Title: A Match Made in Cyberspace: Applicant Perspectives on a Virtual Residency Application Process

Authors: Shirley Chen, B.S.[1*]; Melanie Schroeder, B.S.[2*]; Thomas Kun Pak, B.A.[3]; Natasha Topolski, B.S.[4]; Emelyn Zaworski, B.S.[5]; Kseniya Anishchenko, B.A.[6]; Shyon Parsa, B.S.[7]; Christina Zhu, B.S. B.A.[8]; Esther Bae, B.S.[9]; Whitney Stuard, Ph.D.[10]; Jay Patel, B.S.[11]; Shanon Quach, B.S.[12]; Sahar Panjwani, B.S.[13]

[1]S. Chen is a medical student at Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee.

[2]M. Schroeder is a medical student at University of Arizona College of Medicine - Phoenix, Phoenix, Arizona.

[3]T.K Pak is a medical student at University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

[4]N. Topolski is a medical student at the McGovern Medical School at University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston, Texas.

[5]E. Zaworski is a medical student at the Medical College of Wisconsin, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin.

[6]K. Anishchenko is a medical student at the University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado.

[7]S. Parsa is a medical student at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School, Dallas, Texas.

[8]C. Zhu is a medical student at Texas Tech University Health Science Center School of Medicine, Lubbock, Texas.

[9]E. Bae is a medical student at Wayne State University School of Medicine, Detroit, Michigan.

[10]W. Stuard is a medical student at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School, Dallas, Texas.

[11]J. Patel is a medical student at the University of Tennessee Health Science Center College of Medicine, Memphis, Tennessee.

[12]S. Quach is a medical student at the University of North Texas Health Science Center, Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine, Fort Worth, Texas.

[13]S. Panjwani is a medical student at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley School of Medicine, Edinburg, Texas.

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Prior Presentations

This work will be presented virtually as a poster at the American Medical Student Association's 72nd Annual Convention in April 2022.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Joseph Camerano, Rijul Asri, Ryan Chiu, Samuel Neher, Norman Farr, Matthew McEchron, Brian Drolet, and Christine Ford, and the other individuals who assisted with the development and distribution of this survey.

Disclaimer

No direct funding was provided for this study. The authors have no financial interests to declare in relation to the content of this article.

Corresponding Author

Shirley Chen

3000 Vanderbilt Pl Apt 402

Nashville, TN 37212

Phone: 734-837-2139

Fax: not applicable

Email: xueni@umich.edu

Word Counts

Abstract: 249

Manuscript: 2496

Abstract

Background: The COVID-19 pandemic precipitated an entirely virtual 2020-2021 residency application cycle. With many specialties continuing virtual interviews, it remains essential to evaluate all stakeholders perspectives.

Objective: This study aimed to evaluate applicants' perspectives on the completely virtual 2020-2021 Match.

Methods: An online survey utilizing Likert scale and free response questions was distributed to residency applicants in 2021 post-Match to query their perspectives on the virtual application cycle.

Results: Participants (n=158/2811, 5% estimated response rate) represented 24 states and applied to 31 specialties. Most were satisfied with their Match experience (73.1%) and thought virtual interviews should continue (68.6%). However, applicants felt that the virtual setting permitted interview hoarding (73.9%) and that their medical school did not provide adequate electronic equipment (66.1%). Applicants found Twitter (78.4%) and Instagram (69.1%) to be helpful social media platforms for evaluating fit. While many applicants (56.9%) did not support application limits, most supported interview limits (62.7%) and preference signaling mechanisms (59.7%). Free responses data elucidated applicants' views on how the virtual Match impacted financial access, evaluation of program culture, and the future of residency interviews.

