

5 Recruiting New Faculty: Developing a Diverse Pool and an Equitable Search Process

In this part of this book we will consider practical solutions that have been developed (or in some cases *could* be developed) to address aspects of faculty life in contemporary academic institutions that are often not inclusive. We begin with issues of recruitment of new faculty, and then follow the working lives of faculty who are in fact hired into our institutions.

Faculty and administrators agree that the future of a college or university lies in the new faculty. One provost we knew often said, “The university with the best faculty wins.” Always a small minority of the faculty, given the long careers of most academics after tenure and the increased reliance on contingent faculty, the new tenure-track faculty hired as assistant professors bring in new energy and vision, and keep the university alive to new intellectual developments and research techniques. Because the future of the institution—both short and long-term—rests with the new assistant professors (except in a tiny handful of elite institutions that still do most of their hiring at the senior level), recruiting and hiring is a process many faculty care passionately about and are willing to spend considerable time on.

In this chapter we outline the earliest steps in the search and hiring process—defining the position, recruiting the applicant pool, and setting up the search committee process. When these steps are taken thoughtfully and carefully, search committees that have the capacity to make good decisions will be able to review a diverse pool of candidates. The first steps are critical if the department is going to hire faculty who will add diversity to the institution. In the next chapter we will outline procedures to ensure a fair and equitable decision process at the end of a search.

Pursuing Diversity and Excellence

Hiring new faculty can either help change a department in productive ways or maintain the department's status quo. Faculty commitment to recruitment and hiring can become a resource for institutional change efforts or a resource for resistance. Those faculty who hope to see a more inclusive institution that retains or improves its academic standing are readily persuaded that it is important to invest in hiring practices that are not only thoughtful and effective, but relatively unbiased by the cognitive limitations and shortcuts we have outlined. Equally, faculty in under-resourced institutions may be persuaded that more diverse faculty would meet the demands from students and for service to the institution more adequately.

At the same time, the tradition in some institutions of horse-trading for new hires, of turf battles about the definition of positions, of preoccupation with hiring people who will easily "fit in," and of intense debates over the final candidate, is long and familiar. Some faculty believe that their department's excellence depends on those very traditions, and that change in the service of diversity must inevitably risk the hard-won success and collegiality of the department to date. Not surprisingly, in a study of science and engineering departments that were part of an institutional change effort taking place over more than a decade at one research-intensive university, faculty and department chairs who expressed these kinds of beliefs most often came from departments that in fact did not succeed at the broader effort to achieve greater gender diversity in the faculty (Stewart, Malley, & Herzog, 2016).

It is, then, not just helpful but necessary for institutional leaders to explain how and why diversity and excellence are mutually compatible—perhaps even inextricably linked—goals and outcomes. Since attitudes and beliefs are notoriously difficult to change, whether they are explicit or implicit, we emphasize institutionalized structures that promote processes that mitigate the damaging effects of these kinds of beliefs.

Because of the habitual assumption that either excellence or inclusion must be traded off to achieve the other, any effort to develop, implement, and institutionalize new procedures for the recruitment of faculty must clearly maximize both goals. Recruitment efforts must also build on what is known both about how unconscious cognitive shortcuts like relying on people's

fit with our expectations and past experience can lead to poor judgments, and about how those errors and schemas can operate within the recruitment process. As a result of decision-making strategies that rely on representativeness and availability, we are likely to picture successful applicants as sharing personal characteristics with the majority of current job occupants (Kahneman, 2011). However, resistance can be lessened in the face of results showing that new procedures pay off in a more diverse junior faculty that is also at least as outstanding in accomplishments as the less diverse one that preceded it.

In this chapter we will focus on overcoming reliance on the cognitive shortcuts discussed earlier, including reliance on the representativeness, availability, and anchoring decision-making strategies, as well as schemas about gender, race-ethnicity, and other characteristics that are not directly job relevant. We will outline procedures we know about from many institutions, but of course the examples most familiar to us will often come from our own two institutions (the University of Michigan and Hunter College).

Preparing the Description of the Position (or “Writing the Ad”)

Why the Position Description Matters: Lack of Diversity in Pools of Applicants

To date most “pools of applicants” (i.e., the total set of people who apply for a position) are not diverse in most fields in terms of race and ethnicity, and in some fields in terms of gender (Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi, & Richards, 2004). The candidates in these “pools” are expected to have a range of skills and talent, and faculty are quite confident of their ability to assess the skill and talent of potential colleagues. But faculty cannot hire individuals who do not apply: if women and minorities are not in the pool of applicants, they cannot become future colleagues. In short, a diverse pool is a precondition for hiring women and minorities. Having a diverse pool of applicants has other advantages: there is considerable evidence that the diversity of the pool of applicants affects how women and minorities in that pool are evaluated, if they do apply (Sackett, Dubois, & Noe, 1991), and whether they are hired (Bilimoria & Buch, 2010; Smith et al., 2004). This matters because, as we have seen, on average, potential employers, including faculty, are not able to judge skill and talent equally well among women and minorities and among White men.

The Impact of Differential Representation of Groups in the Pool of Applicants

One factor that makes a difference in the process of evaluation is how well represented people from a particular group are in the pool of people being rated. The availability strategy or heuristic leads us to expect success in candidates like those whose success we have seen before—in the case of most university faculty, people who are male and White. Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977) proposed that the representation of women in corporations might make a difference in women's treatment; she suggested that conditions were particularly problematic when the representation was skewed (less than 15%), that it improved when it was tilted (between 16% and 35%), and best when it was balanced (between 35% and 65%). Parallel reasoning has been suggested for racial-ethnic minorities, though it is recognized that their base rate in the overall population is not roughly half, as is women's. So the relevant indicators of "skew" and "tilt" are different, but the same general point holds: when minorities are very rare in an organization, their situation will be more difficult.

Three scholars from the University of Minnesota (Sackett, DuBois, & Noe, 1991) designed an unusually rigorous assessment of the impact of group representation by gender and by race on evaluations. Using a large database that had been created by the U.S. Employment Service for other purposes, they examined the ratings of employee performance provided by supervisors of employees in hundreds of different jobs that ranged in the representation of women (in one case) or Blacks (in the other case) from 10% to 90%. This database was particularly useful for studying the impact of the ratio of women and minorities in the job because there were other data available: a composite indicator of cognitive ability (based on several different tests assessing general cognitive ability, verbal ability, and numerical ability), psychomotor ability (a composite of motor coordination, finger dexterity, and manual dexterity), education, and firm experience.

