**APPENDIX A: DETAILS OF SURVEY METHOD AND DATASETS**

Our study uses data from several sources, the primary ones being the results of a national survey of tenured US law professors and the subsequent follow-up in-depth interviews with a smaller sample selected from the larger group of respondents. In addition, the data found in the AALS Directory of Law Teachers were used both to create the initial random sample of eligible law professors, and to estimate a model of nonresponse. The AALS Directory of Law Teachers is based on data provided by the law schools themselves and is the best available complete list of full-time law professors at all AALS member and non-member but fee-paying schools. At the time our sample was pulled, the AALS Directory listed professors from 187 law schools, including all faculty from the 186 law schools then accredited by the ABA, as well as law faculty from the Judge Advocate General’s School. Finally, information on law schools was collected from a number of sources. We used the *U.S. News and World Report* for 2005 (the year in which data collection for Phase 1 was completed) to ascertain not only rankings and tiers of law schools, but also data on the demographics of faculties and other relevant information (for example, geographic location, size of student body, etc.). Religiously affiliated schools were identified through Baylor’s Affiliated Law School mailing list in 2007 and cross-checked across the webpages of the law schools.

The national survey upon which our quantitative results are based was sent to a random sample of 2,076 eligible professors, drawn from the AALS Directory and stratified on gender with an oversample for minority professors. Of these surveys, 1,222 responded to the survey, the majority of whom – 1,174 respondents – completed an entire version of the survey (for a response rate of 63.1 percent). An additional 48 respondents completed a substantial portion of the survey, yielding a total response rate of 65.6 percent. To obtain these response rates, we worked with NORC to follow up by phone with individuals who did not respond to initial mail-outs and the subsequent web version of the survey. The telephone version of the survey excluded a portion of the questions included in earlier versions, focusing on the key components of the survey to ensure maximum participation.

While the survey response rate of 63.1 percent for completed surveys is quite good, particularly when surveying elite populations, we still used the external datasets we gathered to investigate possible nonresponse bias issues in the national survey. With the exception of the variable recording whether an individual was contacted via telephone survey or submitted the survey without telephone reminder(s) (either responding or affirmatively refusing to respond), no individual variable explained more than 1 percent of the variance in nonresponse. For this one variable (if an individual responded without telephone prompting), individuals were about twice as likely to respond to the survey.

After investigation of the predictive power of variables individually, we used a logistic regression to predict nonresponse using multiple independent variables, and found that besides the telephone contact with the individual, four additional variables were statistically correlated with nonresponse (though the substantive impact of these additional four variables was small). These four variables – gender, ethnicity, age, and ranking of school – along with whether there was telephone follow-up, were included in a final model of nonresponse. Women and older professors were slightly more likely to participate in the study, while professors of color and professors at elite institutions (Top 20) were slightly less likely to participate. Our purpose was to control for nonresponse by using predicted response rates as inverse probability weights. If the model perfectly predicted nonresponse, this method would perfectly control for nonresponse. In practice, however, with a nonresponse model that, while predictive, is not strongly predictive (i.e., does not substantively predict a large share of the variance in prediction), this procedure can inflate the variance of estimators substantially. To avoid this outcome, the predicted probabilities were grouped into deciles, from which we used the inverse of the mean response rate as the corrected weight controlling for nonresponse. We combined this prediction of nonresponse with the stratified weights from the sampling scheme to produce weights that control, albeit imperfectly, for both the sampling scheme and nonresponse.

In addition, for the purposes of this article, the 128 respondents at the central administration, dean, or associate dean level were dropped to focus on those respondents whose primary duties were teaching and research. Twelve additional respondents were dropped because their race or gender was unknown, and these are key variables in the part of our analysis reported here. Our final sample for our analysis in this article was therefore 1,082 respondents, 328 of whom responded via the shortened telephone survey.[[1]](#endnote-1) Appendix Table 1 provides basic descriptive statistics for the respondents, after weighting for both our sampling methodology and nonresponse. In our sample, law professors of color make up 20.4 percent of tenured law professors, female law professors are 27.7 percent of tenured law professors. These demographics are, in general, quite similar to the population of law professors at AALS-affiliated schools, which was the targeted survey population (see Mertz et al. 2011, 14-16). Appendix Table 2 provides some basic results regarding how job satisfaction varies across different categories as well. Beyond the gap in satisfaction within traditional outsider groups, which is the central point of this article, these descriptive results contain a number of other interesting findings. As has been found in other job satisfaction studies (see discussion in text), additional personal characteristics also contributed to significant differences in job satisfaction. For example, professors in partnered relationships expressed higher job satisfaction than professors who never married, or were widowed. By contrast, parental status, sexual orientation, and religiosity do not impact job satisfaction. This differs somewhat from some research on lawyers’ job satisfaction, where parental status has been found to impact job satisfaction (Heinz, Hull, and Harter 1999).

