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Gateways vs. Pathways

- **Entry points** into valued organizations, communities or institutions
  - E.g., admissions, hiring, promotion; decisions requiring a yes/no response

- **Fluid processes** that influence one’s ability to access an entry point and succeed after entry
  - E.g., mentorship, sponsorship, feedback, social network processes

(Chugh & Brief, 2008; Milkman, Akinola, & Chugh, 2015)
Agenda and Focus of Talk

Inequities in Gateway Processes

**Key Focus**
- Organizational-level decisions
- Perceptions
- Racial diversity

---

Inequities in Pathway Processes

**Key Focus**
- Individual-level decisions
- Contextual factors
- Race and gender diversity

---

How do definitions of diversity perpetuate social inequity in organizations?

*(Akinola, Opie, Ho, Castel, Unzueta, & Brief, working paper)*

---

When and where is discrimination most pronounced in academia?

*(Milkman, Akinola, & Chugh, 2012)*
*(Milkman, Akinola, & Chugh, 2015)*
Inequities in Gateway Processes
Diversity Isn’t What It Used To Be: The Consequences of Broad Diversity Definitions
Collaborators

Tina Opie
Babson College

Geoff Ho
Google, Inc.

Safiya Castel
UCLA

Miguel Unzueta
UCLA

Art Brief
University of Utah
Strathmore’s Diversity Statistics

**Functional Diversity**
- Support Staff: 50%
- Engineers: 50%

**Racial Diversity**
- African-Americans: 2%
- Whites: 98%

**Does Strathmore have a racial diversity problem?**
Strathmore’s Racial Diversity

- African-Americans: 2%
- Whites: 98%

Does Strathmore have a racial diversity problem? ...YES
Diversity Definitions

Narrow
- Focused on legal (EEOC protected) categories
  - Sex/Gender
  - Race/Ethnicity
  - LGBT
  - Religion
  - Disability
  - Age/Generational Difference
  - National Origin

Broad
- Focused on any category of difference
  - Legal categories
  - Background/culture
  - Perspectives
  - Skills/abilities/talents
  - Socioeconomic
  - Education
  - Lifestyles/Interests
  - Ideologies
  - Functional knowledge
  - Etc…
UC Berkeley vs. U.S. Airforce

UC Berkeley (2013) defines faculty diversity along the categories of: “members of groups that have been historically underrepresented in higher education such as women, ethnic minorities, religious minorities, differently-abled, lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender and others…”

U.S. Airforce (2013) defines diversity along the categories of: “personal life experiences, geographic background, socioeconomic background, cultural knowledge, educational background, work background, language abilities, physical abilities, philosophical/spiritual perspectives, age, race, ethnicity and gender”
Strathmore’s Diversity Statistics

**Functional Diversity**
- Support Staff: 50%
- Engineers: 50%

**Racial Diversity**
- Whites: 98%
- African-Americans: 2%

Does Strathmore have a racial diversity problem?
Theory and Hypotheses
Edelman, Riggs Fuller, & Mara-Drita (2001)

• Broad definitions shift discourse away from legally protected groups
  – Attention focused on other dimensions of diversity
    • E.g., functional diversity vs. racial diversity

• May result in…
  – Organizations failing to recognize inequities pertaining to groups protected by law
Study 1

- 150 participants from an online participant pool
- Manipulated whether participants saw a broad or narrow definition of diversity
- Showed the two pie charts
- Asked them:
  - Do you perceive Strathmore to be diverse? (3 items)
  - Does Strathmore have a racial diversity problem? (2 items)
Study 1

Perceived Diversity

![Bar chart showing comparison between Narrow Definition and Broad Definition with t(148) = 2.37, p = .02.](image)
Study 1

Racial Diversity Problem

Narrow Definition

Broad Definition

\[ t(147) = 2.31, p = .02 \]
Goal of Mediation Analysis

Broad Definition  \[\rightarrow\]  Less Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem
Goal of Mediation Analysis

Perceive Greater Diversity

Broad Definition

Less Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem
Study 1

Mediation Analysis

Diversity Definition
(0 = Narrow, 1 = Broad)

-0.59*

Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem
Study 1

Mediation Analysis

Perceived Diversity

Diversity Definition
(0 = Narrow, 1 = Broad)

Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem

-.50*

-.59*

/ - .30, n.s.