With all of these measures in hand, the researchers first assessed the gender and race differences in performance evaluations across all evaluators. Then they considered whether that difference could be accounted for by differences in cognitive and psychomotor ability, education, and experience; finally, they considered whether—after all of those other factors had been controlled—the difference might be the result of the differential

representation of women or minorities in the rating group (the proportion of women or the proportion of Blacks). Overall, women were rated only slightly lower than men across all jobs. However, they were rated much lower than men if there were fewer than 50% women in the jobs, and much higher than men if there were more than 50% women in the jobs. It is worth noting that this pattern contains a very important general lesson: the impression of “no difference” can arise from two different underlying patterns that cancel each other out in data that are summed, or aggregated, across the different patterns. While both ability variables and experience—clearly relevant to assessment of performance—played a role in predicting evaluations, so did the representation of women in the job—clearly an irrelevant variable in assessing any individual’s performance.

This pattern did not hold for race. Overall, Blacks in all jobs—regardless of their representation in the job group—were evaluated quite a bit lower than Whites, even after the other factors were controlled. The authors suggested that the pervasiveness of racial schemas (sometimes called stereotypes), and the lack of strong schemas associated with jobs as “raced” as opposed to “gendered”—might account for these results (see also Ilgen & Youtz, 1986).

The perceived “fit” of women (and men) to an occupation (presumably the result of gender, race, and occupational schemas and reliance on the representativeness cognitive strategy) is an important factor in evaluations (see Roberson, Galvin, & Charles, 2007, for a review). Similarly, the proportion of minorities in a setting is an important predictor of evaluations (see Reskin, McBrier, & Kmec, 1999; Roberson et al., 2007, for reviews). For example, Kraiger and Ford (1985) combined data from 74 field and laboratory studies of White raters and 14 studies of Black raters and found that at least in field (or “real world”) studies race differences in ratings declined as the proportion of Blacks rated increased. For both gender and race, then, there is reason to believe that the diversity of the people represented in the pool matters for evaluations. This does not surprise us, given what we know about our reliance on both representativeness and availability cognitive strategies.

Data like these—drawn from the real world, and involving large numbers of consequential judgments across many people—are often considered the most convincing. However, three issues might undermine our belief that these data are relevant to the recruitment of faculty in universities

today: (1) they are mostly based on the inevitably “uncontrolled” situation of people working in the real world rather than controlled laboratory experiments; (2) some of them are based on data collected in the 1980s, so they may reflect dynamics that were present then but are absent now; and (3) they are based on individuals in a range of positions, but none of them in relatively high status, professional positions like those of university faculty. Fortunately, we have a great deal of additional evidence that supports the likelihood that the findings from Sackett et al.—at least with respect to gender—do apply in experimental settings, in recently collected data, and in settings more similar to academia.

In one early study, Madeline Heilman (1980) showed that MBA students evaluating women applicants for relatively high-status managerial positions were affected in their hiring recommendations by the proportion of women in the applicant pool. She used a sophisticated experimental design that required students to make recommendations for pools of 8 applicants, containing 1, 2, 3, 4, or 8 women. Each judge evaluated 8 sets of application materials with applicants randomly identified as either male or female, enabling the experimenters to rule out the possibility that any differences by gender or gender composition were the result of actual differences in the applications. Raters favored men over women only when women constituted 25% of the pool or less, presumably because that low rate triggered the availability and representativeness cognitive strategies. There is similar, more recent, evidence from studies of women in high-ranking military positions (Pazy & Oron, 2001), of women being hired into managerial positions in savings and loan organizations (Cohen, Broschak, & Haveman, 1998), and of men in nursing and women police officers (Hewstone, Crisp, & Turner, 2011)—that is, from assessments of higher status, more professional-level workers—that proportional representation affects evaluations.

Having a Diverse Pool Matters

In short, in addition to our commonsense motivation to develop a diverse pool—that we cannot hope to hire a more diverse faculty if we do not attract more diverse applicants for our positions—there is also a data-based rationale. That is, our capacity to fairly assess women and minorities (and those from rare groups in general) is lower when we have only a very small number of people from those groups in our applicant pools.

A number of explanations have been proposed and studied to account for why this might be so, beyond the cognitive shortcuts we have already discussed. Some scholars have emphasized the “fit” between the schema for the group individuals belong to and the schema for the job (Heilman, 1983) or the similarity or dissimilarity in group membership between judges and applicants (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). Both of these approaches assume that an applicant’s group membership—which should not be relevant to assessment of an individual’s qualifications or performance—is made salient when their group is statistically rare, lower in general social status, or viewed negatively in terms of competence for the particular job or occupation (Roberson, Galvin, & Charles, 2007). If we have a more diverse pool of applicants, we are less likely to rely on group membership in evaluating applicants, and more likely to actually focus on individual accomplishments. Ensuring a broad and diverse pool of applicants is, then, an important focus for search committees. But how can committees change the features of the pool of applicants, especially in a field in which males and/or Whites are numerically dominant?

Defining the Position to Maximize a Diverse Pool of Applicants

A good place to start is with the definition of the position. If the job is defined in narrow terms (a common strategy in many faculty hires), it will focus on a single research area within a discipline or subfield, will require use of particular methods or approaches, and may also dictate specific courses to be taught.

Here is a typical example of this type of faculty advertisement:

The Department of Psychology at Terrific University is seeking an Assistant Professor with a promising program of research in the area of stigma and stereotyping in social psychology. The successful applicant will not only demonstrate excellence in this research area but will be able to teach courses in Social Psychology, Prejudice and Discrimination, and Attitude Change.

Broad or Narrow Qualifications

Every narrow qualification that is specified will have the effect of leading some potential applicants to select themselves *out* of the pool of possible applicants. Moreover, this process of self-selection is probably biased: individuals with privileged statuses (e.g., Whites, men) are likely to feel more

entitled to rewards (e.g., money, positions) than are those with subordinate statuses (e.g., people of color, women; see Bylsma & Major, 1992; Hogue & Yoder, 2003; Hogue, Yoder, & Singleton, 2007; Pelham & Hetts, 2001).

For example, Hogue and Yoder (2003) demonstrated women's "depressed entitlement." Undergraduate students were told "I am investigating the effects of verbal reasoning ability on job performance. You will be completing an exercise that is used to measure verbal reasoning ability for future employees." Students were given an example of the task and then asked to project their competence at it and to indicate how much they should be paid for this task from \$1 to \$15. As is generally found in studies of this phenomenon, women thought they should be paid significantly less than men (on average \$7.48) while men thought they should be paid more (on average \$10.27). Importantly, this difference in pay existed despite there being no difference in the judged quality of men's and women's work by external judges or by the students themselves. The analogy to a search process is that detailed specifications of desirable features of an applicant may stimulate a process of self-evaluation of "fit" that will lead to a pool that is less diverse. Thus, if women and underrepresented minority potential job applicants, more often than White men, conclude, "I am not what they are looking for" or "I am not qualified" when reviewing the required qualifications for a position, our applicant pools may be unnecessarily homogeneous.

