

Moens, Eline; De Pessemier, Dyllis; Baert, Stijn

**Working Paper**

## How Do Recruiters Assess Applicants Who Express a Political Engagement?

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 16730

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

*Suggested Citation:* Moens, Eline; De Pessemier, Dyllis; Baert, Stijn (2024) : How Do Recruiters Assess Applicants Who Express a Political Engagement?, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 16730, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/295753>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 16730

**How Do Recruiters Assess Applicants  
Who Express a Political Engagement?**

Eline Moens  
Dyllis De Pessemier  
Stijn Baert

JANUARY 2024

## DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 16730

# How Do Recruiters Assess Applicants Who Express a Political Engagement?

**Eline Moens**

*Ghent University*

**Dyllis De Pessemier**

*Ghent University*

**Stijn Baert**

*Ghent University, University of Antwerp, Université catholique de Louvain and IZA*

JANUARY 2024

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ISSN: 2365-9793

**IZA – Institute of Labor Economics**

Schaumburg-Lippe-Straße 5–9  
53113 Bonn, Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0  
Email: [publications@iza.org](mailto:publications@iza.org)

[www.iza.org](http://www.iza.org)

## ABSTRACT

---

# How Do Recruiters Assess Applicants Who Express a Political Engagement?\*

Although unequal treatment of workers based on political affiliation is prohibited in many countries, it is conspicuously understudied in the discrimination literature. In this study, we set up a vignette experiment with genuine recruiters to provide more insight into the effect of political engagement in job applicants on the assessment of their resumes by these professionals. We find that, overall, recruiters view an applicant as less creative, open-minded, empathetic and emotionally sensitive when a political engagement is expressed. These stigma are greater for candidates with a right-wing nationalist commitment. Relatedly, these candidates are assessed worse in terms of overall hireability and perceived inclination or taste among employers, colleagues and customers to collaborate with them. They are, however, seen as somewhat more assertive. In contrast to research conducted in one- or two-party systems, we do not find interactions with the political preference of the recruiter herself/himself. Overall, the effect of mentioning a political engagement in a resume is more negative when the required education level of the vacancy is high.

**JEL Classification:** D72, J21, J71, P16, C91

**Keywords:** hiring discrimination, political preference, vignette experiment

**Corresponding author:**

Eline Moens  
Ghent University  
Sint-Pietersplein 6  
9000 Gent  
Belgium

E-mail: [Eline.Moens@UGent.be](mailto:Eline.Moens@UGent.be)

---

\* This research did not receive any specific grant. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. We thank Thomas Gift and Louise Devos for their feedback on early versions of the manuscript.

# 1. Introduction

Discrimination of workers based on political affiliation is prohibited in the EU, following article 21 on non-discrimination of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, as well as in the United States (Baert, 2018). Yet this form of unequal treatment is conspicuously understudied in peer-reviewed literature on discrimination in the labour market. Indeed, in Lippens et al.'s (2023) meta-analysis of all correspondence experiments that measured hiring discrimination between 2005 and 2020, there was, remarkably, only one field experiment on political affiliation included in Web of Science, i.e., Gift and Gift (2015), as compared to those on race, ethnicity, and national origin (143 studies), gender (72 studies) and religion (21 studies).

This study by Gift and Gift (2015) concluded that hiring discrimination based on political preference does indeed exist in the United States. More concretely, they found that, at least in 2012, the average employer in the highly conservative Collin County (Texas) was more likely to call back a Republican job seeker than a Democratic job seeker, whereas the typical employer in the highly liberal Alameda County (California) was more inclined to call back a Democratic job seeker than a Republican job seeker.<sup>1</sup>

Based on their research, a number of questions arise. First, is evidence for lower recruitment probabilities for those with a particular political preference replicated in other contexts, particularly in countries with a different political system than the two-party system of the United States? Second, what are the underlying mechanisms of this unequal treatment? The present study focuses on these questions.

More concretely, we run an innovative vignette experiment in Flanders, Belgium, where genuine recruiters assess fictitious job candidates who experimentally differ in revealing diverging engagements, among which are political engagements. In line with potential theoretical motives for political engagement to impact employment opportunities identified

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to this experimental evidence, administrative data analyses have predominantly been used to investigate this type of discrimination in the context of (former) communist countries (Appleton et al., 2009; Dessens et al., 2008; Liu, 2012), showing positive discrimination towards communist-party members (i.e., communist-party members are favoured in comparison to non-communist-party members). However, it is not possible to deduct causal relationships from administrative data since potentially not all characteristics are reported on, nor can they be controlled.

in earlier research, this assessment comprises also (i) inclination or taste to collaborate and (ii) anticipated personality, besides (iii) overall hireability. Indeed, following the seminal taste-based discrimination theory (Becker, 1957), employers, customers and co-workers may experience a disutility by collaborating with employees with whom they fear, on the basis of their political commitment, they have nothing in common or differ from in ideas and standards (Bryne, 1971; Hewstone et al., 2002; Shafranek, 2020; Shafranek, 2021). Next, in line with the theory of statistical discrimination, based on political cues, recruiters might evaluate job applicants differently in terms of personality and thereby make judgements on their productivity (Bakker et al., 2015; Gerber et al., 2012b; Gift & Gift, 2015; Mondak & Halperin, 2008; Weisberg et al. 2011). Our experiment allows us to test these theoretical considerations, which we will explore further below, for the first time in peer-reviewed literature within the recruitment context.

In addition, our experimental design allows us to investigate how the impact of political engagement on job candidate assessment differs by further candidate characteristics as well as job and recruiter characteristics. In particular, we test the interaction between the political affiliation of the employer and employee in a more direct way than Gift and Gift (2015) did. Moreover, we test whether centre-right candidates are considered more suitable for jobs with higher levels of education and left-wing candidates are more considered for social and creative positions, in line with previous theoretical research indicating that individuals with these affiliations are more likely to be found in them, which we discuss further below.

We summarise our research questions (RQ) as follows.

**RQ1:** How do recruiters assess job applicants who reveal a political engagement on their resumes within the framework of a democratic multi-party system? **RQ1bis:** How does this differ according to the specific political engagement that was expressed?

**RQ2:** To what extent do applicant, job and recruiter characteristics moderate the effect of revealing political engagement in a resume on candidate assessment within the framework of a democratic multi-party system? **RQ2bis:** How does this differ according to the specific political engagement that was expressed?

## **2. Experimental setup**

### **2.1 Institutional setting**

A large-scale online survey experiment was set up and sent out to genuine recruiters in May 2023 in Flanders, Belgium. Belgium is a country with a multi-party political system, which is a prevalent political system in Europe, e.g., the Netherlands, Finland, Norway, Switzerland all have a comparable political landscape (Caramani, 2017; Kekkonen & Ylä-Anttila, 2021).

More specifically, Belgium is a federal state, with parliaments both at the federation level and at the level of the regions and communities (Vlaamse Overheid, n.d.). In concrete terms, this means that, in addition to municipal and European council elections, voters in Flanders go to vote both for the Flemish parliament (which covers the Flanders region and the Dutch-speaking community) and for the federal parliament. The same Flemish parties are running for both parliaments. In the 2019 elections for both parliaments, the following parties gained several seats: left-wing socialists ('Partij van de Arbeid van België'), greens ('Groen'), social democrats ('Vooruit'), Christian democrats ('Christen-Democratisch en Vlaams'), liberal democrats ('Open Vlaamse Liberalen en Democraten'), nationalists ('Nieuw-Vlaamse Alliantie') and right-wing nationalists ('Vlaams Belang').

Interestingly, the Public Employment Agency of Flanders (PEAF) encourages job seekers to refrain from mentioning any form of political preference on their resume (VDAB, n.d.). They even recommend them to adjust their privacy-settings on social media profiles if they ever post politically-oriented content to decrease the chances of future employers thinking negatively of them as an applicant (VDAB, n.d.).

### **2.2 Data collection**

The invited recruiters were selected by scraping email addresses linked to vacancies closely related to the vacancies we used in our survey (see Section 2.2) from the database of the PEAF. Scraping from this database ensures representativeness since PEAF is the largest and most important job search platform in Flanders. Reminders to participate were sent out to the non-respondents one and two weeks after the initial invitation. To incentivise participation, respondents were given the opportunity to enter their email addresses at the

end of the questionnaire to have a chance at winning a gift voucher. For confidentiality reasons, these email addresses were detached from the survey responses before starting the analyses.

A total of 250 male and female professional recruiters completed the full survey and passed the screening questions and attention check. This corresponds to 1,250 unique vignette observations. Among them, 71.6%, identified as women. Our sample was thereby comparable in gender distribution with HR professionals of working age from the European Social Survey (ESS).<sup>2</sup> All recruiters had prior experience in evaluating job applicants, with 7.2% having less than one year experience, 40.0% having between one and five years of experience and 52.8% having more than five years of experience.

Of the recruiters, 4.4% indicated the left-wing socialist party to be their first Flemish political party of preference, 10.0% the green party, 10.4% the socialist democrat party, 8.0% the Christian democrat party, 15.2% the liberal political party, 25.2% the nationalist party and 20.4% the right-wing nationalist party. The remaining 6.4% preferred not to answer this question or could not answer this question as their political preference was volatile. The election results for the Flemish Parliament in 2019 align reasonably well with these preferences, with the exception of the Christian democrat party, which scored slightly higher in this election (Vlaamse Overheid, n.d.).

### **2.3 Pre-experimental survey**

The survey consisted of a pre-experimental part, an experimental part and a post-experimental part.<sup>3</sup> Recruiters were only able to complete the remaining parts of the survey when, in the pre-experimental part, they gave informed consent and when they indicated they have had actual recent experience with the selection and recruitment of applicants ('In the past year, were you responsible for recruiting applicants?') and 'What percentage of your

---

<sup>2</sup> In line with Sterkens et al. (2021), we consulted data from the 2020 wave of ESS to compare our sample distribution of recruiters to the European HR professionals in terms of age. Survey respondents were selected according to the ISCO-08 occupation codes of 1212 (Human resource managers), 2423 (Personnel and careers professionals), 3333 (Employment agents and contractors) and 4416 (Personnel clerks).

<sup>3</sup> A pilot test with 10 recruiters was performed, giving us the opportunity to evaluate and adjust the survey in terms of clarity, credibility and duration.



time at work is dedicated to evaluating applicants?’). Next, the question ‘How long have you been involved in the evaluation of applicants?’ was asked, allowing us to employ it as a control variable in our analyses. Finally, we asked for which of the eight following jobs recruiters most recently made hiring decisions: (i) travel guide, (ii) orderly, (iii) (hand) sewer, (iv) fast food cook, (v) mental health expert, (vi) family medicine physician, (vii) economist, and (viii) cytotechnologist. In the experiment, recruiters had to assess applicants for this job. If they did not have recent experience with any of these eight jobs, one of these eight vacancies was randomly assigned.

These eight fictitious vacancies varied systematically among three job characteristics, namely the required level of education (higher education required or not), the importance of assisting and caring for others within the job (high or low importance) and the importance of thinking creatively within the job (high or low importance). These job characteristics were taken into account since previous research shows that specific party affiliation can be seen as a cue for educational attainment, social behaviour and creativity. That is, (i) on average, voters of the social democrat party and the right-wing nationalist party are, consistently over the course of multiple years, and in Belgium as well as in other EU countries, less educated than voters of the Christian democrat party, the nationalist party and the liberal democrat party (Abts et al., 2015; Shafranek, 2020), (ii) social behaviour and altruism can be linked to a left-wing political preference (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Kelly, 2018; McClosky, 1958; Zettler & Hilbig, 2010), and (iii) high levels of creativity are also positively correlated with a preference for left-wing political parties (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

The specific occupations were selected based on their O\*NET score.<sup>4</sup> We systematically varied on the aforementioned characteristics whilst also considering as much variation as possible with regard to job sectors to maximise external validity. The classification of the selected occupations according to the specified characteristics can be found in Appendix Table A1.

## **2.4 Experimental phase**

After completing the pre-experimental part, recruiters received instructions on the next

---

<sup>4</sup> O\*Net OnLine is an application supported by the US Department of Labor that contains information on more than 900 occupations.

step, i.e., the actual experiment. They were asked to imagine that they were a recruiter at a certain company with the task of filling in a specific position (as outlined in Section 2.3). After providing recruiters with a description of the specific vacancy, we asked them to examine five fictitious resumes ('vignettes') with regard to whether the applicants should be invited for a first interview. Respondents were able to go back and forth between the five fictitious applicants whilst assessing them. Furthermore, it was clarified that it was unnecessary to place the fictitious applicants in order of preference and that it was possible to withhold as many applicants as they wanted to. This way, respondents could not feel obliged to discriminate against any applicant characteristics.

The fictitious applicants varied systematically amongst three vignette factors, as shown in Table 1: (i) gender, (ii) age, and (iii) extracurricular activities. Concerning the main factor (iii), a political engagement was mentioned in one fourth of the vignettes, in which the aforementioned Flemish political parties (left-wing socialist, green, social democrat, Christian democrat, liberal democrat, nationalist and right-wing nationalist) stood an equal chance. The specific engagement consisted of being a board member, general secretary or treasurer of the party's local office. In another fourth of the vignettes a non-political, yet comparable, engagement was mentioned as a first set of control conditions (board member, general secretary or treasurer of the neighbourhood committee, carnival committee, cultural council, traffic safety committee, family union, non-profit organisation related to poverty and deprivation or food bank). Finally, in the other half of the vignettes no extracurricular commitment was mentioned. Thus, we ensured that recruiters on average saw only one or two resumes with a mentioned political preference in each deck of five, which allowed us to conceal the goal of the study more effectively.