-.57**
Study 1

Functional Diversity

- Support Staff 50%
- Engineers 50%

Racial Diversity

- Whites 98%

[CATEGORY NAME] [PERCENT AGE]
Study 2

Strathmore’s Racial Diversity

Some

87%

Some

White

Black

Asian

Hispanic

Native Am.

A lot

33%

26%

12%

28%

1%
Study 2

Mediation Analysis

Diversity Definition
(0 = Narrow, * \(.60\)
1 = Broad) → Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem
Study 2

Mediation Analysis

Perceived Diversity

Diversity Definition (0 = Narrow, 1 = Broad)

Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem

- .50*
- .70**
- .60*
/.25, n.s.
Study 3

• 73 MBA students

• Survey
  - “how was diversity defined at your most recent place of employment?”
    • Rated on a 1-5 scale (broad vs. narrow)
    • Coded statements

• Asked them:
  - Perceived diversity of most recent place of employment? (3 items)
  - Whether the company had a racial diversity problem? (2 items)
Study 3

Mediation Analysis

Diversity Definition
(0 = Narrow, 1 = Broad)

Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem

-.30**
Study 3

Mediation Analysis

Perceived Diversity

Diversity Definition (0 = Narrow, 1 = Broad)

Recognition of Racial Diversity Problem

.48***

-.30**

/ -.08, n.s.

-.40**
Study 4

Do companies with more broad diversity definitions have a lower representation of minorities and women?
Study 4

• Diversity Statements
  – Taken from company websites
  – Broad vs. Narrow coded subjectively and objectively

• Diversity Statistics
  – Source: Building a Better Legal Profession (BBLP)/ the National Association for Legal Career Professionals (NALP)
  – % Women and % Minorities (Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians)

Do companies with more broad definitions have a lower representation of women and minorities?
Study 4

• Diversity Statements
  – Taken from company websites
  – Broad vs. Narrow coded subjectively and objectively

• Diversity Statistics
  – Source: Building a Better Legal Profession (BBLP)/ the National Association for Legal Career Professionals (NALP)
  – % Women and % Minorities (Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians)

Do companies with more broad definitions have a lower representation of women and minorities?
Study 4
Regression Model Predicting % Minorities and Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Diversity Definition (rated)</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Words</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Offices</td>
<td>.19†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>-1.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>-1.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>-1.83***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.19†</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.51***</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.24**</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.83***</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: n= 253, level 1; n=135, level 2. Regions were dummy coded
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001
Summary

• Broadening the definition of diversity is beneficial
  – Brought attention to people that have been overlooked in organizations

• Broadening the definition of diversity has ironic consequences
  – Shifts discourse away from legally protected groups (e.g., women and minorities)
  – Attention focused on other dimensions of diversity (e.g., functional, personality)

• Organizations may be less likely to recognize inequities pertaining to groups protected by law, perpetuating inequitable social hierarchies
Inequities in Pathway Processes
The When and Where of Discrimination: An Audit Study in Academia
Collaborators

Katherine Milkman
The Wharton School,
University of Pennsylvania

Dolly Chugh
NYU Stern School of Business
We all get these emails...

- I got your name from ...
- I read your paper on....
- I saw you on XYZ website...
- ...and I am interested in applying to PhD programs

Are you available to meet?
Hello Modupe,

I hope this finds you well. I am writing to see if you’d have time to connect in coming weeks as I am considering applying to doctoral programs.

