kao, S.-F., & Hsieh, Y.-H. (2011). Attitudes towards older people and managers'
7 intention to hire older workers: A Taiwanese study. *Educational Gerontology*, 37, 835–
8 853. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03601277.2010.485007>
- 9 Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1998). The cultural psychology of personality. *Journal of*
10 *Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 63–87. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198291004>
- 11 Meisner, B. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of positive and negative age stereotype priming
12 effects on behavior among older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B,*
13 *Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 67, 13–7.
14 <http://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr062>
- 15 Neumark, D., Burn, I., & Button, P. (2016). Experimental age discrimination evidence and the
16 Heckman critique. *American Economic Review*, 106, 303–308.
17 <http://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20161008>
- 18 Neumark, D., & Button, P. (2014). Did age discrimination protections help older workers
19 weather the great recession? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33, 566–601.
20 <http://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21762>
- 21 North, M. S., & Fiske, S. T. (2015). Modern attitudes toward older adults in the aging world:
22 A cross-cultural meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 993–1021.
23 <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0039469>
- 24 Orth, U., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Robins, R. W. (2010). Self-esteem development from young
25 adulthood to old age: A cohort-sequential longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and*
26 *Social Psychology*, 98, 645–658. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0018769>

- 1 Perry, E. L., Kulik, C. T., & Bourhis, A. C. (1996). Moderating effects of personal and
2 contextual factors in age discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 628–647.
3 <http://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.81.6.628>
- 4 Posthuma, R. A., & Campion, M. A. (2009). Age stereotypes in the workplace: Common
5 stereotypes, moderators, and future research directions. *Journal of Management, 35*,
6 158–188. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308318617>
- 7 Preacher, K., Cai, L., & MacCallum, R. (2007). Alternatives to traditional model comparison
8 strategies for covariance structure models. In T. D. Little, J. A. Bovaird, & N. A. Card
9 (Eds.), *Modeling contextual effects in longitudinal studies* (pp. 33–62). Mahwah, NJ:
10 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 11 Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-
12 Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38*, 119–126.
- 13 Riach, P. A., & Rich, J. (2010). An experimental investigation of age discrimination in the
14 English labor market. *Annals of Economics and Statistics, 99*, 169–185.
- 15 Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in
16 personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies.
17 *Psychological Bulletin, 132*, 1–25. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.1>
- 18 Shore, L. M., & Goldberg, C. B. (2005). Age discrimination in the workplace. In R. L.
19 Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and*
20 *organizational bases*. (pp. 209–225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 21 Smith, D. B., & Ellingson, J. E. (2002). Substance versus style: A new look at social
22 desirability in motivating contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 211–219.
23 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.211>
- 24 Stumpp, T., Muck, P. M., Hülshager, U. R., Judge, T. a., & Maier, G. W. (2010). Core self-
25 evaluations in Germany: Validation of a German measure and its relationships with
26 career success. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 59*, 674–700.

- 1 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00422.x>
- 2 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behaviour. In S.
3 Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago,
4 IL: Nelson-Hall.
- 5 Taylor, P., McLoughlin, C., Brooke, E., Di Biase, T., & Steinberg, M. (2013). Managing
6 older workers during a period of tight labour supply. *Ageing and Society*, 33, 16–43.
7 <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X12000566>
- 8 Truxillo, D. M., Finkelstein, L. M., Pytlovany, A. C., & Jenkins, J. S. (2015). Age
9 discrimination at work: A review of the research and recommendations for the future. In
10 A. J. Colella & E. B. King (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination*.
11 Oxford University Press.
- 12 Wanberg, C. R., Kanfer, R., Hamann, D. J., & Zhang, Z. (2016). Age and reemployment
13 succes after job loss: An integrative model and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*,
14 142, 400–426. <http://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000019>
- 15 Wang, M., Burlacu, G., Truxillo, D., James, K., & Yao, X. (2015). Age differences in
16 feedback reactions: The roles of employee feedback orientation on social awareness and
17 utility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1296–1308. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0038334>
- 18 West, R. L., Bagwell, D. K., & Dark-Freudeman, A. (2008). Self-efficacy and memory aging:
19 The impact of a memory intervention based on self-efficacy. *Ageing, Neuropsychology*,
20 and *Cognition*, 15(3), 302–329. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13825580701440510>
- 21 Wöhrmann, A. M., Fasbender, U., & Deller, J. (2016). Using work values to predict post-
22 retirement work intentions. *Career Development Quarterly*, 64, 98–113.
23 <http://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12044>
- 24 Zaniboni, S. (2015). The interaction between older workers' personal resources and perceived
25 age discrimination affects the desired retirement age and the expected adjustment. *Work*,
26 *Ageing and Retirement*, 1, 266-273.

1 Table 1

2 *Means, standard deviations, and correlations for all of the variables (N = 100-102)*

Variable	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Age	36.10	6.64	-							
2. Sex (1 = male)	0.63	0.49	.10	-						
3. Education (1 = university degree)	0.85	0.36	-.15	-.03	-					
4. Social desirability sum score	6.95	2.07	.22*	.10	.00	-				
5. Core self-evaluations	4.43	0.78	.23*	.02	.27**	.37**	-			
6. Negative attitudes toward older workers	3.42	0.67	-.10	.10	.15 [†]	-.17 [†]	-.10	-		
7. Avoidance of hiring older people	3.15	1.00	-.25*	.10	.06	-.14	-.27**	.62**	-	
8. Selection of the oldest candidate (1=yes)	0.25	0.43	-.00	.06	-.02	-.07	-.01	-.05	-.16 [†]	-

3 † $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

4

5

6

1 Table 2

2 *Fit indices for structural models (N = 100)*

Model	Loglikelihood	AIC	BIC	SABIC
Mediation model (partial) with interaction	-160.809	353.617	395.300	344.768
Mediation model (full) with interaction	-161.001	352.003	391.080	343.706

3 *Note.* Bold entries signify the lowest values in each column, AIC = Akaike Information Criteria, BIC = Bayesian
 4 Information Criteria, SABIC = Sample-size Adjusted Bayesian Information Criteria


5

6

1 Figure 1


2 *Estimated path model showing relationships between negative attitudes toward older workers, core self-evaluations, avoidance of hiring older*
3 *people, and selection of the oldest candidate with unstandardized coefficients (N = 100)*

4 *p<.05, **p<.01.



1 Figure 2

2 *Core self-evaluations moderate the relationship between negative attitudes toward older workers and avoidance of hiring older people*



3