Cues of Belonging

Cues that women or minorities do not "belong" in a setting have powerful effects in raising doubts that individuals have talent (Walton & Cohen, 2007) or should pursue particular fields (Cheryan, Plaut, Davies, & Steele, 2009). If our goal is to increase the chances that a woman or a person of color will consider applying, it will help if we do not provide cues that lead them to feel they do not belong or would not fit the job definition (see Breugh, 2013; Cheryan et al., 2009; Gaucher, Friesen, & Kay, 2011; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Dittmann, & Crosby, 2008; Walker, Feild, Giles, Armenakis, & Bernerth, 2009; Yoder, 2002). If we hope to attract a wide range of applicants, jobs should be described in the broadest terms that are accurate (e.g., by listing several alternative topics or approaches) and offer a range of courses that might be taught rather than a specific and

limited set. A more inclusive version of the advertisement above might read:

The Department of Psychology at Terrific University is seeking an Assistant Professor with a promising program of research on the dynamics and consequences of power relations between social groups. The successful applicant will not only demonstrate excellence in this research area but will be able to teach courses appealing to undergraduates both in that area and in broader domains of psychology.

It might be even better if the department were willing and able to advertise for a truly “open position”:

The Department of Psychology at Terrific University is seeking an Assistant Professor with a promising program of research in any area. The successful applicant will not only demonstrate excellence in this research area but will be able to teach courses appealing to undergraduates both in that area and in broader domains of psychology.¹

Box 5.1

Sample “Broad” and “Open” Job Descriptions

The “broad” or “open” descriptions listed here were used for actual faculty searches in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences at the University of Michigan. They reflect different degrees of “openness” and different strategies for signaling their openness, but they are all more open than traditional job descriptions in these fields.

English Department

The English Department at the University of XX expects to make an appointment in Composition and Rhetoric in [date]. We are particularly interested in innovative scholars at the entering or advanced Assistant or beginning Associate level, and we are excited to consider a broad range of areas of specialization, including, for example, rhetorical theory and/or history, genre studies, technologies of literacy, discourse studies, and new media writing. The successful candidate will contribute to vibrant and expanding programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Send letter of application, c.v., statement of current and future research plans, statement of teaching philosophy and experience, writing sample, and three letters of reference by October 20th, Attention: [address]. The University of XX is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer and is supportive of the needs of dual career couples. Women and minority candidates are encouraged to apply. All applications will be acknowledged.

(continued)

Box 5.1 (continued)**Philosophy Department**

Rank open (tenured or tenure-track) appointment. Begins [date]. Four courses/academic year (semester system) at all levels, thesis supervision, usual committee and other nonteaching duties. University-year (nine-month) appointment. A[rea] O[f] S[pecialization]: Open. A[rea] O[f] C[oncentration]: Open. Ph.D. prior to appointment (normally). The Department is open to the possibility of interdisciplinary appointments. Salary highly competitive. All applicants should ensure that their dossiers contain a cover letter and current CV. The cover letter should state whether the applicant is applying for a tenured or untenured position. Applicants for a junior position should also include letters of recommendation, samples of written work, a statement of current and future research plans, evidence of teaching excellence, and a statement of teaching philosophy and experience. Applicants for a tenured position may, if they wish, provide references and written work or other supplementary materials. Women and members of minority groups are especially encouraged to apply. The University supports the needs of dual-career couples. Please send all materials to [address]. Acknowledgment of receipt of your materials will be sent via e-mail. Applications must be received by [date] to be assured of full consideration. The University of XX is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Anthropology Department

The Department of Anthropology invites applications for one or more full-time faculty positions in **sociocultural anthropology**, rank open, to begin in [date], pending administrative approval. We seek creative scholars who integrate ethnography and theoretical analysis, and who deepen our dialogue with other disciplines and debates. Successful candidates will be able to teach introductory and higher level undergraduate courses in addition to graduate seminars, and their research and teaching interests should complement the strengths of our existing faculty (for more information consult our website at [URL]). The PhD must be completed before the beginning of the appointment. Since we expect to conduct some interviews at the [date] meeting of the American Anthropological Association, applications received before [date] will be at an advantage. Please send hard copies only of: (1) a cover letter; (2) a c.v.; (3) a statement of current and future research plans; (4) a statement of teaching philosophy and experience; (5) a sample of scholarly writing; (6) evidence of teaching excellence; (7) and the names and addresses of three

Box 5.1 (continued)

references to: [address]. The University of XX is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer, supportive of the needs of dual career couples. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

Physics Department

The Physics Department anticipates that a tenure-track faculty position will be available with a [date] starting date. We are considering applications in all areas of physics represented in the department: High Energy Physics, Condensed Matter Physics, Atomic Molecular and Optical Physics (AMO), Astrophysics, Biophysics, and Theoretical Physics. We are particularly interested in applicants working in the areas of Theoretical Astrophysics, Condensed Matter Theory, String Theory, AMO Theory or High Energy Theory. Candidates are required to have a doctoral degree in physics. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

The successful candidate is expected to establish an independent research program and to contribute effectively to the Department's undergraduate and graduate teaching programs. Applicants should send a curriculum vitae (CV), a brief statement of present and future research plans, a statement of teaching experience and interests, and the names of at least three persons who can provide letters of recommendation.

For full consideration applications should be received between [dates]. The University of XX is a non-discriminatory/affirmative action employer. The University is responsive to the needs of dual career couples.

Cues of belonging can be conveyed by gendered language in job advertisements, such as the use of *dominant* instead of *excellent*. Male-dominated jobs tend to use more masculine terms than female-dominated jobs do, while feminine words are used equally in both types (Gaucher, Friesen, & Kay, 2011). In a laboratory setting, where the same job can be described in different terms, the use of "masculine" words for an administrative assistant job (*boasts, demanding, strong*) attracted women (the only group tested) less than an advertisement with "feminine" or neutral words (*polite, sensitive, capable*) (Gaucher et al., 2011). The lower attraction was not because women did not think they could handle the job. The language was off-putting.

The mention of diversity values in a job advertisement may affect African Americans and Whites differently. African Americans see mention of a moral

obligation as suggesting they might be treated well by the institution, while Whites are more attracted by an explanation for diversity that stresses benefits to the institution (Williamson, Slay, Shapiro, & Shivers-Blackwell, 2008).

The Impact of Broad Searches

The opportunity to search “openly” or broadly can arise both if multiple positions are available at the same time or (when hiring opportunities are rare) if departments are willing to search for “the best available candidate” regardless of the area of specialization. At the University of Michigan broad searches have been the long-standing practice of some departments, not because of an historic commitment to recruiting diverse applicant pools, but because of an historic commitment to excellence. However, Michigan’s experience shows that it is not enough to have broad searches. Historically, “open searching” did *not* generally benefit candidates like women and racial-ethnic minorities in these departments. That is because those searches still relied on the strategies or heuristics that we know result in biased judgments. This fact underscores the importance of the underlying desire to increase diversity; without that motivation, no procedural change will result in different outcomes.