School characteristics only impact job satisfaction marginally. Appendix Table 2 provides detailed information on the distribution of job satisfaction across different school types. Overall, across all tiers of law schools, there is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction. However, if one focuses solely on one difference – top tier vs. all others – professors at top tier institutions (defined as Top 20 in the US News ranking) are somewhat more satisfied with their jobs than professors at lower ranked schools.[[2]](#endnote-2) The public/private divide among schools does not demonstrate a divide in job satisfaction; professors at both types of schools are equally satisfied with their jobs. The same is true for religious versus non-religious law schools.

Various professional markers are connected with significant differences in personal satisfaction as well, as Appendix Table 3 shows. In particular, cohort, measured by when the respondent obtained tenure, is statistically significant, with the oldest cohort (those who received tenure before 1980) being significantly more satisfied than other cohorts with their personal situation at their law school. Higher professional status (a title of Full instead of Associate Professor) is also related to higher job satisfaction – as is holding a chaired position. A small number of respondents indicated that they were primarily legal writing or clinical professors (note that our sample included only tenured professors, so these are faculty with tenure); these respondents did not have statistically significantly different job satisfaction levels from the tenured faculty whose jobs were more research-focused.

Finally, Appendix Table 3 provides basic descriptive statistics on the individual questions asked in the survey that make up the five latent factors we investigate. While only four of these five latent factors are significant in our initial exploration of an appropriate SEM model (see Appendix B), we report descriptive statistics on all five here to provide a more complete picture of the pathways of job satisfaction we investigated. Most respondents report that they agree or strongly agree with many statements indicative of having voice within the institution; for example, 76 percent of tenured law professors agreed with the statement that they are “listened to with respect during hiring/promotion decisions” while 78 percent agreed that their “opinions matter to [their] law school colleagues.” Somewhat fewer professors believed they had an impact on the major decisions at their law school – specifically, 65 percent. Within the questions pertaining to collegiality, again, there are several questions where a large majority of law professors – around 80 percent – agree or strongly agree with statements regarding collegiality, including whether colleagues from different groups get along, The primary exception to this general agreement is on questions regarding faculty agreement on substantive issues; when asked whether their colleagues saw eye to eye on issues related to teaching and student affairs, faculty hiring and promotion, and law school mission, only about 40 percent of our respondents agreed.

We also investigated divergences between the dean’s evaluation of a respondent’s job performance and the respondent’s own evaluation (as reported by the respondent).[[3]](#endnote-3) Most respondents reported that their deans evaluated their performances in much the same way they themselves did – with the exception of their contributions to the profession and the time they invested in mentoring colleagues. Both of these questions had a much broader range of responses, with a large percentage of professors reporting lower self-evaluation (by comparison with how they thought their deans evaluated them), and an equally large percentage of professors reporting higher self-evaluation on these two questions. This factor, however, did not have a significant effect on job satisfaction.

Two multi-part questions on the survey asked about law school priorities from the perspective of on the one hand what respondents felt the priorities should be, and on the other hand what the actual priorities were. We compared the two sets of answers to check for divergences between respondents’ own priorities for their law schools’ missions, and what they felt the actual priorities in place were. Some of the issues listed tested for priorities given to “standards” or credentialism, while some others looked at questions of diversity. In terms of both kinds of mission priorities – either of having elite, credential-based standards or a having a commitment to diversity, faculty overall agree that they have similar goals to their institution about 70-75 percent of the time. To the extent that faculty differ from the institution regarding overall issues of diversity, the difference is most often that the faculty member cares *more* about the issue than the institution, with 10 percent or fewer of law professors reporting that the institution has put a higher priority on an issue than they themselves would. (The one exception to this is the subcategory of “promoting demographic diversity in the faculty;” 19 percent of law professors felt their institution put significantly more much weight on this issue than they would.) With respect to the potential “high standards” mission of a law school, respondents were more likely (than in the case of diversity) to feel that, overall, the institution overvalued the factors listed. For example, faculty are more likely to place a *lower* priority than their schools on “achieving a good position in national rankings;” 33 percent of our respondents had a significant gap in how important they felt a national ranking was. In all these cases, however, the *majority* of professors felt their vision of a law school mission reasonably matched the vision adopted by their institution.

