Dimensions of Diversity:

How Public Sector Job Candidates Express Commitment to Diversity

Abstract

This study examined applications to tenure-track faculty positions with qualifications related to diversity. The sample included application materials submitted by 454 candidates for 11 tenure-track faculty positions at a public research university. Application letters were coded for references to nine dimensions of diversity: ethnicity was mentioned most frequently, followed by references to nonspecific forms of diversity, disability, age, class, and gender. Comparisons among the searches revealed that applicants to nursing, sociology, clinical psychology, and teaching/learning positions had the highest density of references to diversity, and applicants to engineering and physical sciences had the lowest density of diversity references, with applicants to other disciplines reflecting intermediate densities of diversity references. Nearly 25% of applicants did not reference diversity, rendering the application unresponsive to the application requirements. Applicant self-disclosures of diversity were rare, occurring in less than 7% of the letters. These results replicate and extend previous work regarding how faculty applicants address diversity requirements, and reveal potential differences among disciplines in approach to the diversity construct. The results are discussed in terms of suggestions for faculty candidates and those involved in faculty search processes.
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How Faculty Applicants Address Diversity – A Replication and Extension

Higher education seeks to “create diverse and welcoming campus communities for all students” (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, p. 1). Content analysis of universities’ mission statements found references to diversity to be common among public universities, but rare in private universities’ mission statements (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). Stich and Reeves (2016) found references to diversity to be among the top ten most frequent elements in 60 university mission statements. At a disciplinary level, analyses of mission statements found references to diversity in 16% of medical schools (Valsangkar, Chen, Wohltjen, & Mullan, 2014), 27% of engineering colleges (Creamer & Ghoston, 2012), and 41% of schools of social work (Holosko, Winkel, Crandall, & Briggs, 2015). Although university diversity plans may “unwittingly reinforce practices that support exclusion and inequity” (Iverson, 2010, p. 194) by framing those who represent diversity as outsiders (Iverson, 2010, 2012), ideally, mission statements clarify institutional goals and create a shared sense of purpose (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). An empirical question is how individual constituents interpret institutional values such as diversity.

What does *diversity* in higher education mean to faculty candidates who are expected to advance diversity through their research, teaching, and service and must articulate how they will do so in their application materials? Individuals seem to conceptualize diversity constrained either to a few specific dimensions or to nonspecific terms. Several models have been developed to try to capture these conceptualizations. In order to contextualize this research, the current relevant models of diversity are reviewed here briefly. These models include Sue’s tripartite framework (2001) that includes 11 dimensions of similarities and differences among groups of individuals: race, sexual orientation, marital status, religious preference, culture, disability, ethnicity, geographic location, age, socioeconomic status, and gender. Similarly, Loden’s (1996) model includes six primary dimensions (gender, age, ethnicity, race, ability/disability, and sexual orientation) and 11 secondary dimensions (military experience, religion, income, work experience, geographic location, organization role and level, family status, communication style, work style, education, and first language). Loden’s model was designed for organizations, which may explain the inclusion of work and organization dimensions not found in Sue’s model.

Ethnicity1 is most central to most individuals’ concepts of diversity, followed by gender (Baker, Schmaling, Fountain, Blume, & Boose, 2016; Banks, 2009; Bowman, 2010; Boysen, 2011; Green, Callands, Radcliffe, Luebbe, & Klonoff, 2009; Hon, Weigold, & Chance, 1999; Littleford, 2013; Ocampo, Prieto, Whittlesey, Connor, Janco-Gidley, Mannix, & Sare, 2003; Schmaling, Trevino, Lind, Blume, & Baker, 2015). For example, among applicants to a post-doctoral diversity position open to applicants from any discipline, references to ethnicity were more frequently cited than references to any other primary dimension of diversity (Baker et al., 2016). In another study, applicants to assistant professor positions in three disciplines made nonspecific references to diversity (e.g., “I support the advancement of diversity”) most frequently, followed by references to disability, age, and gender (Schmaling et al., 2015). The presence of disability on this list may not reflect intentional discussion of disability as diversity, however, given that one of the positions examined was in a clinical health discipline. The frequency of nonspecific references to diversity is akin to the findings by Green et al. (2009) that nearly one-third of their graduate student respondents used broad statements to define diversity in their own words.