Conclusions: Our study highlights that, across geography and specialty, many applicants support virtual interviews continuing. It also offers insight into how medical schools and residency programs can support applicants in the virtual environment. Additionally, the virtual setting provides an opportunity to evaluate mechanisms for addressing congestion within the Match, with most applicants supporting interview caps and preference signaling.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic caused a paradigm shift in the residency application process, with precautions requiring the suspension of in-person away rotations and pivoting to virtual interviews during the 2020-2021 cycle.[1–3]

Existing studies on the 2020-2021 virtual application process surveyed applicants before interviews occurred, asked residents in the context of fellowship applications, or assessed how faculty viewed virtual interviews.[4–10] While studies indicate that fellowship program directors prefer in-person interviews, residents applying for fellowship expressed mixed opinions about whether virtual interviews should continue.[5–10] Fellowship applicants noted the financial and time benefits of virtual interviews but expressed concerns with evaluating fit.[5–8] A comprehensive evaluation of a virtual Match process requires input from all stakeholders, including applicants to residency positions. The data remain unclear regarding whether this population wants virtual interviews to continue.[4,5,8]

One noted benefit of virtual interviews is the greatly reduced monetary commitment. Before the pandemic, there were calls for change regarding the financial costs of residency applications, with several studies finding that video interviews could be a cost-saving alternative to traditional in-person interviews.[11–15] The 2020-2021 Match confirmed this, as the virtual application process was estimated to save candidates nearly $6,000.[16] The switch to virtual interviews also sparked a surge in residency programs' social media presence.[17–20] However, the utility of social media and other remote resources such as websites and virtual programming for applicants remains unclear. Another area of study is evaluating policies that address the increasing number of applications and interviews per applicant.[21] Finally, virtual interviews may

exacerbate inequities for those without access to electronic equipment and high-speed Internet, a phenomenon termed digital redlining.[22–24]

Our study aims to evaluate applicants' perspectives on the 2020-2021 virtual residency application cycle. We identified three key outcomes: [1] general thoughts including overall satisfaction and concerns with the virtual environment, [2] utility of resources provided by programs for evaluating fit, and [3] perspectives on changes to make during future cycles .

Methods

This study aimed to characterize applicants' perspectives post-Match on the impact of a completely virtual setting on the 2020-2021 residency application process. A survey was distributed through a national medical student organization email list and grassroots social media efforts.

Given that the 2020-2021 cycle was the first completely virtual residency application process, no prior surveys were available to assess student opinions on this topic. Therefore, a 30-question survey instrument was developed by consulting members of a national medical student committee focused on medical education, 2020-2021 residency applicants, and survey methodology experts. Surveys by the National Resident Matching Program and specific specialties were also referenced.

Five M.D. and/or Ph.D. methodology experts evaluated the appropriateness of our instrument in addressing the study's objectives as part of pre-testing. A pilot study was then conducted with 20 fourth-year medical students to ensure question clarity prior to wide distribution.

We identified three key outcomes to assess: [1] general thoughts, [2] program resources, and [3] perspectives on future cycles. First, it was important to characterize applicants' overall satisfaction with the cycle and concerns unique to the virtual setting. Second, given how applicants were not able to visit programs in-person, we aimed to identify what resources provided by residencies were most useful for determining compatibility with a program. Third, we assessed applicant opinions on policies to implement during future cycles in response to the virtual setting.

Most questions utilized a 5-point Likert scale by which students either rated their agreement with statements about the application cycle or the helpfulness of listed resources. Five free response questions allowed applicants to elaborate on their application experience. The survey instrument can be accessed in the online supplemental content.

Response percentages, 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and statistical significance were calculated using a customized Python computing package.[25] For analysis of survey items using Likert scales, categories of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" were grouped together as "Agree", "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" were grouped together as "Disagree", "Helpful" and "Extremely Helpful" were grouped together as "Helpful", and "Unhelpful" and "Extremely Unhelpful" were grouped together as "Unhelpful".[26] Statistical significance was determined by testing for overlap among the 95% CIs for "Agree", "Neutral", and "Disagree" for questions asking about agreement with a statement and "Helpful", "Neutral", and "Unhelpful" for questions asking about the helpfulness of a resource. For analysis of free response questions, three independent reviewers identified common themes that provided nuance to the Likert scale results. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion among the analysts.

The Vanderbilt Human Research Protections Program granted this study Institutional Review Board exemption.

Results

The survey was emailed to members of a national medical student organization. 11,243 students viewed the correspondence and, of those, we estimate that 25% were eligible to participate since students apply to residency during their last year of medical school. Therefore, we conclude that 2,811 email recipients met study criteria. Given that grassroots social media efforts were also utilized, students contacted via social media likely overlapped with students contacted via the national organization. It is therefore not possible to determine the exact numbers of students reached with these combined methods. With a total of 158 responses, we conservatively estimate our response rate to be approximately 5%. This survey captured individuals from 24 states who applied into 31 specialties, including 8 combined specialty programs (Table 1).

