

updated September 2019

Recruitment Guidelines

Virginia Valian
Hunter College – CUNY; CUNY Graduate Center

General Principles

- Incorporate the idea of universal design (think curb cutouts and large font name tags): treat everyone equally, in a way that is responsive to difference
 - What helps women and people of color should help everyone, or at least be neutral for others
 - People are different, even within a group: women can have “male” responses and men can have “female” responses
 - Appreciate difference in coming up with solutions, while trying to use same solution for everyone
 - Take into account the variability in human response and encompass that variability
- Be prepared to spend more time than you would like in consultations with others and in examinations of your procedures
- Learn about the ways that gender influences judges' evaluations (Stewart & Valian, 2018, esp chapters 3 and 4; Valian, 1998)
- If institution does not already have good programs for partner hires and target of opportunity hires, encourage it to develop them
- Be transparent
- Be skeptical about
 - the objectivity of your judgment (Tetlock, 2005; Uhlmann & Cohen, 2007)
 - the value of across-the-board "gender-blind" and "race-blind" frameworks (Apfelbaum, Norton, & Sommers, 2012)
 - the consequences of your genuine commitment to meritocratic principles; evidence that you've done the right thing, when it's very clear what the right thing is, slightly increases the probability that you'll do the wrong thing when the data are more mixed (Monin & Miller, 2001)
- Experiment and refine your method
 - If you tried something that didn't work, try to figure out why
 - Keep trying

Recruitment

Maximizing the likelihood of including women and minorities in the applicant pool, the short list, and the list of top candidates

Identify the areas where mistakes are most likely

- A. job description
- B. assembling candidate pool
- C. evaluation of candidate's credentials
- D. evaluation of candidate's interest
- E. treatment of candidate at interview
- F. quality of job offer

A. job description

- a. make it as broad as is feasible
- b. consider who benefits and who does not from the wording
- c. actively consider new areas
- d. seek out opinions of people with softer voices

B. assembling the candidate pool

- a. know the percentage of women PhDs for last 10 years, so that the assembled pool at least meets the available percentage of women
- b. lead an active, rather than passive, search: find people
- c. extra effort is needed to attract women and minorities
- d. make phone calls, attend conference social events for women and minorities, publicize an open house at conferences with special outreach to women and minorities, cultivate graduate students contacts
- e. be willing to search at schools with lower ratings than your own (because women and under-represented minorities are more likely than white men to be overrepresented at lower-ranked schools)
- f. consider searching for couples (requires resources)
- g. consider cluster hires (requires resources)

C. evaluation of candidate's credentials

- a. determine criteria and weights ahead of time; stick to them
- b. change criteria only after extensive discussion with a diverse group of people; reevaluate all candidates in terms of the new criteria
- c. ask whether the criteria (filters) that determine whether someone moves to the next stage of consideration disproportionately favor white men (Sagaria, 2002)
 - i. some criteria may be inappropriate; e.g., is someone going to make a better chair because they have 10 rather than 5 years of experience?
 - ii. reevaluate *all* candidates with new criteria

- iii. beware of shifting standards
- d. make sure that the same criteria and evaluations are being used for men and women (with respect to, e.g., joint publications, collaborations, interdisciplinary work, work in new areas (e.g., Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008))
- e. at least one of each candidate's publications should be read by at least one member of the search committee
- f. be cautious in use of proxies: evaluate prestige of degree institution or current institution with the awareness that location affects productivity and that it is possible to be over-impressed by prestige; identify women and minorities who are publishing more than is typical for their location
- g. be cautious in reading letters of recommendation: they might overrate men and underrate women (Madera, Hebl, Dial, Martin, & Valian, 2019; Trix & Psenka, 2003)

D. evaluation of candidate's interest in position

- a. people differ in how they express genuine interest; do not assume that someone who does not express interest in the way you expect lacks interest
- b. do not assume that women or minorities cannot be moved