Broad definitions are not necessarily nebulous. Nonspecific definitions, however, may hinder inclusive actions targeting historical and institutional oppressions specific to the society in question. After all, “a diverse faculty plays an important role in achieving an inclusive institution” (U.S. Department of Education, p. 37). The typical components of applications to tenure-track faculty positions at research universities include curriculum vitae, references, and letters of application in which candidates address how they meet the qualifications of the position and their experience and future plans in terms of scholarly work, teaching, and service (Kelsey, 2014). Some institutions seeking to enhance the diversity of their faculty also ask applicants to address diversity, e.g., to describe their experience with “diversity issues, diverse students, and working in multicultural environments” (Turner, 2002, p. 17). Individuals’ statements about diversity, like institutional mission statements, may reflect candidates’ commitment to diversity. Advertisements for faculty positions at the campus in this study include diversity qualifications, and applicants are expected to address their background and expertise related to each qualification in their letters when they apply. Examples of diversity qualifications have included, “teach… multicultural/diversity/pluralism courses,” “ability to contribute to (redacted university’s) diversity goals in research, teaching, and/or service,” and “contribute to our campus diversity goals (e.g., incorporate issues of diversity into mentoring, curriculum, service or research). Applicants may respond by reflecting upon their professional and personal experiences that demonstrated expertise in the advancement of diversity. Faculty search protocols requiring applicants to address diversity may reflect a particular institutional commitment to inclusion and advancing diversity as a shared institutional responsibility.

As noted above, one approach to addressing position-related diversity requirements involves discussing personal experiences that suggest diversity-related skills. As such, applicants may self-disclose ways in which they represent diversity, including immutable personal characteristics. Self-disclosure is potentially risky, however, because of persistent discrimination against ethnic/racial minority and female applicants rooted in conscious or unconscious biases (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handelsman, 2012; Steinpreis, Anders, & Ritzke, 1999; Trix & Psenka, 2003; Wennerås & Wold, 1997), although some studies have found preferences for underrepresented applicants (Williams & Ceci, 2015). Given these dynamics, it is possible that the risk of self-disclosure may impact the ways that some applicants craft diversity statements, rendering professional reflections on advancing diversity safer than personal self-disclosure.

The present study examines the content of applications to faculty positions in multiple academic disciplines. All positions had a qualification related to diversity: applicants were instructed to address this and other qualifications in their application letters. The research questions were, first, how do applicants address diversity, and do the referenced dimensions of diversity vary by discipline? Second, how frequently do applicants self-disclose about personal diversity characteristics? Third, how successful were these searches in recruiting gender and ethnic minorities compared to U.S. population statistics regarding gender and ethnic minority doctorates in each discipline?

**Methods**

**Institution and Searches**

The study was conducted at a medium-sized, suburban campus of a large, public, land-grant research university. The positions of interest were tenure-track, non-administrative faculty positions in any discipline that included a required qualification related to diversity posted over a two-year period. For example, a position in electrical engineering included the required qualification to “advance diversity consistent with the campus strategic plan,” followed by a link to the strategic plan website, and the instructions to apply requested a “cover letter with a clear description of experience relevant to each of the required and preferred qualifications.”) Eleven campus searches met these criteria (one additional search was excluded because it did not include a required qualification related to diversity). Table 1 lists the disciplines of the searches, which included fields in the disciplines of education, nursing (two searches, which were combined), and STEM; seven searches were at the rank of assistant professor, and four searches were at the rank of assistant or associate professor.

**Participants, Materials, and Procedure**

Research materials consisted of applicant cover letters, including the diversity statements. Faculty applicants were required to submit materials via an electronic portal maintained by campus human resources (HR). For the purposes of this study, personnel in HR de-identified the cover letters and provided these de-identified materials to the authors. Given this, the study was deemed exempt from review by the authors’ Institutional Review Board.

A total of 881 applications were submitted across all 11 searches. Applications were not evenly distributed. For searches with over 100 applications, a random sample was selected in order to have a feasible number of applications to code. For example, there were 239 applications to the sociology position: a 25% proportion was used to identify 59 applications to code. This process left a sample of 466. Within these applications, the researchers excluded 12 incomplete or unusable documents (e.g., letters of recommendation, letters with pages missing, etc.), for a total of 454 applications. Due to the small size of the applicant pools, the study combined the data from the two nursing searches (*n* = 4 and 8).