**APPENDIX B: DETAILS OF STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING**

We begin with a description of some of the more complex factors involved in our overall analysis. We then focus on the differences in satisfaction among demographic groups revealed by our data, with white men reporting significantly higher levels than other groups and women of color the least satisfied. To understand these differences better, we had to create a more complete picture of job satisfaction for law professors – one that could explicitly model gaps in satisfaction across traditional outsider groups.

Our survey grouped individual questions on a similar theme together. To provide some *ex ante* structure to our model, we take each group of questions as different potential factors. (The questions themselves were formulated based on hypotheses generated from the relevant literatures and on items used by survey researchers examining parallel issues.) We therefore determine *ex ante* the theme to which each question relates (e.g., collegiality), and let the data determine the relative weighting of each individual sub-question within that theme to create a factor. The survey contains sets of questions on based on (1) voice/respect, (2) collegiality and agreement between faculty members, (3) self-evaluation, (4) dean evaluation as perceived by respondent, (5) what the core mission of a law school should be, and (6) what the core mission of respondent’s institution is. (As noted, there are multiple sub-parts to each category.) The survey also contained many other sets of questions, but these were the ones revealed by exploratory analyses to have the most potential impact on satisfaction.

The self-evaluation versus dean evaluation, and the respondents’ priorities for law school mission versus law school’s actual mission (as perceived by respondent) require more explanation. In an effort to measure how an individual respondent interacts with their institution, we created two variables of dissonance for the respondent: first, how each respondent’s self-evaluation and perceived dean evaluation are different; and second, how each respondent’s concept of what his or her law school *should be* differs from her or his law school’s perceived *actual* priorities or mission. We create these measures by finding the absolute value of the difference between the respondent’s dean’s evaluation and the respondent’s self-evaluation for each question, and similarly for the core mission questions as well. For the evaluation questions, the original question varied from 1 to 3 (below average – average – above average), and therefore, the dissonance varies from 0 to 2, which corresponds to the maximum difference between self- and dean evaluations.[[4]](#endnote-4) Similarly, the five-level scale regarding mission (“not at all important” to “extremely important”) becomes a measure of dissonance between the individual and the institution from 0 to 4, with 4 suggesting that the individual and the institution have very different priorities with respect to the question at issue.

Having created these measures of some important aspects of the interplay between institutional culture and individual, we used exploratory factor analysis to investigate how these variables measure underlying latent factors of institutional culture and their interaction with job satisfaction. This exploratory analysis helps to guide our choice of model in our structural equation modeling (SEM). We made the simplifying assumption that each substantively themed group of survey questions (e.g., regarding interaction with colleagues, self-evaluation, respect from different law school constituencies, and law school mission) would measure at most two factors.[[5]](#endnote-5) For example, in analyzing questions about alignment with institutional mission, we found two underlying factors at work: one that primarily measured whether diversity, broadly defined, was a core institutional mission, and another that primarily measured whether having objective standards was a core institutional mission. The factors that emerged from this kind of analysis provided a backbone for our model of job satisfaction, as the primary explanatory variables. Within other substantive areas, only one factor was particularly strong, suggesting that the group of questions really only measured one construct. Finally, one theme did not appear to impact job satisfaction significantly; this was the divergent evaluation of performance between the respondent and the respondent’s dean. Overall, this approach allowed for a streamlined model of job satisfaction that pointed to four main factors affecting job satisfaction: (1) having voice/respect in the institution, (2) degree of collegiality within the institution across different constituencies, (3) divergent visions of law schools’ mission with respect to diversity, broadly defined, and (4) divergent visions of mission with respect to disputed conceptions of maintaining standards.[[6]](#endnote-6) The model that came from this exploratory analysis had two parts: an underlying measurement model of the four factors that remained (voice/respect, collegiality, dissonance in diversity vision and dissonance in standards vision) and a separate model that investigates how these four latent factors, along with other observed exogenous variables, impact job satisfaction.

