

## Supplementary Materials

### Achievement Goals, Social Impressions, and Interview Likelihood

#### Experiment 1: Methods

In Experiment 1 only, we mistakenly used the word “sex” rather than “gender” in the instruction check. This was rectified in the subsequent experiments.

#### Experiment 1: Ancillary participant gender and prior interview experience moderator analyses

**Moderation by Participant Gender.** The participant gender moderation analyses yielded two significant effects. Mastery-approach versus Performance-avoidance Goal  $\times$  Applicant Gender was significant for both interview likelihood ( $\beta = 0.19$  [0.06, 0.33],  $p = .006$ ) and perceived competence ( $\beta = 0.16$  [0.02, 0.30],  $p = .026$ ). In both instances the positive effect of mastery-approach goals relative to performance-avoidance goals was slightly stronger for female participants than male participants.

**Moderation by Prior Interviewer Experience.** The prior interviewer experience moderation analyses yielded four significant effects. Mastery-approach versus Performance-avoidance Goal  $\times$  Prior Experience was significant for interview likelihood ( $\beta = -0.21$  [-0.35, -0.07],  $p = .004$ ), perceived competence ( $\beta = -0.18$  [-0.32, -0.04],  $p = .014$ ), and perceived warmth ( $\beta = -0.16$  [-0.31, -0.02],  $p = .028$ ). In each instance the positive effect of mastery-approach goals relative to performance-avoidance goals was slightly stronger for those without prior interviewer experience. Mastery-approach versus Performance-approach Goal  $\times$  Prior Experience was also significant for perceived warmth ( $\beta = -0.16$  [-0.30, -0.02],  $p = .025$ ); the positive effect of

mastery-approach goals relative to performance-approach goals was slightly stronger for those without prior interviewer experience.

Experiment 2: Ancillary participant gender and prior interview experience moderator analyses

**Moderation by Participant Gender.** There were no significant interactions.

**Moderation by Prior Interviewer Experience.** There were no significant interactions.

Experiment 3: Hypotheses regarding possible Applicant Gender moderation

Using both male and female targets allowed us to test novel hypotheses regarding applicant gender. Based on prior research on gender stereotypes in the workplace, we generated the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis H5a:* Male applicants are perceived as more competent than female applicants.

*Hypothesis H5b:* Female applicants are perceived as more warm than male applicants (Cuddy et al., 2011; Strinić et al., 2022).

However, it is important to note that recent empirical work suggests some degree of diminution in these gender stereotypes over time, especially regarding competence (Eagly et al., 2019). This suggests the possibility that we may actually observe no difference in competence or warmth perceptions across applicant gender. Thus:

*Hypothesis H5c:* We expected no differences between the male and female applicants in interview likelihood.

Including applicant gender as an independent variable in Experiment 3 also allowed us to examine whether the different patterns for performance-approach vs. performance-avoidance

goals predicting warmth found in the first two experiments was a) a function of applicant gender, or b) simply by chance (i.e., unsystematic variation). We tentatively hypothesized:

*Hypothesis H6a:* A Primary Achievement Goal  $\times$  Applicant Gender interaction in which there is no difference between performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals in perceived warmth for the male applicant (as observed in Experiment 1), whereas a performance-approach goal leads to greater perceived warmth than a performance-avoidance goal for the female applicant (as observed in Experiment 2).

Relatedly, we tentatively hypothesized:

*Hypothesis H6b:* Moderation by applicant gender of the effect of a performance-approach vs. performance-avoidance goal on interview likelihood via perceived warmth.

See the main text for results for applicant gender; in short, we observed no significant findings for this variable.

Experiment 3: Ancillary participant gender and prior interview experience moderator analyses

**Moderation by Participant Gender.** There were no significant interactions.

**Moderation by Prior Interviewer Experience.** A number of the moderation analyses with primary achievement goal and interviewer experience yielded a significant interaction; here we will focus on those also found in Experiment 1 (but not Experiment 2). Mastery-approach versus Performance-avoidance Goal  $\times$  Prior Experience was significant for interview likelihood ( $\beta = 0.19$  [0.08, 0.30],  $p < .001$ ) and perceived warmth ( $\beta = 0.14$  [0.02, 0.27],  $p = .022$ ). In each instance the positive effect of mastery-approach goals relative to performance-avoidance goals was slightly stronger for those with prior interviewer experience (the opposite pattern of that observed in Experiment 1). None of the moderation analyses with applicant gender and

interviewer experience yielded a significant interaction. None of the three-way interactions involving primary achievement goal, applicant gender, and interviewer experience were significant.

In sum, only a few interactions emerged in the exploratory analyses across experiments and none were consistent across the three studies. The two interactions that emerged across two of the studies showed opposite simple effects. In short, the findings are highly robust across participant gender and prior interviewer experience. The findings are also robust across applicant gender, as seen in the Study 3 results.

## References

- Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Beninger, A. (2011). The dynamics of warmth and competence judgments and their outcomes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 73-98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2011.10.004>
- Eagly, A. H., Nater, C., Miller, C. I., Kaufmann, M., & Sczesny, S. (2019). Gender stereotypes have changed: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of US public opinion polls from 1946 to 2018. *American Psychologist*, 75, 301-315. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000494>
- Strinić, A., Carlsson, M., & Agerström, J. (2022). Occupational stereotypes: professionals' warmth and competence perceptions of occupations, *Personnel Review*, 51, 603-619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2020-0458>