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ABSTRACT

IMPORTANCE: Residency applicants often use social media to discuss the positive and negative features of prospective training programs. An examination of the content discussed by applicants could provide guidance for how a medical education faculty can better engage with prospective trainees and adapt to meet the educational expectations of a new generation of digital-native physicians.

OBJECTIVE: The objective was to identify unstructured social media data submitted by residency applicants and categorize positive and negative statements to determine key themes.

DESIGN: The study design was qualitative analysis of a retrospective cohort.

SETTING: Publicly available datasets were used.

PARTICIPANTS: The participants were anonymized medical trainees applying to residency training positions in 9 specialties—dermatology, general surgery, internal medicine, obstetrics/gynecology, plastic surgery, otolaryngology, physical medicine and rehabilitation, pediatrics, and radiology—from 2007 to 2017.

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES: After we developed a standardized coding scheme that broke comments down into major features, themes, and subthemes, all unstructured comments were coded by two independent researchers. Positive and negative comments were coded separately. Frequency counts and percentages were recorded for each identified feature, theme, and subtheme. The percent positive and negative comments by specialty were also calculated.

RESULTS: Of the 6314 comments identified, 4541 were positive and 1773 were negative. Institution was the most commonly cited major feature in both the positive (n = 767 [17%]) and...
negative (n = 827 [47%]) comments. Geography was the most cited theme, and City, Cost of Living, and Commute were commonly cited subthemes. Training was the next most cited major feature in both positive (n = 1005 [22%]) and negative (n = 291 [16%]) comments, with Clinical Training being more commonly cited compared to Research Opportunities. Overall, 72% of comments from all were positive; however, the percent of comments that were positive comments varied significantly across the 9 specialties. Pediatrics (65%), dermatology (66%), and internal medicine (68%) applicants were more likely to express negative comments compared with the global average, but physical medicine and rehabilitation (85%), radiology (82%), otolaryngology (81%), and plastic surgery (80%) applicants were more likely to express positive comments.

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE: This qualitative analysis of positive and negative themes as posted by applicants in recent matching years is the first and provides new detailed insights into the motivations and desires of trainees.
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INTRODUCTION

For digital-native millennial medical students, social media is a natural form of communication. The social media environment is expansive and rapidly changing, with weekly social media use among 18- to 24-year-olds increasing from 89% to 98% from 2014 to 2016. The average number of social media sites that a young adult visits weekly is 7.6, and a higher education level is associated with increased social media use. This environment allows information that may have been shared only among a group of friends to instead be publicly posted and shared broadly. To this end, medical students and residents are using social media to study, network, discuss patient encounters, job hunt, share research, and more. However, research surrounding medical trainees and social media has largely been limited to professionalism. Listening to the voice of patients on platforms such as Yelp has been suggested as a way to understand their needs and improve the experience of health care. Similarly, listening to the digital voice of students and residents may allow for improvement in the delivery of medical education.

For most medical students, the transition from medical student to resident is formative, and the selection of a residency program represents a critical decision, but there is a limited understanding of how modern medical school seniors use social media to assess residency programs. We hypothesized that unstructured social media data created by medical students regarding residency selection will provide new, valuable, and renewable insights on their expectations and preferences for residency training. The National Resident Match Program (NRMP) Applicant Survey provides some insights into candidate preferences, but it is only periodically published and has limited breadth, given its structured design and limited dissemination. A better understanding of the contemporary expectations of medical students would allow residency programs to better recruit and engage prospective learners while adapting to meet the educational expectations of a new generation of physicians.

METHODS

We performed an Internet search of key social media sources: Twitter, Reddit, Facebook, Student Doctor Network (SDN), Aunt Minnie, and Otomatch. We selected postings using the following terms: “residency match list,” “interview experiences,” and “residency rank list.” We identified postings related to 9 specialties: dermatology, general surgery, internal medicine, obstetrics/gynecology, plastic surgery, otolaryngology, physical medicine and rehabilitation, pediatrics, and radiology. All searches were conducted within 1 week of the rank list deadline for the 2017 NRMP match (February 22, 2017). This study is exempt from Northwestern Institutional Review Board approval, because it used only publicly available datasets.