We combine these two models – the latent factors model and the model examining the impact of latent factors and other exogenous variables on job satisfaction – into a single hierarchical model using SEM.[[7]](#endnote-7) Based on our exploratory analysis, the first half of our SEM model (which measures the latent factors that are theorized to impact job satisfaction) had four factors: voice, collegiality, dissonance in diversity mission, and dissonance in standards mission. For the collegiality factor, a number of the questions on the longer survey form were not contained in the abbreviated telephone survey given by NORC. In an effort to keep our sample size robust and avoid biasing the results, we dropped those questions that were not asked, so that we could retain the 328 respondents to the telephone survey. (This takes on added importance given our finding that response to phone survey [as opposed to other methods] was the one criterion that showed up as important in our correction for non-response bias.) To test whether the latent factor was substantially different, we ran the latent model with the additional questions as well, restricting our sample to just 754 respondents. The collegiality factor from each model (with the additional questions, and without) had a correlation of 0.95 (for the smaller sample), which suggests that dropping these additional questions did not drop a significant amount of information about collegiality. Appendix Table 4 provides descriptive statistics of the latent factors that are used to fit the model of job satisfaction, and how those factors differ for traditional outsider groups. It demonstrates that each of the factors themselves differ substantially across groups. Specifically, with a baseline of approximately zero for white men, white female professors have a lower average value of voice, similar to male professors of color. Female professors of color have the lowest value of voice. The other factors follow a similar pattern, though in the case of the factors measuring dissonance, the direction is reversed: traditional outsider groups have higher average dissonance than white male professors.

These latent factors then form the basis of the structural portion of our SEM. We use as our dependent variable job satisfaction, which varies from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied. As over half the respondents reported being very satisfied with their personal job situation, the data are significantly skewed. This does not bias the coefficients, but it makes the variance estimates biased. We use robust standard errors to control for this issue. In the initial specifications, the exogenous observed variables included institutional-level variables, such as public law school or not, urban or not, top tier or not, percentage of female faculty, and percentage of minority faculty – and individual-level variables, including under fifty or not, married/partnered or not, and high salary or not. Most of the exogenous observed variables were not predictive of job satisfaction in the regression, with the exception of whether an individual had a high salary ($125,000 or more), which was positively correlated with job satisfaction. Our final model therefore includes only high salary as an exogenous, observed control variable, and the four latent variables that measure different aspects of institutional culture.

**Appendix Table 1: Descriptive Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Demographic** | **% of Population (# of obs)** |
| **Individual Characteristics** |  |
| White Men | 60% (373) |
| White Women | 20% (365) |
| Minority Men | 13% (193) |
| Minority Women | 8% (151) |
| LGBTQ\* | 6% (85) |
| Average age | 54 (sd. 9.2) |
| **Family Status** |  |
| Partnered | 84% (790) |
| Kids | 76% (543) |
| **Cohort** |  |
| Tenure in 2000s | 14% (191) |
| Tenure in 1995-99 | 21% (260) |
| Tenure in 1990-94 | 16% (182) |
| Tenure in 1980s | 27% (268) |
| Tenure before 1980 | 23% (163) |
| **Salary** |  |
| Salary of 125K+ | 63% (555) |
| **School Characteristics** |  |
| Top 20 | 18% (160) |
| Top 21-50 | 19% (206) |
| 2nd Tier | 31% (306) |
| 3rd Tier | 14% (168) |
| 4th Tier | 19% (227) |
| Public Institution | 42% (460) |
| Religious Institution | 30% (316) |
| % Women Faculty | 36% (s.d. 8.7%) |
| % Minority Faculty | 16% (s.d. 12.1%) |
| Rural | 13% (133) |
| \*Our survey did not explicitly include the category “queer,” but in addition to the categories “gay,” “lesbian,” “transgendered,” “bisexual,” and “heterosexual,” also added an option of “other” that allowed respondents to specify other identities. |