**<Table 1 about here>**

Besides enhancing external validity, gender and age were varied because the existing literature identifies the gender and age of the applicant as potential moderators of the assessment of individuals by political affiliation (Verba et al., 1997; Devroe & Wauters, 2018; Abts et al., 2015). More specifically, Shafranek (2020) shows that people are milder towards out-partisans that deviate from the stereotypical out-party member. In this respect, different age categories are associated with different parties. For instance, in Flanders, people with preferences for the Christian democrat party are older, while those with

preferences for the liberal democrat party and the green party are younger. People showing preferences for the social democrat party and the right-wing nationalist party are, mostly 40- and 50-year-olds (Abts et al. 2015). Also in this respect, women are usually less engaged in politics than men, according to Verba et al. (1997). Furthermore, women are generally perceived as more leftist than men (Devroe & Wauters, 2018). This implies that even if a woman indicates to have a right-wing political preference, she will be perceived as more centrist than her male counterpart, which can also impact the relationship between expressing a specific political engagement and the assessment of the applicant. We would thus expect the effects of a left-wing political preference to be reinforced if the applicant is female and to be weakened if the applicant is male. The reverse moderating effect is expected for applicants showing a right-wing political preference (i.e., reinforcement for men, weakening for women).

For the vignette layout, we used the resume templates from the PEAf. Besides the aforementioned three vignette factors, all applicants had a common Flemish name<sup>5</sup> and an indication of Belgian nationality. The city of residence was kept constant over the different resumes to avoid interference of a potentially perceived correlation between city of residence and political preference (as assumed by Gift & Gift, 2015). To make sure all resumes appeared realistic, we added all contact details that one would typically find on written resumes (i.e., phone number, email address, postal address and date of birth). All applicants had a suitable degree for the job and between 4,5 and 5,5 years of relevant work experience.<sup>6</sup> Last, we also added language skills and hobbies to the fictitious resumes, since these are also commonly mentioned on resumes and can help to make the inclusion of a political engagement less obvious. Language skills were kept constant amongst all fictitious applicants. The resume section ‘hobbies’ contained at least one politically neutral hobby for every fictitious applicant (Shafranek, 2020). In cases where the vignettes contained an extracurricular activity, two items were thus mentioned in the hobby section on the applicant’s resume. Resumes like these are realistic. That is, people often mention

---

<sup>5</sup> Both first and last names were selected from the Statbel (the Belgian statistics office) list with most common names for 18 to 64 years old in Flanders.

<sup>6</sup> In the instructions, we emphasised that potential gaps in resumes (due to combinations of the vignette factor ‘age’ and the amount of relevant experience that was kept constant) were periods filled with experience irrelevant to this specific vacancy rather than periods of inactivity, to avoid misunderstandings or any bias towards applicants with gaps of inactivity (as suggested in research by Sterkens et al., in press).

memberships and commitments in their resumes in Flanders, as recognised by the HR professionals we interviewed (see above). The resumes differed slightly from each other in terms of layout to make the cases more realistic and thus enhance external validity. The different templates used can be found in Appendix B.

By following the randomisation method of Auspurg and Hinz (2015), meaning that the constructed combinations of vignette levels of the three vignette factors gender, age and extracurricular activities were randomised across the different resume templates, we were able to ensure that the above-mentioned minor differences in layout, demographic information and the number of years of relevant work experience, did not impact the results of this study.

After showing a specific resume, we asked the recruiter to assess the applicant. The assessment consisted of three dimensions: inclination or taste to collaborate, anticipated personality traits and overall hireability. All items related to these three assessment dimensions can be consulted in Appendix Table A2. They were all measured on an eleven-point Likert scale (with a score of zero corresponding to ‘completely disagree’ and a score of ten to ‘completely agree’).

First, we included three items to measure taste to collaborate, in line with the seminal theory of taste-based discrimination by Becker (1957). This theory is based on a general distaste towards or preference not to work with members of the out-group (out-partisans in this case) as opposed to in-group members (or co-partisans) (Becker, 1957).<sup>7</sup> Taste to collaborate can be divided into three subtypes. In the first type, the employer himself is the source of the discrimination, while in the second and third type the employer expects his employees and clients to have certain tastes towards collaboration with the applicant (Becker, 1957). Therefore, our scale ‘taste to collaborate’ comprises these three items: ‘applicants with this profile, generally work well together with their employer’, ‘applicants with this profile, generally work well together with their colleagues’ and ‘applicants with this

---

<sup>7</sup> The similarity-liking principle suggests that recruiters prefer job applicants with similar ideas and norms over applicants with opposing views, implying that the above-mentioned distaste would primarily occur towards out-partisans (Bryne, 1971; Hewstone et al., 2002; Shafranek, 2020; Shafranek, 2021). However, a general distaste towards applicants showing any form of political preference could also arise since some evaluators expect not to have anything in common with any party affiliates (Shafranek, 2021).

profile, generally work well together with their clients', in line with Sterkens et al. (2022).<sup>8</sup>

Second, recruiters' expectations of the participants' 'big five' personality traits (extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness) were mapped by an evaluation of two items, derived from Weisberg et al. (2011), for each personality trait (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Schmidt et al., 2016).<sup>9</sup> Indeed, based on political cues, recruiters might make assumptions about applicants' personality (Gift & Gift, 2015). This is consistent with the theory of statistical discrimination, which is based on inter-group differences and stereotypes (Phelps, 1972; Arrow, 1973). In turn, personality is considered to be an important predictive indicator of future job performance and is therefore often taken into account by HR professionals when making hiring decisions (Baert & Decuyper, 2014; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Schmidt et al., 2016).<sup>10</sup> In the next paragraph, we discuss the 'big five' personality dimensions in greater detail as well as their link with political preferences.

The first personality dimension, extraversion, consists of sociability and assertiveness (Weisberg et al., 2011). With regards to political preferences, it is expected that people openly showing any political preference are perceived as more extravert (Bakker et al., 2015; Erdheim et al., 2006; Gerber et al., 2012b; Hibbing et al., 2011; Mondak & Halperin, 2008; Mössner, 2005). Some studies link this personality dimension to a right-wing political affiliation (Bakker et al., 2015; Barbaranelli et al., 2007; Caprara et al., 1999; Vecchione et al., 2011). However, others fail to identify this correlation (Gerber et al., 2012a; Gerber et al., 2012b; Mondak & Halperin, 2008; Schoen & Schumann, 2007). Next, neuroticism can be defined as 'a lack of emotional stability' or 'a tendency to experience anxiety, anger and sadness' and is positively correlated to a left-wing political orientation (Bakker et al., 2015; Costa & McCrae, 1992; Sibley et al., 2012; Weisberg et al., 2011). Agreeableness, i.e., the 'tendency to work together with others in social harmony and to take the emotions of others into consideration' as well as openness, which consists of creativity and open-mindedness,

---

<sup>8</sup> Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency:  $\alpha = .929$ .

<sup>9</sup> Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency for extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness:  $\alpha = .888$ ,  $\alpha = .674$ ,  $\alpha = .881$ ,  $\alpha = .900$ , and  $\alpha = .850$  respectively.

<sup>10</sup> More specifically, conscientiousness proves to have predictive value for both job and training proficiency in every job, while extraversion shows similar results though only in occupations where social interaction and management are important (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Agreeableness and neuroticism have proven to predict how well employees are able to work in teams (Mount et al., 1998). Finally, openness correlates with superior networking skills (Wolff & Kim, 2012) and better performance in companies that operate in an international context (Caligiuri, 2000).

can also be positively correlated to left-wing political preferences (Bakker et al., 2015; Costa & McCrae, 1992; Kunz, 2005; Weisberg et al., 2011). Finally, conscientiousness, which is a personality dimension that combines self-discipline and orderliness, is positively correlated with a right-wing conservative political orientation and negatively correlated with left-wing political preferences (Bakker et al., 2015; Barbaranelli et al., 2007; Caprara et al., 1999; Gerber et al., 2012a; Gerber et al., 2012b; Mondak & Halperin, 2008; Schoen & Schumann, 2007; Vecchione et al., 2011; Weisberg et al., 2011).

Third, the final assessment dimension comprised overall hireability, which consisted of interview probability ('I think I would invite this applicant for a job interview') and hiring probability ('There is a fair chance that I would hire this applicant'). This scale is in correspondence with Sterkens et al. (2021).<sup>11</sup>

## **2.5 Post-experimental survey**

The post-experimental part of the survey consisted of a series of personal questions about the recruiters. First, previous experimental research showed that people, in general, find a situation in which a recruiter discriminates against an out-partisan to be unacceptable (Shafranek, 2020). For this reason, it was important to consider social desirability tendencies when drawing conclusions on the relation between the expression of a political engagement and the assessment dimensions. Therefore, a short version of the BIDR scale was adopted (Paulus, 1991; Steenkamp et al., 2010). Second, recruiters were asked to indicate their gender. This was asked because it could play a moderating role in the relationship between the expression of a political engagement and the assessment dimensions (Baert, 2015; Carlsson & Rooth, 2007). Third, we asked the recruiters to rank the seven Flemish political parties in order of their personal preference, in line with Burden and Klofstad (2005). This allows us to test the hypotheses on the similarity-liking principle and, more specifically in the context of this study, the idea of rewarding co-partisans and punishing out-partisans (Byrne, 1971; Gift & Gift, 2015; Munro et al., 2010).<sup>12</sup> In this respect, Kekkonen & Ylä-Anttila

---

<sup>11</sup> Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency:  $\alpha = .836$ .

<sup>12</sup> These ideas can be considered rooted in the broader framework of social identity theory as proposed by Tajfel (1982). Social identity theory suggests that individuals categorise themselves and others into social groups, leading to in-group favoritism and out-group discrimination. This categorization can be based on various factors, including political affiliation.

(2021) show that, in Finland, affective polarisation has increased, mainly driven by voters evaluating their least favourite party more negatively.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Effect of revealing a political engagement on recruiters' assessment

We start this section by examining how recruiters in general assess applicants who openly express a political engagement on their resumes within the framework of a democratic multi-party system (RQ1). Next, we investigate more specifically how recruiters assess applicants who openly express a political engagement for a specific political party on their resumes (RQ1bis).

The answer to RQ1 can be found in Table 2, where we present the results of linear regression analyses, with the taste to collaborate, the anticipated personality traits and the hireability scales as the dependent variable, the applicant characteristics discussed in Section 2.4 as independent variables (clustering all political versus non-political engagements in two indicators) and the job and recruiter characteristics discussed in Sections 2.3 and 2.5 as control variables. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. In Appendix Table A4, we perform similar analyses, yet with the individual items capturing taste to collaborate, anticipated personality traits and hireability.

<Table 2 about here>

With regard to RQ1, we find that applicants who pronounce a political engagement score on average 0.338 ( $p = .012$ ) units lower on the 'anticipated openness' scale (ranging from 0 to 10), i.e., 3.4 percentage points (pp), compared to applicants who do not mention an extracurricular activity on their resume. In particular, Appendix Table A4 shows that these applicants are both seen as less creative ( $\beta = -.287, p = .034$ ) and as less open-minded ( $\beta = -.390, p = .013$ ). In addition, applicants who pronounce a political engagement are perceived as less agreeable ( $\beta = -.262, p = .024$ ), which is particularly due to being perceived as less empathetic ( $\beta = -.349, p = .007$ ). However, applicants who pronounce a political

engagement are also viewed as less neurotic ( $\beta = -.292, p = .000$ ) as they are expected to be less emotionally sensitive ( $\beta = -.711, p = .000$ ) compared to applicants who do not mention an extracurricular activity. In contradiction to our expectations based on the existing literature, we do not find that applicants who pronounce a political engagement are perceived as more extraverted ( $\beta = .148, p = .194$ ). Nevertheless, Appendix Table A4 does show that these applicants are perceived as somewhat more assertive.

As a robustness check, we conduct similar multivariate regression analyses as in Table 2 using only a subsample of recruiters with low to average social desirability scores. Participants were considered as scoring 'high' on the social desirability scale when they had a score above the sample average plus one standard deviation. The results can be found in Appendix Table A3. The results are in line with the results of the benchmark analyses in Table 2.

The answers to **RQ1bis** can be found in Table 3 and Appendix Table A6. Similar analyses as in Table 2 and Table A4 are conducted, yet not with a political engagement in general but with a political engagement in a specific political party as independent variables. As opposed to the effect of expressing a political engagement in general, we now also see, next to an impact on anticipated personality traits, significant results when it comes to taste to collaborate and overall hireability.

**<Table 3 about here>**

First, regarding taste to collaborate, we see a negative effect of expressing a political engagement with the right-wing nationalist party ( $\beta = -.702, p = .001$ ). From Appendix Table A6, we learn that for these applicants, taste-based employer discrimination ( $\beta = -.800, p = .001$ ), employee discrimination ( $\beta = -.747, p = .000$ ) and client discrimination ( $\beta = -.559, p = .016$ ) all apply. Regarding the left-wing socialist party, there is not a statistically significant outcome observed concerning the inclination to collaborate in general ( $\beta = 0.082, p = .616$ ). As can be seen in Appendix Table A6, this lack of significance is attributed to the offsetting effects of negative taste-based employer discrimination ( $\beta = -0.312, p = .047$ ) and positive taste-based client discrimination ( $\beta = 0.492, p = .006$ ): recruiters do not anticipate a successful collaboration between these applicants and the employer, but they do anticipate it between these applicants and clients.

Second, in regard to expected personality traits, we find that a political engagement with



the green party leads to an expectation of more extraversion ( $\beta = 0.442, p = .000$ ). This is particularly driven by a higher expected assertiveness ( $\beta = 0.689, p = .000$ ). The latter is also the case for applicants engaged with the right-wing nationalist party ( $\beta = 0.313, p = .007$ ). The next personality trait, neuroticism, is assessed to be lower for applicants engaged with parties at both ends of the political spectrum, i.e., left-wing socialist ( $\beta = -0.184, p = .066$ ), green ( $\beta = -0.484, p = .027$ ), nationalist ( $\beta = -0.648, p = .001$ ) and right-wing nationalist ( $\beta = -0.337, p = .027$ ). When we focus on emotional sensitivity (one of the underlying items of anticipated neuroticism), we see that engagement with every single political party makes recruiters think the applicant is less prone to emotional sensitivity (left-wing socialist:  $\beta = -0.601, p = .006$ ; green:  $\beta = -0.733, p = .017$ ; social democrat:  $\beta = -0.905, p = .038$ ; Christian democrat:  $\beta = -0.515, p = .019$ ; liberal democrat:  $\beta = -0.434, p = .002$ ; nationalist:  $\beta = -0.591, p = .014$ ; right-wing nationalist:  $\beta = -1.177, p = .001$ ). When we examine the personality trait agreeableness, we find that applicants who are engaged with the liberal democrat party ( $\beta = -0.362, p = .001$ ) and the right-wing nationalist party ( $\beta = -1.099, p = .000$ ) score lower than applicants who do not mention an extracurricular activity on their resume. Recruiters anticipate right-wing nationalist applicants to be less inclined to work with others ( $\beta = -0.976, p = .001$ ) and less empathetic ( $\beta = -1.222, p = .000$ ). The latter is also expected from applicants with a political engagement with the liberal democrat party ( $\beta = -0.595, p = .000$ ). Regarding the personality trait conscientiousness, applicants engaged with the green party are seen as more conscientious ( $\beta = 0.584, p = .005$ ), which is especially driven by the perception of being well organised ( $\beta = 0.724, p = .000$ ). Nationalist applicants are also perceived as more organised compared to applicants who do not mention an extracurricular activity on their resume ( $\beta = 0.497, p = .007$ ). On the last studied personality trait, openness, applicants engaged with the right-wing nationalist party score lower ( $\beta = -1.171, p = .002$ ), both because these applicants are expected to be less creative ( $\beta = -0.679, p = .043$ ) and less open-minded ( $\beta = -1.663, p = .000$ ).

