

Running head: SPSP 2001 SURVEY

Trends in Graduate Admissions and Support in Personality and Social Psychology Ph.D.

Programs in North America, 2000-01

Janet K. Swim

The Pennsylvania State University

Lisa G. Aspinwall

University of Utah

### Abstract

An online survey of Ph.D. programs in personality and social psychology in North America was conducted to assess perceived and actual trends in the size and quality of the applicant pool, and to assess the amount and nature of support offered to graduate students in the 2000-01 academic year. Fifty-nine out of 104 programs (57%) responded. Consistent with respondents' perceptions of the applicant pool and entering class, comparisons with previous surveys indicated a drop in the size of the applicant pool since 1996 but little change in the quality of graduate students accepting offers. There was little difference between the demographics of the applicant pool and those of the entering class. However, the proportion of ethnic minorities both applying and being accepted was well below the ethnic minority composition of the U.S. as reported by the 2000 U.S. census. Finally, funding and recruitment offers are described across different geographic regions with different cost of living.

Trends in Graduate Admissions and Support in Personality and Social Psychology Ph.D.  
Programs in North America, 2000-01

The Society of Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) has conducted surveys to obtain information about graduate programs in personality and social psychology to help people compare their own programs to other programs and to provide information useful to the field as a whole (Uleman & Weary, 1992; Larsen & Salovey, 1996). For instance, the 1996 survey contained questions about size of programs, admission standards, financial support, program requirements, content areas covered, and graduate student productivity (e.g., publications, presentations, and placement, Larsen & Salovey, 1996). The SPSP Graduate Training Committee and the SPSP Executive committee decided that it would be useful to continue to monitor various aspects of graduate programs.

The 2000-2001 survey was undertaken to assess the size of graduate programs in personality and social psychology and possible implications that changes in the size of programs might have. Survey data from 1990 to 1998 from the National Science Foundation (NSF) indicate that there has been a five-year decrease in the number of people enrolled in graduate programs since a peak in 1993 (Ilardi, 1999). However, the rate of decrease is not constant across fields. The Social Sciences experienced the greatest decrease (2.6%) and Psychology one of the smallest rates of decrease (.3%). This survey, like other aggregate data on doctoral programs in psychology, does not provide specific information about personality and social psychology. Moreover, other data sources about applicants and enrollments do not specifically address the possible implications of a decrease in applications on personality and social graduate programs. For instance, changes in the applicant pool and enrollment could change programs in terms of the demographics of applicant pools and the quality of students in graduate programs and may affect responses made by graduate programs in terms of recruitment efforts or financial aid packages given. For instance, increasing competition may require special efforts to advertise doctoral programs and to recruit people who have been accepted to the program. Also, it is possible that changes may be affecting certain types of programs more than others. For instance,

small programs may feel the effects of a sustained decrease in applicant pools more than large programs. The 2000-2001 survey examined these factors, as well as financial offers made to incoming students.

## Method

### Respondents and Procedure

Of the 104 Ph.D. programs contacted, 59 submitted completed surveys, for a response rate of 57%. Details characterizing the sample may be found in the results section. A list of Ph.D. programs in personality and/or social psychology in the United States and Canada was derived from a number of sources including the APA Guide to Graduate Programs in Psychology (2001); the Social Psychology Network's ([www.socialpsychology.org](http://www.socialpsychology.org)) listing of programs with websites; and Peterson's Graduate Programs in the Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences (2001).

Faculty and administrators of the programs were first contacted via e-mail in May 2001. We also posted a message to the SPSP listserv. The message indicated that the survey would help identify trends in training, recruitment, and support of graduate students, provide comparative data that might be helpful in terms of planning and development of departmental and university resources, and would aid in the development of a database that could be useful in tracking success of diversity initiatives. After a three-week period, we sent additional e-mails to faculty members at each institution that had yet to reply.

### Measures

The survey was posted on the web (see [http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/k/jks4/spsp\\_part1.htm](http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/k/jks4/spsp_part1.htm)). Respondents were first asked about the applicant pool processed in the Spring of 2001 and those accepting offers to begin graduate training in the Fall of 2001. They were asked the size of the applicant pool, the number of positions they wished to fill, and the number that accepted offers. They were also asked demographic questions about those applying and those accepting offers. More specifically, they were asked about gender composition, the number of ethnic minority women and men (i.e., African-American, Chicano/Latino, Asian-American/Pacific Islander, Native American), and the

number of women and men from countries outside North America. Additionally, they were asked about the GRE (verbal, quantitative, and analytic) scores for the applicant pool and those accepting offers.

