



# Kent Academic Repository

**Nicholson, Dawn H, Hopthrow, Tim and Randsley de Moura, Georgina (2021)**  
***Gender, Hidden Profiles and the Individual Preference Effect.* Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 52 (8). pp. 735-750. ISSN 0021-9029.**

## Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/91728/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

## The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12846>

## This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

## DOI for this version

## Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

## Additional information

## Versions of research works

### Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

### Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal**, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

### Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact [ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Tables

Table 1.  
*Study Details: Participant Gender, Mean Age/SD and Split by Information Condition.*

<b>Study</b>	<b>Total N – Hidden Profile (Pre-Exclusion)</b>	<b>Total Hidden Profile Gender Split (Pre-exclusion)</b>	<b>Total N – Hidden Profile (Post-Exclusion)</b>	<b>Total Hidden Profile Gender Split (Post-exclusion): M/F</b>	<b>Total N – Manifest Profile</b>	<b>Total Manifest Profile Gender Split: M/F</b>
<b>1</b>	42	22 males 19 females  (1 gender undisclosed)	33	20 Males ( $M_{age} = 27.55$ , $SD = 6.37$ ), Age Range = 18-40  13 Females ( $M_{age} = 35.54$ , $SD = 12.00$ ), Age Range = 24-64	37	20 males ( $M_{age} = 30.45$ , $SD = 11.02$ ), Age Range = 18-55  17 females ( $M_{age} = 28.18$ , $SD = 5.35$ ), Age Range = 19-38
<b>2</b>	84	42 males 41 females  (1 gender undisclosed)	67	33 Males ( $M_{age} = 34.67$ , $SD = 10.25$ ), Age Range = 19-62  34 Females ( $M_{age} = 35.38$ , $SD = 7.99$ ), Age Range = 24-53	76	36 males ( $M_{age} = 33.08$ , $SD = 10.68$ ), Age Range = 19-63  40 females ( $M_{age} = 32.87$ , $SD = 11.05$ ), Age Range = 18-61
<b>3</b>	87	45 males 42 females	56	27 Males ( $M_{age} = 30.48$ , $SD = 9.42$ ), Age Range = 19-58  29 Females ( $M_{age} = 37.31$ , $SD = 11.73$ ), Age Range = 21-61	73	40 males ( $M_{age} = 30.63$ , $SD = 9.74$ ), Age Range = 19-61  33 females ( $M_{age} = 34.82$ , $SD = 10.95$ ), Age Range = 20.57
<b>4</b>	110	53 males 57 females  (1 gender undisclosed)	70	35 Males ( $M_{age} = 32.30$ , $SD = 10.23$ ), Age Range = 21-60  35 Females ( $M_{age} = 35.63$ , $SD = 12.54$ ), Age Range = 20-62	126	64 males ( $M_{age} = 32.73$ , $SD = 9.33$ ), Age Range = 18-57  62 females ( $M_{age} = 36.26$ , $SD = 12.35$ ), Age Range = 18-66 (2 gender undisclosed)
<b>5</b>	147	79 males 64 females	109	61 Males ( $M_{age} = 33.28$ , $SD = 8.98$ ), Age Range = 21-60	132	62 males ( $M_{age} = 34.35$ , $SD = 8.93$ ), Age Range = 20-62 (1 age undisclosed)

		(4 gender undisclosed)		48 Females ( $M_{age} = 34.44$ , $SD = 9.61$ ), Age Range = 21-63		69 female ( $M_{age} = 34.30$ , $SD = 8.68$ ), Age Range = 22-59 (1 gender undisclosed)
<b>6</b>	165	82 males 83 females	137	73 Males ( $M_{age} = 26.74$ $SD = 9.21$ ), Age Range = 18-61	N/A	
				64 Females ( $M_{age} = 27.30$ , $SD = 8.90$ ), Age Range = 18-57		
<b>7</b>	174	93 males 81 females	126	65 Males ( $M_{age} = 31.35$ $SD = 11.81$ ), Age Range = 18-67	N/A	
				61 Females ( $M_{age} = 32.39$ , $SD = 12.04$ ), Age Range = 18-62		
<b>8</b>	79	38 males 41 females	56	24 Males ( $M_{age} = 31.75$ , $SD = 11.42$ ), Age Range = 19-54	77	49 males ( $M_{age} = 27.84$ , $SD = 10.04$ ), Age Range = 18-67
				32 Females ( $M_{age} = 25.84$ , $SD = 6.42$ ), Age Range = 18-44		28 females ( $M_{age} = 31.64$ , $SD = 12.80$ ), Age Range = 19-61
<b>9</b>	78	42 males 36 females	52	27 Males ( $M_{age} = 32.15$ , $SD = 15.80$ ), Age Range = 18-68	76	42 males ( $M_{age} = 33.05$ , $SD = 14.51$ ), Age Range = 18-74
				25 Females ( $M_{age} = 32.96$ , $SD = 12.03$ ), Age Range = 19-64		34 females ( $M_{age} = 33.03$ , $SD = 11.95$ ), Age Range = 18-62

Table 2.