Benefits and concerns with a virtual residency application process

The majority of respondents were satisfied with their 2020-2021 Match experience (114 of 156 [73.1%]; $P<0.05$; 95% CI 66.1-80.0; Table 2). When asked if they thought the virtual setting allowed more students to hoard interviews, a significant proportion of respondents agreed (116 of 157 [73.9%]; $P<0.05$; 95% CI 67.0-80.8; Table 2). Most respondents agreed that the lack of in-person away rotations limited their ability to evaluate programs (81 of 157 [51.6%]; $P<0.05$; 95% CI 43.8-59.4; Table 2). Furthermore, ranking residency programs was a concern, with a majority agreeing that the virtual setting made the ranking process challenging (98 of 157 [62.4%]; $P<0.05$; 95% CI 54.8-70.0; Table 2).

Nearly all respondents agreed that the virtual setting increased financial access to interviews (151 of 154 [98.1%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 95.9-100; Table 2), and the majority agreed that they were able to attend more interviews because of reduced financial constraints (122 of 157 [77.7%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 71.2-84.2; Table 2). Beyond finances, most respondents agreed that they had the necessary resources to complete residency interviews (132 of 155 [85.2%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 79.6-90.8; Table 2). However, while a majority agreed that their school provided sufficient physical space for virtual interviews (79 of 132 [59.8%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 51.5-68.2; Table 2) and sufficient guidance on how to interview virtually (95 of 150 [63.3%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 55.6-71.0; Table 2), most respondents did not believe that their medical school provided adequate electronic equipment for virtual interviews (78 of 118 [66.1%]; P< 0.05; 95% CI 57.6-74.6; Table 2).

Utility of resources provided by residency programs in evaluating fit

When assessing compatibility with a program, the majority of respondents agreed that Twitter (58 of 74 [78.4%]; P<0.05%; 95% CI 69.0-87.8; Table 3) and Instagram (76 of 110 [69.1%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 60.5-77.7; Table 3) were helpful. Conversely, a majority thought that Tik Tok was unhelpful (12 of 17 [70.6%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 48.9-92.2; Table 3)

Interestingly, while respondents agreed that all aspects of program websites were helpful and most programming organized by residencies were helpful, virtual second looks (26 of 68 [38.2%]; P>0.05; 95% CI 26.7-49.8; Table 3), informal conversations with other applicants (61 of 117 [52.1%]; P>0.05; 95% CI 43.1-61.2; Table 3), and resident or faculty social media accounts (56 of 104 [53.8%]; P>0.05; 95% CI 44.3-63.4; Table 3) were not found to be significantly helpful by respondents.

Changes to the residency application process

When asked about future application cycles, the majority of respondents did not support an application limit (87 of 153 [56.9%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 49.0-64.7; Table 4) but supported an interview limit (96 of 153 [62.7%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 55.1-70.4; Table 4). Most also agreed with implementing a preference signaling mechanism to indicate genuine interest in a program (89 of 149 [59.7%]; P<0.05; 95% CI 51.9-67.6; Table 4). Finally, the majority of respondents thought that residency programs should continue to provide virtual interviews even when in-person interviews are again possible (105 of 153 [68.6%]; P<0.05; CI 61.3-76.0; Table 4).

Additional insights from free response questions

The free response comments add nuance to the Likert scale findings outlined above. Five major themes emerged: [1] Financial access: while virtual interviews can improve equity by increasing financial access, respondents expressed that finances should not be the only consideration when deciding whether to continue virtual interviews. [2] Interview resources: access to resources varied greatly among participants, and provision of resources by medical schools—including physical space, electronic equipment, and preparation tools such as third party mock interview software—were highly valued by applicants. [3] Online presence: a residency's online presence greatly impacted applicants' perception of the program, but concerns existed about the role of social media in future cycles, including the possibility of students being required to utilize social media during this process and programs evaluating applicants by their social media presence. [4] Evaluation of program culture: several factors hindered applicants' ability to evaluate fit with a program, including a lack of meaningful interactions with residents and faculty, an inability to observe the hospital environment, and the possibility of programs curating their online presence. [5] Future of residency interviews: respondents had conflicting opinions about the future of residency interviews, with many concerned about equity regarding

optional virtual interviews. Additional insights and illustrative quotes can be found in Supplemental Tables 1-5.