Respondents were next asked their perceptions of change in the number of applicants to their program, the quality of the applicants, and the quality of those accepting offers. They were also asked to speculate why these perceived changes occurred. Next, they were asked what method of recruitment they used. They were asked to indicate whether they used any of 7 possible methods (developed a web page, fully paid visits, partially paid visits, recruitment visits with all those given offers coming at the same time, incentives for accepting offers before April 15, and personal computers). They were then asked to describe any other methods they used.

Following these questions was a series of questions about financial offers. They were first asked about typical offers and then asked about enhanced offers they may have made to exceptionally well-qualified students. These questions addressed the monthly amount of the stipend and the number of months covered by the stipend, whether offers included funding for additional years, the type of positions offered (e.g., teaching assistant, research assistant, and/or scholarships or fellowships), and whether offers included tuition reimbursement, health insurance, and summer support. Finally, they were given the opportunity to specify other aspects of their typical and enhanced offers.

After answering these questions, respondents were asked to describe their graduate program in terms of the number of faculty and students in the program and whether the program was private or public. We also asked whether the focus of their program was applied social; social; social and personality; or personality. These were the categories that best described the programs in the 1992 survey (Uleman & Weary, 1992). They were also given the opportunity to indicate whether their program focus was something other than these four types. Some of these other types included some combination of basic and applied social (e.g., organizational and social, or basic and applied). Thus, a single category that combined these programs with those who indicated that they were applied programs was formed for the analyses. They were also

asked the location of their university and whether they were located in an area with low, average, or high cost of living. Because of differential distribution of cost of living by location, we combined low and average cost of living into one category for analyses.

## Results

### Sample and Characteristics of the Responding Programs

Most responding programs were from the U.S. ( $n = 53$ , 91.4%) with the rest being from Canada ( $n = 5$ , 8.6%) or unspecified ( $n = 1$ ). Thirty-four percent were from the Northeast or Mid-Atlantic states, 29% from the Midwest, 21% from the Western/Pacific region, 7% from the South or Southeast, and 8.6% from Canada. Seventeen percent indicated that they were located in an area with a low cost of living; 42%, a average cost of living; and 39%, a high cost of living. The majority of responses came from public universities (76% public, 24% private).

Forty-six percent described themselves as social psychology programs, 36% as social and personality, 15% as including an applied aspect in their program (e.g., applied, basic and applied, or social combined with industrial/organizational or organizational psychology), and the remainder (5%) as some other type of social/personality program. The number of social/personality faculty in each program ranged from 1 to 26 with a mean of 6.58 ( $SD = 3.78$ ) and median of 6.00. The modal responses were 5 ( $n = 12$ ) and 6 ( $n = 14$ ). The number of graduate students in each program ranged from 1 to 40 with the mean of 15.21 ( $SD = 9.58$ ) and median of 12.50. Thus, the average student-to-faculty ratio was 2.27:1. The range was from approximately 1:1 to 5.5:1 with most (78%) being 3:1 or less.

All of the programs were housed in psychology departments. These departments ranged in size from 8 to 154 faculty ( $M = 35.54$ ,  $SD = 20.84$ , median = 32). The number of students in the department ranged from 20 to 230 ( $M = 85.72$ ,  $SD = 45.08$ , median = 86).

### Size and Quality of Applicant Pool and Entering Class for the 1992, 1996 and 2001 Samples

Descriptive information about the size, gender and ethnic composition, and admissions credentials of both the Spring 2001 applicant pool and the Fall 2001 entering class may be found

in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 contains information directly comparable to information from the 1992 and 1996 surveys. Table 2 provides information only available from the present survey.