Third, with regard to hireability, applicants associated with the green party score higher on hireability ( $\beta = 0.580, p = .001$ ), i.e., 5.8 pp, compared to applicants who do not mention an extracurricular activity on their resume. Both interview probability ( $\beta = 0.735, p = .002$ ) and hiring probability ( $\beta = 0.424, p = .036$ ) are higher when a political engagement with the green party is mentioned on the resume. When recruiters encounter the resume of a right-wing nationalist, recruiters are not less inclined to invite them for a job interview ( $\beta = -0.445,$

$p = .358$ ); however, they expect to be less inclined to hire the applicant ultimately ( $\beta = -0.934$ ,  $p = .008$ ). A possible explanation here is that political affiliation is not seen as a reason to discriminate when offering a job interview, but that during an interview, members of a right-wing nationalist party will likely show the aforementioned negative qualities, lowering the chances of final hiring.

Again, as a robustness check, we conduct similar multivariate regression analyses as in Table 3 using only a subsample of recruiters with low to average social desirability scores. The results can be found in Appendix Table A5. Whereas most of the discussed findings also apply to the subsample of recruiters with low to average social desirability scores, we do see some differences. That is, where anticipated personality traits for applicants engaged with the green party is concerned, we now no longer see a statistically significant positive effect on anticipated extraversion ( $\beta = 0.259$ ,  $p = .143$ ) and, when it comes to anticipated conscientiousness, the positive effect of engagement with this party is only significant at the 10% level ( $\beta = 0.425$ ,  $p = .079$ ). Next, expressing an engagement with the liberal democrat party no longer leads to a statistically significant negative effect on anticipated agreeableness ( $\beta = -0.018$ ,  $p = .929$ ), and we now also see a positive effect of engagement with this party on hireability ( $\beta = 0.657$ ,  $p = .009$ ).

As the analyses in the context of answering **RQ1bis** imply multiple hypothesis testing, we also employed Holm's correction for multiple hypotheses testing (Holm, 1979). There are some minor implications, yet the overall findings remain largely consistent. When taking the Holm-adjusted  $p$ -values into account, the results concerning the specific political parties that were significant at the 5% and the 10% significance level in Table 3, are no longer significant. In light of the discussion above concerning neuroticism, this implies that only the significant result for the nationalist party remains (maintaining its significance level at 1%). On top of that, the discussed impact of an association with the right-wing nationalist party on anticipated agreeableness is still significant but no longer at the 0,1% yet at the 1% significance level. Similarly, the impact of an association with the green party on anticipated conscientiousness and the impact of an association with the right-wing nationalist party on anticipated openness, as discussed above, is significant at the 5% instead of the initially reported 1% significance level.

### 3.2 Applicant, job and recruiter characteristics as moderators

In this subsection, we examine whether applicant, job or recruiter characteristics have a moderating role in the relationship between expressing a political engagement on applicants' resumes and recruiters' assessment of these applicants within the framework of a democratic multi-party system. We look at political engagement in general first (RQ2); next, we look at political engagement with a specific political party (RQ2bis).

The results of the moderation analyses are presented in Table A7 and Table A8. We regress taste to collaborate, anticipated personality traits and hireability on applicant, job and recruiter characteristics as well as on interactions between pronouncing a political engagement and (i) all other varying applicant characteristics, (ii) the dimensions in which the jobs differed, and (iii) the gender and political preference of the recruiter; see Section 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 for our motivation. We emphasise that the coefficient estimates of the interaction with the recruiter characteristics cannot be given a causal interpretation, due to the lack of experimental manipulation of these characteristics.

We find that the effect of mentioning a political engagement as a job candidate is more negative when the required education level of the vacancy is high. We observe a significant negative interaction term for taste to collaborate ( $\beta = -.896, p = .001$ ), anticipated extraversion ( $\beta = -.639, p = .041$ ), anticipated agreeableness ( $\beta = -.895, p = .001$ ), anticipated conscientiousness ( $\beta = -.620, p = .045$ ), anticipated openness ( $\beta = -.810, p = .009$ ), and hireability ( $\beta = -.984, p = .000$ ). We do not find that the other applicant, job or recruiter characteristics play a convincing moderating role when we look at the effect of mentioning a political engagement in general.

As can be seen in Table A8, significant interaction terms are far more numerous when engagement for specific political parties is investigated. Concerning applicant characteristics, we see a convincingly more negative image of the applicant when engaged with the right-wing nationalist party, when younger or older than approximately 40 years old. When an applicant with this political engagement is older than 40 years old, we see a significant impact on taste to collaborate ( $\beta = -1.118, p = .000$ ), agreeableness ( $\beta = -1.727, p = .004$ ), conscientiousness ( $\beta = -1.492, p = .008$ ), openness ( $\beta = -2.371, p = .001$ ) and hireability ( $\beta = -2.019, p = .000$ ). When a right-wing nationalist candidate is younger than 40 years old, we observe an impact on taste to collaborate ( $\beta = -1.121, p = .002$ ),

conscientiousness ( $\beta = -0.766, p = .011$ ), and openness ( $\beta = -1.768, p = .002$ ). Although the moderating role of age is not surprising (see Section 2.4), the latter finding is, as Shafranek (2020) shows, that people are milder towards out-partisans that deviate from the stereotypical out-party member and, according to Abts et al. (2015), people showing preferences for the right-wing nationalist party in Flanders are mostly 40- and 50-year-olds. Note that the findings from Abts et al. (2015) are based on pre-decade data, cautioning that the average profile of right-wing nationalist party members may have changed since then.

Another interesting finding is that when the applicant is female, the positive effect of engagement with the green party on hireability no longer remains ( $\beta = -1.035, p = .008$ ); similarly, there is no negative effect of engagement with the right-wing nationalist party on hireability ( $\beta = .910, p = .018$ ) for women. These results align with our expectations since, as explained in Section 2.4, women are always perceived as a little more leftist than stated: when an applicant is seen as more leftist than green, she is possibly perceived as somewhat more extreme left-wing, and we did not see a positive effect of engagement with the left-wing socialist party on hireability, but only of engagement with the green party. A similar reasoning applies to engagement with the right-wing nationalist party: when women are perceived as more leftist than stated, they are perceived as being situated closer to the centre of the political spectrum, and we did not find a negative effect of political engagement on hireability in that context.

Concerning the interaction with job characteristics, we find that when the required education level is high and the applicant is engaged with the nationalist or the right-wing nationalist party, taste to collaborate ( $\beta = -.828, p = .033$ ;  $\beta = -.964, p = .005$ ), as well as hireability ( $\beta = -1.367, p = .000$ ;  $\beta = -1.487, p = .002$ ), is negatively impacted. However, when the required educational level is high and the applicant is engaged with the liberal democrat party, recruiters form a convincingly more negative image of the applicant, including of extraversion ( $\beta = -2.216, p = .005$ ), neuroticism ( $\beta = .687, p = .001$ ), openness ( $\beta = -1.770, p = .004$ ) and hireability ( $\beta = -1.499, p = .003$ ). In summary, required education level indeed has a moderating role in the relationship between the expression of a political engagement and several assessment dimensions, yet not always in the expected direction as, discussed in Section 2.3., voters of the right-wing nationalist party are typically less educated than voters of the nationalist party and the liberal democrat party (Abts et al., 2015).

When the required level of creativity is high and the applicant is engaged with the nationalist or the right-wing nationalist party, we see a convincingly more positive image of the applicant, such as on taste to collaborate ( $\beta = .615, p = .042$ ;  $\beta = 1.213, p = .012$ ), which is rather unexpected since for vacancies with high levels of required creativity, more positive effects were expected for applicants revealing a left-wing political preference (as discussed in Section 2.3). However, the significance of these moderations contradicting expectations is not very pronounced.

Regarding the recruiter characteristics, and in contrast to the indirect findings in Gift and Gift (2015) in the two-party system of the US, we do not find significant interactions related to applicants and recruiters having the same or a different political party of preference. In contrast, the gender of the recruiter does seem to play a role when the political engagement is on the left of the spectrum, but there is no clear line to draw here. The combination of a left-wing socialist applicant and a female recruiter boosts the hireability score ( $\beta = 1.669, p = .000$ ) and the applicant is seen as more extraverted ( $\beta = 1.020, p = .001$ ). When the applicant is associated with the green party and the recruiter is female, the applicant is assessed to be more prone to neuroticism ( $\beta = 1.257, p = .000$ ), but is also seen as more open ( $\beta = .789, p = .007$ ).

## 4. Conclusion

This study addressed a notable gap in the international academic literature on labour market discrimination by focusing on stigma related to political engagement. Using a vignette experiment, we examined whether political engagement, in general or for a specific party, leads to a different assessment of job candidates in terms of taste to collaborate with the candidate, their perceived personality and their hireability. In doing so, we explicitly controlled for a propensity for socially desirable responses among the genuine recruiters who participated.

Our findings reveal noteworthy effects associated with expressing political engagement in general: compared to job applicants who do not reveal an extracurricular activity, applicants expressing political engagement are perceived to demonstrate heightened

assertiveness and reduced emotional sensitivity, albeit at the cost of being perceived as less empathetic and open. The assessment of lower emotional sensitivity is remarkably consistent across engagement for all seven parties included.

Focusing on specific political parties reveals notable results particularly for the right-wing of the political spectrum. That is, we find that applicants expressing a political engagement with the right-wing nationalist party have a lower hiring probability compared to applicants who do not mention an extracurricular activity on their resume. However, they are still given an equal opportunity for an interview. This could be explained by the notion that political preference is not seen as a basis for discrimination, but rather that during an interview, recruiters expect it to become apparent that right-wing nationalists may collaborate less effectively with employers, colleagues and clients and that these applicants are less agreeable (including less open to teamwork and empathic) and less open (including less creative and open-minded).

Our study design also allows us to investigate recruiter, job and applicant characteristics as moderators in the relationship between revealing political engagement and candidate assessment. In contrast to research conducted in one- or two-party systems, we do not find differences in the results depending on the political preference of the recruiter. Other characteristics, such as the required education level of the job, do play a role: the effect of expressing a political engagement in a resume is more negative when the required education level of the vacancy is high.

We conclude this study by acknowledging limitations concerning the validity of this research and by formulating related directions for future research. In particular, the data collection in this experimental setup does not occur within real-life circumstances, and participants are aware of taking part in an experiment. Consequently, participants may respond in a socially desirable manner. Nevertheless, we believe our results are valid, due to several reasons. First, an increasing number of studies show high correlation between self-reported perceptions in similar experiments and actual behaviour (Mas & Palais, 2017; Baert et al., in press). Second, it was improbable for participants to discern the socially desirable response as only in one fourth of the vignettes a political engagement was mentioned to conceal the goal of the study. Third, a lower score on certain assessment dimensions based on political engagement was identified, which is evidently not socially

desirable. Thus, we suspect any bias to be limited; at worst, a highly negative effect was distorted to moderately negative. Nevertheless, we advocate for experimental field research that, while offering less insight into the ‘why’ question addressed in this study, can more precisely reveal the costs of political engagement in terms of hireability.

Finally, we acknowledge the specificity of our results for the Flemish context, as only Flemish political parties were included, and participants were only professionally active in Flanders. Although the included parties are very similar in ideology to parties elsewhere in the world, especially in Europe, where even groups are formed within the European Parliament based on these ideological similarities, it is possible that the image of these parties can vary from country to country. While we do not immediately see reasons that, say, the established stigma regarding personality traits should be very context-sensitive, we are outspoken in asking for replication of our research within: i) other countries with multi-party systems, and ii) contexts with other political systems.

## References

- Abts, K., Swyngedouw, M. & Meuleman, B. (2015). *Het profiel van de Vlaamse kiezers in 2014. Wie stemde waarom op welke partij? Analyse op basis van de postelektorale verkiezingsonderzoeken 1991–2014. Onderzoeksverslag Centrum voor Sociologisch Onderzoek*. Instituut voor Sociaal en Politiek Opinieonderzoek, Leuven. Working paper.
- Appleton, S., Knight, J., Qingjie, X. & Song, L. (2009). The economics of Communist Party membership: The curious case of rising numbers and wage premium during China’s transition. *Journal of Development Studies*, 45, 256–275.
- Arrow, K. (1973). The theory of discrimination. In Ashenfelter, O., Rees, A. (Eds.) *Discrimination in labor markets*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Auspurg, K. & Hinz, T. (2015). *Factorial survey experiments*. California: Sage Publications.
- Baert, S. (2015). Field experimental evidence on gender discrimination in hiring: Biased as Heckman and Siegelman predicted? *Economics*, 9(1), 1–11.
- Baert, S. (2018). Hiring discrimination: An overview of (almost) all correspondence experiments since 2005. In: Gaddis, S.M. (Ed.) *Audit studies: Behind the scenes with*

*theory, method, and nuance* (pp. 63–77).