In contrast to searches lacking a commitment to diversity, in 2006, the Michigan Chemistry Department decided to experiment with an “open searching” approach, with the explicit hope that it could *simultaneously* better its standing in the field and attract a more diverse applicant pool. Happily, the department maintained data about their applicant pool “before” and “after” the new procedure. Between the academic years 2001 and 2004, the “before” period when the department used conventionally narrow advertisements for positions, women candidates submitted about 15 applications each year. Between 2006 and 2009, the “after” period when they adopted a policy of “open searching,” women submitted an average of 34 applications each year—more than doubling their previous yield. The percentage of women in the available pool (PhDs obtained five years ago) did not change over this period: roughly 30% to 35% of chemistry PhDs went to women from 1995 to 2005.²

In the “before” period, not quite 30% of the department’s actual new hires were women ($n=2$) and none were underrepresented minorities; in the “after” period, more than 50% of the new hires were women and three were underrepresented minorities. Not only did open searches increase the

total applicant pool (as it would simply by broadening the areas of specialization), it also attracted a more diverse applicant pool. But why? Why did this department's open searching strategy result in a more diverse pool? We believe one main reason is that they proactively sought out diverse applicants at conferences and through colleagues they knew at institutions that have diverse student bodies or who themselves have track records of mentoring students and postdocs from diverse backgrounds. Perhaps most importantly, they adopted review strategies that maximized their ability to make accurate judgments of talent, regardless of the gender or race/ethnicity of the applicant.

There was another, unanticipated benefit of the new procedure: a much larger proportion of the department participated in the hiring process. Rather than delegating the search to those most directly involved and "expert," many people participated and therefore felt some commitment to the candidates hired. This benefit—greater faculty involvement and investment in new faculty—is quite separate from the obvious benefit in terms of diversity.

Finally, we note that the department's "objective" excellence increased during this period. For example, in 1999 its "average reputation" rating on *U.S. News and World Report's* 5-point scale was 3.9, while by 2014 it was 4.2, corresponding to a rise in the ranking from 20th to 15th in a little over a decade.³ It is impossible to know which of the many variables that changed during this period were responsible for the increase in ranking. The improvement cannot be attributed unequivocally to the hiring of women and faculty of color. However, the data suggest at the very least that diversifying the faculty is compatible with increasing its excellence. It is clearly worth departments' trouble to experiment with open searches, tracking their efforts, and tracking the results, with respect to both anticipated and unanticipated costs and benefits.

Difficulties to Overcome in Conducting Broad Searches

We recognize some of the value-based and practical difficulties for many departments of deciding to adopt the practice of using broad job definitions even if they would attract a more diverse pool of applicants. Any change in practices is likely to be experienced by some department members as either a repudiation of the past (in which they are invested) or a risky shift away from practices that have "worked." In fact, one aspect of past practices must be repudiated in order to embrace the goal of increasing the diversity

of the faculty. Historically, many academic positions have been defined in terms of the previous occupant or a very specific current teaching need. This practice aims at reproduction of past research or curricular needs. An unintended side effect is to reproduce the homogeneous demographics of the past department faculty (Moody, 2004). Searching for someone in an emergent research area could eliminate the latter problem, but it still will not fill a narrowly defined past research or teaching need. Moreover, if the “emergent area” position is defined narrowly, it also is still likely to result in a narrow pool.⁴ For this reason, we believe that departments will only alter their practices if they believe that past practices—even if they produced some good outcomes and certainly were not intentionally exclusionary—will not produce an adequately diverse pool and therefore must change.

For two practical reasons, searching more broadly than a department has done before may generate concerns among faculty accustomed to narrowly targeted searches. The first is that narrowly targeted searches permit assessment of applicants according to narrow criteria; what criteria can apply across a much less homogeneous applicant pool? The second is that narrowly targeted searches yield small, manageable applicant pools; how can we manage a large pool of applications? These two concerns indeed point to two practical problems that should not be ignored.

Different review procedures will be entailed by a larger, more diverse pool (e.g., having applications reviewed by two faculty on the search committee first, and then only going to the rest of the committee if they met a threshold evaluation; only inviting applicants to submit letters and papers after an initial screening of CVs, etc.). Our point here is that these practical problems can be addressed and are a natural outcome of the very result we are aiming for: a large, diverse pool of applicants.

In defining the position, the rank of the faculty member sought is also a factor to consider. Pools are likely to be most diverse at the earliest career stages and least diverse for more senior searches (because older scholars are less diverse than younger scholars). In addition, senior searches are most likely to focus on individuals who are “known” (in person or by reputation) to various faculty in the department. This sense of “knowledge” increases the likelihood that some implicit assumptions (e.g., about who will move, and what the conditions are for their moves) might affect faculty deliberations in ways that might limit the diversity of the candidates still further (Maynard & Brooks, 2008). For example, some faculty assume that women will be less likely to move a whole family than men, that parents will be

unlikely to disrupt children's lives (or the lives of children of particular ages), that current marriages or relationships are stable, and that women will not move without a high-status position for their partner, but men will (Stewart, Malley, & Herzog, 2016). These assumptions will tend to disadvantage women, the partnered, and parents, regardless of their capacity to improve the excellence of the department and its diversity.

The Impact of Expressed Institutional Values

Assuming that the rank, research focus, and teaching demands can be defined in terms that favor a broader pool of applicants, are there other issues to consider? Smith et al. (2004) found that special hiring programs (including dual career opportunities), family-friendly policies, and job descriptions that mention institutional values that support diversity are more likely to yield diverse hires. We suspect that these results arise because women and minorities are more likely than majority applicants to expect to be judged according to stereotypes (i.e., to experience stereotype threat), leading them—unless there is contrary evidence—to expect rejection, to assume that they may not fit, or to anticipate discrimination absent an explicit signal that the hiring institution will take their application seriously (Steele, 2011). Therefore, evidence that they are being evaluated not because of their demographic characteristics, but on the basis of their professional expertise, is likely to reduce stereotype threat and increase their confidence in the evaluation process (see also Cohen, Steele, & Ross, 1999; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008).

Another reason women and minorities may attend to signals about inclusiveness and attention to families is that some institutions may not be thought of as likely to be “friendly” about family issues; applicants may hold institutional schemas about them that are associated with the opposite (e.g., resource poor, or cold, competitive, and intensely aggressive). In such cases, signaling the availability of these policies may provide counter-evidence that leads women and minority applicants to consider such schools more seriously. If we consider all of these factors, it seems best to find ways to signal that the institution is committed to fair and inclusive processes in recruitment and hiring (and subsequent evaluations of faculty; see, e.g., Bilimoria & Buch, 2010), as well as to family-friendly policies for all faculty, while simultaneously avoiding any suggestion that the department's primary concern in evaluating potential candidates has to do with anything other than the excellence of the candidate.