Number of applicants and entering students. As shown in Table 1, the average number of applicants dropped from 53.1 in 1992 and 54.4 in 1996 to 42.4 in 2001. This represents a statistically significant drop in the number of applicants (95% confidence interval for 2001 = 37.60 to 46.53) with a drop of 20% over the five-year period. However, this drop does not appear to have detrimentally affected enrollments. The average entering class size in 2001 was 3.55 students, close to the average desired number of 3.75. The 2001 entering class was similar to that of 1996 ( $\bar{M} = 3.5$ ) but less than that of 1992 ( $\bar{M} = 4.2$ ). The student-to-faculty ratio was lower than in previous years. Programs may have been able to respond to the decrease in applicants and perhaps competition for applicants from other universities by making offers to admissions to more students (relative to what was required in 1996) to obtain the desired number of students in their programs. In 2001, programs made an average of 7.09 offers which is up from an average of 6.2 from 1996 but down from an average of 7.5 in 1992.

Admissions credentials (grades and test scores). Table 1 presents the average GPA and average of the verbal and quantitative GRE scores for the 1992, 1996, and 2001 entering classes. Table 2 presents GPA and verbal, quantitative, and analytic scores for the applicant pool and the entering class of 2001. As shown in Table 1, average grades and test scores of the entering classes of 1992, 1996, and 2001 were quite similar, with GPAs being about 3.65 and average GRE scores nearly equivalent across years. Thus, the decrease in the size of the applicant pool since the 1996 survey does not appear to have affected the quality of the entering class.

Additional information about the credentials of the 2001 applicants is shown in Table 2. For this

group, verbal GREs tended to be lower than the quantitative and analytic scores, and this was true for both the applicant pool and those accepting offers.

### Perceived Changes in the Size and Quality of the Applicant Pool

The general pattern of findings for perceived changes in the number and quality of applicants mirrored actual changes, with respondents indicating a decrease in the size of the applicant pool but little change in the quality of the applicants and those given offers of admission. Three-fifths of the respondents indicated that there had been a decrease in the size of their applicant pool in the past few years (61%, with 49% of the total respondents indicating a moderate decrease and 12% a sharp decrease). The remainder indicated either no change (19%) or an increase (19%). On the item assessing the perceived quality of the applicant pool, most respondents indicated that there was either no change in the quality of those applying (46%) or that the quality had increased in the past few years (36%). Sixteen percent reported that the quality of their applicant pool had decreased in the past few years. Similarly, most indicated that there was no change in the quality of students who accepted offers to their program (52%) or that their quality had increased (38%). The remainder thought that the quality of students accepting offers to their program had decreased (7%).

Explanations for perceived changes. Respondents provided open-ended explanations for perceived changes. Of those explaining decreases in the pool and its quality, most tended to focus on an improved economy that created attractive employment alternatives to graduate school. Similarly, one respondent noted that people were moving from their applied program to industrial/organizational programs. One person noted that there was increased competition from regionally close universities. One person noted that his or her program had decreased its recruiting efforts.

Of those explaining increases in their pool and its quality, most noted something with regard to improved prestige of their programs (new hires, junior faculty getting to be better known, an increase in national rankings). A few also noted that they had been able to increase their funding efforts, such as increasing the size of graduate stipends. One person noted that his or her program had increased its recruitment efforts.

Gender composition. In contrast to the proportion of women affiliated with Division 8 (43%, American Psychological Association, 1999), the proportion of women applying and being accepted into social and personality doctoral programs is much greater than that of men by about 2-to-1 margin, with 64% of the applicant pool and 70% the entering class being female. This ratio held for all ethnic groups (white, U.S. and Canadian ethnic minorities, and foreign students). Of the North American minority students (African-American, Chicano/Latino, Asian-American/Pacific Islander, Native American), 72% of the 2001 applicants and entering students were women. Similarly, of the foreign applicants (i.e., those from outside North America), the majority were women (73% of the pool, 78% of those accepting offers).

Paired t-tests comparing the percentage of women in the applicant pool and their percentage in the entering class indicated no difference between the two for the overall sample ( $t(45) < 1$ , ns), for ethnic minority students ( $t(14) < 1$ , ns) and for foreign students ( $t(14) = 1.29$ ,  $p < .22$ ). Thus, assuming similar quality in applicants, similar rates of applying to different programs, and a similar desire to attend graduate school, there appears to be no gender bias in the selection process.