I am specifically interested in Columbia. I would welcome the opportunity to speak with you, perhaps meet for coffee, at your convenience. I also see that Kathy and Damon Phillips are on faculty now. They are good friends with a great professor/mentor of mine from when I was a student at Johnson, Melissa Thomas-Hunt. In any event, I look forward to hearing from you.

Warmly,
Michelle
347.853.4906

What if this had been from Brad? What if it had been from Jamaal?

Michelle Wonsley
• Do academics discriminate on the basis of race and gender?
Evidence of Discrimination

• Recent evidence of discrimination against women and minorities exists in many settings:
  
  – Employment
    • Blind orchestra auditions help women *(Goldin and Rouse, 2000)*
    • Identical black candidates 50% less likely to receive an interview in Boston, Chicago *(Bertrand and Mullainathan, 2004)*
    • Caucasians just released from prison equivalent to Black/ Latino with no such record *(Pager, Western, and Bonikowski, 2009)*

  – Housing *(Massey and Lundy, 2001)*
  
  – Credit *(Ross and Yinger, 2002)*
  
  – K-12 Education *(Farkas, 2003)*
What about Academia?

- If you would expect to see a post-racial and post-gender world anywhere, it might be in academia
  - Egalitarianism is prized
  - Affirmative action is widespread
  - A setting where some believe reverse-discrimination may exist

"Daddy works in a magical, faraway land called Academia."
• Do academics discriminate on the basis of race and gender?
  – If so, how much?
  – In what context is discrimination most pronounced?
What if this request had been for today rather than the more distant future?

What if this had been from Brad? What if it had been from Jamal?
Choices about the future are shaped by “temporal distance” \cite{Trope2003}

- Choices for now vs. later rely on different processes and mental representations \cite{McClure2004}

- Temporal distance heightens construal level \cite{Trope2003}
Construal Level Theory

- **Immediate Events Trigger Low Level Construal:**
  - Concrete reasoning
  - Focus on how the event will occur
  - Focus on feasibility of the event

- **Distant Events Trigger High Level Construal:**
  - Abstract generalizations
  - Focus on why the event should occur
  - Focus on desirability of the event

**Near-future** events lead one to consider “can I do it?” whereas **distant future** events lead one to consider “is doing it worthwhile?”
Construal Level and Stereotyping

• **Theory**: Abstract construals’ desirability/why focus heightens reliance on perceived average group characteristics, stereotypes in judgment

• **Evidence**: High level construal mindsets increase reliance on stereotypes in lab studies McCrea, Wieber, and Myers (2011)

• **Implications**: Let’s look at “Brad” and “Jamaal” ...
Methods

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN
Field Experiment Set in Academia

• **Procedure:** Subjects (faculty at U.S. universities) received an email from a prospective doctoral student *requesting a 10 minute meeting*

• **Randomization:**
  1. Student’s name (designed to signal identity)
     • Gender (male or female)
     • Race (Caucasian, Black, Hispanic, Chinese or Indian)
  2. Timing of meeting request: “now” vs. “later”
Faculty Subjects

- 6,548 faculty at top 260 Universities
  - 1 or 2 from each of 6,300 Ph.D.-granting departments

- Characteristics pulled from homepages:
  - Race, gender, rank, university affiliation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Representative Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professor</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern (EST)</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central (CST)</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain (MST)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific (PST)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 4,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Surveys to Pre-Test Race and Gender Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Race Recognition</th>
<th>Gender Recognition</th>
<th>SES (1 = low, 3 = high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Brad Anderson</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Smith</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meredith Roberts</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claire Smith</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Lamar Washington</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terell Jones</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>94%***</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keisha Thomas</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latoya Brown</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Carlos Lopez</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Gonzalez</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriella Rodriguez</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juanita Martinez</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Raj Singh</td>
<td>90%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deepak Patel</td>
<td>85%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sonali Desai</td>
<td>85%***</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indira Shah</td>
<td>85%***</td>
<td>94%***</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chang Huang</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>94%***</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dong Lin</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>94%***</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mei Chen</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>94%***</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ling Wong</td>
<td>100%***</td>
<td>78%***</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported significance levels indicate the results of a two-tailed, one sample test of proportions to test the null hypothesis that the observed recognition rate is equal to that expected by chance (16.7% for race and 50% for gender). *** 0.1%, ** 1%, * 5%
Emails All Sent on a Monday at 8 am