After the completion of each search, HR provided the federally mandated demographic summary information regarding the self-reported gender and ethnicity of the pool of applicants to the authors. As legally required, this self-reporting was voluntary; not all applicants provided this information.

**Coding Procedures**

The application letters were coded in two ways. First, each sentence was coded for references to eight specific forms of diversity, unspecified forms of diversity, or no reference to diversity. Second, the entire letter was coded for applicant self-disclosures for each of the same nine dimensions of diversity, or no self-disclosed diversity.

**Content coding.** MAXQDA version 11 (VERBI GmbH, 2013) was used to code the application letters. The coding system was comprised of nine codes. Six of the codes reflected federally protected classes and dimensions of diversity: age (age-related terms or conditions), ethnicity (references to race, ethnicity, and culture), gender (gender-specific labels or behavior), disability (physical or mental conditions, symptoms, or status), military experience, and spirituality (expressions of beliefs regarding higher powers or spiritual practices). Two additional codes – class (socioeconomic status) and sexual orientation -- were added based on Sue’s (2001) and Loden’s (1996) dimensions of diversity. The ninth code -- unspecified diversity -- was added to be applied to other mentions of diversity that did not specifically reference the other eight codes, e.g., “I wish to support underrepresented graduate students” as “underrepresented” could refer to any dimension of diversity. Sentences could contain multiple codes, e.g., “I study depressive disorders in women of color” would be coded for disability, ethnicity, and gender. (The coding manual is available on request to the first author.)

Two variables were retained for analysis: the total frequency of each diversity code in each letter, and a measure of diversity code density, calculated by dividing the total number of all diversity codes for each letter by the number of diversity codes plus the number of sentences without references to diversity in each letter.

**Self-disclosure coding**. The application letters were also coded for occurrences of self-disclosure in each of the nine content coding categories, i.e. self-referential remarks regarding one or more diversity dimensions. The content of the self-disclosure was coded for each code category. For example, each specific ethnicity that was mentioned was recorded (1 = White, 2 = Black, 3 = Asian, 4 = Middle Eastern, 5 = Native American, 6 = Latino, 7 = Pacific Islander) as well as unspecified minority self-disclosures (code = 8), and no mention of ethnicity (code = 0).

**Coding process**. The coding group included seven psychology students. The first author led the training, included reading a coding manual; group training, practice coding, and discussion; and independent practice. The training phase ended when the coders achieved code-by-code and sentence-by-sentence inter-rater reliability > 80%. The application letters were randomly assigned to the coders. In addition, approximately ten percent (*n* = 48) of the documents were randomly chosen for reliability coding unbeknownst to the coders. Assigned documents were placed in separate electronic folders for each coder to maintain the blind regarding reliability coding. Weekly meetings continued during the coding phase to discuss coding challenges to prevent coder drift. In terms of content coding, a sentence-by-sentence comparison of primary coders’ codes versus other coders’ codes revealed an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability at 73%.

**Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics were used to characterize the results. Tests for differences among the searches was conducted using one-way ANOVAs with post-hoc Duncan tests (using an alpha of p < .005 because of the multiple comparisons) used to identify homogenous subsets among the searches.

**Results**

**Diversity Content in the Application Letters**

The first research question examined applicants’ references to diversity, and to examine how references to diversity varied by discipline. Across searches, references to ethnicity appeared most frequently in the letters (*n* = 1341), followed by references to unspecified forms of diversity (*n* = 1315), disability (*n* = 1057), age (*n* = 848), class (*n* = 517), gender (*n* = 403), sexual orientation (*n* = 102), spirituality (*n* = 99), and military experience (*n* = 35). Table 1 lists the average frequency for each diversity code and for diversity code density for each search.

A one-way ANOVA comparing the searches on diversity code density was significant, *F*(9, 444) = 67.56, *p* < .001. Post-hoc Duncan tests identified four homogenous subsets of searches, which are listed in the order of increasing diversity density: (1) the two engineering searches, environmental hydrology and math); (2) the math and industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology search; (3) the I/O psychology search and educational leadership; and (4) the teaching and learning, clinical psychology, sociology, and nursing searches. Evidently, applications to the math, I/O psychology, and educational leadership searches overlapped with each other and occupied a middle ground in terms of references to diversity, whereas applications to the other searches were reliably lower or higher in the density of their references to diversity. One-way ANOVAs revealed significant differences between the searches for every dimension of diversity (*p* < .005).