Ethnic composition. In the overall 2001 sample (U.S. plus Canada), the percentage of North American ethnic minority students (African-American, Chicano/Latino, Asian-American/Pacific Islander, Native American) was 15.6 % for the applicant pool and 14.6% for

the entering class, reflecting no change since 1992 (see Table 1). Similarly, in 2001, approximately 14.1% of all applicants and 12.6% of the entering students were from countries outside North America. Comparable data were not collected in 1992 or 1996, and it is unclear whether foreign students may have been counted as minority students in these prior surveys. Like the gender composition data, there is little difference between the proportion of minority and foreign students in the applicant pool and the entering class (both  $t_s < 1$ , ns), suggesting little bias in the selection process.

However, it should be noted that the proportion of U.S. ethnic minority applicants and entering students remains low relative to the proportion in the U.S. as a whole. If one considers only U.S. applicants and programs (i.e., excluding applicants and entering students from countries outside North America and excluding data from the Canadian respondents<sup>1</sup>), the proportion of ethnic minorities who applied and accepted offers were 17.27% and 17.11%, respectively. In contrast, according to the 2000 U.S. census, 30% of the population considers themselves Hispanic/Latino/a or nonwhite (1.5% listed two or more races which could have included white).

#### Financial Offers of Support for Graduate Study

We asked respondents to describe both their typical and enhanced offers. Forty-seven percent ( $n = 28$ ) indicated that they made enhanced offers to recruit especially qualified candidates. They gave enhanced offers to 1 to 4 students ( $M = 1.56$ ,  $S.D. = 1.00$ , which is about 22% of those to whom offers were made).

Type of support. The typical offer was most frequently a Teaching Assistant position (81%). However, about half of the typical offers also included Research Assistantships ( $n = 29$ ,

---

<sup>1</sup> This selection process was done in order to be able to compare applicant data to the 2001 U.S. census.

49%) and scholarships, fellowships, or other work that did not require any teaching or special research ( $n = 30$ , 51%). However, one program gave fellowships that required a minimal amount of teaching responsibilities. The enhanced offers tended to be awards that did not require any teaching ( $n = 18$ , or 64%). A few enhanced offers were for Teaching Assistantships ( $n = 2$ ) and Research Assistantships ( $n = 3$ ).

Amount of monthly stipends and additional summer support. On average, students were offered stipends of \$1,300 per month<sup>2</sup> ( $SD = \$264$ , range = \$666 to \$2,210) with the most typical offer being a 9-month offer ( $n = 40$ , or 68%, made 9-month offers, 1 made an 8-month offer; 5 made 10-month offers, and 11 made 12-month offers). The average monthly stipend did not vary as a function of public vs. private institution ( $F < 1$ , ns). The enhanced offers increased the amount of the total offer by an average of \$3602 ( $SD = \$2202$ , range from \$1,000 to \$9,000). Most of the typical offers included tuition waivers with most of these being full tuition waivers (full, 78%; partial, 12%; no tuition waiver, 7%). In addition to a regular-year stipend and tuition benefits, 36% included summer support in their typical offer, and 32% included summer support in their enhanced offers. Summer support added an average of \$3,577 to the typical offer and \$3214 to the enhanced offers. Roughly half of the offers included health insurance coverage (51%), with 80% of these including full coverage (range of amount covered was from 75-100%).

Funding by cost of living and geographical region. Monthly stipends for the regular academic year (not including summer) were analyzed as a function of geographical region and

---

<sup>2</sup>Some Canadian universities specified that the amount they reported was in Canadian dollars. The mean reported here does not reflect adjustments to be equal to U.S. dollars. If it is assumed that all Canadian respondents indicated Canadian dollars and the stipends were adjusted for currency rates, the average monthly stipend for the entire sample would be US\$1,255 per month ( $SD = \$304$ , range = \$602 to \$2,210), the enhanced offers would be US\$3,404 higher than the typical offers ( $SD = \$2237$ , range from \$1,000 to \$9,000), and summer support would add an average of US\$3,333 to the typical offer. None of the Canadian universities used summer support as an enhancement, in part because most had 12-month stipends as part of their typical offers.

respondent-reported cost of living in the city in which the university was located. Monthly stipends varied by cost of living, as one might expect,  $F(1,47) = 6.25$ ,  $p < .02$ , but not by region,  $F < 1$ , ns). However, because it might be most useful for programs to have comparisons by both region and cost of living, we present the average typical monthly stipend value broken down by both of these categories (see Table 4).