Search Procedures Matter

Once a job description exists, it is important to design search procedures that will facilitate a more diverse pool of serious candidates than the current faculty displays. As sociologists Reskin et al. (1999, p. 350) point out, “Demographic patterns tend to be self-perpetuating.” They suggest three reasons this happens: (1) potential employees tend to be assessed in terms of their similarity to current “organizational elites” (due to the representativeness strategy or heuristic and our reliance on prestige as a proxy for quality—discussed at length in the next chapter); (2) hiring is often conducted through existing informal networks of current employees (the operation of homophily matters here); and (3) demographic majorities create environments that may feel inhospitable to demographic minorities. Fortunately, there are remedies for each of these factors.

Identifying New Types of Candidates

First, search committees can adopt an explicit goal of identifying candidates who are *different* from existing faculty, and they can develop strategies for attracting those applicants. In pursuing this goal, it is optimal to treat searching as an activity that is engaged in year-round by all faculty members. When faculty attend talks or are at conferences, they can and should be on the lookout for rising young colleagues in the field, paying particular attention to those from underrepresented groups who are impressive in these settings. Approaching women and minorities who give a stimulating paper in the department or at a conference, and discussing it with them, while at the same time encouraging them to stay in touch, is a great way to develop a much more diverse network not only of potential applicants for positions, but of references to other applicants, such as their students. Accumulating this kind of record in a department can lead to a collectively maintained list of “people to watch out for” that can alert all faculty members about potential future colleagues to look for at other meetings.

It can be difficult for faculty to avoid relying on a narrow network of department members’ former mentors and colleagues as sources of applicants and references. Moreover, though faculty may be tempted to rely on the prestige of the institution where an applicant was trained, the highest ranked departments (often the ones where existing faculty were trained, but largely composed of “organizational elites”) are not necessarily producing the largest numbers of female graduates and are unlikely to be

producing the largest numbers of people of color (as chapter 4 documents). Therefore, relying on colleagues in those departments will not yield the most diverse pool of candidates. (We discuss this issue in detail in the next chapter.) Instead, one strategy is to identify individuals who are mentoring women and minority doctoral students at other institutions and consider those faculty for senior positions at one's institution. If one's own institution graduates significant numbers of well-trained women and minorities in fields where they are underrepresented, those graduates become a good source of suggestions for other women and people of color as they move on to graduate, postdoctoral, and faculty or research careers. It may make sense to recruit those graduates back onto the faculty in the future, in addition to relying on them as trusted references for women and minority applicants for faculty positions.

Search Committee Practices

Search procedures after composition of the job ad vary across disciplines and institutions. Each facet of the search process has implications for how candidates will be recruited and assessed. For example, does the committee request full applications from all candidates or only from a subset? If the latter (and numbers may dictate a limited number of full applications), the committee might underestimate the qualifications of some applicants because they have not had room to provide information about their best assets. In requesting candidates' materials, committees can provide some open-ended opportunity for applicants to "make a case" for their fit and relevance to the position, so the committee can avoid having too little information to perceive an applicant's interesting qualifications (see Roberson et al., 2007, on the value of more information in making better judgments). Increasingly, departments ask applicants to submit a statement about their past contributions to diversity and their anticipated contribution at the institution to which they are applying. The Davis campus of the University of California has developed "guidelines" for applicants in preparing such statements (http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/diversity/equity_inclusion/diversity_statements_writing.html). These statements may help committees identify both some faculty who have little interest or commitment to diversity and some with a past track record of mentoring or contributing to institutional change that might matter to the department.

The Search Committee Composition

It is equally important to be careful about choosing who will serve on the committee that screens full applications and will make recommendations for hiring decisions. If the job has been defined broadly, it will be helpful to have broad expertise represented among the reviewers of applications.

Competence of the Committee It is best if there are individuals on the review committee who are knowledgeable about the operation of implicit biases. Knowledge does not ensure that the biases will not operate, but it does increase the likelihood of self-conscious efforts to use procedures that will minimize the operation of bias. Including as diverse a group of faculty as is feasible is critical to the fairness of the decision-making process, despite the fact that many members of our culture share the implicit biases about gender, race, parental status, and other variables that may affect judgments.

Why is a diverse committee important? In a revealing study of jurors waiting for assignment to trials, Sommers (2006) assessed the quality of the deliberations of racially diverse (two African American and four White “jurors”) versus homogeneous (six White jurors) “juries” constructed to fill the waiting period. These juries were shown videotaped testimony for a trial of an African American defendant. Sommers found that the more diverse jury engaged in a more careful and accurate discussion of the evidence than the homogeneous jury. Moreover, the better discussion was *not* driven by the comments of the Black jurors. The White jurors performed better (made fewer factually incorrect assertions, were more likely to correct errors, and discussed the case longer) in the presence of African American peers. This phenomenon—of White group members performing cognitive tasks more carefully in diverse than in homogeneous groups—has been confirmed in a nonjury setting (Sommers, Warp, & Mahoney, 2008). Using very different, mathematical reasoning, Scott Page (2008) has argued that diverse groups—which bring different tools to solving a problem—are likely to come up with more creative and better solutions to problems. The benefits of diversity that we reviewed in chapter 2 are relevant to the performance of search committees.

Credibility of the Committee Not only is a diverse committee likely to engage in a better deliberative process, but the diversity contributes to the

prima facie credibility of the committee's fairness to applicants and the rest of the community. It is important not to assume that a committee with many women or minority group members will be a committee biased in favor of hiring women or minority group members since evidence shows that women and minorities hold implicit attitudes much like those of majority group members. However, a diverse committee composition is likely to reassure both applicants and people in the institution that a range of people's perspectives have influence in decision-making. That is, committee composition can operate as a cue that diversity is welcome (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). And if jury deliberations are analogous to search committee deliberations, a diverse committee is likely to operate with greater explicitness and care about evaluating individuals according to specific criteria.

Educating the Committee Two further procedures may increase the competence of search committees. The first is providing the committee with training and educational resources that increase members' knowledge of the impact of evaluation biases and ways to overcome them. There is increasing evidence that exposure to well-designed, data-based education alters faculty knowledge (see, e.g., Carnes, Devine, Manwell, Byars-Winston, Fine, Ford, et al., 2015) and affects department-level decision-making (Carnes et al., 2015; Sekaquaptewa, 2015) as well as hiring outcomes (LaVaquer-Manty & Stewart, 2008). Workshops of this sort have been offered to search committee members at the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, Florida International University, the University of California, Davis, and Northeastern University, among others.

An alternative approach is to identify "equity advisors" who can serve on search committees in departments other than their own and provide input about appropriate procedures. This strategy has been successful at some institutions (e.g., the University of California, Irvine, and Michigan State University), though at others it has carried an unappealing suggestion of surveillance rather than assistance. If the equity advisors are well-educated, have a high degree of credibility, and are not felt merely to be "policing" the process, this model may work as well.