Discussion

Most applicants were satisfied with the 2020-2021 Match and wanted residencies to continue providing virtual interviews. However, many expressed equity concerns including greater opportunities for interview hoarding and disparities in resources provided by medical schools. For determining fit, Instagram and Twitter were found to be particularly helpful social media platforms, and information on official program websites was consistently found to be helpful. The majority of applicants supported a preference signaling mechanism and interview limit, but only a minority supported an application limit.

Pre-pandemic studies disagreed on whether applicants preferred virtual interviews to the traditional in-person format.[27,28] Those supporting virtual interviews primarily did so due to financial considerations.[28] Our survey of applicants who participated in a completely virtual residency application process demonstrated that the majority were satisfied with their Match experience and want virtual interviews to continue. However, free response comments indicated equity concerns if virtual interviews are offered as an alternative to in-person interviews due to the travel costs associated with the in-person format. Although our study was concordant with past studies finding that most applicants felt they had adequate resources to complete virtual interviews, a majority of our participants thought that their schools did not provide sufficient electronic resources.[2] As virtual interviews continue, this could be an opportunity for medical schools to combat digital redlining by providing students with the technology required to succeed in the virtual setting.[29–31] A recognized disadvantage of virtual interviews is the

difficulty applicants have with evaluating compatibility with a program.[27] This is evidenced by how most of our study participants agreed that a completely virtual application process made ranking programs more challenging. To address the challenge of evaluating fit virtually, applicants have increasingly relied on the social media presence of programs.[32,33] Few studies have evaluated the utility of social media platforms for applicants in this context. Interestingly, one pre-pandemic study found that students did not believe Twitter or Instagram presence to be important when evaluating residency programs.[27] Our results suggest that not only did study participants find Instagram and Twitter to be helpful when evaluating program compatibility, they also found websites on the whole and most programming organized by residencies to be helpful. However, free response comments expressed caution with this increased reliance on social media due to the potential for developing bias towards students more active on social media.

Our study found that the abrupt adoption of virtual interviews raised other concerns. One was students' increased ability to hoard interviews in the virtual setting. Possible means to address this include application and interview limits, with our study only demonstrating majority support for the latter. Interestingly, a few specialties—emergency medicine, ophthalmology, and psychiatry— implemented interview caps for the 2021-2022 cycle.[34,35] Additionally, most of our study participants supported preference signaling to address the congestion associated with the increasing number of applications residency programs receive.[21] Otolaryngology implemented a preference signaling system during the 2020-2021 Match, and the majority of the participants were satisfied with their experience.[36] During the 2021-2022 cycle, more specialties—internal medicine, dermatology, and general surgery—are utilizing a preference signaling mechanism within their supplemental applications.[37] With more widespread adoption of both interview limits

and preference signaling, it remains to be seen how these new policies will be received by Match stakeholders. Considering these findings and results from other studies, we propose four recommendations (Figure 1).[2,27,28,30,31,34–41]

Our study has several limitations. Given that survey participation was voluntary, there was potential for response bias towards applicants with particularly strong feelings about their Match experience. Despite extensive grassroots efforts, we collected responses from only a small fraction of all Match participants, limiting analysis based on applicant identity, geography, and specialty. Additionally, since all survey items were optional, there were variable response rates across questions. Due to the lack of standardized survey instruments on this topic, we developed our own survey questions and are only able to demonstrate internal validity through pilot testing. Further research on this topic with larger sample sizes or qualitative methodology is needed to solidify students' perspectives on this topic

Future directions for our study include assessing applicant satisfaction with interview caps and preference signaling in the virtual setting. With the possibility of in-person interviews continuing, applicant satisfaction with a hybrid interview process should also be evaluated.

Conclusions

Our study demonstrates that, across specialty and geography, Match participants support virtual interviews. Residencies can help applicants better evaluate program compatibility by investing in social media, official websites, and virtual programming, while medical schools can combat potential disparities by providing students with the resources needed for virtual interviews. Residency applicants also support interview caps and preference signaling to address

the high number of applications residency programs receive and the greater potential to hoard interviews in the virtual setting.