- Baert, S., & Decuyper, L. (2014). Better sexy than flexy? A lab experiment assessing the impact of perceived attractiveness and personality traits on hiring decisions. *Applied Economics Letters*, 21(9), 597–601.
- Baert, S., Herregods, J., & Sterkens, P. (in press). What does job applicants' body art signal to employers? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*.
- Bakker, B. N., Hopmann, D. N. & Persson, M. (2015). Personality traits and party identification over time. *European Journal of Political Research*, 54, 197–215.
- Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V. & Vecchione, M. (2007). Voters' personality traits in presidential elections. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(7), 1199–1208.
- Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1–26.
- Becker, G. S. (1957): *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burden, B. C. & Klofstad, C. A. (2005). Affect and cognition in party identification. *Political Psychology*, 26(6), 869–887.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Caligiuri, P. M. (2000). The big five personality characteristics as predictors of expatriates' desire to terminate the assignment and supervisor rated performance. *Journal of Personal Psychology*, 53(17), 67–87.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C. & Zimbardo, P. G. (1999). Personality profiles and political parties. *Political Psychology*, 20(1), 175–197.
- Caramani, D. (2017). *Comparative politics* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Carlsson, M. & Rooth, D. O. (2007). Evidence of ethnic discrimination in the Swedish labor market using experimental data. *Labour Economics*, 14(4), 716–29.
- Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000). *Official Journal of the European Communities*. Consulted on [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text\\_en.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf).
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEOPI-R: Professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Dessens J., Flap, H., Jansen, W. & Verhoeven, W.J. (2008). Income advantages of Communist Party members before and during the transformation process. *European Societies*, 10, 379–402.



- Devroe, R. & Wauters, B. (2018). Political gender stereotypes in a list-PR system with a high share of women MPs: Competent men versus leftist women? *Sage Journals*, 7(4), 788–800.
- Erdheim, J., Wang, M. & Zickar, M. J. (2006). Linking the big five personality constructs to organizational commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(5), 959–970.
- European Social Survey [ESS]. (2023). *ESS10 integrated file, edition 3.1* [Dataset]. Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research. Doi: [https://doi.org/10.21338/ess10sce03\\_0](https://doi.org/10.21338/ess10sce03_0)
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D. & Dowling, C. M. (2012a). Disagreement and the avoidance of political discussion: Aggregate relationships and differences across personality traits. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(4), 849–874.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D. & Dowling, C. M. (2012b). Personality and strength and direction of partisan identification. *Political Behavior*, 34, 653–688.
- Gift, K. & Gift, T. (2015). Does politics influence hiring? Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Political Behavior*, 37, 653–675.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M. & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 575–604.
- Hibbing, M. V., Ritchie, M. & Anderson, M. R. (2011). Personality and political discussion. *Political Behavior*, 33, pp. 601-624.
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 6, 6570.
- Kekkonen, A., & Ylä-Anttila, T. (2021). Affective blocs: Understanding affective polarization in multiparty systems. *Electoral Studies*, 72, 102367.
- Kelly, J. T. (2018). *Fitting the stereotype: Partisan/Ideological group stereotypes and social identity*. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Kunz, V. (2005). Persönlichkeitseigenschaften und Wahlverhalten in den alten und neuen Bundesländern nach der Theorie des überlegten Handelns. In S. Schuman & H. Schoen (Eds.), *Persönlichkeit. Eine vergessene Größe der empirischen Sozialforschung*. Wiesbaden. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Lippens, L., Vermeiren, S., & Baert, S. (2023). The state of hiring discrimination: A meta-analysis of (almost) all recent correspondence experiments. *European Economic Review*,

151(1), 104315.

- Liu, Q. (2012). Unemployment and labor force participation in urban China. *China Economic Review*, 23, 18–33.
- Mas, A., & Pallais, A. (2017). Valuing alternative work arrangements. *American Economic Review*, 107(12), 3722–3759.
- McClosky, H. (1958). Conservatism and personality. *American Political Science Review*, 52(1), 27–45.
- Mondak, J. J. & Halperin, K. D. (2008). A framework for the study of personality and political behavior. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38, 335–362.
- Mössner, A. (2005). Typisch Parteiidentifizierer? Parteiidentifikation und Persönlichkeit. In S. Schuman & H. Schoen (Eds.), *Persönlichkeit. Eine vergessene Größe der empirischen Sozialforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R. & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-factor model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance*, 11(10), 145–165.
- Munro, G. D., Lasane, T. P. & Leary, S. P. (2010). Political partisan prejudice: Selective distortion and weighting of evaluative categories in college admissions applications. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40, 2434–2462.
- Phelps, E. S. (1972). The statistical theory of racism and sexism. *The American Economic Review*, 62(4), 659–661.
- Schmidt, F. L., Oh, I. S. & Shaffer, J. A. (2016). *The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 100 years of research findings*. Fox School of Business Research Paper.
- Shafranek, R. M. (2020). *Spillover: Partisan conflict in nonpolitical settings*. Evanston, Illinois. Dissertation.
- Shafranek, R. M. (2021). Political considerations in nonpolitical decisions: A conjoint analysis of roommate choice. *Political Behavior*, 43, 271–300.
- Schoen, H. & Schumann, S. (2007). Personality traits, partisan attitudes and voting behaviour: Evidence from Germany. *Political Psychology*, 28(4), 471–498.
- Sibley, C., Osborne, D & Duckitt, J. T. (2012). Personality and political orientation: Meta-analysis and test of threat-constraint model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46(6), 644–677.

- Statbel (Algemene Directie Statistiek – Statistics Belgium) (2023). *Voornamen van de bevolking in 2023 per gewest en leeftijdsklasse*. Consulted on <https://statbel.fgov.be/nl/themas/bevolking/namen-en-voornamen>.
- Steenkamp, J. B. E., De Jong, M. G., & Baumgartner, H. (2010). Socially desirable response tendencies in survey research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(2), 199–214.
- Sterkens, P., Baert, S., Rooman, C. & Derous, E. (2022). Why making promotion after burnout is like boiling the ocean. *European Sociological Review*, 34(4), 516–531.
- Sterkens, P., Caers, R., De Couck, M., Van Driessche, V., Geamanu, M. & Baert, S. (2021). Costly mistakes: Why and when spelling errors in resumes jeopardise interview chances. *PLoS ONE*, 18(4).
- Sterkens, P., Sharipova, A., & Baert, S. (in press). Disclosing the ‘big C’: What does cancer survivorship signal to employers? *European Journal of Health Economics*. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-023-01618-2>
- Swyngedouw, M., Gaasendam, C., Abts, K. & Meuleman, B. (2016). Verschillen en complementariteit tussen groene en rode kiezers. *Sampol*, 7, 12–18.
- VDAB (n.d.). *Een job vinden via Facebook*. Consulted on <https://www.vdab.be/zoektips/facebook>.
- Vecchione, M., Schoen, H., Castro, J. L. G., Cieciuch, J., Pavlopoulos, V. & Caprara, G. V. (2011). Personality correlates of party preference: The big five in five big European countries. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(6), 737–742.
- Verba, S., Burns, N. & Schlozman, K. L. (1997). Knowing and caring about politics: Gender and political engagement. *The Journal of Politics*, 59(4), 1051–1072.
- Vlaamse Overheid (n.d.). *Vlaams Parlement: Uitslagen 2019 (volledig)*. Vlaanderenkiest.be. Retrieved December 11, 2023, from <https://www.vlaanderenkiest.be/verkiezingen2019/#/parlement/02000>
- Weisberg, Y. J., DeYoung, C. G. & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). Gender differences in personality across the ten aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 00178.
- Wolff, H. & Kim, S. (2012). The relationship between networking behaviours and big five personality dimensions. *Career Development International*, 17(1), 43–66.
- Zettler, I. & Hilbig, B. E. (2010). Attitudes of selfless: Explaining political orientation with altruism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(3), 338–342.

**Table 1.** Vignette factors and levels

Vignette factors	Vignette levels
Gender	1. Male 2. Female
Age	1. 30 ± 3 year 2. 40 ± 3 year 3. 50 ± 3 year
Extracurricular activity	1. Political Engagement: Left-wing socialist 2. Political Engagement: Green 3. Political Engagement: Social democrat 4. Political Engagement: Christian democrat 5. Political Engagement: Liberal democrat 6. Political Engagement: Nationalist 7. Political Engagement: Right-wing nationalist 8. Non-political Engagement: Neighbourhood committee 9. Non-political Engagement: Carnival committee 10. Non-political Engagement: Cultural council 11. Non-political Engagement: Traffic safety committee 12. Non-political Engagement: Family union 13. Non-political Engagement: NPO poverty & deprivation 14. Non-political Engagement: Food bank 15.–28. No extracurricular commitment

*Note.* To avoid vignettes appearing too similar to respondents, three years were randomly deducted from or added onto the vignette levels, in analogy with Sterkens et al. (2022). The vignette factor ‘Extracurricular activity’ was included in the resumes under ‘hobbies’, next to one non-politically correlated hobby (in line with Shafranek, 2020). In cases with the level ‘No extracurricular commitment’, only this one hobby was mentioned on the resume. The factorial product of the vignette levels (28 x 2 x 3) resulted in a vignette universe of 168 unique vignette combinations. A D-efficient sample of 200 vignettes, randomly allocated in forty decks of five vignettes was used in the survey, where decks were randomly allocated to the recruiters (D-efficiency: 97.1037).

**Table 2.** Impact of expressing a political engagement on the assessment dimensions: Multivariate regression analysis

	Taste to collaborate	Anticipated extraversion	Anticipated neuroticism	Anticipated agreeableness	Anticipated conscientiousness	Anticipated openness	Hireability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)							
Political extracurricular activity	-0.086 (0.104)	0.148 (0.114)	-0.292*** (0.079)	-0.262* (0.116)	0.093 (0.111)	-0.338* (0.133)	0.031 (0.144)
Non-political extracurricular activity	0.017 (0.111)	-0.046 (0.137)	-0.092 (0.070)	0.118 (0.119)	-0.054 (0.114)	-0.074 (0.131)	0.056 (0.121)
Female (ref. = Male)	0.019 (0.088)	-0.092 (0.106)	0.100 <sup>†</sup> (0.059)	0.111 (0.096)	0.011 (0.093)	0.030 (0.109)	0.083 (0.110)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.146 (0.108)	0.012 (0.132)	-0.001 (0.070)	0.040 (0.113)	0.083 (0.122)	0.104 (0.137)	0.177 (0.127)
Older	0.062 (0.106)	0.019 (0.133)	0.053 (0.073)	0.039 (0.119)	0.008 (0.117)	-0.012 (0.132)	0.024 (0.133)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
High required educational level (ref. = Not required)	0.142 (0.103)	0.111 (0.125)	-0.192** (0.061)	0.050 (0.124)	0.650*** (0.114)	-0.223 <sup>†</sup> (0.126)	-0.581*** (0.118)
High required level of helpfulness (ref. = Not required)	0.369** (0.123)	0.762*** (0.128)	0.327*** (0.063)	0.755*** (0.135)	-0.074 (0.106)	0.526*** (0.126)	0.190 (0.128)
High required level of creativity (ref. = Not required)	-0.307** (0.095)	0.091 (0.116)	0.021 (0.054)	-0.180 <sup>†</sup> (0.103)	0.040 (0.089)	0.291** (0.111)	-0.582*** (0.106)
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.396** (0.113)	-0.190 (0.121)	0.050 (0.061)	-0.322* (0.130)	-0.129 (0.119)	-0.027 (0.124)	0.102 (0.122)
Preferred party (ref. = Undecided)							
Left-wing socialist	0.013 (0.296)	0.000 (0.277)	0.299 <sup>†</sup> (0.153)	-0.087 (0.269)	-0.402 (0.245)	-0.712** (0.249)	0.773 <sup>†</sup> (0.396)
Green	0.929*** (0.224)	0.446 <sup>†</sup> (0.245)	0.353* (0.159)	0.581* (0.276)	0.139 (0.259)	0.449 (0.305)	1.142*** (0.318)
Social democrat	0.262 (0.241)	0.427 <sup>†</sup> (0.244)	0.358* (0.138)	0.429 (0.263)	0.233 (0.266)	0.526* (0.247)	1.047*** (0.279)
Christian democrat	0.815** (0.252)	0.777** (0.285)	0.101 (0.172)	0.851** (0.278)	0.553 <sup>†</sup> (0.290)	0.883** (0.271)	1.265*** (0.294)
Liberal democrat	0.970*** (0.245)	0.636* (0.271)	0.186 (0.146)	1.174*** (0.274)	0.688** (0.245)	0.773** (0.268)	1.393*** (0.301)
Nationalist	0.352 <sup>†</sup> (0.210)	0.238 (0.215)	0.324* (0.141)	0.391 <sup>†</sup> (0.220)	-0.070 (0.233)	0.124 (0.211)	1.019*** (0.253)
Right-wing nationalist	0.416 <sup>†</sup> (0.246)	0.500 <sup>†</sup> (0.260)	0.204 (0.142)	0.488 <sup>†</sup> (0.282)	0.124 (0.255)	0.379 (0.280)	1.084*** (0.265)
% of time evaluating applicants (c.)	0.004 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)	-0.006*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.003)	0.007** (0.002)	0.003 (0.003)	0.008*** (0.002)
Experience evaluating applicants (ref. = Less than 1 year)							
1 to 5 years	-0.497** (0.179)	-0.614** (0.186)	0.045 (0.120)	-0.394* (0.189)	-0.725*** (0.201)	-0.643*** (0.179)	0.623** (0.219)
More than 5 years	-0.813*** (0.172)	-0.909*** (0.192)	-0.007 (0.121)	-0.815*** (0.195)	-1.026*** (0.202)	-0.920*** (0.185)	0.363 (0.233)
Social desirability score	0.021 (0.017)	0.013 (0.020)	0.011 (0.009)	0.025 (0.020)	0.039* (0.019)	0.028 (0.020)	-0.044* (0.019)
Observations	1,250						

Note. The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*)(\*)(†) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) ((10%)) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference), c. (continuous variable).