A standardized coding scheme was developed (see Supplement 1, available online). The scheme included 3 nested levels: major features, themes, and subthemes. Comments were coded to the highest level of specificity possible; for example, “The city is expensive” is coded as Institution (major feature) > Geography (theme) > Cost of Living (subtheme). Two authors (LA, BD) coded all unstructured comments using NVIVO v11 (QSR International, Burlington, Mass).
Discrepancies were discussed (SX, LA, BD) until a consensus was reached. We determined the proportion of positive comments by specialty using Stata v14 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas) with a logit transform to calculate 95% confidence intervals. We used a logistic regression model to compare the proportion of comments that were positive within each specialty. Specialties were identified as having a greater proportion of positive comments than overall (odds ratio [OR] > 1.0, P < .05), a lower proportion of positive comments than overall (OR < 1.0, P < 0.05), or not significantly different than average.

RESULTS

Three online resources—SDN, Aunt Minnie, and Oto-match—yielded results that met our search criteria. The most recent relevant posting groups were identified, and up to 3 per specialty were mined for comments. Focusing on the 3 most recent forums and threads by year allowed for a more contemporary analysis. For dermatology, plastic surgery, otolaryngology, internal medicine, and radiology, the forums used corresponded with the 2014—2015, 2015—2016, or 2016—2017 NRMP match cycles. For the remaining specialties, earlier groups were used representing match cycles 2007—2008 (obstetrics/gynecology), 2011—2012 (physical medicine and rehabilitation), and 2012—2013 (general surgery and pediatrics). These postings yielded 6314 total comments (4541 positive and 1773 negative entries) specifically related to individual residency programs. On SDN alone, these comments accounted for more than 1.2 million aggregate views.

Of the positive comments (Figure 1A), Institution was the most commonly cited major feature (n = 1323 [29%]), and Geography was the most cited theme (n = 767 [17%]). City (n = 312 [7%]), Cost of Living (n = 121 [3%]), and Cultural and Leisure Activities (n = 104 [2%]) were the most commonly cited subthemes. Training was the next most cited major feature (n = 1005 [22%]), and Clinical Training (n = 655 [14%]) was more commonly cited than Research Opportunities (n = 238 [5%]). Resident Experience was another commonly cited feature with important themes and subthemes, including Likeable Residents (n = 248 [5%]), Successful Fellowship Placements (n = 197 [4%]), and Perceived Resident Happiness (n = 188 [4%]). Table 1 highlights representative comments from each of these themes and subthemes. Institution was also the most commonly cited negative feature (n = 827 [47%]; see Figure 1B), with Geography being the most cited theme (n = 637 [36%]), and City (n = 191 [11%]), Commute (n = 112 [6%]), and Cost of Living (n = 88 [5%]) being the most cited subthemes (Figure 1B). Training was the next most cited major feature (n = 291 [16%]); again, Clinical Training (n = 226 [13%]) was cited much more commonly than Research (n = 49 [3%]). A summary of major features by specialty is included in the supplementary materials available online.

Figure 2 shows the percent of positive comments across the 9 specialties. Overall, 72% of comments were positive; however, there were significant differences across specialties. Pediatrics (65%), dermatology (66%), and internal medicine (68%) applicants were more likely to express negative comments compared to the global average, whereas physical medicine and rehabilitation (85%), radiology (82%), otolaryngology (81%), and plastic surgery (80%) applicants were more likely to express positive comments.
DISCUSSION

Understanding the preferences of residency candidates can provide guidance to residency programs. Medical students are highly active in social media within the context of rating specific residency programs across numerous specialties, and our results provide a review of positive and negative themes posted by applicants in recent matching cycles. Despite differences in the length of training and nature of training in primary, subspecialty, and surgical specialties, the valued features and themes were largely concordant, including Geography, Clinical Training, and Resident Experience.