Messages sent from email accounts of the form: firstname.lastname@domain.com
SUBJECT: Prospective Doctoral Student (On Campus Today/Next Monday)

Dear Professor [Surname of Professor Inserted Here],

I am writing you because I am a prospective doctoral student with considerable interest in your research. My plan is to apply to doctoral programs this coming fall, and I am eager to learn as much as I can about research opportunities in the meantime.

I will be on campus today/[next Monday], and although I know it is short notice, I was wondering if you might have 10 minutes when you would be willing to meet with me to briefly talk about your work and any possible opportunities for me to get involved in your research. Any time that would be convenient for you would be fine with me, as meeting with you is my first priority during this campus visit.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Student’s Full Name Inserted Here]
Outcomes of Interest

1. Response Received within One Week
   - 67% of emails received a response within a week

2. Meeting Request Accepted
   - Coded by RA’s (97% agreement rate)
   - 40% of meeting requests accepted
     • In other words: 59% of responders said “yes”

3. Response Speed
   - Hazard models used to address right censoring
   - Median response speed: 5.6 hours
Paper #1: Temporal Distance and Discrimination: An Audit Study in Academia

Psychological Science (2012)

Results - Temporal Distance and Discrimination: Part 1

COMPARING CAUCASIAN MALES TO OTHER STUDENTS (GROUPED)
Response Received

% of Emails that Received a Response

Now

- Caucasian Male Students
- Other Students

- 69%
- 67%

Insignificant gap
Request Accepted

% of Requests that Received an Acceptance

- Caucasian Male Students
- Other Students

Insignificant gap between 36% and 37%
Survivorship Function: Awaiting a Reply

Now

Proportion of Students Still Awaiting a Reply

Hours Since Meeting Request was Sent

- Cacausian Male Students
- Other Students
Results: Part 2

COMPARING CAUCASIAN MALES TO OTHER STUDENTS (SEPARATELY)
Response Rates (Relative to White Males)

Baseline:
Response rate to white males (69% now)
Contact

Lorenzo D. Baber
Associate Professor and Division Head, Higher Education
School of Education
Iowa State University
Email: ldbaber@iastate.edu
Twitter: @doczo
Phone: 515-294-8374
Response Rates (Relative to White Males)

Baseline:
Response rate to white males
(69% now; 74% later)
Acceptance Rates (Relative to White Males)

Baseline:
Acceptance rate for white males (36% now)
Acceptance Rates (Relative to White Males)

Baseline:
Acceptance rate for white males (36% now; 48% later)
Results - Temporal Distance and Discrimination: Part 3

EXAMINING MATCHED-RACE & GENDER FACULTY-STUDENT PAIRS
Faculty Responses to Students of Their Race or Gender

- Racial match increases reply rate by a factor of **1.28**
- No effect of gender match on reply rate
- “Temporal discrimination effect” still present even for matched race and gender faculty-student pairs
  - Effect size is not diminished

*Journal of Applied Psychology (2015)*

Results – What Happens Before

HOW BIG IS THE BIAS IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF ACADEMIA?
## Faculty Subjects by Academic Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Discipline</th>
<th># of Narrow Sub-Disciplines</th>
<th>Avg. Base (9 Month) Salary</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Other Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$63,651</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$45,897</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$71,107</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$38,023</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$69,222</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$49,257</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$46,375</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$70,123</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural, Physical Sciences and Math</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$60,245</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$52,889</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### University Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Other Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that some sub-disciplines fit into more than one broad disciplinary category, which is why the total number of narrow sub-disciplines listed here does not sum to the total number in our sample.