**Table 3.** Impact of expressing a specific political engagement on the assessment dimensions: Multivariate regression analysis

	Taste to collaborate	Anticipated extraversion	Anticipated neuroticism	Anticipated agreeableness	Anticipated conscientiousness	Anticipated openness	Hireability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)							
Left-wing socialist	0.082 (0.164)	0.242 (0.226)	-0.184 <sup>†</sup> (0.099)	0.041 (0.175)	0.027 (0.235)	-0.122 (0.207)	0.031 (0.297)
Green	0.193 (0.127)	0.442 <sup>***</sup> (0.082)	-0.484* (0.217)	0.029 (0.158)	0.584 <sup>**</sup> (0.204)	-0.022 (0.250)	0.580 <sup>**</sup> (0.175)
Social democrat	-0.342 (0.293)	-0.066 (0.344)	-0.056 (0.155)	-0.425 <sup>†</sup> (0.256)	-0.128 (0.175)	-0.395 (0.260)	-0.160 (0.189)
Christian democrat	0.202 (0.197)	0.105 (0.248)	-0.057 (0.125)	-0.176 (0.223)	0.011 (0.163)	-0.124 (0.278)	0.293 (0.254)
Liberal democrat	-0.018 (0.191)	-0.113 (0.242)	-0.256 (0.160)	-0.362 <sup>**</sup> (0.112)	-0.025 (0.299)	-0.228 (0.234)	0.379 (0.255)
Nationalist	0.002 (0.247)	0.487 (0.307)	-0.648 <sup>**</sup> (0.200)	0.220 (0.225)	0.368 <sup>†</sup> (0.210)	-0.189 (0.331)	-0.092 (0.380)
Right-wing nationalist	-0.702 <sup>**</sup> (0.210)	-0.087 (0.218)	-0.337* (0.151)	-1.099 <sup>***</sup> (0.306)	-0.171 (0.280)	-1.171 <sup>**</sup> (0.374)	-0.689 <sup>†</sup> (0.373)
Neighbourhood committee	0.317 <sup>†</sup> (0.176)	0.460 <sup>**</sup> (0.141)	-0.323 (0.234)	0.409 (0.307)	0.245 (0.256)	0.404 (0.323)	0.012 (0.257)
Carnival committee	-0.077 (0.233)	-0.244 (0.304)	-0.124 (0.111)	0.151 (0.266)	-0.231 (0.245)	-0.273 (0.272)	-0.064 (0.316)
Cultural council	-0.336 (0.291)	-0.303 (0.324)	-0.188 (0.158)	-0.346 (0.244)	0.028 (0.202)	-0.356 (0.260)	-0.360 <sup>†</sup> (0.193)
Traffic safety committee	0.130 (0.276)	0.113 (0.319)	0.018 (0.086)	0.158 (0.244)	-0.091 (0.255)	0.096 (0.186)	0.008 (0.213)
Family union	-0.169 (0.273)	-0.099 (0.445)	-0.088 (0.164)	0.077 (0.320)	-0.398 (0.325)	-0.088 (0.456)	0.296 (0.291)
NPO deprivation	0.112 (0.252)	-0.101 (0.397)	-0.199 (0.172)	0.330 (0.324)	0.123 (0.221)	0.066 (0.277)	0.204 (0.186)
Food bank	0.151 (0.218)	-0.084 (0.206)	0.186 (0.120)	0.112 (0.210)	-0.044 (0.230)	-0.230 (0.208)	0.302 (0.242)
Female (ref. = Male)	0.024 (0.084)	-0.091 (0.103)	0.092 (0.057)	0.123 (0.091)	0.023 (0.092)	0.046 (0.105)	0.089 (0.105)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.147 (0.108)	0.009 (0.130)	0.015 (0.067)	0.040 (0.110)	0.063 (0.118)	0.109 (0.135)	0.171 (0.128)
Older	0.048 (0.105)	0.018 (0.130)	0.057 (0.071)	0.023 (0.112)	-0.005 (0.116)	-0.027 (0.128)	-0.015 (0.127)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
High required educational level (ref. = Not required)	0.147 (0.104)	0.117 (0.125)	-0.189 <sup>**</sup> (0.061)	0.056 (0.126)	0.651 <sup>***</sup> (0.116)	-0.216 <sup>†</sup> (0.128)	-0.591 <sup>***</sup> (0.119)
High required level of helpfulness (ref. = Not required)	0.358 <sup>**</sup> (0.124)	0.751 <sup>***</sup> (0.129)	0.327 <sup>***</sup> (0.063)	0.737 <sup>***</sup> (0.136)	-0.078 (0.107)	0.506 <sup>***</sup> (0.129)	0.183 (0.130)
High required level of creativity (ref. = Not required)	-0.292 <sup>**</sup> (0.094)	0.107 (0.114)	0.017 (0.053)	-0.159 (0.101)	0.046 (0.089)	0.310 <sup>**</sup> (0.108)	-0.569 <sup>***</sup> (0.106)
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.394 <sup>**</sup> (0.113)	-0.193 (0.120)	0.052 (0.062)	-0.313* (0.131)	-0.140 (0.121)	-0.029 (0.125)	0.107 (0.124)
Preferred party (ref. = Undecided)							
Left-wing socialist	0.006 (0.305)	-0.022 (0.279)	0.321* (0.158)	-0.100 (0.271)	-0.399 (0.257)	-0.744 <sup>**</sup> (0.246)	0.746 <sup>†</sup> (0.396)
Green	0.931 <sup>***</sup> (0.230)	0.476 <sup>†</sup> (0.253)	0.332* (0.161)	0.609* (0.283)	0.159 (0.263)	0.461 (0.311)	1.109 <sup>**</sup> (0.324)
Social democrat	0.255 (0.240)	0.414 <sup>†</sup> (0.242)	0.372 <sup>**</sup> (0.136)	0.421 (0.259)	0.224 (0.268)	0.507* (0.246)	1.033 <sup>***</sup> (0.275)
Christian democrat	0.788 <sup>**</sup> (0.256)	0.749* (0.287)	0.121 (0.173)	0.810 <sup>**</sup> (0.278)	0.523 <sup>†</sup> (0.293)	0.852 <sup>**</sup> (0.274)	1.219 <sup>***</sup> (0.292)

Liberal democrat	0.965*** (0.247)	0.630* (0.272)	0.180 (0.145)	1.177*** (0.276)	0.693** (0.245)	0.768** (0.270)	1.379*** (0.305)
Nationalist	0.349 (0.214)	0.233 (0.215)	0.336* (0.142)	0.380 <sup>†</sup> (0.220)	-0.070 (0.238)	0.119 (0.213)	0.998*** (0.254)
Right-wing nationalist	0.404 (0.248)	0.496 <sup>†</sup> (0.261)	0.205 (0.142)	0.476 <sup>†</sup> (0.283)	0.127 (0.258)	0.365 (0.282)	1.064*** (0.269)
% of time evaluating applicants (c.)	0.004 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)	-0.006*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.003)	0.007** (0.002)	0.002 (0.003)	0.008*** (0.002)
Experience evaluating applicants (ref. = Less than 1 year)							
1 to 5 years	-0.519** (0.182)	-0.631** (0.190)	0.043 (0.123)	-0.431* (0.190)	-0.731*** (0.206)	-0.685*** (0.182)	0.607** (0.224)
More than 5 years	-0.844*** (0.176)	-0.930*** (0.194)	-0.013 (0.121)	-0.860*** (0.196)	-1.036*** (0.207)	-0.970*** (0.187)	0.339 (0.236)
Social desirability score	0.021 (0.017)	0.013 (0.020)	0.010 (0.009)	0.025 (0.019)	0.040* (0.019)	0.027 (0.020)	-0.045* (0.019)
Observations	1,250						

*Note.* The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) ((†)) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) ((10%)) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference), c. (continuous variable).

## Online Appendix A: Additional tables

**Table A1.** Jobs and corresponding job characteristics used in the experiment

<b>Job</b>	<b>Required educational level</b>	<b>Required level of helpfulness</b>	<b>Required level of creativity</b>
Travel guide	Low	High	High
Orderly	Low	High	Low
Sewer, hand	Low	Low	High
Cook, fast food	Low	Low	Low
Mental health expert	High	High	High
Family medicine physician	High	High	Low
Economist	High	Low	High
Cytotechnologist	High	Low	Low

*Note.* As explained in Section 2.3, jobs were selected and categorised based on data provided by O\*Net. Jobs with ‘Req. educational level’ ‘Low’ in this table were selected from ‘Job zone 1’ or ‘Job zone 2’, and jobs with ‘Req. educational level’ ‘High’ were selected from ‘Job zone 5’. The qualification into ‘High’ and ‘Low’ level of ‘Req. level of helpfulness’ is based on the O\*Net variable ‘Work activities – assisting and caring for others’: when ‘Req. level of helpfulness’ is classified as ‘Low’, this variable is lower than 40 and when ‘Req. level of helpfulness’ is classified as ‘High’, it is higher than 60. For ‘Req. level of creativity’, the O\*Net variable ‘Work activities – thinking creatively’ was employed (classified as ‘Low’ when lower than 40 and as ‘High’ when higher than 60).



**Table A2.** Specific items for the assessment of the applicant

<b>Assessment dimensions</b>	<b>Statement</b>
<b>A. HIREABILITY</b>	
Interview probability	I think I would invite this applicant for a job interview.
Hiring probability	There is a fair chance that I would hire this applicant.
<b>B. TASTE TO COLLABORATE</b>	
Ability to work together with employer	Applicants with this profile generally work well together with their employer.
Ability to work together with colleagues	Applicants with this profile generally work well together with their colleagues.
Ability to work together with clients	Applicants with this profile generally work well together with their clients.
<b>C. PERSONALITY TRAITS</b>	
Perceived extraversion: Sociability	Applicants with this profile are generally sociable.
Perceived extraversion: Assertiveness	Applicants with this profile are generally assertive.
Perceived neuroticism: Emotional sensitivity	Applicants with this profile are, in general, emotionally sensitive.
Perceived neuroticism: Inability to cope with stress	Applicants with this profile generally have a good ability to cope with stress (reversed coding).
Perceived agreeableness: Willingness to work in teams	Applicants with this profile generally enjoy working together with others.
Perceived agreeableness: Empathy	Applicants with this profile are generally empathetic.
Perceived conscientiousness: Self-discipline	Applicants with this profile usually have a high level of self-discipline.
Perceived conscientiousness: Level of organisation	Applicants with this profile are usually organised.
Perceived openness: Creativity	Applicants with this profile are usually creative.
Perceived openness: Open-mindedness	Applicants with this profile are usually open-minded.

*Note.* As explained in Section 2.4, these items were all measured on an eleven-point Likert scale (with a score of zero corresponding to ‘completely disagree’ and a score of ten to ‘completely agree’).

**Table A3.** Impact of expressing a political engagement on the assessment dimensions: Multivariate regression analysis using a restricted sample of recruiters with low or average social desirability scores

	Taste to collaborate	Anticipated extraversion	Anticipated neuroticism	Anticipated agreeableness	Anticipated conscientiousness	Anticipated openness	Hireability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)							
Political extracurricular activity	-0.095 (0.116)	0.112 (0.123)	-0.290*** (0.079)	-0.325** (0.118)	0.065 (0.117)	-0.401** (0.138)	0.067 (0.163)
Non-political extracurricular activity	-0.064 (0.132)	-0.110 (0.141)	-0.092 (0.070)	0.034 (0.137)	-0.085 (0.126)	-0.119 (0.153)	0.029 (0.143)
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.032 (0.102)	-0.128 (0.111)	0.102 <sup>+</sup> (0.058)	0.073 (0.104)	0.015 (0.102)	-0.003 (0.119)	0.063 (0.123)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.140 (0.126)	0.036 (0.140)	0.011 (0.071)	0.032 (0.125)	0.053 (0.133)	0.118 (0.151)	0.168 (0.143)
Older	0.080 (0.124)	0.039 (0.138)	0.056 (0.073)	0.082 (0.128)	-0.051 (0.130)	0.017 (0.146)	-0.050 (0.149)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Observations	1,045						

*Note.* The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. Participants were considered as scoring 'high' on the social desirability scale when they had a score above the sample average plus one standard deviation. When 'Yes' is indicated in the row 'B. Job characteristics' and 'C. Recruiter characteristics', the job and recruiter characteristics discussed in Section 2.3 and 2.4 are added as control variables. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) ((+)) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) (10%) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference).

**Table A4.** Impact of expressing a political preference on the individual items of the assessment dimensions: multivariate regression analysis

	Taste to collaborate			Anticipated extraversion		Anticipated neuroticism	
	Employer	Colleagues	Clients	Social	Assertive	Emotional sensitivity	Inability to cope with stress
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)							
Political extracurricular activity	-0.186 <sup>†</sup> (0.111)	-0.113 (0.113)	0.042 (0.116)	0.049 (0.132)	0.247* (0.119)	-0.711*** (0.123)	0.128 (0.134)
Non-political extracurricular activity	-0.117 (0.119)	0.045 (0.118)	0.122 (0.118)	-0.007 (0.143)	-0.086 (0.142)	-0.301** (0.113)	0.117 (0.119)
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.014 (0.093)	0.055 (0.095)	0.017 (0.096)	-0.038 (0.114)	-0.147 (0.111)	0.146 (0.101)	0.054 (0.106)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.150 (0.116)	0.185 (0.113)	0.103 (0.121)	0.117 (0.136)	-0.093 (0.139)	0.030 (0.121)	-0.032 (0.129)
Older	0.031 (0.109)	0.088 (0.115)	0.066 (0.117)	0.054 (0.145)	-0.016 (0.138)	0.035 (0.128)	0.070 (0.128)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Observations	1,250						

*Note.* The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. When ‘Yes’ is indicated in the row ‘B. Job characteristics’ and ‘C. Recruiter characteristics’, the job and recruiter characteristics discussed in Section 2.3 and 2.5 are added as control variables. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) (((†))) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) ((5%)) (((10%))) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference).

Table A4 Continued.