We were interested in the proportion of applicants without any references to diversity, i.e., those that had been unresponsive to the diversity requirement. Overall, 24.2% of applicants’ letters had no references to diversity at all. Omitting any reference to diversity was most common among applicants to engineering (EE: 71.8%; ME: 57.8%), followed by math (38.1%), environmental hydrology (21.7%), industrial/organizational psychology (16.7%), and educational leadership (8.3%) positions. Both the sociology (1.8%) and teaching and learning (1.2%) positions included only one application omitting references to diversity. All of the nursing and clinical psychology applicants referenced diversity.

**Applicant Self-Disclosure**

Another research question was the frequency of faculty applicants’ self-disclosure of personal diversity characteristics, and if self-disclosures varied by discipline. Applicant diversity self-disclosure was rare: only 6.6% of applicants (*n* = 30) self-disclosed information related to one or more diversity dimensions. Applicants to the teaching and learning, sociology (*n* = 8 each), and environmental hydrology (*n* = 7) accounted for two-thirds of those who self-disclosed. Most of these self-disclosures referenced underrepresented characteristics. However, both of the applicants who referenced physical/mental abled-ness described themselves as abled. Among the nine applicants who referenced their gender, the one man was in a female-predominant (according to the 2015 Survey of Earned Doctorates, NSF, 2016) field (sociology) and two of the women were in male-predominant fields (environmental hydrology): the remaining five women were in female-predominant fields.

**Applicant Characteristics Compared to the U.S. Population**

The final research question regarded the success of these searches in recruiting gender and ethnic minorities compared to U.S. population statistics regarding gender and ethnic minority doctorates in each discipline. We examined applicant disclosures to Human Resources (HR), and to the U.S. population, by discipline. The proportions of women and persons of color (Hispanic, Black, Asian, American Indian, and multiracial) in the U.S. population (U.S. citizens or permanent residents) with earned doctorates in each discipline were based on the NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED) for 2015 (National Science Foundation, 2016). Table 2 shows the proportions of women and people of non-White race and Hispanic ethnicity as disclosed to HR, and in the 2015 SED (National Science Foundation, 2016) among U.S. citizens and permanent residents, and the results of tests for differences in those proportions.

The proportions of applicants who identified as female were *less* than the proportions of females in the 2015 SED in four searches – two in female-predominant fields, and two in male-predominant fields. These differences suggest that the recruitment strategies were *successful* in attracting male applicants to two fields in which they are underrepresented -- teaching and learning, and clinical psychology -- but *unsuccessful* in attracting female applicants to two fields in which they are underrepresented - mechanical engineering and environmental hydrology. No gender differences were found in the other six searches.

The proportions of applicants who identified as ethnic minorities were *greater* than the proportions of ethnic minorities in the 2015 SED in six fields: teaching and learning, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, environmental hydrology, mathematics/statistics, and nursing. These results suggest that the recruitment strategies were successful in attracting ethnic/racial minority applicants beyond the proportions in the population of earned doctorates. No ethnicity differences were found for the other four searches.

**Discussion**

This study sought to characterize the frequencies of faculty applicant references to specific and nonspecific forms of diversity, and to examine differences in such references to diversity by discipline. References to ethnicity, unspecified diversity, and disability were most common, averaging over two references per application across the sample. These diversity dimensions were also referenced most frequently in a previous study of applications to three faculty positions (Schmaling et al., 2015). These results are similar to previous research that has found references to ethnicity to be central aspects of diversity (Baker et al., 2016; Banks, 2009; Bowman, 2010; Boysen, 2011; Green, Callands, Radcliffe, Luebbe, & Klonoff, 2009; Hon, Weigold, & Chance, 1999; Littleford, 2013; Ocampo et al., 2003; Schmaling et al., 2015).