In order to offer either kind of program, institutions must create a small group of senior faculty to take on the task of studying the literature and presenting it to their colleagues or sitting in on search committees. A course

release, freedom from some other service burdens, or direct compensation are essential to signal the value of this labor and make it truly feasible.

In addition to such educational approaches, it may be helpful to consider creating “standing” search committees with a term of a few years, composed of individuals who have been educated and are committed to the twin goals of excellence and diversity (see policy adopted by Michigan’s College of Engineering: <https://adaa.engin.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2013/07/RH-Presentations-2015.pdf>). In this way, the institution may benefit from a slower, more deliberative hiring process and a cadre of well-educated faculty charged with performing it.

Institutional Self-Representation

As the department, and the search committee, seek to attract diverse faculty (and students), they need to consider how the institution and the department represent themselves on websites and in other descriptions and materials candidates might review. Does the department appear to be diverse in its current composition? Open to a range of perspectives? Eager to increase its breadth and inclusion of a range of interests and types of students and faculty? Possessed of policies that support faculty members’ personal lives when there are increases in the complexity of responsibilities for family members requiring care?

The philosophy departments at Columbia University and New York University are two examples of philosophy departments that explicitly address inclusiveness on their websites (<http://philosophy.columbia.edu/content/minorities-and-philosophy-initiative>, <http://as.nyu.edu/philosophy/climate.html>, respectively). While the intended audience is students rather than faculty, by their concern and their provision of resources, the departments indicate the value they place on diversity and inclusiveness.

If the department’s self-descriptions are not complete in providing good information about those issues, consider sending applicants packets of information that will improve their understanding of the institution’s commitments. Some institutions have identified women or underrepresented minority faculty who are willing to meet with job applicants outside the hiring department, so they can provide them with information about the institutional and community climate and culture for their group. (Of course, this imposes a service burden on those faculty that needs to be

addressed.) As discussed earlier, women and minorities respond to cues that they might fit in or belong to a given field, department, or situation—or that they might not. It is worth the search committee's time to think through how the department can best represent itself and the institution—accurately—in a welcoming and inclusive manner.

Relying on Data

Finally, at the beginning of the search process, in the course of it, and at the end of it, collecting, maintaining, and reviewing accurate data about the pool of candidates and applicants, about the long, medium, and short lists' characteristics, and about the outcomes (offers made, rejected, and accepted) is critical. Collecting and—especially—reviewing data can itself affect both search processes and their success.

One practice that several schools and colleges at the University of Michigan have adopted is to provide every department with annual data about the rate of PhD attainment by women and minorities in the relevant field five years earlier (as a rough and slightly conservative proxy for the demography of the available market) at PhD-granting institutions, at institutions Michigan faculty consider “peers,” and at Michigan itself (see box 5.2). In addition, data are provided about the current population of faculty and doctoral students in that department, and space is provided for (required) reporting about the characteristics of the applicant pool, the interview list, and the final short list.

Routine inspection of the figures provided at the outset of the search allows departments (and deans) to notice when PhD production at the institution in that field is a poor guide to peer or national PhD production. That issue can then be examined and addressed. In addition, mistaken assumptions about the potential availability of applicants can be corrected, and realistic aspirations (including aspirations to attract “ahead” of the pool's rate of women and minorities!) can be developed.

Monitoring the demographic makeup of the applicant pool should be accomplished through a process that keeps gender and race reporting separate from the search committee, so those factors will not be made salient and trigger reliance on schemas, thereby biasing evaluation of individual dossiers. In the course of the search, these data can be monitored, and deans or provosts can hold search committees accountable for at least attracting

Box 5.2

Pool Data Summary Form for Search Committees

Table 1.

Percentage of doctoral degrees conferred to women and underrepresented minorities in [department] at the University of Michigan, 14 peer institutions, and all R1 institutions with [department] programs: 2000–2011

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
University of Michigan													
Total number of doctoral degrees conferred	52	41	47	40	50	44	44	52	48	56	34	33	541
% doctoral degrees conferred to women	8%	10%	9%	18%	6%	5%	9%	19%	15%	11%	18%	27%	12%
% doctoral degrees conferred to URM ^{1,2}	8%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	5%	9%	10%	4%
14 peer institutions													
Total number of doctoral degrees conferred ³	511	531	471	494	556	552	584	725	723	680	658	730	7,215
% doctoral degrees conferred to women	11%	13%	12%	11%	11%	14%	11%	12%	18%	17%	19%	13%	14%
% doctoral degrees conferred to URM	6%	8%	9%	2%	10%	4%	5%	11%	7%	8%	11%	7%	7%
R1 institutions													
Total number of doctoral degrees conferred ⁴	1,192	1,196	1,059	1,058	1,208	1,269	1,505	1,627	1,595	1,486	1,539	1,679	16,413
% doctoral degrees conferred to women	11%	12%	13%	13%	12%	14%	13%	13%	18%	16%	18%	16%	14%
% doctoral degrees conferred to URM	7%	8%	6%	8%	9%	7%	6%	11%	7%	8%	10%	9%	8%

Source: WebCASPAR/IPEDS Completions Survey.

1. African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans (including Alaska Natives).
2. Temporary residents were excluded when calculating percent doctoral degrees conferred to underrepresented minorities, as these individuals were not assigned a race-ethnicity code in the WebCASPAR/IPEDS Completions Survey database.
3. The Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the [College] provided a list of peer institutions for each department. The peer institutions for this discipline include: [Institution names]. Data for these comparison institutions were mapped to University of Michigan departments based on Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code assignments (2000). Because of differences in organizational structures across institutions and how individual institutions assign CIP codes to their respective departments, the mappings were made in a way to be more inclusive rather than exclusive.
4. Includes R1 institutions that conferred doctoral degrees in [department].

Box 5.2 (continued)

Table 2

Faculty search: Applicant pool and candidate pool—Fall 2013/Winter 2014 recruitment season

	Applicant pool	Intermediate list ⁷	Intend to invite
Total	134	134	7
% women ⁵	9%	9%	29%
% URM ⁶	1%	1%	0%
N, unknown sex	114	114	2
N, Unknown race/ethnicity	82	82	6

Source: Departmental Pool Composition Report.

5. When calculating percent female, individuals without an assigned sex code (male or female) were included in the denominator.

6. When calculating percent underrepresented minority (African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans), individuals without an assigned race-ethnicity code were included in the denominator; therefore, the proportion of minorities reported in this table may underestimate the actual proportion of minorities comprising the applicant pool and/or candidate pool.

7. The “Intermediate List” category is for candidates who have merited additional consideration, i.e., candidates for whom reference letters and/or papers were requested by the department. Those invited to campus are usually drawn from the intermediate list.