Nested within Resident Experience, Likeable Residents and Perceived Resident Happiness were repeated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Feature</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Sample Positive Comment</th>
<th>Sample Negative Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>“Arguably one of the best places for young people to live”</td>
<td>“Not a great city”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>“Great cost of living”</td>
<td>“Expensive area to live”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural activities</td>
<td>“Lots of things to do”</td>
<td>“Really bland small city with not much to do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>“Great public transportation options”</td>
<td>“Lots of driving to clinical sites”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Clinical training</td>
<td>Subspecialty training</td>
<td>“Great pulm/critical care department”</td>
<td>“Weaker in peds derm and allergy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surgical training</td>
<td>“Great operative volume, especially in flaps”</td>
<td>“Seemed to be weaker in hand surgery”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Basic science tinnitus and hearing loss research available”</td>
<td>“No funded clinical research”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident experience</td>
<td>Likeable residents</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Residents were warm &amp; cordial during dinner”</td>
<td>“Residents seemed cliquey”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>Successful fellowship placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Excellent fellowship match list to outstanding institutions”</td>
<td>“Most recent fellowship match didn’t seem great”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Most Commonly Mentioned Positive and Negative Major Features, Themes, and Subthemes and Representative Comments

Figure 2

Percentages (and 95% confidence intervals) of positive comments across specialty type out of a total of 6314 comments; numbers in parentheses indicate the comments in that specialty type. The dashed vertical line indicates the overall proportion of positive comments.
The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education has made resident wellness initiatives a recent key focus, and our data suggest that improving the well-being of current residents would positively impact resident recruitment. Geography was the most commonly cited positive and negative theme and also the most important factor in prior studies, including the 2017 NRMP Applicant Survey. Although location is intrinsic and immutable, subtheme analysis illuminates how a program could best present itself, a nuance lacking in the NRMP dataset. As an example, programs could address the issues of cost of living, commuting, and cultural activities by highlighting reasonable living options, public transportation or ridesharing, concerts, sporting events, and outdoor activities during interviews and on their websites.

The variation in positive comments by specialty has several implications. Programs with more critical applicants could focus on addressing perceived negative features during interviews. Programs with more positive applicants could focus their attention on accentuating their strengths. Ultimately, the skew toward more positive or negative comments may also reflect applicants of a certain specialty being more critical or more willing to share negative opinions.

There are several limitations to this analysis. The majority of comments originated on a single site, SDN, with the notable exceptions of radiology and otolaryngology. Because comments are posted anonymously, we were unable to control for characteristics of the commenter. Although we cannot say how many unique posters contributed to the comments, the total number of views of each page would suggest that the information shared was disseminated widely. Studies of “lurkers” in social media settings have found that many find just reading the content is enough, suggesting that individuals who view without posting may still be influenced by what they read. The significant range in the number of comments among the different specialties reflects specialty-specific variability in the use of social media. Finally, our data cannot provide the relative importance of each theme to respondents. Although NRMP provides a weighted average of the importance of a feature, the majority of items fall within a narrow range.

The use of social media comes naturally to millennial learners, who tend to be collaborative, inclusive, and desiring of feedback. It is not surprising that residency applicants commonly use social media to discuss and obtain peer feedback with regard to potential residency programs. Our results demonstrate that social media can be a useful, unstructured data source that offers some advantages compared to traditional, structured survey approaches. Such data allow for a more stratified understanding of the motivations and desires of current applicants. In medical schools, faculty have already begun to adapt to the needs of millennial learners by soliciting their feedback, leading to the de-emphasizing of traditional lectures in favor of small groups and team-based activities. Residency programs might consider the online comments of applicants in order to recruit the strongest applicants and adapt to their changing preferences and expectations for post-graduate training. Medical educators themselves should consider participating directly in social media to, for example, dispel rumors, in addition to establishing a safe, anonymous platform for engaging with prospective residents.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA
Supplementary material accompanying this article can be found in the online version at doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2018.05.019
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**SUPPLEMENT 1**