Most applicants made references to diversity, which would be expected because all of the positions had a required qualification related to diversity. However, nearly a quarter of applicants made no reference to diversity, which was troubling given that each position had a qualification related to diversity that applicants were expected to address. This study’s data cannot address why applicants neglected to respond to position qualifications, which would be a valuable direction for future research. One possibility is inadequate preparation: these faculty candidates may have had limited experience with others from different backgrounds and with different abilities, or had ample experience with diverse others but did not recognize these experiences with diversity, or recognized them but did not know how to frame them as such in their applications. Another possible explanation might be the extent to which applicants personalized each application to be responsive to each institution and position qualifications. Applicants are advised to tailor their application to each position (Pain, 2013), which can be a daunting task when applying to over 50 positions (Kaplan, 2013), but reflects attention to detail and responsiveness to position requirements, including, in this study, the institution’s commitment to diversity.

The searches differed significantly in terms of references to diversity dimensions. Applications to people-centric disciplines (e.g., nursing, clinical psychology, sociology, teaching/learning) unsurprisingly had higher densities of references to diversity than the laboratory-based sciences and engineering. Applications to the latter fields were also most likely to lack any reference to diversity in their materials. Previous research on engineering school mission statements have found about one-quarter to reference diversity and that diversity references are related to higher proportion of female students (Creamer & Ghoston, 2012). References to diversity in mission statements may help mitigate against extant stereotypes that successful engineering students are perceived to be masculine, dominant, and forceful (de Pillis, & de Pillis, 2008). Opportunities to address diversity abound in all disciplines, which may be obscured to some faculty applicants and little addressed in some disciplines. All graduate students have worked with others -- other students, faculty, and staff in laboratories and classrooms, and people in industry, professional organizations, and communities -- whose characteristics differ from their own. That most individuals’ conceptualizations of diversity appear constrained and narrow may be the most pertinent issue that precludes effective appreciation and description of one’s experiences with diversity that will inform their research, teaching, and service.

A second goal of the study was to examine the frequency of faculty applicant self-disclosed diversity characteristics. Very few applicants disclosed aspects of their own diversity. Less than 10% referenced any of their own characteristics in their application letters, which represented a small fraction of racial/ethnic minorities or gender as self-disclosed to HR. The opportunities to address diversity mentioned above extend to self-disclosure – self-disclosure provides opportunities to acknowledge and discuss privilege or majority characteristics, or personal experiences with disadvantage or underrepresentation. Interestingly, most applicants reported their gender and ethnicity to HR in response to federally-mandated demographics questions, and from these data (see Table 2), it appears that there was a good deal of gender and ethnic diversity among the applicants. Without querying applicants regarding their cognitions, the reasons for not referencing their own diversity are unknown. However, the reasons could include valid concerns about the potential for negative biases and lack of objectivity on the part of search committees as reviewed in the introduction. Search committees may not ask applicants about their personal characteristics: the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) enforces federal statutes regarding employment discrimination on the basis of age, race, religion, or sex (see http://[www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes](http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes)/). Applicants also may have lacked a framework for diversity so that their own diverse identities were not considered. Other reasons could include the use of outdated forms with anachronistic limitations such as use of binary gender or requiring applicants to identify with a single racial or ethnic group. Finally, applicants may have not self-disclosed to avoid being cast as a person chosen for a job over another candidate because of minority status.

The third goal of the study was to compare applicants’ self-reported gender and ethnicity characteristics to those of U.S. doctorates. Overall, the proportions of racial/ethnic minorities in the applicant pools was greater than those of U.S. doctorates in all but one search, and these differences achieved statistical significance in a majority of the searches. The gender representation in the searches differed from U.S. doctorates in a minority of the searches, and for those searches with statistically significant differences, female applicants were *less* common than expected in two searches in which females are underrepresented in the disciplines, and male applicants were *more* common than expected in two searches in which males are underrepresented in the disciplines. These results would suggest that the inclusion of the diversity qualification may have been more successful in achieving ethnic/racial diversity than gender diversity in fields in which women are underrepresented, akin to previous research (Schmaling et al., 2015). Different position requirements, such as specifical gender inclusion goals in the applicant pool, may be needed to increase the numbers of female applicants in these disciplines.