Table 3

Percentage of women and underrepresented minorities on the tenure track (funded) in [department]

	2001	2013
Total faculty ⁸	82	57
% women	7% (n = 6)	11% (n = 6)
% URM	4% (n = 3)	5% (n = 3)

Source: M-Pathways Human Resources Data Warehouse (HR01); effective dates: 03/01/2001 and 09/15/2013.

8. Excludes dry appointments; faculty with appointments in more than one department in the [College] (i.e., greater than 0% time equivalence) were counted in each department.

an applicant pool that reflects the diversity of the doctoral degree pool. When such data were first shared with departments at Michigan, many were surprised that they had graduated fewer women and minority PhDs than they thought, and that the pool of available applicants was larger than they had believed. Over time, they came to expect the annual update of information, and at least some departments use the data to challenge themselves to achieve the outstanding and diverse applicant pool they need if they are to hire the kind of faculty they want.

Concluding Thoughts

The steps in the process of *recruitment of candidates* and *preparing the search committee* outlined here are the crucial first steps in most hiring. However, institutions sometimes engage in hiring processes that do not assume a job opening, an advertisement, and recruitment of many candidates. Instead, this kind of hiring is often “person specific.” We will discuss that kind of hiring in the next chapter, where we also discuss the evaluation of candidates in general. For now, we note that in most hiring it is important not only to search broadly but to set up a process for *evaluating candidates* that will be truly fair and equitable if a department is to successfully identify the best candidate for a position. It is to that process that we turn in the next chapter.

Finally, we have developed a list of practical recommendations, based on the principles outlined above. We organize the list by the constituency of faculty—administrative leaders, faculty in departments, and applicants for positions. But—of course—all of the recommendations are meant to operate together to support a common goal: attracting a diverse pool of applicants to our institutions.

Recommendations for Practices that Increase the Diversity of Applicant Pools

Provosts, Deans, and Department Chairs

1. Assert the twin goals of excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service and diversity in faculty hiring. Encourage confidence that these two goals are mutually compatible and indeed mutually reinforcing. Rely on data about the benefits of diversity.

2. Encourage the adoption of “open searches,” and remind faculty that they can be used to enhance both the diversity and the excellence of applicant pools and subsequent faculty hires.
3. Publicly praise and consider rewarding departments or other units that succeed in increasing the diversity and excellence in their faculty. Describe the ways they accomplished this achievement to encourage others.
4. Provide new resources for hiring that may be needed to increase diversity (e.g., more funding for travel for applicants or costs of providing educational resources to committees, etc.).
5. Establish procedures that hold search committees and departments accountable for their procedures and their outcomes:
 - a. Ensure that institutional policies that support faculty in various family situations are clear and accessible in institutional self-descriptions (on paper and on the web). This may include dual career support, childcare support, and policies that support modification of duties or paid leaves under conditions of care for new children and/or sick relatives.
 - b. Establish search committees that are diverse in terms of demographic characteristics and expertise but homogeneous in commitment to proactive, fair, and equitable processes.
 - c. Provide search committees and/or equity advisors with appropriate educational or training resources to perform their job competently. Consider appointing search committees over multiple years to maximize the development of expertise at searching.
 - d. Ask search committees to document the procedures they use to maximize the diversity of the applicant pool, the fairness of their procedures, and their outcomes.
 - e. Provide institutional data on PhD pools and department-level outcomes that search committees and departments can use.
 - f. Monitor the short lists and approve searches only when they reflect the pool of applicants (and potential applicants).
 - g. Avoid undermining the work of search committees by overruling their recommendations if they have performed according to appropriate procedures.
 - h. Support departments’ efforts to improve their climates so they will be more welcoming and inclusive.

Search Committees and Departments

1. Define the position as broadly as possible and write the advertisement in correspondingly broad terms:
 - a. Include reference in the advertisement to your interest in attracting diverse excellent applicants:
 - i. Ensure that the committee that evaluates applications reflects the breadth of the advertisement and includes at least some individuals with a particular interest in increasing faculty diversity, as well as individuals with different demographic characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, etc.).
 - ii. Signal that the institution is committed to providing support to faculty with all kinds of household situations and family members by publicizing policies that provide those kinds of support.
 - iii. Request application letters that allow candidates to detail their interest in your position, their qualifications, and their special expertise.
 - iv. Consider requesting a statement from applicants about their interest in, experience with, and capacity to contribute to institutional diversity efforts.
2. Take full advantage of educational resources and/or equity advisors. Promote equitable search committee practices department-wide so all department members understand their motivation and value.

Applicants for Faculty Positions

Everyone seeking a first faculty appointment is, to some extent, underinformed about what matters most to search committees. However, women and minorities are, on average, less likely to have access to mentors and informal networks that demystify the process. We believe the advice here is valuable to all job seekers but is especially important for those who have not been socialized by a deliberate process of professional preparation, mentoring, and network development.

1. Pay attention to the description of the position, for two reasons:
 - a. Positions that are defined broadly may reflect departmental commitments to consider a broad range of talented individuals, and they may therefore be of particular interest to women and minorities concerned about their own “fit” with a department and about a department’s climate for them.

b. Positions that are defined broadly are likely to attract many applicants (relative to those defined more narrowly). As a result, applicants may have to work particularly hard to differentiate themselves from others.

2. Generally, approach the job application process by providing *each* search committee with an account of your qualifications that differentiates you in terms of the following:

a. Your excellent qualities; be sure to provide clear evidence of your accomplishments in your CV and in your cover letter, and in research and teaching statements:

i. Do not assume your record speaks for itself; emphasize the contributions you think are important.

ii. Explain (on your CV or in your research statement or in your cover statement) which of the projects and publications most directly represent your work (and not your advisor's or collaborators'). You can do this by outlining the role of particular projects in your overall program of research and also by describing the different contributions you and others made to a particular project.

iii. Do not overemphasize a particular aspect of the position you may be most passionate about (e.g., teaching or research), when in fact the search committee is looking for evidence of a balanced commitment to multiple domains.

iv. Present your past accomplishments and immediate future work as coherent and integrated. You don't need to mention everything you've ever done, especially if doing so would create an impression that your efforts are not coordinated or organized by clear goals.

b. Your fit with their needs; outline what you might bring to the position that would add something new to the department, as well as what you might bring that would complement or strengthen existing departmental faculty or other resources. If you can include both kinds of contributions, that's helpful!

c. The specific reasons (in terms of type of institution, department, faculty, students, or curriculum) that you are excited about this particular position. Often search committees are engaged in guessing whether applicants are "serious" or would really come if invited; provide them with explicit evidence that you are serious.