*Positive Coding Schema*

1 **Faculty**
   a Academic
   b Aligned research
   c Available or relatable
   d Broad range of faculty interests
   e Chair
      i Aligned research interests
      ii Available or relatable
      iii Experienced
      iv Honest
      v Impressive or prestigious
      vi Involved
   vii Kind
   viii Likeable
   ix Supportive
      f Experienced
      g Impressive or prestigious
      h Kind
      i Likeable
      j Number of faculty
   i Large (increased opportunities)
   ii Small (intimate)
   k Program Director
      i Aligned research interests
      ii Available or relatable
      iii Experienced
      iv Honest
      v Impressive or prestigious
      vi Involved
   vii Kind
   viii Likeable
   ix Supportive
      1 Sufficient supervision of clinical practice
      m Support resident career development
      n Support resident education
      o Support resident research
      p Supportive

2 **Good Training**
   a Clinical training experience
      i Continuity
      ii Electives
      iii Externships
      iv Global health, international opportunities
      v Good subspecialty experience
      vi Good surgical/procedural experience
      vii High acuity/volume
      viii Other experience
      ix Preparation for future attending job
   1 Good academic practice training
   2 Good private practice training
   b External, outside training opportunities
      i Business
      ii Education
      iii Ethics
      iv Global/ public health
      v Innovation
      vi Law
   c Research opportunities, strength of areas of concentration
      i Basic science
      ii Clinical
      iii Health services, health policy
      iv Other
   d Sufficient autonomy

3 **Institution**
   a Features
      i Academic or library resources
      ii Community program
      iii County or underserved population
      iv Diversity of institution
      v Endowment
      vi External certifications (ex. level 1 trauma, stroke)
      vii Facilities
      viii Health information technology (EHR)
      ix Pharmaceutical company interactions
      x Private
      xi Public
      xii Size (number of sites)
      xiii VA
   b Fellowship opportunities
      i Number of fellowship spots
      ii Presence of intended fellowship
   c Geography
      i City
      ii Coastal
      iii Commute
      iv Cost of living
      v Cultural and leisure activities
      vi Diversity
Mix of rural and city
Near family connections
Near friend connections
Opportunities for significant other
Relationship to nearby program
Rural
Safety
Weather
Reputation
NIH ranking
Other rankings
US News ranking
Visa sponsorships
H-1B
J1

4 Intangible Positive Features
Clinically oriented program
Culture match/fit
Fit with faculty culture
Fit with institutional culture
Fit with resident culture
Supportive
Research-oriented program
Service-oriented program

5 Interactions with Other Trainees
Fellows
Nurse practitioners
Physician assistants

6 Interview Day Experience
Experience with co-applicants
Faculty interaction during visit
Food
Breakfast
Lunch
Pre-interview dinner
Gifts
Overall organization and logistics
Program offered financial assistance
Resident interaction during visit
Staff interaction during visit
Travel cost

7 Resident Experience
Camaraderie amongst residents
Career development
Successful fellowship placements

1 External fellowship placement
2 Internal fellowship placement
Successful job placement
Successful placement
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v Not impressive or prestigious
vi Not involved
vii Not kind
viii Not likeable
ix Not supportive
x Research interests not aligned

b Inexperienced
c Lack of faculty support for resident research
d Lack of sufficient supervision of clinical practice
e Lack of support for resident career development
f Lack of support of residency education
g Limited range of faculty interests
h Not academic
i Not available or relatable
j Not impressive or prestigious
k Not kind
l Not likeable
m Not supportive
n Number of faculty

i Large (overwhelming, decreased intimacy)
ii Small (limiting)

o Program Director
  i Inexperienced
  ii Not academic
  iii Not available or relatable
  iv Not honest
  v Not impressive or prestigious
  vi Not involved
  vii Not kind
  viii Not likeable
  ix Not supportive
  x Research interests not aligned

2 Poor Training

a Clinical training experience
  i Continuity
  ii Electives
  iii Externships
  iv Global health, international opportunities
  v Low acuity or volume
  vi Other experience

vii Poor subspecialty experience

viii Poor surgical/procedural experience
ix Preparation for future attending job

1 Poor academic practice training
2 Poor private practice training

b External, outside training opportunities
  i Business

ii Education
iii Ethics
iv Global / public health
v Innovation
vi Law

c Insufficient autonomy
d Research opportunities, strength of areas of concentration
  i Basic science
  ii Clinical
  iii Health services, health policy
  iv Other