The results have important implications for those involved in the faculty search process. Faculty searches are crucial opportunities to increase diversity advocates and allies among the faculty, enhance consciousness about diversity, and add diverse faculty. Institutional policies, such as anti-bias training, can mitigate bias, although search committee members may resent such accountability interventions (Isaac, Lee, & Carnes, 2009; Self, Mitchell, Mellers, Tetlock, & Hildreth, 2015). Turnover (departure) bias and applicant diversity are key factors in changing workforce diversity (O’Brien, Scheffer, van Nes, & van der Lee, 2015). This study’s data from HR suggest that applicant diversity was good compared to disciplinary pools, but applicant abilities to address diversity varied considerably. One potentially troubling observation was that no references to diversity were found in 25% of letters, which was a greater proportion than in a previous study (14% in Schmaling et al., 2015). In informal discussions, the chairs of these search committees described processes whereby applicants who did not address the diversity requirement would not progress in the searches. One search chair commented that many applicants seemed to use standard application ‘packages’ that were not personalized for each search. The submission of applications that are untailored to the requirements of each position, as well as to the university, department, and institutional strategic plan (etc.), is unlikely to result in advancement in a search. While tailoring each application is surely time-consuming, not doing so may ultimately end in wasted time and effort (Pain, 2013).

In addition to the limitations mentioned above, the generalizability of the results of this study is limited by the positions searched during the timeframe of the study. For example, no searches for faculty positions in the arts or humanities were studied. Furthermore, potential applicants undoubtedly self-selected or self-disqualified for the positions in unmeasured ways, e.g., based on the location, size, research-extensive nature, and other characteristics of the university. The Survey of Earned Doctorates (NSF, 2016) reports gender and ethnicity for US citizens only, whereas citizen status was not reported for the applicant pools by HR, which may limit the validity of the comparisons. We used data from the 2015 Survey of Earned Doctorates (NSF, 2016) to estimate gender and ethnicity representation among all doctorates in the U.S. Although one year’s data might provide unstable estimates, inspection of these proportions across three years (2013-2015) revealed little variability.

In summary, faculty application letters to positions in ten disciplines with qualifications related to diversity most frequently mentioned ethnicity, followed by references to nonspecific forms of diversity, disability, age, class, and gender. Comparisons among the searches revealed that applicants to person-focused fields had higher densities of references to diversity, especially compared to applicants to faculty positions in engineering and physical sciences. Applicants to these latter positions also were less likely to make any reference to diversity, despite the positions’ diversity requirements. One way to address diversity would be to discuss one’s own characteristics – the majority of applicant pools were more ethnically diverse than U.S. doctorates -- but applicant self-disclosures of diversity were rare, perhaps due to concerns about discrimination. These results suggest there is opportunity and need to assist future faculty members in their ability to articulate and affirm diversity to advance higher education’s ability to serve a diverse populace. Graduate students and post-doctoral fellows should receive grounding in multidimensional conceptualizations of diversity, assistance in building connections with diverse others, and help in framing diversity statements alongside the development of research and teaching statements (Austin, 2006; Ball, 2014).
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Footnotes

1Absent evidence of genetic differences between races (National Human Genome Research Institute, 2006), race and ethnicity may be viewed as sociocultural constructs (Nagayama Hall, 2010), leading us to use the phrase ‘ethnicity’ throughout this paper, which includes the United States’ federal definition of race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, White) and ethnicity (Hispanic origin, Not of Hispanic origin) (Office of Management and Budget, 1997), and their combination.