**Appendix Table 2: Exploratory Data: Job Satisfaction for Different Demographics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Continuous Variable** |  | **Very Dissatisfied (# obs)** | **Somewhat Dissatisfied (# obs)** | **Neutral (# obs)** | **Somewhat Satisfied (# obs)** | **Very Satisfied (# obs)** |
| Job Satisfaction |  | 5% (63) | 7% (91) | 11% (122) | 26% (284) | 51% (497) |
|  |
| **Individual Characteristics** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race and Gender(*p*-value: 0.000)[[8]](#endnote-8) | White Men | **4% (13)** | **6% (21)** | **9% (33)** | **26% (95)** | **56% (203)** |
| White Women | **7% (25)** | **12% (42)** | **12% (44)** | **24% (87)** | **45% (158)** |
| Minority Men | **10% (15)** | **6% (12)** | **16% (28)** | **22% (50)** | **46% (82)** |
| Minority Women | **6% (10)** | **12% (16)** | **11% (17)** | **32% (52)** | **38% (54)** |
| Sexual Orientation(*p*-value: 0.947) | LGBTQ\* | 6% (5) | 7% (7) | 13% (11) | 24% (26) | 50% (36) |
| Heterosexual | 5% (55) | 7% (77) | 10% (105) | 26% (249) | 51% (435) |
| Partnered(*p*-value: 0.005) | Not Partnered | **5% (12)** | **11% (26)** | **15% (36)** | **32% (68)** | **37% (63)** |
| Partnered | **5% (42)** | **7% (58)** | **10% (81)** | **24% (197)** | **54% (409)** |
| Kids(*p*-value: 0.193) | No Kids | 5% (12) | 13% (30) | 9% (21) | 30% (56) | 43% (74) |
| Kids | 4% (22) | 9% (51) | 11% (64) | 27% (150) | 50% (255) |
| Tenure Year(*p*-value: 0.0002) | Tenure in 2000s | **6% (11)** | **11% (20)** | **9% (19)** | **32% (61)** | **42% (76)** |
| Tenure in 1995-99 | **6% (16)** | **11% (28)** | **12% (34)** | **27% (74)** | **43% (102)** |
| Tenure in 1990-94 | **3% (8)** | **9% (17)** | **14% (27)** | **28% (43)** | **46% (82)** |
| Tenure in 1980s | **7% (20)** | **5% (16)** | **9% (24)** | **27% (72)** | **53% (130)** |
| Tenure before 1980 | **4% (7)** | **4% (7)** | **9% (15)** | **16% (29)** | **67% (102)** |
| Salary(*p*-value: 0.000) | Salary under 125K | **8% (35)** | **12% (51)** | **15% (62)** | **28% (129)** | **37% (142)** |
| Salary of 125K+ | **4% (22)** | **6% (35)** | **8% (51)** | **24% (137)** | **59% (308)** |
| **School Characteristics** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tier(*p*-value: 0.12) | Top 20 | 2% (5) | 6% (10) | 8% (12) | 21% (36) | 62% (93) |
| Top 21-50 | 6% (15) | 8% (17) | 7% (20) | 26% (53) | 53% (94) |
| 2nd Tier | 5% (14) | 8% (28) | 13% (39) | 27% (80) | 47% (134) |
| 3rd Tier | 5% (13) | 7% (13) | 10% (21) | 22% (42) | 56% (79) |
| 4th Tier | 7% (15) | 8% (22) | 13% (27) | 30% (68) | 42% (92) |
| Public or Private(*p*-value: 0.820) | Public Institution | 6% (27) | 8% (41) | 10% (52) | 27% (130) | 49% (196) |
| Private Institution | 5% (36) | 7% (50) | 11% (70) | 25% (153) | 52% (300) |
| Religious(*p*-value: 0.847) | Religious Institution | 6% (20) | 7% (28) | 10% (32) | 28% (83) | 49% (145) |
| Nonreligious Institution | 5% (43) | 8% (63) | 11% (90) | 25% (200) | 52% (351) |
| Urban or Rural(*p*-value: 0.442) | Urban | 5% (51) | 8% (84) | 11% (109) | 25% (245) | 51% (438) |
| Rural | 8% (12) | 5% (7) | 9% (13) | 28% (39) | 50% (59) |
| \*Our survey did not explicitly include the category “queer,” but in addition to the categories “gay,” “lesbian,” “transgendered,” “bisexual,” and “heterosexual,” also added an option of “other” that allowed respondents to specify other identities. |