Years of guaranteed funding. Almost all programs (96%) guaranteed funding for students in their first year. Approximately 70% guaranteed funding for additional years, given good academic standing ( $M = 4.15$  additional years). An additional 20% of the programs did not guarantee funding but informed students that graduate students were typically funded for additional years ( $M = 4.20$  additional years).

#### Recruitment Efforts

A final section of the survey pertained to efforts to recruit graduate students. The most popular method of recruitment was using web pages with 48 of the 59 (81%) noting that they had developed web pages describing their area for prospective students. The next most popular recruitment effort was to have either partially paid ( $n = 26$ , 44%) or fully paid ( $n = 16$ , 27%) visits by prospective students. Other recruitment efforts included mass mailings advertising the program ( $n = 11$ , 19%) and giving incentives for accepting offers before April 15 ( $n = 1$ ). Open-ended responses indicated some of the following as recruitment strategies: guaranteeing funding for four years, signing bonus (\$5,000) for anyone coming with a scholarship, sending posters about program to other Universities, sending students information about programs, sending faculty reprints, sending information about the city where their university was located, having information about one's program listed on other web pages such as Gradschool.com, weekend recruitment events with parties, and having current students involved in recruitment efforts.

### Correlates of Perceived Changes in Size and Quality of Applicants

We examined department characteristics that might predict perceived changes in number and quality of applicants. For instance, large programs may not see much difference, but smaller programs may more keenly feel the impact of decreases in the size of the applicant pool.

However, there was no relationship between the number of social/personality faculty, social/personality graduate students, or student-faculty ratio and responses to these questions. Cost of living was similarly unrelated to these perceptions.

We also tested whether type of program (e.g., social versus personality) affected these perceptions. We found a marginally significant effect for type of program on the perceived quality of the applicant pool,  $F(2,52) = 2.66$ ,  $p < .08$ , and the perceived quality of those who accepted offers,  $F(2,53) = 2.52$ ,  $p < .09$ , such that applied social and social programs were more likely to indicate an improvement in the quality of their applicant pool ( $M_s = 3.66$ ,  $3.38$ , respectively) and those who accepted offers than ( $M_s = 3.78$ ,  $3.50$ , respectively) than social-personality programs which tended to indicate no change in quality ( $M = 2.95$  for the applicant pool,  $3.15$  for those accepting offers). However, there was no relationship between the type of program and the number of applicants, the quality of the applicants, and the quality of the entering class (as assessed by GPA and GRE scores).

We also correlated perceptions of changes in the applicant pool with the GPA and GRE scores for applicants and those accepting offers. None of these correlations was significant. Similarly, none of the correlations was significant between perceived changes and the total number of applicants, the total number of accepting offers, and the number of women, men,

ethnic minorities, and those from outside North America who applied and accepted offers.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, we tested whether any of the aspects of student funding were related to perceived changes in the applicant pool. There were only two significant correlations. The first was for the number of months the typical funding offer was given. Programs with 8- or 9-month funding perceived a decrease in the size of their applicant pool ( $\underline{M} = 2.32$ ) while those with 10-to-12-month funding reported no change ( $\underline{M} = 2.94$ ),  $\underline{F}(1,54) = 4.31$ ,  $p < .04^4$ . Second, programs that did not include money for the summer in their enhanced offers perceived that the quality the applicant pool had decreased,  $\underline{r}(28) = -.38$ ,  $p < .05$ . (The correlation with perceptions of decreased quality of entering students was marginally significant,  $\underline{r}(28) = -.32$ ,  $p < .09$ ). It is possible that students use the availability of summer support as a selection criterion for submitting applications or accepting offers or that the lack of funds for summer support being correlated with lack of program funding more generally or other factors that could lead to decreased quality of the applicant pool. For instance, although not statistically significant, those that offered summer support tended to have higher monthly stipends ( $\underline{M} = \$1355$ ) than those not offering summer stipends ( $\underline{M} = \$1268$ ),  $\underline{t}(55) = 1.21$ ,  $p = .23$ .

### Discussion

Comparisons of the 1992, 1996, and 2001 survey data indicate that there was a 20% decrease in the number of applications to doctoral programs in personality and social psychology

---

<sup>3</sup> There was one significant correlation, but this may have been a function of skewed data. The correlation was between the number of students from outside North America and perceptions of the quality of applicants. The more applicants and students who accepted offers from outside North America, the higher the perceived quality,  $\underline{r}(46) = .34$ ,  $.36$ , respectively. The correlation with perceived quality was significant for the number of men from outside of the United States,  $\underline{rs}(46) = .42$  and  $.50$ , respectively, but not the number of women,  $\underline{rs}(46) = .22$  and  $.21$ , respectively. However, there were very few men from outside North America who accepted offers.