Table 1

*Average Frequencies of Diversity Codes and of Diversity Density per Application by Search*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Education | | Engineering | | Envir. |  |  | Psychology | |  |
| Code | Leadership  *n* = 48 | T&L  *n = 81* | EE  *n = 39* | ME  *n = 83* | Hydro.  *n* = 60 | Math  *n* = 21 | Nursing  *n* = 12 | Clinical  *n* = 12 | I/O  *n* = 42 | Sociology  *n* = 56 |
| Age | 3.52  (4.31)\* | 4.98  (4.52) | 0.05  (0.22) | 0.05  (0.27) | 0.13  (0.47) | 0.86  (3.05) | 2.17  (3.54) | 2.75  (2.90) | 0.50  (1.67) | 2.93  (4.55) |
| Class | 1.98  (2.80) | 2.23  (2.50) | 0.03  (0.16) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.08  (0.33) | 0.19  (0.60) | 0.17  (0.39) | 1.67  (2.35) | 0.21  (0.52) | 3.57  (4.02) |
| Disability | 0.79  (1.52) | 0.74  (2.13) | 0.18  (0.51) | 1.00  (2.18) | 1.02  (2.21) | 2.43  (3.57) | 10.92  (6.82) | 14.75  (4.33) | 2.62  (5.76) | 6.05  (10.49) |
| Ethnicity | 3.46  (5.50) | 8.07  (6.96) | 0.18  (0.56) | 0.19  (0.83) | 0.42  (0.72) | 0.86  (3.48) | 1.08  (1.24) | 2.42  (2.81) | 1.19  (2.06) | 6.48  (7.61) |
| Gender | 0.79  (2.07) | 1.15  (1.80) | 0.03  (0.16) | 0.06  (0.45) | 0.27  (0.61) | 0.33  (1.11) | 0.50  (1.00) | 1.67  (2.54) | 0.74  (1.94) | 3.32  (4.14) |
| Military  Experience | 0.02  (0.14) | 0.11  (0.65) | 0.05  (0.22) | 0.01  (0.11) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.17  (0.39) | 0.67  (1.44) | 0.14  (0.47) | 0.11  (0.68) |
| Sexual  Orientation | 0.13  (0.61) | 0.41  (1.18) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.03  (0.18) | 0.05  (0.22) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.42  (0.79) | 0.10  (0.37) | 0.91  (2.31) |
| Spirituality | 0.08  (0.28) | 0.56  (1.49) | 0.10  (0.50) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.03  (0.18) | 0.00  (0.00) | 0.25  (0.62) | 0.08  (0.29) | 0.14  (0.78) | 0.61  (1.80) |
| Unspecified  Diversity | 4.29  (4.25) | 7.37  (6.57) | 0.31  (1.17) | 0.23  (0.79) | 1.05  (1.57) | 0.33  (1.11) | 0.67  (0.99) | 2.83  (1.85) | 2.07  (3.20) | 5.04  (4.90) |
| Diversity  Density | 0.35  (0.21) | 0.50  (0.20) | 0.04  (0.09) | 0.07  (0.12) | 0.11  (0.10) | 0.14  (0.18) | 0.61  (0.23) | 0.59  (0.10) | 0.24  (0.20) | 0.52  (0.22) |

\*Standard deviations are in parentheses. Note: T&L = teaching and learning; EE = electrical engineering; ME = mechanical engineering; I/O = industrial/organizational.

Table 2

*Applicant Characteristics Reported to Human Resources and in the Survey of Earned Doctorates*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | % Female | | | % Ethnic Minority | | |
|  | HR | *Z* for Comparison | US PhDs | HR | *Z* for Comparison | US PhDsc |
| Education: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Educational Leadership | 57.7 | 0.6, ns | 61.7 | 42.6 | 1.6, ns | 31.3 |
| Teaching & Learning | 48.8 | 3.7\*\* | 69.1a | 42.4 | 3.1\*\* | 24.9 |
| Engineering: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electrical | 10.3 | 0.8, ns | 14.6 | 67.6 | 3.6\*\* | 37.1 |
| Mechanical | 3.6 | 2.7\*\* | 13.8 | 68.8 | 8.6\*\* | 22.7 |
| Environmental Hydrology | 16.5 | 3.9\*\* | 33.6b | 51.4 | 8.2\*\* | 19.1 |
| Mathematics (statistics) | 32.1 | 1.2, ns | 39.4 | 68.1 | 4.8\*\* | 33.3 |
| Nursing (two searches) | 100.0 | 0.9, ns | 93.8 | 50.0 | 2.1\* | 26.2 |
| Psychology: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clinical | 45.5 | 2.7\*\* | 78.8 | 30.0 | 0.3, ns | 26.2 |
| Industrial/Organizational | 48.8 | 1.5, ns | 61.1 | 37.8 | 1.2, ns | 28.0 |
| Sociology | 56.9 | 1.3, ns | 61.9 | 25.0 | 0.7, ns | 27.6 |

aThe SED subfield of “all teaching fields” was used. bThe SED subfield of “physical sciences and earth sciences” was used as the advertisement requested a PhD in “an earth science, engineering, or other physical-science related discipline.” cOnly the race/ethnicity of US citizens is reported in the SED, whereas temporary visa holders may apply and be counted among the HR statistics. Note: proportions are the number who endorsed being female or non-White divided by the reported, ns = statistically non-significant, \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01