**Appendix Table 3: Latent Constructs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions regarding Voice and Respect** | **Strongly Disagree (# obs)** | **Disagree (# obs)** | **Neutral (# obs)** | **Agree (# obs)** | **Strongly Agree (# obs)** |
| I feel respected by my students | 0.1% (2) | 0.9% (11) | 3% (45) | 38% (432) | 58% (580) |
| I am comfortable in the classroom | 0 | 0.3% (5) | 2% (26) | 29% (318) | 69% (721) |
| I feel respected by my colleagues at the law school | 1% (20) | 3% (36) | 9% (111) | 41% (450) | 45% (453) |
| My opinions matter to my law school colleagues | 2% (34) | 6% (64) | 14% (153) | 47% (480) | 31% (336) |
| I am listened to with respect during hiring/promotion decisions | 3% (45) | 6% (61) | 15% (169) | 45% (460) | 31% (327) |
| I often disagree with my tenured colleagues | 2% (30) | 26% (266) | 28% (297) | 30% (329) | 13% (138) |
| I generally feel comfortable voicing any disagreements I have with my tenured colleagues | 2% (27) | 7% (88) | 8% (101) | 46% (499) | 37% (357) |
| I have an impact on major decisions at my law school | 5% (57) | 11% (127) | 19% (203) | 39% (422) | 26% (257) |
| I am respected within my field | 0.5% (5) | 2% (25) | 15% (158) | 46% (500) | 36% (377) |
|  |
| **Questions regarding Collegiality** | **Strongly Disagree (# obs)** | **Disagree (# obs)** | **Neutral (# obs)** | **Agree (# obs)** | **Strongly Agree (# obs)** |
| Colleagues at different seniority levels get along well | 2% (16) | 4% (41) | 9% (75) | 51% (381) | 34% (234) |
| Colleagues at same seniority level get along well with each other | 2% (16) | 6% (55) | 10% (93) | 51% (371) | 30% (212) |
| Faculty with different research interests get along well | 2% (14) | 4% (36) | 11% (102) | 52% (382) | 31% (212) |
| Faculty members of different genders get along well | 1% (15) | 4% (51) | 8% (105) | 51% (536) | 36% (346) |
| Faculty members of different political orientations get along well | 4% (42) | 10% (131) | 17% (184) | 48% (490) | 21% (197) |
| Faculty members of different races get along well | 2% (29) | 4% (64) | 12% (144) | 50% (515) | 32% (298) |
| Faculty members of different sexual orientations get along well | 2% (13) | 2% (25) | 13% (95) | 50% (328) | 33% (211) |
| Faculty members tend to agree on issues related to teaching and student affairs | 5% (41) | 27% (205) | 26% (197) | 38% (267) | 4% (35) |
| Faculty members tend to agree on issues related to faculty hires and promotions | 7% (63) | 23% (188) | 27% (196) | 39% (272) | 3% (28) |
| Faculty members tend to agree on issues related to law school mission and priorities | 9% (70) | 25% (204) | 26% (186) | 35% (252) | 5% (34) |
|  |
| **Questions Regarding Divergent Dean Evaluation** | **Mean (s.d.)** | **Median** | **% Much Lower** | **% Similar** | **% Much Higher** |
| Teaching | 0.1 (0.5) | 0 | 5% (40) | 79% (557) | 16% (114) |
| Mentoring Students | 0.07 (0.5) | 0 | 12% (73) | 73% (511) | 15% (120) |
| Quality of Scholarship | 0.06 (0.5) | 0 | 10% (81) | 72% (512) | 17% (123) |
| Quantity of Publications | 0.04 (0.5) | 0 | 9% (71) | 77% (540) | 14% (102) |
| Collegiality | 0.02 (0.6) | 0 | 17% (106) | 69% (492) | 15% (119) |
| Committee Work/Service to Institution | -0.01 (0.5) | 0 | 17% (101) | 71% (528) | 12% (92) |
| Contribution to Community/Society | -0.04 (0.6) | 0 | 19% (127) | 67% (484) | 13% (97) |
| Contribution to Profession (Serving on Board, Journals, etc.) | -0.01 (0.8) | 0 | 32% (222) | 38% (269) | 31% (215) |
| Mentoring Colleagues | -0.02 (0.7) | 0 | 30% (201) | 45% (326) | 25% (187) |
|  |
| **Questions regarding Divergent Mission: Diversity** | **Mean (s.d.)** | **Median** | **% Much Lower** | **% Similar** | **% Much Higher** |
| Promoting demographic diversity in faculty | 0.1 (0.6) | 0 | 19% (146) | 63% (634) | 18% (253) |
| Protecting academic freedom by promoting diversity of opinions and political attitudes | 0.3 (0.5) | 0 | 1.0% (8) | 66% (453) | 33% (259) |
| Promoting demographic diversity in the student body | 0.1 (0.6) | 0 | 14% (101) | 70% (708) | 16% (228) |
| Creating open and accepting classroom environments where students can feel comfortable | 0.2 (0.5) | 0 | 6% (51) | 75% (729) | 19% (249) |
| Teaching student tolerance; opening their minds to other cultures and new ideas | 0.3 (0.5) | 0 | 4% (27) | 67% (644) | 29% (357) |
| Producing students who will represent indigents or underrepresented communities | 0.3 (0.5) | 0 | 6% (45) | 69% (676) | 25% (308) |
| Providing legal services to the community | 0.1 (0.5) | 0 | 9% (71) | 76% (770) | 15% (188) |
|  |
| **Questions regarding Divergent Vision: Standards** | **Mean (s.d.)** | **Median** | **% Much Lower** | **% Similar** | **% Much Higher** |
| Producing highest quality faculty research | 0.1 (0.5) | 0 | 8% (74) | 75% (765) | 17% (193) |
| Encouraging faculty to achieve high visibility in important public policy debates | 0.09 (0.5) | 0 | 10% (67) | 73% (524) | 17% (134) |
| Admitting students with strongest possible credentials in terms of undergraduate GPA, quality of undergraduate institution, and LSAT score | -0.1 (0.5) | 0 | 18% (225) | 74% (732) | 8% (76) |
| Maintaining tough teaching standards, and setting high goals for student excellence | 0.3 (0.5) | 0 | 1% (12) | 68% (708) | 31% (315) |
| Producing students who will occupy the highest ranks of the legal profession | -0.08 (0.5) | 0 | 13% (158) | 80% (788) | 7% (80) |
| Producing students who are well prepared for the practice of law | 0.2 (0.4) | 0 | 2% (9) | 82% (602) | 17% (120) |
| Achieving or maintaining a good position in national rankings | -0.3 (0.5) | 0 | 33% (354) | 63% (637) | 3% (34) |