<sup>4</sup> Although Canadian programs were more likely to have 12-month offers than U.S. programs, country did not predict perceptions of change, and the effect of length of the stipend offers remained significant when country was included as a covariate.

between 1996 and 2001. This decrease could reflect a tendency for people to apply to fewer programs or a tendency for fewer people to be applying to graduate programs. The decrease in the number applying is consistent with trends in enrollment in science programs in general, as reported by NSF (Ilardi, 1999).

In contrast to the NSF data, however, our data do not indicate that the decrease in number of applicants has altered the number and quality of those who are accepting offers for doctoral study. Our data indicate that there should be little concern about changes in the number and quality of students entering social and personality programs.

Respondents' perceived changes mirrored these trends in that, on average, they perceived a decrease in the number of applicants and no change in the quality of those accepting offers. We also tested whether perceived changes were related to departmental characteristics and only found the suggestion that offering summer funding was associated with a greater perceived number of applicants and higher perceived quality of applicants and those accepting offers.

The lack of significant correlations between perceived changes and the gender and ethnic composition of the sample suggest that changes in the applicant pool are not affecting these variables. Moreover, the data reveal that there appears to be no selection bias for gender, ethnic minority status, or foreign status, assuming equal quality across groups.

The 2001 survey found that the number of women exceeds the number of men applying and accepting offers by a 2-to-1 margin. This ratio differs from the current percent of women (43%) and men in Division 8 (American Psychological Association, 1999). Assuming equal rates of hiring, retention, and promotion in graduate school and beyond, these data suggest that the proportion of women in the field will likely exceed the proportion of men over time and the increasing number of women in the field may address some issues with regard to representation

of women in positions of influence (American Psychological Association, 1999; Hogan & Sexton, 1991).

It also should be noted with concern that the data indicate that the proportion of ethnic minorities applying and accepting offers in the U.S. is lower than the proportion in the general U.S. population. Thus, the problem of underrepresentation of ethnic minority students in graduate programs likely stems farther back in the education process which could include interest in attending graduate school or in college attendance and retention. It should also be noted that the data do not address whether there are, for example, issues with regard to retention of ethnic minority students in graduate programs or placement of ethnic minority students.

## References

- American Psychological Association. (1999). *Women in the American Psychological Association* [Biannual assessment of the status of women in the American Psychological Association]. Retrieved October 4, 2001, from <http://www.apa.org/pi/wpo/wapa/acknow.html>.
- American Psychological Association. (2001). *Graduate study in psychology: 2000 edition with 2001 addendum*.
- Hogan, J. D., & Sexton, V. S. (1991). Women and the American Psychological Association. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 623-634.
- Ilardi, B. (1999, December 15). *Graduate Enrollment in Science and Engineering Continued to Decline in 1998* (NSF 00-307). Retrieved October 4, 2001 from <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/databrf/db00307.htm>.
- Larsen, R., & Salovey, P. (1996). [Survey of Doctoral Programs in Personality and Social Psychology, 1996]. Unpublished raw data. (Available from Society of Personality and Social Psychology).
- Peterson's Graduate Programs in the Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences* (2001). Florence, KY: Thomson Learning.
- Social Psychology Network's list of Ph.D. Programs in Social Psychology* [<http://www.socialpsychology.org> ; Ph.D. program URL <http://www.socialpsychology.org/socprogs.htm>].
- Uleman, J. S., & Weary, G. (1995). Survey of doctoral programs in personality and social psychology, 1992. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 245-255.

Author Note

Correspondence may be addressed to Janet K. Swim, Department of Psychology,  
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802. Electronic mail: JKS4@PSU.EDU.

We would like to thank the respondents who participated in the survey.

Table 1

Application and Enrollment Data for Ph.D. Programs in Personality and Social Psychology in 1992, 1996, and 2001.