	Anticipated agreeableness		Anticipated conscientiousness		Anticipated openness		Hireability	
	Eagerness to work with others	Empathetic	Self-disciplined	Organised	Creative	Open minded	Interview probability	Hiring probability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>								
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)								
Political extracurricular activity	-0.175 (0.121)	-0.349** (0.128)	0.019 (0.121)	0.167 (0.119)	-0.287* (0.135)	-0.390* (0.155)	0.163 (0.162)	-0.100 (0.148)
Non-political extracurricular activity	0.079 (0.127)	0.157 (0.129)	-0.124 (0.119)	0.016 (0.122)	-0.185 (0.147)	0.037 (0.132)	0.183 (0.122)	-0.072 (0.138)
Female (ref. = Male)	0.034 (0.100)	0.187 <sup>†</sup> (0.108)	0.012 (0.098)	0.009 (0.099)	0.023 (0.117)	0.037 (0.116)	0.098 (0.116)	0.068 (0.119)
Age (ref. = Middle)								
Younger	-0.023 (0.121)	0.102 (0.130)	0.074 (0.129)	0.092 (0.128)	0.037 (0.148)	0.171 (0.146)	0.248 <sup>+</sup> (0.135)	0.106 (0.138)
Older	-0.006 (0.123)	0.084 (0.135)	0.065 (0.121)	-0.049 (0.126)	-0.052 (0.145)	0.028 (0.138)	0.082 (0.138)	-0.034 (0.147)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Observations	1,250							

Note. The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. When 'Yes' is indicated in the row 'B. Job characteristics' and 'C. Recruiter characteristics', the job and recruiter characteristics discussed in Section 2.3 and 2.5 are added as control variables. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) ((†)) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) ((10%)) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference).

**Table A5.** Impact of expressing a specific political preference on the assessment dimensions: Multivariate regression analysis using a restricted sample of recruiters with a lower social desirability tendency

	Taste to collaborate	Anticipated extraversion	Anticipated neuroticism	Anticipated agreeableness	Anticipated conscientiousness	Anticipated openness	Hireability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)							
Left-wing socialist	0.038 (0.241)	0.091 (0.257)	-0.265* (0.117)	-0.177 (0.166)	-0.102 (0.270)	-0.376 <sup>†</sup> (0.193)	-0.004 (0.407)
Green	0.024 (0.128)	0.259 (0.176)	-0.549* (0.241)	-0.132 (0.151)	0.425 <sup>†</sup> (0.240)	-0.223 (0.300)	0.509* (0.226)
Social democrat	-0.185 (0.221)	0.173 (0.484)	-0.119 (0.145)	-0.389 (0.271)	0.207 <sup>†</sup> (0.116)	-0.403 (0.282)	-0.010 (0.209)
Christian democrat	0.098 (0.223)	-0.104 (0.251)	0.013 (0.119)	-0.356 (0.241)	-0.022 (0.212)	-0.319 (0.288)	0.280 (0.328)
Liberal democrat	0.284 <sup>†</sup> (0.169)	0.186 (0.218)	-0.198 (0.157)	-0.018 (0.206)	0.181 (0.287)	0.211 (0.248)	0.657** (0.249)
Nationalist	-0.097 (0.276)	0.457 (0.285)	-0.696*** (0.181)	0.099 (0.229)	0.320 (0.226)	-0.345 (0.331)	-0.032 (0.436)
Right-wing nationalist	-0.699** (0.246)	-0.192 (0.254)	-0.200* (0.090)	-1.161*** (0.264)	-0.407 (0.246)	-1.129** (0.369)	-0.713 <sup>†</sup> (0.388)
Neighbourhood committee	0.261 (0.190)	0.305 <sup>†</sup> (0.163)	-0.385 (0.267)	0.292 (0.371)	0.258 (0.317)	0.310 (0.426)	-0.042 (0.307)
Carnival committee	-0.288 (0.259)	-0.509* (0.255)	-0.157 <sup>†</sup> (0.094)	-0.121 (0.272)	-0.298 (0.289)	-0.395 (0.290)	0.138 (0.274)
Cultural council	-0.410 (0.315)	-0.295 (0.347)	-0.113 (0.131)	-0.324 (0.292)	0.040 (0.196)	-0.346 (0.345)	-0.479 (0.292)
Traffic safety committee	-0.034 (0.358)	0.089 (0.275)	0.009 (0.105)	-0.056 (0.342)	-0.158 (0.225)	-0.014 (0.234)	-0.110 (0.356)
Family union	-0.319 (0.374)	-0.143 (0.475)	-0.194 (0.200)	-0.071 (0.385)	-0.415 (0.347)	-0.227 (0.519)	0.203 (0.389)
NPO deprivation	0.289 (0.240)	-0.027 (0.406)	-0.089 (0.170)	0.428 (0.304)	0.008 (0.301)	0.172 (0.305)	0.211 (0.232)
Food bank	0.074 (0.292)	-0.103 (0.262)	0.205 <sup>†</sup> (0.119)	0.117 (0.289)	-0.045 (0.274)	-0.218 (0.294)	0.233 (0.320)
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.028 (0.097)	-0.120 (0.110)	0.090 <sup>†</sup> (0.054)	0.092 (0.101)	0.029 (0.101)	0.012 (0.118)	0.069 (0.119)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.141 (0.124)	0.027 (0.138)	0.027 (0.067)	0.023 (0.121)	0.030 (0.132)	0.112 (0.150)	0.155 (0.141)
Older	0.050 (0.124)	0.015 (0.137)	0.064 (0.071)	0.037 (0.125)	-0.069 (0.130)	-0.021 (0.143)	-0.093 (0.146)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Observations	1,045						

*Note.* The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. Participants were considered as scoring 'high' on the social desirability scale when they had a score above the sample average plus one standard deviation. When 'Yes' is indicated in the row 'B. Job characteristics' and 'C. Recruiter characteristics', the job and recruiter characteristics discussed in Section 2.3 and 2.5 are added as control variables. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) ((†)) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) (10%) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference).

**Table A6.** Impact of expressing a political preference on the individual items of the assessment dimensions: Multivariate regression analysis

	Taste to collaborate			Anticipated extraversion		Anticipated neuroticism	
	Employer	Colleagues	Clients	Social	Assertive	Emotional sensitivity	Inability to cope with stress
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)							
Left-wing socialist	-0.312* (0.156)	0.067 (0.220)	0.492** (0.178)	0.068 (0.172)	0.416 (0.322)	-0.601** (0.219)	0.233 (0.231)
Green	0.201 (0.157)	0.204 (0.157)	0.175 (0.167)	0.194† (0.105)	0.689*** (0.115)	-0.733* (0.305)	-0.235 (0.204)
Social democrat	-0.258 (0.289)	-0.389 (0.286)	-0.380 (0.349)	-0.011 (0.369)	-0.121 (0.332)	-0.905* (0.434)	0.793* (0.344)
Christian democrat	0.059 (0.212)	0.222 (0.200)	0.324 (0.222)	0.153 (0.264)	0.057 (0.266)	-0.515* (0.217)	0.400† (0.228)
Liberal democrat	-0.154 (0.198)	-0.079 (0.219)	0.178 (0.220)	-0.056 (0.349)	-0.170 (0.165)	-0.434** (0.137)	-0.077 (0.240)
Nationalist	0.011 (0.245)	-0.060 (0.263)	0.055 (0.273)	0.497 (0.347)	0.477 (0.291)	-0.591* (0.239)	-0.705** (0.258)
Right-wing nationalist	-0.800** (0.243)	-0.747*** (0.197)	-0.559* (0.229)	-0.486 (0.379)	0.313** (0.115)	-1.177** (0.356)	0.502* (0.232)
Neighbourhood committee	0.298 (0.206)	0.410* (0.165)	0.242 (0.197)	0.409* (0.175)	0.510*** (0.137)	-0.323 (0.333)	-0.322 (0.270)
Carnival committee	-0.442 (0.272)	0.106 (0.251)	0.105 (0.248)	-0.005 (0.308)	-0.484 (0.322)	-0.493* (0.219)	0.245 (0.189)
Cultural council	-0.485† (0.265)	-0.454 (0.277)	-0.069 (0.354)	-0.302 (0.373)	-0.304 (0.293)	-0.617** (0.209)	0.241 (0.372)
Traffic safety committee	0.203 (0.288)	0.121 (0.317)	0.064 (0.258)	0.215 (0.298)	0.011 (0.368)	-0.248 (0.311)	0.284 (0.256)
Family union	-0.268 (0.249)	-0.154 (0.265)	-0.084 (0.322)	-0.122 (0.495)	-0.076 (0.410)	-0.362 (0.229)	0.186 (0.262)
NPO deprivation	-0.132 (0.256)	0.139 (0.287)	0.329 (0.250)	-0.097 (0.385)	-0.105 (0.415)	-0.230 (0.203)	-0.168 (0.281)
Food bank	0.052 (0.226)	0.150 (0.225)	0.252 (0.228)	-0.088 (0.250)	-0.079 (0.191)	0.106 (0.205)	0.266 (0.201)
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.011 (0.087)	0.056 (0.090)	0.026 (0.094)	-0.033 (0.113)	-0.150 (0.106)	0.144 (0.101)	0.039 (0.099)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.140 (0.113)	0.188† (0.112)	0.114 (0.121)	0.112 (0.136)	-0.094 (0.137)	0.032 (0.125)	-0.002 (0.121)
Older	0.012 (0.108)	0.077 (0.112)	0.054 (0.117)	0.053 (0.141)	-0.018 (0.134)	0.009 (0.127)	0.105 (0.123)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Observations	1,250						

*Note.* The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. When ‘Yes’ is indicated in the row ‘B. Job characteristics’ and ‘C. Recruiter characteristics’, the job and recruiter characteristics discussed in Section 2.3 and 2.5 are added as control variables. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) ((†)) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) ((10%)) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference).

Table A6 Continued.

	Anticipated agreeableness		Anticipated conscientiousness		Anticipated openness		Hireability	
	Eagerness to work with others	Empathetic	Self-disciplined	Organised	Creative	Open-minded	Interview probability	Hiring probability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>								
Extracurricular activity (ref. = None)								
Left-wing socialist	0.234 (0.253)	-0.153 (0.191)	-0.024 (0.278)	0.078 (0.211)	-0.147 (0.278)	-0.097 (0.157)	0.265 (0.325)	-0.203 (0.295)
Green	-0.012 (0.198)	0.070 (0.138)	0.445 <sup>†</sup> (0.253)	0.724 <sup>***</sup> (0.175)	-0.177 (0.310)	0.133 (0.285)	0.735 <sup>**</sup> (0.237)	0.424 <sup>*</sup> (0.201)
Social democrat	-0.420 <sup>*</sup> (0.180)	-0.431 (0.363)	0.001 (0.161)	-0.257 (0.275)	-0.287 (0.290)	-0.504 <sup>†</sup> (0.257)	-0.006 (0.201)	-0.313 (0.235)
Christian democrat	-0.144 (0.263)	-0.209 (0.207)	-0.035 (0.182)	0.056 (0.183)	-0.141 (0.327)	-0.106 (0.257)	0.262 (0.355)	0.325 <sup>†</sup> (0.186)
Liberal democrat	-0.129 (0.094)	-0.595 <sup>***</sup> (0.161)	-0.076 (0.228)	0.027 (0.420)	-0.297 (0.295)	-0.158 (0.206)	0.361 (0.247)	0.396 (0.273)
Nationalist	0.295 (0.200)	0.146 (0.265)	0.239 (0.254)	0.497 <sup>**</sup> (0.181)	-0.228 (0.332)	-0.151 (0.383)	0.090 (0.411)	-0.273 (0.372)
Right-wing nat.	-0.976 <sup>**</sup> (0.297)	-1.222 <sup>***</sup> (0.344)	-0.354 (0.333)	0.011 (0.267)	-0.679 <sup>*</sup> (0.333)	-1.663 <sup>***</sup> (0.454)	-0.445 (0.483)	-0.934 <sup>**</sup> (0.350)
Neighbourhood com.	0.548 <sup>*</sup> (0.246)	0.270 (0.383)	0.129 (0.274)	0.360 (0.264)	0.509 (0.330)	0.299 (0.326)	0.039 (0.280)	-0.016 (0.239)
Carnival com.	0.072 (0.328)	0.229 (0.267)	-0.366 (0.299)	-0.096 (0.218)	-0.488 (0.325)	-0.058 (0.255)	0.193 (0.269)	-0.322 (0.413)
Cultural council	-0.413 (0.279)	-0.279 (0.248)	-0.090 (0.240)	0.146 (0.241)	-0.407 (0.335)	-0.306 (0.244)	-0.167 (0.221)	-0.553 <sup>**</sup> (0.198)
Traffic safety com.	0.173 (0.264)	0.143 (0.260)	-0.257 (0.253)	0.076 (0.276)	0.235 (0.175)	-0.043 (0.247)	0.136 (0.201)	-0.120 (0.254)
Family union	0.017 (0.325)	0.138 (0.329)	-0.319 (0.272)	-0.478 (0.412)	-0.270 (0.442)	0.093 (0.482)	0.365 (0.298)	0.227 (0.326)
NPO deprivation	0.231 (0.382)	0.429 (0.325)	0.140 (0.258)	0.106 (0.210)	-0.154 (0.281)	0.287 (0.297)	0.213 (0.177)	0.195 (0.220)
Food bank	0.014 (0.184)	0.210 (0.271)	-0.084 (0.237)	-0.005 (0.230)	-0.516 <sup>*</sup> (0.204)	0.055 (0.252)	0.462 <sup>†</sup> (0.241)	0.142 (0.294)
Female (ref. = Male)	0.044 (0.094)	0.202 <sup>†</sup> (0.104)	0.028 (0.097)	0.018 (0.097)	0.030 (0.114)	0.062 (0.111)	0.102 (0.113)	0.076 (0.112)
Age (ref. = Middle)								
Younger	-0.014 (0.118)	0.095 (0.127)	0.059 (0.127)	0.067 (0.123)	0.049 (0.144)	0.169 (0.143)	0.243 <sup>†</sup> (0.137)	0.099 (0.138)
Older	-0.020 (0.114)	0.066 (0.131)	0.046 (0.120)	-0.055 (0.126)	-0.047 (0.141)	-0.006 (0.131)	0.052 (0.134)	-0.083 (0.140)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
Observations	1,250							

Note. The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.1. When 'Yes' is indicated in the row 'B. Job characteristics' and 'C. Recruiter characteristics', the job and recruiter characteristics discussed in Section 2.3 and 2.5 are added as control variables. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) ((†)) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) ((10%)) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: ref. (reference), com. (committee).