*Hidden Profile Results By Hypotheses (excludes participants who did not select the intended initial preference).*

<b>H No.</b>	<b>Hypothesis Description</b>	<b>Overall Results</b>				<b>Heterogeneity</b>				
		OR/ Cohen's d	90% CI	Z- Value	p- value	Q	P <sub>q</sub>	I <sup>2</sup> %	T <sup>2</sup>	T
<b>1<sup>2</sup></b>	Female participants will be better able to overcome the IPE and demonstrate more improved decision-making than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.56 <sup>1</sup>	0.36,0.88	-2.38	.017	13.23	.10	39.54	0.18	0.43
<b>2<sup>3</sup></b>	Female participants will be more confident in the Optimal Candidate (A) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.14	-0.07,0.34	1.21	.23	14.27	0.08	43.93	0.04	0.20
<b>3<sup>4</sup></b>	Female participants will be less confident in the Suboptimal Candidate (C) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.15	-0.36,0.05	-1.39	.16	14.07	0.08	43.13	0.04	0.20
<b>4<sup>3</sup></b>	Female participants will report lower overall confidence in their candidate selection decision compared to their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.20	0.07,0.33	2.93	.00	6.49	0.59	0	0	0
<b>5<sup>3</sup></b>	Female participants will report less difficulty in correcting and amending their candidate selection decision than their male counterparts, having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.09	-0.26,0.09	-0.95	.34	10.75	0.22	25.61	0.02	0.14

*Note<sup>1</sup>. Odds Ratio for H1 and Cohen's d for H2-H5.*

*Note<sup>2</sup>. N = 699.*

*Note<sup>3</sup>. N = 704*

*Note.<sup>4</sup> N = 702*

Table 2 (a).

*Hidden Profile Results By Hypotheses (includes all participants irrespective of selection the intended initial preference).*

<b>H No.</b>	<b>Hypothesis Description</b>	<b>Overall Results</b>				<b>Heterogeneity</b>				
		OR/ Cohen's d	90% CI	Z- Value	p- value	Q	P <sub>q</sub>	I <sup>2</sup> %	T <sup>2</sup>	T
<i>1<sup>2,2a</sup></i>	Female participants will demonstrate more improved decision-making than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.93 <sup>1,1a</sup>	0.74,1.18	-0.54	.586	3.07	.93	0	0	0
		0.61 <sup>1,1b</sup>	0.43,0.86	-2.65	.008	12.82	.12	37.61	0.11	0.33
<i>2<sup>3</sup></i>	Female participants will be more confident in the Optimal Candidate (A) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.17	0.05,0.29	2.59	.01	8.09	0.43	1.07	0	0.02
<i>3<sup>4</sup></i>	Female participants will be less confident in the Suboptimal Candidate (C) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.06	-0.25,0.12	-0.64	.52	16.50	0.04	51.51	0.04	0.20
<i>4<sup>3</sup></i>	Female participants will report lower overall confidence in their candidate selection decision compared to their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.18	0.10,0.25	4.42	.00	3.01	0.93	0	0	0
<i>5<sup>3</sup></i>	Female participants will report less difficulty in correcting and amending their candidate selection decision than their male counterparts, having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.07	-0.21,0.06	-0.98	.33	9.45	0.31	15.36	0.01	0.08

*Note<sup>1</sup>. Odds Ratio for H1 and Cohen's d for H2-H5.*

*Note<sup>1a,1b</sup>. Top row = gender differences at Time 1 (partial information); Second Row = gender differences at Time 2 (full information).*

*Note<sup>2</sup>. N = 964.*

*Note<sup>2a</sup>. N = 954.*

*Note<sup>3</sup>. N = 962*

*Note<sup>4</sup>. N = 960*

Table 3.

*Manifest Profile - Results compared to Hidden Profile hypotheses (Seven studies only)*

<b>H No.</b>	<b>Hypothesis Description</b>	<b>Overall Results</b>				<b>Heterogeneity</b>				
		OR/ Cohen's d	90% CI	Z- Value	p- value	Q	P <sub>q</sub>	I <sup>2</sup> %	T <sup>2</sup>	T
<i>1<sup>2,3</sup></i>	Female participants will demonstrate more improved decision-making than their male counterparts when presented with a one-page structured Manifest Profile (comprising full candidate attribute information).	0.76 <sup>1</sup>	0.54,1.06	-1.60	.110	4.44	0.62	0	0	0
<i>2<sup>2</sup></i>	Female participants will be more confident in the Optimal Candidate (A) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.07	-0.09,0.22	0.83	.41	5.47	0.49	0	0	0
<i>3<sup>2</sup></i>	Female participants will be less confident in the Suboptimal Candidate (C) than their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	-0.12	-0.36,0.12	-1.00	.32	11.60	0.07	48.27	0.05	0.21
<i>4<sup>2</sup></i>	Female participants will report lower overall confidence in their candidate selection decision compared to their male counterparts having viewed full candidate attribute information.	0.01	-0.17,0.19	0.08	.93	7.52	0.28	20.26	0.01	0.11

*Note<sup>1</sup>. Odds Ratio for H1 and Cohen's d for H2-H4.*

*Note<sup>2</sup>. N = 597.*

*Note<sup>3</sup>. Since there is only one decision point in the Manifest Profile condition, this decision quality comparison is simply whether male/female participants chose the correct candidate (Candidate A) at the single decision point.*