	Year of Survey		
	1992	1996	2001
<b>Total number of applicants</b>			
Mean	53.1	54.4	42.4
(S.D.)	(32.4)	(46.71)	(26.28)
Mode	--	20	33
Range	6-135	3-300	5-124
<b>Offers of admission</b>			
Mean	7.5	6.2	7.1
(S.D.)	(5.5)	(4.07)	(4.88)
Mode	5	4	2
Range	0-26	0-17	0-21
<b>Number accepting offers</b>			
Mean	4.2	3.5	3.5
(S.D.)	(2.7)	(2.58)	(2.38)
Mode	4	2	3
Range	0-14	0-12	1-12
<b>Current student-to-faculty ratio</b>			
Mean	2.5	2.7	2.3
(S.D.)	(1.3)	(1.57)	(.95)
Mode	4	2	3
Range	0-14	0-12	1-12
<b>Characteristics of Entering Class</b>			
<b>Percent minorities</b>			
Mean	14	12.5 <sup>1</sup>	15.6 <sup>2</sup>
(S.D.)	(19)	(12)	(9)
Mode	--	--	.18
Range	0-100	0-50	0-.44

Table 1 continues

	Year of Survey		
	1992	1996	2001
<b>GPA</b>			
Mean	3.60	-- <sup>3</sup>	3.70
(S.D.)	(.20)	--	(.18)
Mode	--	--	3.80
Range	3.0-4.0	--	3.12-3.97
<b>GRE (V&amp;Q average)</b>			
Mean	642	632	639
(S.D.)	(41.6)	(51.44)	(48.92)
Mode	--	550	650
Range	563-720	512-733	530-765

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> This figure appears to be based on the ethnic composition of all Ph.D. students in the responding programs, not just the proportion in the applicant pool or entering class.

<sup>2</sup> This figure includes North American minorities only, and does not include any of the 14.64% of the entering class who were from outside North America and whose ethnicity was not assessed.

<sup>3</sup> There appears to have been a scaling error in the GPA data reported for 1996.

Table 2

Admission Credentials of 2001 Applicant Pool and Entering Class

	GPA	GRE-Verbal	GRE-Quantitative	GRE-Analytic
<b>Applicant pool</b>				
Mean	3.54	557	624	635
(S.D)	(.14)	(52)	(44)	(45)
Median	3.54	550	630	639
Range	3.00-4.00	450-700	500-740	468-702
<b>Entering class</b>				
Mean	3.70	607	670	695
(S.D)	(.18)	(56)	(52)	(61)
Median	3.73	608	673	700
Range	3.12-3.97	447-740	550-790	550-782

Table 3

Average Monthly Graduate Stipends in 2001 as a Function of Geographical Region and Cost of Living

Geographical region	Cost of Living		Region average
	Low/average	High	
<b>Northeastern/Mid-Atlantic U.S.</b>			
Mean	1247	1395	1325
(S.D.)	(114)	(214)	(186)
Minimum	1111	1155	1111
Median	1222	1333	1250
Maximum	1465	1825	1600
<u>N</u>	10	10	20
<b>Midwestern U.S.</b>			
Mean	1266	1364	1289
(S.D.)	(232)	(172)	(219)
Minimum	906	1111	906
Median	1167	1422	1250
Maximum	1600	1500	1600
<u>N</u>	13	4	17
<b>Western/Pacific U.S.</b>			
Mean	1123	1547	1371
(S.D.)	(244)	(466)	(434)
Minimum	753	667	667
Median	1133	1555	1394
Maximum	1389	2210	2210
<u>N</u>	5	7	12
<b>Southern/Southeastern U.S.</b>			
Mean	1044	1111	1061
(S.D.)	(113)	----	(98)
Minimum	944	1111	944
Median	1021	1111	1066
Maximum	1167	1111	1167
<u>N</u>	3	1	4

Table continues

Geographical region	Cost of living		Region average
	Low/average	High	
Canada			
Mean	1288	1167	1264
(S.D.)	(197)	----	(179)
Minimum	1000	1167	1000
Median	1354	1167	1333
Maximum	1444	1167	1444
<u>N</u>	4	1	5
Overall average			
Mean	1223	1414	
(S.D.)	(200)	(309)	
Minimum	753	667	
Median	1179	1417	
Maximum	1600	2210	
<u>N</u>	35	23	

Note: All amounts rounded to the closest dollar. Information for Canadian schools was kept in the dollar amount reported by respondents.