**Table A7.** Impact of expressing a political engagement on the assessment dimensions: Multivariate regression moderation analysis

	Taste to collaborate	Anticipated extraversion	Anticipated neuroticism	Anticipated agreeableness	Anticipated conscientiousness	Anticipated openness	Hireability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extra. activity (ref. = None)							
Political extra. activity	1.091* (0.543)	0.950 <sup>†</sup> (0.515)	-0.207 (0.316)	0.964 <sup>†</sup> (0.505)	0.152 (0.562)	0.448 (0.562)	0.209 (0.654)
Non-political extra. activity	0.249 (0.372)	0.059 (0.425)	-0.060 (0.197)	0.775* (0.380)	0.134 (0.312)	0.051 (0.392)	-0.195 (0.357)
Female (ref. = Male)	0.037 (0.118)	-0.178 (0.142)	0.043 (0.077)	0.034 (0.121)	0.052 (0.140)	-0.015 (0.144)	0.056 (0.155)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.269 <sup>†</sup> (0.147)	0.247 (0.181)	0.152 <sup>†</sup> (0.088)	0.277 <sup>†</sup> (0.153)	0.105 (0.173)	0.269 (0.183)	0.140 (0.182)
Older	0.109 (0.134)	0.205 (0.184)	0.206* (0.095)	0.250 <sup>†</sup> (0.147)	-0.003 (0.178)	0.014 (0.166)	-0.056 (0.180)
Political extra. activity × Female	-0.034 (0.219)	0.004 (0.236)	0.177 (0.149)	0.151 (0.228)	-0.077 (0.223)	-0.054 (0.280)	-0.024 (0.296)
Political extra. activity × Younger	-0.216 (0.254)	-0.466 (0.289)	-0.380* (0.181)	-0.282 (0.266)	-0.047 (0.280)	-0.263 (0.330)	0.214 (0.326)
Political extra. activity × Older	-0.004 (0.238)	-0.311 (0.293)	-0.390* (0.177)	-0.317 (0.263)	-0.193 (0.279)	-0.081 (0.320)	0.056 (0.350)
<b>B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
High required educational level (ref. = Not required)	0.325* (0.148)	0.308 <sup>†</sup> (0.177)	-0.241** (0.083)	0.284 <sup>†</sup> (0.165)	0.802*** (0.153)	-0.050 (0.177)	-0.355* (0.160)
High required level of helpfulness (ref. = Not required)	0.341 <sup>†</sup> (0.178)	0.729*** (0.188)	0.328*** (0.082)	0.706*** (0.190)	-0.120 (0.145)	0.601** (0.182)	0.104 (0.183)
High required level of creativity (ref. = Not required)	-0.260* (0.127)	0.098 (0.153)	-0.025 (0.077)	0.011 (0.132)	0.060 (0.118)	0.340* (0.138)	-0.665*** (0.165)
Political extra. activity × High required educational level	-0.896** (0.264)	-0.639* (0.311)	0.114 (0.150)	-0.895** (0.271)	-0.620* (0.307)	-0.810** (0.306)	-0.984*** (0.272)
Political extra. activity × High required level of helpfulness	-0.027 (0.306)	-0.037 (0.308)	0.090 (0.155)	0.300 (0.331)	0.219 (0.269)	-0.128 (0.304)	0.121 (0.310)
Political extra. activity × High required level of creativity	0.122 (0.227)	0.097 (0.302)	-0.007 (0.131)	-0.192 (0.251)	0.171 (0.198)	0.215 (0.287)	0.155 (0.277)
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.319* (0.144)	-0.293* (0.148)	0.000 (0.088)	-0.358* (0.163)	-0.118 (0.150)	-0.190 (0.137)	0.111 (0.165)
Preferred party (ref. = Undecided)							
Left-wing socialist	0.121 (0.318)	0.040 (0.305)	0.342 <sup>†</sup> (0.174)	0.056 (0.308)	-0.464 (0.283)	-0.635* (0.269)	0.717 <sup>†</sup> (0.411)
Green	0.995*** (0.246)	0.491 <sup>†</sup> (0.278)	0.367* (0.178)	0.704* (0.314)	0.053 (0.291)	0.495 (0.333)	1.057** (0.347)
Social democrat	0.348 (0.259)	0.501 <sup>†</sup> (0.271)	0.405** (0.153)	0.595* (0.295)	0.156 (0.294)	0.621* (0.273)	0.989** (0.300)
Christian democrat	0.910** (0.271)	0.842** (0.307)	0.131 (0.190)	1.004** (0.311)	0.488 (0.315)	0.979** (0.298)	1.221*** (0.321)
Liberal democrat	1.113*** (0.268)	0.723* (0.299)	0.203 (0.166)	1.373*** (0.310)	0.656* (0.269)	0.901** (0.302)	1.386*** (0.326)
Nationalist	0.482* (0.238)	0.336 (0.250)	0.357* (0.162)	0.586* (0.261)	-0.123 (0.266)	0.241 (0.245)	0.988*** (0.278)
Right-wing nationalist	0.535* (0.266)	0.583* (0.287)	0.228 (0.159)	0.647* (0.319)	0.065 (0.285)	0.483 (0.303)	1.053*** (0.295)
% of time evaluating applicants (c.)	0.004 (0.002)	0.004 (0.003)	-0.006*** (0.001)	0.002 (0.003)	0.007** (0.002)	0.002 (0.003)	0.008*** (0.002)



Experience evaluating applicants (ref. = Less than 1 year)							
1 to 5 years	-0.507** (0.185)	-0.603** (0.190)	0.051 (0.120)	-0.397* (0.192)	-0.726*** (0.204)	-0.641*** (0.178)	0.623** (0.227)
More than 5 years	-0.844*** (0.179)	-0.917*** (0.195)	-0.008 (0.120)	-0.850*** (0.201)	-1.053*** (0.204)	-0.951*** (0.187)	0.348 (0.240)
Social desirability score	0.020 (0.018)	0.013 (0.020)	0.012 (0.009)	0.028 (0.020)	0.041* (0.019)	0.029 (0.020)	-0.043* (0.019)
Political extra. Act. × Female recruiter	-0.236 (0.238)	0.194 (0.273)	0.170 (0.140)	-0.011 (0.267)	-0.066 (0.242)	0.308 (0.290)	0.095 (0.300)
Comparison of preferred party of applicant and recruiter (ref. = No comparison possible)							
Same preferred party	-1.008 (0.628)	-0.330 (0.607)	-0.244 (0.292)	-0.982 <sup>†</sup> (0.535)	0.033 (0.497)	-0.811 (0.537)	-0.354 (0.648)
Different preferred party	-0.416 (0.466)	-0.396 (0.445)	-0.160 (0.266)	-0.695 (0.425)	0.267 (0.459)	-0.436 (0.453)	0.127 (0.549)
Observations	1,250						

*Note.* The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.2. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\* (\* ((+))) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1% (5% (10%))) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: extra. (extracurricular), act. (activity), ref. (reference), c. (continuous variable).

**Table A8.** Impact of expressing a specific political engagement on the assessment dimensions: Multivariate regression moderation analysis

	Taste to collaborate	Anticipated extraversion	Anticipated neuroticism	Anticipated agreeableness	Anticipated conscientiousness	Anticipated openness	Hireability
<b>A. APPLICANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Extra. act. (ref. = None)							
Left-wing socialist	1.650 (1.146)	1.200 (0.886)	-0.381 (0.595)	1.486 (0.961)	0.330 (1.141)	0.666 (0.932)	-1.322 (0.831)
Green	0.884 (1.007)	1.684 (1.102)	-1.592*** (0.437)	0.160 (1.094)	0.525 (0.704)	-0.845 (1.023)	1.304 (0.936)
Social democrat	0.292 (1.311)	1.456 (1.141)	0.782 (0.643)	1.010 (1.346)	-1.525 (1.198)	-0.466 (1.199)	-0.723 (0.974)
Christian democrat	1.147 (0.694)	0.439 (0.786)	0.027 (0.431)	0.802 (0.759)	-0.176 (0.879)	0.535 (0.789)	0.404 (0.792)
Liberal democrat	1.258 (1.010)	1.275 (1.032)	-1.243** (0.447)	1.356 (1.276)	0.503 (0.725)	-0.176 (1.192)	2.421* (1.085)
Nationalist	1.506 (1.094)	2.027 <sup>†</sup> (1.082)	0.597 (0.473)	1.095 (1.119)	-0.029 (0.929)	1.308 (1.654)	0.908 (0.998)
Right-wing nationalist	0.856 (0.909)	-0.142 (0.647)	-0.368 (0.450)	0.177 (0.677)	0.462 (0.718)	0.767 (0.984)	0.599 (0.932)
Neighbourhood committee	0.310 <sup>†</sup> (0.171)	0.455** (0.149)	-0.319 (0.241)	0.408 (0.301)	0.240 (0.260)	0.395 (0.330)	0.008 (0.249)
Carnival committee	-0.091 (0.253)	-0.268 (0.321)	-0.125 (0.120)	0.142 (0.281)	-0.250 (0.245)	-0.305 (0.287)	-0.089 (0.323)
Cultural council	-0.320 (0.288)	-0.282 (0.321)	-0.192 (0.151)	-0.326 (0.256)	0.054 (0.211)	-0.327 (0.268)	-0.331 <sup>†</sup> (0.198)
Traffic safety committee	0.160 (0.276)	0.131 (0.347)	0.032 (0.100)	0.199 (0.245)	-0.084 (0.266)	0.126 (0.186)	0.028 (0.200)
Family union	-0.174 (0.276)	-0.110 (0.444)	-0.097 (0.162)	0.067 (0.326)	-0.411 (0.323)	-0.106 (0.462)	0.282 (0.290)
NPO deprivation	0.120 (0.261)	-0.098 (0.407)	-0.217 (0.178)	0.325 (0.347)	0.103 (0.244)	0.062 (0.288)	0.193 (0.188)
Food bank	0.165 (0.214)	-0.072 (0.212)	0.184 (0.130)	0.122 (0.217)	-0.041 (0.227)	-0.225 (0.215)	0.308 (0.249)
Female (ref. = Male)	0.009 (0.101)	-0.076 (0.126)	0.048 (0.065)	0.071 (0.109)	0.006 (0.114)	0.054 (0.123)	0.068 (0.123)
Age (ref. = Middle)							
Younger	0.206 (0.127)	0.110 (0.160)	0.087 (0.077)	0.082 (0.132)	0.104 (0.142)	0.177 (0.156)	0.148 (0.148)
Older	0.064 (0.125)	0.067 (0.161)	0.137 <sup>†</sup> (0.080)	0.081 (0.134)	0.088 (0.141)	0.021 (0.149)	0.028 (0.149)
Left-wing socialist × Female	-0.078 (0.229)	-0.686* (0.303)	-0.125 (0.187)	-0.083 (0.156)	-0.372 (0.352)	-0.365 <sup>†</sup> (0.187)	0.704 <sup>†</sup> (0.389)
Green × Female	0.059 (0.277)	-0.275 (0.213)	0.290 (0.340)	0.708** (0.226)	-0.131 (0.352)	-0.030 (0.466)	-1.035** (0.385)
Social democrat × Female	0.714 <sup>†</sup> (0.422)	-0.274 (0.471)	0.347* (0.166)	0.285 (0.499)	-0.188 (0.346)	0.574 (0.552)	0.602 (0.415)
Christian democrat × Female	-0.098 (0.397)	0.008 (0.492)	0.255 (0.218)	0.032 (0.492)	0.483 (0.366)	-0.109 (0.531)	0.020 (0.480)
Liberal democrat × Female	0.375 (0.378)	0.717** (0.249)	-0.122 (0.243)	0.094 (0.242)	0.612 (0.373)	-0.087 (0.268)	0.452 (0.366)
Nationalist × Female	-0.107 (0.491)	-0.757 (0.636)	-0.085 (0.257)	0.112 (0.496)	0.106 (0.536)	-0.862 (0.781)	-0.832 (0.691)
Right-wing nationalist × Female	0.135 (0.275)	0.684 (0.513)	0.708*** (0.135)	0.645 (0.429)	-0.252 (0.437)	0.789 (0.501)	0.910* (0.382)
Left-wing socialist × Younger	-0.648 (0.551)	-0.235 (0.335)	0.106 (0.326)	-0.651 <sup>†</sup> (0.376)	-0.206 (0.676)	-0.368 (0.412)	0.818 (0.671)
Green × Younger	0.249 (0.247)	-0.435 <sup>†</sup> (0.256)	-0.272 (0.345)	0.382 (0.380)	0.144 (0.392)	0.551 (0.374)	0.060 (0.305)
Social democrat × Younger	-0.096 (0.633)	-1.819*** (0.405)	-0.459** (0.175)	-0.652 (0.641)	-0.008 (0.635)	-0.374 (0.381)	0.489 (0.560)
Christian democrat × Younger	-0.076 (0.387)	-0.409 (0.595)	0.221 (0.174)	-0.295 (0.434)	-0.111 (0.401)	-0.477 (0.543)	0.035 (0.576)
Liberal democrat × Younger	0.278 (0.277)	0.003 (0.259)	0.218 (0.218)	0.415 (0.265)	1.169*** (0.328)	1.360*** (0.337)	-0.363 (0.263)
Nationalist × Younger	-0.790 (0.502)	-0.337 (0.597)	-0.971*** (0.261)	-0.036 (0.477)	-0.503 (0.590)	-0.298 (0.857)	-0.122 (0.453)
Right-wing nationalist × Younger	-1.121** (0.354)	-0.652 (0.474)	-0.128 (0.199)	-0.932 <sup>†</sup> (0.520)	-0.766* (0.297)	-1.768** (0.564)	-0.744 <sup>†</sup> (0.394)

Left-wing socialist × Older	0.052 (0.492)	-0.153 (0.408)	-0.084 (0.286)	0.382 (0.334)	-0.457 (0.698)	-0.356 (0.425)	0.669 (0.609)
Green × Older	0.286 (0.358)	-0.630 (0.443)	0.386 (0.247)	0.839 (0.608)	-0.157 (0.324)	1.149* (0.557)	-0.344 (0.354)
Social democrat × Older	0.504 (0.453)	-1.069** (0.394)	-0.897** (0.282)	-0.495 (0.371)	0.548 (0.505)	0.349 (0.539)	-0.182 (0.501)
Christian democrat × Older	0.274 (0.415)	-0.304 (0.423)	-0.725* (0.353)	-0.081 (0.530)	-0.094 (0.312)	-0.075 (0.341)	0.502 (0.612)
Liberal democrat × Older	0.853 (0.614)	0.056 (0.329)	1.030** (0.307)	0.507 (0.485)	0.789 (0.603)	1.752*** (0.490)	0.051 (0.554)
Nationalist × Older	-1.039† (0.560)	0.405 (0.701)	-1.166*** (0.229)	-0.900† (0.535)	-0.272 (0.685)	-0.957 (1.006)	-0.516 (0.513)
Right-wing nationalist × Older	-1.118*** (0.303)	-1.038 (0.658)	-0.246 (0.260)	-1.727** (0.587)	-1.492** (0.553)	-2.371** (0.672)	-2.019*** (0.441)