---

**National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty (NSOFP) 2009 Data**

*National Center for Education Statistics*
Discrimination by Discipline

- Business: 62.3% (62.3%) and 19.0% (19.0%)
Discrimination by Discipline

- Business: 62.3% (19.0%)
- Education: 65.6% (17.5%)
- Human services: 69.8% (13.8%)
- Health sciences: 54.6% (11.4%)
- Engineering and computer sciences: 59.0% (9.1%)
- Life sciences: 60.9% (5.8%)
- Natural, physical sciences and math: 63.9% (5.9%)
- Social sciences: 68.5% (2.5%)
- Humanities: 75.5% (0.5%)
- Fine Arts: 74.8% (-16.5%)

Legend:
- Response Rate to Minorities & Females
- Additional Responses to Caucasian Males
Size of Discriminatory Gap:

-75  -32  -1  1  32  75  percentage points

(reverse discrimination)
What Drives the Disciplinary Gaps?

- Across 10 Broad NSOFP Fields:
  Correlation of 0.47 between yearly pay and gap size

- Across 89 Narrow NSOFP Fields:
  $13k increase in pay associated with a 4 pct. pt. increase in gap
| Academic Discipline Characteristics | Z-Avg. Faculty Pay | Z-Pay x Minority or Female Student | Z-Fac% Minority x Minority | Z-Fac% Minority x Student | Z-Fac% Minority x Female | Z-Fac% Female x Female | Z-Fac% Female x Student | Z-PhD Students % Minority | Z-PhD% Minority x Minority | Z-PhD% Minority x Student | Z-Undergraduate % Minority | Z-Und% Minority x Minority | Z-Und% Minority x Student | Z-Undergraduate % Female | Z-Und% Female x Female | Z-Und% Female x Student | Z-School Rank (US News) | Z-School Rank x Minority or Female Student |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Public School                     | -                 | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Public School x Minority or Female Student | 0.25**          | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Z-Undergraduate % Minority        | -                 | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Z-Und% Minority x Minority        | -                 | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Z-Und% Minority x Student         | -                 | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Z-Und% Female x Female            | -                 | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Z-Und% Female x Student           | -                 | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Z-School Rank (US News)           | -0.06             | -0.06                             | -0.01                    | -0.06                    | -0.06                    | -0.005                 | -0.005                 | -0.005                  | -0.005                    | -0.005                    | -0.005                  | -0.005                    | -0.005                  | -0.005                  | -0.005                 | -0.005                 | -0.005                 | -0.005                  |
| Z-School Rank x Minority or Female Student | -               | -                                 | -                         | -                        | -                        | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                         | -                        | -                       | -                      | -                      | -                      | -                       | -                      |
| Black                              | -0.088**          | -0.091**                          | -0.180**                 | -0.176**                 | -0.178**                 | -0.178**               | -0.180**               | -0.180**                | -0.180**                 | -0.180**                 | -0.180**               | -0.180**                 | -0.180**               | -0.180**               | -0.180**               | -0.180**               | -0.180**               | -0.180**               |
| Hispanic                           | -0.078            | -0.080**                          | -0.172**                 | -0.159**                 | -0.161**                 | -0.161**               | -0.161**               | -0.161**                | -0.161**                 | -0.161**                 | -0.161**               | -0.161**                 | -0.161**               | -0.161**               | -0.161**               | -0.161**               | -0.161**               | -0.161**               |
| Indian                             | -0.177**          | -0.178**                          | -0.268**                 | -0.253**                 | -0.255**                 | -0.255**               | -0.255**               | -0.255**                | -0.255**                 | -0.255**                 | -0.255**               | -0.255**                 | -0.255**               | -0.255**               | -0.255**               | -0.255**               | -0.255**               | -0.255**               |
| Chinese                            | -0.123**          | -0.124**                          | -0.215**                 | -0.204**                 | -0.206**                 | -0.206**               | -0.206**               | -0.206**                | -0.206**                 | -0.206**                 | -0.206**               | -0.206**                 | -0.206**               | -0.206**               | -0.206**               | -0.206**               | -0.206**               | -0.206**               |
| Female                             | -0.042            | -0.044                            | -0.134**                 | -0.128**                 | -0.130**                 | -0.130**               | -0.130**               | -0.130**                | -0.130**                 | -0.130**                 | -0.130**               | -0.130**                 | -0.130**               | -0.130**               | -0.130**               | -0.130**               | -0.130**               | -0.130**               |
| Black x Female                     | 0.059^            | 0.063^                            | 0.153^                   | 0.146^                   | 0.148^                   | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                  | 0.148^                   | 0.148^                   | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                   | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                 | 0.148^                 |
| Hispanic x Female                  | 0.078             | 0.081^                            | 0.172^                   | 0.170^                   | 0.172^                   | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                  | 0.172^                   | 0.172^                   | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                   | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                 | 0.172^                 |
| Indian x Female                    | 0.105^            | 0.105^                            | 0.194^                   | 0.172^                   | 0.174^                   | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                  | 0.174^                   | 0.174^                   | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                   | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                 | 0.174^                 |
| Chinese x Female                   | 0.015             | 0.015                             | 0.101^                   | 0.093^                   | 0.095^                   | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                  | 0.095^                   | 0.095^                   | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                   | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                 | 0.095^                 |