**Appendix Table 4: Latent Factors**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Construct** | **White Men Mean Value (s.d.)** | **White Women Mean Value (s.d.)** | **Minority Men Mean Value (s.d.)** | **Minority Women Mean Value (s.d.)** |
| Voice | -0.01 (0.012) | -0.07 (0.015) | -0.09 (0.020) | -0.12 (0.022) |
| Collegiality | -0.02 (0.026) | -0.32 (0.035) | -0.32 (0.055) | -0.52 (0.039) |
| Diversity Dissonance | 0.009 (0.025) | 0.22 (0.035) | 0.39 (0.059) | 0.53 (0.065) |
| Standards Dissonance | 0.008 (0.019) | 0.083 (0.022) | 0.079 (0.030) | 0.15 (0.029) |

**Appendix Table 5: Latent Factor Model**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Latent Factor** | **Measurement Variable** | **Coefficient (s.d.)** |
| **Voice** | Respected by Students | 1 (constrained) |
| Comfortable in Classroom | 0.52 (0.07) |
| Respected by Colleagues | 2.52 (0.25) |
| Opinions Matter to Colleagues | 3.25 (0.33) |
| Listened to with Respect in Promotion/Tenure Decisions | 3.21 (0.33) |
| Often Disagree with Colleagues | -0.94 (0.17) |
| Comfortable Voicing Disagreements | 1.87 (0.22) |
| Have Impact on Major Decisions | 3.13 (0.34) |
| Respected within Field | 0.52 (0.12) |
| **Collegiality** | Colleagues of Different Genders Get Along | 1 (constrained) |
| Colleagues of Different Political Orientations Get Along | 1.09 (0.06) |
| Colleagues of Different Races Get Along | 1.10 (0.06) |
| **Dissonance with respect to Standards Mission** | High Quality Scholarship | 1 (constrained) |
| Admitting Students with High Credentials | 1.19 (0.16) |
| Maintaining Tough Teaching Standards | 1.38 (0.15) |
| Producing Students Who Go to Elite Firms | 0.97 (0.16) |
| Maintaining High US News Ranking | 1.23 (0.19) |
| **Dissonance with respect to Diversity Mission** | Promoting Demographic Diversity in Faculty | 1 (constrained) |
| Promoting Demographic Diversity in Student Body | 1.06 (0.04) |
| Creating Open and Accepting Classrooms | 0.79 (0.07) |
| Teaching Tolerance | 0.99 (0.08) |
| Producing Students who Represent the Underrepresented | 0.94 (0.08) |
| Providing Legal Services to the Community | 0.64 (0.062) |