3 Institution

a Features
  i Academic or library resources
  ii Community program
  iii County or underserved population (lack of)
  iv Diversity of institution
  v Endowment
  vi External certifications (ex. level 1 trauma, stroke)
  vii Facilities
  viii Health information technology (EHR)
   ix Pharmaceutical company interactions
   x Private
   xi Public
   xii Size (number of sites)
   xiii VA

b Fellowship opportunities
  i Number of fellowship spots
  ii Lack of intended fellowship

c Geography
  i City
  ii Coastal
  iii Commute
  iv Cost of living
   v Cultural and leisure activities
   vi Diversity
  vii Mix of rural and city
  viii Near family connections
   ix Near friend connections
    x Opportunities for significant other
   xi Relationship to nearby program
   xii Rural
   xiii Safety
   xiv Weather

d Reputation
  i NIH ranking
  ii Other rankings
iii US News ranking
e Visa sponsorships
i H-1B
ii J1

4 Intangible Negative Features
a Clinically oriented program
b Culture match/fit
i Fit with faculty culture
ii Fit with institutional culture
iii Fit with resident culture
iv Not supportive
c Research-oriented program
d Service-oriented program

5 Interactions with Other Trainees
a Fellows
b Nurse practitioners
c Physician assistants

6 Interview Day Experience
a Experience with co-applicants
b Faculty interaction during interview/visit
c Food
i Breakfast
ii Lunch
iii Pre-interview dinner
d Gifts
e Overall organization and logistics
f Program did not offer financial assistance
g Resident interaction during visit
h Staff interaction during visit
i Travel cost

7 Resident Experience
a Camaraderie amongst residents
b Career development
i Unsuccessful fellowship placements

1 External fellowship placement
2 Internal fellowship placement
ii Unsuccessful job placement
c Educational experience
i Academic time
ii Didactics
iii Emphasis on boards preparation
iv Low board passage rates
d Negative work-life balance
e Not likeable residents
f Perceived resident unhappiness
g Resident class size
h Resident feedback is not taken seriously
i Track record/background of residents
j Academic performance of residents
ii Prestige of medical schools
iii Research output of current residents

8 Staff Support
a Administrative support
b Ancillary clinical staff
c GME support
d Research staff support

9 Workplace Characteristics
a Benefits
i Disability insurance
ii Health insurance
iii Life insurance
iv Paternal/maternal leave
b Block schedule
c Hours
i Exceeds duty hours
ii High call
iii Poor hours
d Perks
e Salary
i Moonlighting opportunities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Major Feature</th>
<th>Count (%)</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Major Feature</th>
<th>Count (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>203 (5)</td>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>35 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>53 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>21 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>47 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>32 (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>4 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>43 (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>12 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>26 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>251 (6)</td>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>21 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>70 (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>35 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>249 (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>21 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>208 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>22 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>217 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>22 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>43 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>14 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>1115 (25)</td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>267 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>332 (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>116 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>249 (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>56 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>208 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>21 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>217 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>22 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>43 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>14 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>152 (3)</td>
<td>Plastics</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>39 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>24 (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>14 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>38 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>13 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>55 (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>26 (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>10 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Surgery</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td>General Surgery</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>6 (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>1 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>2 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBGYN</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>165 (4)</td>
<td>OBGYN</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>60 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>46 (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>20 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>40 (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>10 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>34 (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>14 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>11 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>1270 (28)</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>604 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>409 (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>309 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>247 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>52 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>289 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>109 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>183 (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>36 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>52 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>32 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>1093 (24)</td>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>559 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>285 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>235 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>303 (27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>137 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>Major Feature</td>
<td>Count (%)</td>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>Major Feature</td>
<td>Count (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>216 (20)</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>23 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>41 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>35 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>27 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>46 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>98 (35)</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>77 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>51 (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Experience</td>
<td>17 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>53 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Experience</td>
<td>15 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>14 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Characteristics</td>
<td>27 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interview Day Experience</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Day Experience</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>