It may sound as if you should avoid generic job application materials, and it may also seem that specific applications are a lot of work. That's right! But if you want a position, and you are in a highly competitive field, it stands to reason that you need to provide differentiating evidence that you are the best candidate for the job. This does not mean bragging; it means providing relevant information that will be helpful to the search committee in seeing you as you really are.

3. Help your recommenders provide good evidence to search committees:
 - a. Even with the best will in the world, it may not be easy for every one of your letter writers to recall the main things they should emphasize about your accomplishments. In addition to providing them with a sample of your application materials (your CV, cover letter template, research and teaching statements), provide them with a bulleted list of things you think they might want to mention. No one of them will mention them all, but this will help all of them pay attention to the things you care most about.
 - b. Ask recommenders if there is anyone at the institutions you're most excited about whom they might contact with informal input. This is not something that is always appropriate (they may not know anyone or have the kind of relationship that enables them to feel comfortable approaching someone). So you should leave the decision about whether to do anything up to them, but it doesn't hurt to remind them to think about it by asking the question.
4. Disseminate the information you have about yourself in an accessible form; make it easy for someone who is impressed by a talk you give or a paper you publish to find out more about you. A good way to do this is to create a website that posts the material in an accessible and well-organized fashion. Don't forget to mention the website in your cover letter and on your CV.

Notes

1. See box 5.1 for examples of actual advertisements for positions in humanities, social science, and natural science fields. The examples range in terms of how "open" they are, but all of them are broader and signal openness to applicants with a wider range of histories, interests, and accomplishments than the usual advertisements in those fields.

2. IPEDS Completion Survey (<https://webcaspar.nsf.gov/>).
3. See http://web.mit.edu/ir/rankings/USNews_Grad_Rankings_1994-2017.pdf (p.20) and <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-science-schools/chemistry-rankings/>.
4. This has been an unintended consequence of some faculty hiring programs that aim to hire “clusters” of faculty in emergent interdisciplinary research areas. When—as happened in a program launched at the University of Michigan in 2007—the positions had to be defined in detail in order to be reviewed for approval to search, the unintended result was narrow pools and hires that were not demographically diverse. This outcome was mitigated when changes were made in the level of detail required in defining positions.

References

- Bilimoria, D., & Buch, K. K. (2010). The search is on: Engendering faculty diversity through more effective search and recruitment. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 42(4), 27–32.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 389–416.
- Bylsma, W. H., & Major, B. (1992). Two routes to eliminating gender differences in personal entitlement: Social comparisons and performance evaluations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16(2), 193–200.
- Carnes, M., Devine, P. G., Manwell, L. B., Byars-Winston, A., Fine, E., Ford, C. E., et al. (2015). Effect of an intervention to break the gender bias habit: A cluster randomized, controlled trial. *Academic Medicine*, 90(2), 221–230.
- Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(6), 1045–1060.
- Cohen, G. L., Steele, C. M., & Ross, L. D. (1999). The mentor’s dilemma: Providing critical feedback across the racial divide. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 1302–1318.
- Cohen, L. E., Broschak, J. P., & Haveman, H. A. (1998). And then there were more? The effect of organizational sex composition on the hiring and promotion of managers. *American Sociological Review*, 63(5), 711–727.
- Gaucher, D., Friesen, J., & Kay, A. C. (2011). Evidence that gendered wording in job advertisements exists and sustains gender inequality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(1), 109–128.

- Heilman, M. (1980). The impact of situational factors on personnel decisions concerning women: Varying the sex composition of the applicant pool. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26, 386–395.
- Heilman, M. (1983). Sex bias in work setting: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5, 269–298.
- Hewstone, M., Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2011). Perceptions of gender group variability in majority and minority contexts. *Social Psychology*, 42(2), 135–143.
- Hogue, M., & Yoder, J. (2003). The role of status in producing depressed entitlement in women's and men's pay allocations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 330–337.
- Hogue, M., Yoder, J., & Singleton, S. B. (2007). The gender wage gap: An explanation of men's elevated wage entitlement. *Sex Roles*, 56, 573–579.
- Ilgen, D. R., & Youtz, M. A. (1986). Factors affecting the evaluation and development of minorities in organizations. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (pp. 307–337). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kraiger, K., & Ford, J. K. (1985). A meta-analysis of ratee race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 56–65.
- LaVaque-Manty, D., & Stewart, A. J. (2008). "A very scholarly intervention": Recruiting women faculty in science and engineering. In L. Schiebinger (Ed.), *Gendered innovations in science and engineering* (pp. 165–181). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Maynard, D. C., & Brooks, M. E. (2008). The persistence of stereotypes in the context of familiarity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1, 417–419.
- Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Page, S. (2008). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pazy, A., & Oron, I. (2001). Sex proportion and performance evaluation among high-ranking military officers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 689–702.
- Pelham, B. W., & Hetts, J. J. (2001). Underworked and overpaid: Elevated entitlement in men's self-pay. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 93–103.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African

Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 615–630.

Reskin, B. F., McBrier, D. B., & Kmec, J. A. (1999). The determinants and consequences of workplace sex and race composition. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *25*, 335–361.

Roberson, L., Galvin, B. M., & Charles, A. C. (2007). When group identities matter: Bias in performance appraisal. *Academy of Management Annals*, *1*(1), 617–650.

Sackett, P. R., DuBois, C. L., & Noe, A. W. (1991). Tokenism in performance evaluation: The effects of work group representation on male-female and White-Black differences in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(2), 263–267. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.76.2.263

Sekaquaptewa, D. (2015, June). Hiring for diversity: Evaluation of a faculty recruitment workshop to improve faculty diversity and excellence. Poster presented at the National Science Foundation ADVANCE/GSE Program Workshop, Baltimore, MD.

Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, *75*(2), 133–160.

Sommers, S. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*(4), 597–612.

Sommers, S. R., Warp, L. S., & Mahoney, C. C. (2008). Cognitive effects of racial diversity: White individuals' information processing in heterogeneous groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 1129–1136.

Steele, C. M. (2011). *Whistling Vivaldi: And other clues to how stereotypes affect us*. New York, NY: Norton.

Stewart, A. J., Malley, J. E., & Herzog, K. A. (2016). Increasing the representation of women faculty in STEM departments: What makes a difference? *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, *22*(1), 23–47.

Tsui, A. S., & O'Reilly, C. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management Journal*, *32*, 402–423.

Walker, H. J., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., Armenakis, A. A., & Bernerth, J. B. (2009). Displaying employees' testimonials on recruitment web sites: Effects of communication media, employee race, and jobseeker race on organizational attraction and information credibility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(5), 1354–1364.

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 82–96.

Williamson, I. O., Slay, H. S., Shapiro, D. L., & Shivers-Blackwell, S. L. (2008). The effect of explanations on prospective applicants' reactions to firm diversity practices. *Human Resource Management, 47*(2), 311–330.

Yoder, J. (2002). Understanding tokenism processes and their impact on women's work. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 1–8.