Additional Controls: Recipient: Race, Gender, Position (Full, Associate, Assistant); Request for Now; Request for Now x Minority/Female Student, Faculty-Student Racial Match

Observations: 6,206  6,206  6,206  6,206  5,852
R^2: 0.02  0.02  0.03  0.03  0.03

*Significant at the 10% level.  **Significant at 5% level.  ***Significant at 1% level.  ****Significant at the 0.1% level.
Discrimination by University Type

Response Rate Relative to Caucasian Male Students

-25\%  -20\%  -15\%  -10\%  -5\%  +0\%  +5\%

Caucasian F  Black F  Black M  Hispanic F  Hispanic M  Indian F  Indian M  Chinese F  Chinese M

Public School
Discrimination by University Type

Response Rate Relative to Caucasian Male Students

- Caucasian F: +1%
- Black F: +3%
- Black M: +2%
- Hispanic F: +1%
- Hispanic M: +5%
- Indian F: +3%
- Indian M: +12%
- Chinese F: +10%
- Chinese M: +7%

Public School vs. Private School
Summary

• Temporal distance heightens discrimination
  – Decisions about distant future events generate more discrimination than decisions about near future events

• Discrimination varies by discipline
  – Most discriminatory disciplines: business, education, human services, health sciences, engineering
  – Faculty in higher paying disciplines are more discriminatory
  – Faculty in private vs. public institutions are more discriminatory
Implications

• Systems to prevent discrimination are needed in pathway processes
  – E.g., All emails from students get forwarded to a central administrator
  – Systems need not focus solely on gateway processes

• How can women and minorities ensure they do receive a response?
  – Ambiguity is a breeding ground for bias
  – Encourage applicants to make their qualifications clear

• An impressive representation of minorities and women in faculty ranks cannot be assumed to eliminate or reduce discrimination

• Academic programs designed to combat discrimination are needed, particularly in high-paying disciplines and at private universities
The Importance of Word Choice

• Which categories to include in diversity definitions?
  – Which groups end up feeling excluded?
  – What attracts vs. deters applicants?

• Which terms to use to describe women?
  – Female vs. Woman?
  – Woman!!
    • Refers specifically to human beings; female connotes biological sex and refers to mammals not humans
    • Not all women are biologically female; calling women females excludes gender non-conforming people and members of the trans community
    • Female is an adjective; No one refers to men as “males” (e.g., how often do you hear the term “male doctor”?)
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