E. interview

- a. welcome women and minorities as much as white men
 - i. arrange for all candidates to talk to men, women, and minorities about the atmosphere on campus, the extent to which the campus and the community are welcoming, accepting of diversity, a good place to raise children, and so on
 - ii. all members of the search committee should be able to talk knowledgeably and comfortably about different groups on campus, such as women's groups, minority task forces, gay and lesbian groups, and so on
 - iii. all members of the search committee should convey to applicants the idea that the department understands that a productive professional life is more likely if faculty also have an environment that supports their personal life
- b. questions and comments
 - i. never ask an illegal question or make an illegal comment; no personal questions
 - ii. ask everyone the same questions, insofar as that is possible
 - iii. invite all candidates to say what's important to them; write it down
 - iv. to all candidates, indicate a willingness to supply what they need to make the institution attractive to them
 - v. by talking to *all* candidates about the institution's efforts to create a supportive environment, you maximize the chances that people will tell you what they need
- c. work to achieve rapport, understanding that it will be more difficult across demographic divides; bring out the best that the candidate has to offer
- d. provide – to all candidates – creative examples of opportunities that have been offered or that the institution is willing to consider offering
 - i. position for partner
 - ii. development of focus or concentration in candidate's field
 - iii. attracting a particular group of students

F. quality of job offer

- a. provide good resources (salary, space, equipment, other support) to women and minorities
- b. provide attractive work loads for women and minorities
- c. be enthusiastic

Partial References

- Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness: Emergence, practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(3), 205-209.
- Clauset, A., Arbesman, S., & Larremore, D. B. (2015). Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science Advances*, 1(1), e1400005.
- Dipboye, R. (1982). Self-fulfilling prophecies in the selection-recruitment interview. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 579-586.
- Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 416-427.
- Madera, J. M., Hebl, M. R., Dial, H., Martin, R., & Valian, V. (2019). Raising doubt in letters of recommendation for academia: Gender differences and their impact. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 34(3), 287-303.
- Monin, B., & Miller, D. T. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(1), 33-43.
- Norton, M. I., Vandello, J. A., & Darley, J. M. (2004). Casuistry and social category bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 817-831.
- Phelan, J. E., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Competent yet out in the cold: Shifting criteria for hiring reflect backlash toward agentic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 406-413.
- Rupp, D. E., Bashshur, M. R., & Liao, H. (2007). Justice climate, past, present, and future: Models of structure and emergence. In F. J. Dansereau & F. Yammarino (Eds.), *Research in Multi-Level-Issues*, 6, 357-396. Oxford, U.K: Elsevier.
- Sagaria, M. A. D. (2002). An exploratory model of filtering in administrative searches: Toward counter-hegemonic discourse. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 677-710.
- Stewart, A. J. & Valian, V. (2018). *An inclusive academy: Achieving diversity and excellence* (especially chapters 3 and 4). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tetlock, P. E. (2005). *Expert political judgment: How good is it? How can we know?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Trix, F. & Psenka, C. (2003). Exploring the color of glass: letters of recommendation for female and male medical faculty. *Discourse and Society*, 14, 191-220.
- Uhlmann, E. L. & Cohen, G. L. (2005). Constructed criteria: Redefining merit to justify discrimination. *Psychological Science*, 16, 474-480.
- Uhlmann, E. L., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). "I think it, therefore it's true": Effects of self-perceived objectivity on hiring discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 104(2), 207-223.
- UCI ADVANCE Program for Faculty Equity and Diversity. (undated). Best practices for achieving equity and diversity in the faculty recruitment process. Irvine, CA.
- Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vettese, T. (Spring, 2019). Sexism in the academy. *n+1 Magazine*. Retrieved on 23 September 2019 from https://nplusonemag.com/issue-34/essays/sexism-in-the-academy/?fbclid=IwAR1c0uzbGjvVFZ_MQ8N46QyDqoDXT1KqSrTyKf9khQQxYAA5MVt4fLiSGow
- Word, C. O., Zanna, M. P., Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 109-120.