**Appendix Table 6: SEM Results**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Group** | **Coefficient** |
| Constant(*p*-value:0.188)[[9]](#endnote-9) | White Men | 4.02\*\*\* (0.10) |
| White Women | 3.96\*\*\* (0.09) |
| Minority Men | 3.81\*\*\* (0.25) |
| Minority Women | 4.29\*\*\* (0.15) |
| High Salary(*p*-value: 0.939) | White Men | 0.34\*\* (0.11) |
| White Women | 0.35\*\*\* (0.10) |
| Minority Men | 0.09 (0.41) |
| Minority Women | 0.30 (0.19) |
| Voice[[10]](#endnote-10)(*p*-value: 0.141) | White Men | 0.96\*\* (0.37) |
| White Women | 1.77\*\*\* (0.30) |
| Minority Men | 0.36 (1.022) |
| Minority Women | 0.97\* (0.48) |
| Collegiality(*p*-value: 0.148) | White Men | 0.52\*\*\* (0.16) |
| White Women | 0.20 (0.11) |
| Minority Men | 0.35 (0.28) |
| Minority Women | 0.89\*\* (0.34) |
| Dissonance-Standards(*p*-value: 0.139) | White Men | -0.91\*\* (0.35) |
| White Women | -0.21 (0.24) |
| Minority Men | -3.13 (2.10) |
| Minority Women | -1.05\* (0.49) |
| Dissonance-Diversity(*p*-value: 0.144) | White Men | 0.10 (0.22) |
| White Women | -0.19 (0.18) |
| Minority Men | 1.00 (0.74) |
| Minority Women | 0.40 (0.25) |
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1. For this reason, the percentages reported here may be slightly different from those listed in the original final report for the Phase I. See Mertz et al. (2011). [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. We note this just as an aside for readers who were curious based on the numbers; of course, as we indicate, this difference disappears if we simply compare all tiers equally. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. See Appendix B for details on the creation of this variable, and of the variables on dissonance discussed below. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. In Appendix Table 3, we report the positive difference (self-evaluation higher than dean evaluation) – and the negative (difference of self-evaluation lower than dean evaluation) separately, though we collapse them in the model, to a straight divergence measure. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. For further information on this approach, see Fabrigar and Wegener (2011), 55-56 (discussing the tradeoffs on different methods of finding numbers of factors). [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. By external metrics, we mean differences of opinion over the importance of such things as LSAT scores, graduating lawyers who earn top salaries, graduating lawyers who are “practice ready,” etc. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. We first used Bayesian SEM, but found that the results were too sensitive to a given specified prior distribution to provide robust findings. We also investigated running separate SEM models for each demographic group, but ultimately decided that the ability to directly compare across groups – which a joint model provides – was too useful to abandon. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. The *p*-values listed here come from a Chi-squared test that the variable listed is independent of job satisfaction. For example, the *p*-value 0.000 for race and gender suggests that the four different demographic groups have significantly different patterns of job satisfaction. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. This *p*-value uses a Wald test to determine whether the baseline of job satisfaction, after controlling for the latent factors and collegiality, differs for at least one outsider group. As the *p*-value is not small, it suggests that there is no evidence that the baseline of job satisfaction, after controlling for latent factors and high salary, differs across minority status and gender. Put another way, controlling for the latent factors and high salary, the gap in job satisfaction is substantively small, and statistically insignificant. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. The *p*-value reported is based upon the Wald test; note that all four group coefficients for a given latent factor are equal, versus the alternative that at least one coefficient is not equal to the others. For example, the null hypothesis for voice would be that voice does not impact job satisfaction differentially for any of the four demographic groups, while the alternative hypothesis is that voice does impact job satisfaction differentially – that some group(s) values voice in job satisfaction more than other(s) – for at least one group. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)