#### B. JOB CHARACTERISTICS

High required educational level (ref. = Not required)	0.349** (0.122)	0.257† (0.144)	-0.196** (0.069)	0.249† (0.148)	0.806*** (0.130)	-0.020 (0.148)	-0.354** (0.134)
High required level of helpfulness (ref. = Not required)	0.360* (0.141)	0.749*** (0.151)	0.287*** (0.071)	0.657*** (0.155)	-0.153 (0.122)	0.486** (0.151)	0.152 (0.152)
High required level of creativity (ref. = Not required)	-0.329** (0.109)	0.070 (0.131)	0.026 (0.062)	-0.166 (0.116)	-0.037 (0.104)	0.230† (0.120)	-0.595*** (0.125)
Left-wing socialist × High required educational level	-0.314 (0.476)	-0.741* (0.367)	0.394 (0.356)	-0.786† (0.468)	-0.585 (0.777)	-1.034* (0.467)	0.369 (0.617)
Green × High required educational level	0.134 (0.247)	-0.573 (0.489)	-0.312 (0.414)	-0.086 (0.437)	0.047 (0.312)	-0.340 (0.568)	-0.828 (0.594)
Social democrat × High required educational level	-1.549 (1.052)	-0.526 (0.773)	-0.321 (0.256)	-1.675* (0.742)	-0.552 (1.042)	-0.891 (1.060)	-1.382† (0.722)
Christian democrat × High required educational level	-0.652† (0.332)	-0.049 (0.483)	0.432 (0.276)	-0.579 (0.511)	-0.575 (0.765)	-0.284 (0.575)	-0.520 (0.481)
Liberal democrat × High required educational level	-1.488† (0.816)	-2.216** (0.779)	0.687** (0.195)	-1.496† (0.816)	-1.069 (1.195)	-1.770** (0.609)	-1.499** (0.496)
Nationalist × High required educational level	-0.828* (0.385)	-0.246 (0.576)	-0.306 (0.301)	-0.620 (0.397)	-0.742 (0.493)	-0.697 (0.667)	-1.367*** (0.371)
Right-wing nationalist × High required educational level	-0.964** (0.342)	-0.131 (0.557)	0.250 (0.326)	-0.312 (0.323)	-0.716 (0.598)	-0.634† (0.347)	-1.487** (0.469)
Left-wing socialist × High required level of helpfulness	-1.092* (0.449)	-0.869† (0.483)	0.120 (0.304)	-0.789 (0.597)	-0.784 (0.520)	-0.486 (0.882)	-0.795 (0.526)
Green × High required level of helpfulness	-0.345 (0.677)	-0.332 (0.974)	0.563† (0.293)	0.254 (1.169)	-0.063 (0.423)	-0.362 (0.820)	-0.332 (0.346)
Social democrat × High required level of helpfulness	0.775 (0.676)	1.043 (0.920)	-0.216 (0.173)	1.786† (0.948)	1.474** (0.505)	0.465 (0.833)	0.295 (1.154)
Christian democrat × High required level of helpfulness	1.197† (0.634)	0.880 (0.907)	-0.306 (0.381)	1.083 (1.020)	0.793 (0.889)	0.802 (0.662)	1.000† (0.569)
Liberal democrat × High required level of helpfulness	-0.751 (1.177)	0.302 (0.456)	0.181 (0.347)	-0.048 (0.771)	-0.404 (0.793)	-0.293 (0.602)	-0.390 (1.091)
Nationalist × High required level of	-0.063 (0.705)	-0.674 (0.575)	0.213 (0.225)	-0.178 (0.602)	0.023 (0.506)	-0.351 (0.519)	-0.014 (0.623)

helpfulness							
Right-wing nationalist × High required level of helpfulness	-1.042 (0.636)	-0.194 (0.514)	0.065 (0.298)	-0.265 (0.395)	-0.134 (0.384)	-0.732 (0.543)	-0.593 (0.730)
Left-wing socialist × High required level of creativity	-0.339 (0.598)	0.099 (0.327)	-0.133 (0.266)	-0.217 (0.516)	0.403 (0.604)	-0.205 (0.641)	-0.211 (0.682)
Green × High required level of creativity	0.540 (0.444)	1.003 (0.655)	0.179 (0.246)	-0.072 (0.786)	0.642* (0.313)	0.746 (0.765)	0.665 (0.442)
Social democrat × High required level of creativity	-0.123 (0.896)	-0.359 (0.695)	-0.191 (0.265)	-0.301 (0.841)	-0.060 (0.624)	0.125 (0.671)	0.123 (0.812)
Christian democrat × High required level of creativity	-0.632 (0.490)	-0.086 (0.758)	0.487 (0.325)	-0.646 (0.586)	-0.287 (0.560)	-0.246 (0.500)	-0.299 (0.529)
Liberal democrat × High required level of creativity	0.559 (0.750)	-0.505 (0.429)	0.494 (0.342)	0.180 (0.617)	0.169 (0.495)	1.374** (0.492)	-0.962* (0.451)
Nationalist × High required level of creativity	0.615* (0.300)	0.236 (0.679)	-0.313* (0.148)	0.617+ (0.361)	0.801** (0.244)	0.616 (0.601)	0.814 (0.515)
Right-wing nationalist × High required level of creativity	1.213* (0.477)	0.780* (0.303)	-0.280 (0.233)	0.647* (0.291)	0.672** (0.237)	1.049* (0.522)	1.140** (0.402)
<b>C. RECRUITER CHARACTERISTICS</b>							
Female (ref. = Male)	-0.357** (0.135)	-0.250+ (0.140)	0.011 (0.072)	-0.323* (0.154)	-0.155 (0.142)	-0.098 (0.136)	0.057 (0.140)
Political party of preference (ref. = Undecided)							
Left-wing socialist	0.131 (0.333)	0.048 (0.317)	0.367* (0.184)	0.075 (0.317)	-0.464 (0.299)	-0.695* (0.276)	0.679 (0.414)
Green	0.950*** (0.257)	0.430 (0.288)	0.383* (0.184)	0.705* (0.318)	-0.005 (0.301)	0.495 (0.341)	0.997** (0.362)
Social democrat	0.386 (0.265)	0.530+ (0.274)	0.438** (0.157)	0.630* (0.300)	0.154 (0.305)	0.665* (0.279)	1.039** (0.305)
Christian democrat	0.909** (0.279)	0.854** (0.320)	0.187 (0.194)	1.021** (0.319)	0.442 (0.328)	1.012** (0.307)	1.201*** (0.325)
Liberal democrat	1.094*** (0.272)	0.747* (0.305)	0.162 (0.171)	1.365*** (0.314)	0.651* (0.277)	0.868** (0.305)	1.390*** (0.337)
Nationalist	0.482+ (0.246)	0.336 (0.254)	0.386* (0.170)	0.570* (0.264)	-0.126 (0.276)	0.250 (0.251)	0.977** (0.284)
Right-wing nationalist	0.529+ (0.275)	0.617* (0.294)	0.233 (0.165)	0.651* (0.325)	0.083 (0.296)	0.512 (0.310)	1.057** (0.304)
% of time evaluating applicants (c.)	0.003 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)	-0.006*** (0.001)	0.001 (0.003)	0.007* (0.003)	0.002 (0.003)	0.008** (0.002)
Experience evaluating applicants (ref. = Less than 1 year)							
1 to 5 years	-0.569** (0.195)	-0.662** (0.199)	0.040 (0.120)	-0.429* (0.203)	-0.725** (0.216)	-0.737*** (0.182)	0.591* (0.229)
More than 5 years	-0.886*** (0.181)	-0.968*** (0.200)	-0.006 (0.121)	-0.860*** (0.206)	-1.049*** (0.216)	-1.017*** (0.188)	0.324 (0.238)
Social desirability score	0.021 (0.018)	0.017 (0.020)	0.013 (0.009)	0.029 (0.020)	0.045* (0.019)	0.032 (0.020)	-0.042* (0.019)
Left-wing socialist × Female recruiter	0.179 (0.794)	1.020** (0.301)	0.468 (0.376)	0.500 (0.660)	0.575 (0.373)	1.203 (0.733)	1.669*** (0.430)
Green × Female recruiter	-0.777 (0.610)	-0.438 (0.683)	1.257*** (0.215)	-0.340 (0.706)	-0.683 (0.533)	0.789** (0.288)	0.265 (0.704)
Social democrat × Female recruiter	-0.139 (0.826)	-0.492 (0.694)	0.125 (0.371)	-0.630 (0.833)	0.510 (1.084)	0.380 (0.355)	0.914 (0.903)
Christian democrat × Female recruiter	-0.764 (0.466)	-0.369 (0.699)	-0.237 (0.325)	-0.184 (0.680)	-0.544 (0.566)	-0.467 (0.656)	-0.752 (0.500)

Liberal democrat × Female recruiter	-0.446 (1.161)	-0.024 (0.725)	-0.085 (0.218)	-0.622 (0.949)	-1.447* (0.705)	-0.502 (0.672)	-0.778 (1.006)
Nationalist × Female recruiter	-0.069 (0.407)	-0.580 (0.577)	-0.016 (0.330)	0.497 (0.486)	0.429 (0.330)	-0.034 (0.690)	-0.158 (0.536)
Right-wing nationalist × Female recruiter	0.066 (0.675)	0.297 (0.612)	-0.088 (0.272)	-0.155 (0.872)	0.021 (0.593)	-0.840 (1.028)	-0.706 (0.973)
Comparison of preferred party of applicant and recruiter (ref. = No comparison possible)							
Same preferred party	-1.031 (0.724)	-0.249 (0.611)	-0.337 (0.300)	-1.177* (0.582)	0.178 (0.559)	-0.696 (0.619)	-0.315 (0.732)
Different preferred party	-0.508 (0.540)	-0.371 (0.497)	-0.251 (0.267)	-0.798 (0.503)	0.346 (0.508)	-0.315 (0.538)	0.070 (0.630)
Observations	1,250						

*Note.* The presented statistics are coefficient estimates with standard errors in parentheses for the linear regression analyses discussed in Section 3.2. Standard errors are corrected for the clustering of the observations at the recruiter level. Intercepts are not presented. \*\*\* (\*\*) (\*) ((+)) indicates significance at the 0.1% (1%) (5%) ((10%)) significance level. The following abbreviations are used: extra. (extracurricular), act. (activity), ref. (reference), pol. (political), non-pol. (non-political), c. (continuous variable).

## Online Appendix B: Resume templates

### B.1 Resume template 1

<h1>Ann/Kristof Peeters</h1>	
 Broeckstraat, 10, Gavere	02/01/1980, Gent
 Ann/Kristof.peeters@telenet.be	 0477 12 39 06

#### **Ervaring**

---

**Functie** - Bedrijf · locatie 12/2018 - 03/2023

- Taak
- Taak
- Taak

#### **Studies en opleiding**

---

Opleiding, school XXXX - XXXX

#### **Talenkennis**

---

Nederlands	Moedertaal
Frans	Gevorderd
Engels	Gevorderd

#### **Hobby's**

---

Zwemmen  
Extra curriculaire activiteit 2 (indien van toepassing)

# Katrien/Filip Janssens

Vossestraat, 2a, Gavere  
0492 41 78 71  
Katrien/Filip.janssens@proximus.be  
27/04/1983  
Belg

## Ervaring

---

Functie - Bedrijf 03/2018 – 03/2023

- ♦ Taak
- ♦ Taak
- ♦ Taak

## Opleidingen

---

Opleiding - School XXXX – XXXX

## Talenkennis

---

- ♦ Nederlands: moedertaal
- ♦ Frans: gevorderd
- ♦ Engels: gevorderd

## Hobby's

---

Musea bezoeken

Extra curriculaire activiteit 2 (indien van toepassing)

# Lore/Stefaan Willems

Warande, 12, Gavere  
Lore/  
Stefaan.willems@outlook.com  
0479 35 27 91

07/06/1993  
Belg

## OPLEIDING

---

Opleiding, School

XXXX - XXXX

## ERVARING

---

**Functie** - Bedrijf

11/2017 - 03/2023

- Taak
- Taak
- Taak

## TALENKENNIS

---

- Nederlands: moedertaal
- Frans: gevorderd
- Engels: gevorderd

## HOBBY'S

---

- Lezen
- Extra curriculaire activiteit 2 (indien van toepassing)



## B.4 Resume template 4

### CURRICULUM VITAE

#### Leen/Dieter Maes

Liefkenswegel 3  
Gavere  
0483 15 77 94  
Leen/Dieter.maes@gmail.com

07/06/1990  
Belg

#### WERKERVARING

---

<b>Functie</b> - Bedrijf, locatie	11/2018 - 03/2023
▪ Taak	
▪ Taak	
▪ Taak	

#### OPLEIDING

---

<b>Opleiding</b> - School	XXXX - XXXX
---------------------------	-------------

#### TALENKENNIS

---

- Nederlands - Moedertaal
- Frans - Gevorderd
- Engels - Gevorderd

#### HOBBY'S

---

Voetbal  
Extra curriculaire activiteit 2 (indien van toepassing)

## B.5 Resume template 5

# Kato/Lieven Jacobs

Kloosterstraat 23, Gavere  
0475 64 33 22  
Kato/Lieven.jacobs@hotmail.com  
11/01/1970  
Belg

### WERKERVARING

**Functie** - Bedrijf, locatie 03/2018 - 03/2023

- Taak
- Taak

### STUDIES / OPLEIDING

**Opleiding** - School XXXX - XXXX

### TALENKENNIS

- Nederlands - Moedertaal
- Frans - Gevorderd
- Engels - Gevorderd

### HOBBY'S

Wandelen  
Extra curriculaire activiteit 2 (indien van toepassing)