References

1. Hammoud MM, Standiford T, Carmody JB. Potential Implications of COVID-19 for the 2020-2021 Residency Application Cycle. *JAMA*. 2020;324(1):29-30. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8911
2. Chandratre S, Soman A. Preparing for the interviewing process during Coronavirus disease-19 pandemic: Virtual interviewing experiences of applicants and interviewers, a systematic review. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(12):e0243415. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0243415
3. Temsah MH, Alkhattabi F, Aljamaan F, et al. Remote interviews for medical residency selection during the initial COVID-19 crisis: a national survey. *BMC Med Educ*. 2021;21(1):462. doi:10.1186/s12909-021-02890-7
4. Izreig S, Torabi SJ, Kasle DA, Rahmati RW, Manes RP. Otolaryngology Match 2020-21: Survey of Prospective Applicants in the Setting of COVID-19. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol*. 2021;130(5):450-458. doi:10.1177/0003489420952470
5. Ding JJ, Has P, Hampton BS, Burrell D. Obstetrics and gynecology resident perception of virtual fellowship interviews. *BMC Med Educ*. 2022;22(1):58. doi:10.1186/s12909-022-03113-3
6. Lewkowitz AK, Ramsey PS, Burrell D, Metz TD, Rhoades JS. Effect of virtual interviewing on applicant approach to and perspective of the Maternal-Fetal Medicine Subspecialty Fellowship Match. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2021;3(3):100326. doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2021.100326
7. Geary AD, Wang TS, Lindeman B, et al. Perspectives on virtual interviews-A follow-up study of the Comprehensive Endocrine Surgery Fellowship interview process. *Surgery*. 2022;171(1):259-264. doi:10.1016/j.surg.2021.03.069

8. Strumpf Z, Miller C, Livingston D, Shaman Z, Matta M. Virtual Interviews: Challenges and Opportunities for Pulmonary Disease and Critical Care Medicine Fellowship Programs. *Sch*. 2021;2(4):535-543. doi:10.34197/ats-scholar.2021-0043PS
9. Menhaji K, Gaigbe-Togbe BH, Hardart A, et al. Virtual Interviews During COVID-19: Perspectives of Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery Program Directors. *Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg*. 2021;27(9):575-580. doi:10.1097/SPV.0000000000000982
10. Sarac BA, Shen AH, Nassar AH, et al. Virtual Interviews for the Integrated Plastic Surgery Residency Match: The Program Director Perspective. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 2021;9(7):e3707. doi:10.1097/GOX.0000000000003707
11. Hariton E, Bortoletto P, Ayogu N. Using Video-Conference Interviews in the Residency Application Process. *Acad Med*. 2017;92(6):728-729. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000001695
12. Hanson, Melanie. Average Medical School Debt EducationData.org,.https://educationdata.org/average-medical-school-debt. Published December 9, 2021. Accessed February 7, 2022.
13. Nilsen KM, Walling A, Grothusen J, Irwin G, Meyer M, Unruh G. Time and Financial Costs for Students Participating in the National Residency Matching Program (the Match©): 2015 to 2020. *Kans J Med*. 2021;14:53-63. doi:10.17161/kjm.vol1414568
14. The Doctor is Out. Rising Student Loan Debt and the Decline of the Small Medical Practice. Published online June 11, 2019. https://www.aamc.org/system/files/c/1/498034-aamcstatementtothehousesmallbusinesscommitteeregardingmedicaled.pdf
15. Shah SK, Arora S, Skipper B, Kalishman S, Timm TC, Smith AY. Randomized evaluation of a web based interview process for urology resident selection. *J Urol*. 2012;187(4):1380-

1384. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2011.11.108

16. Vining CC, Eng OS, Hogg ME, et al. Virtual Surgical Fellowship Recruitment During COVID-19 and Its Implications for Resident/Fellow Recruitment in the Future. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2020;27(Suppl 3):911-915. doi:10.1245/s10434-020-08623-2
17. Lee DC, Kofskey AM, Singh NP, King TW, Piennette PD. Adaptations in anesthesiology residency programs amid the COVID-19 pandemic: virtual approaches to applicant recruitment. *BMC Med Educ*. 2021;21(1):464. doi:10.1186/s12909-021-02895-2
18. Bram JT, Jia L, Huffman W, Ahn J. Orthopaedic Surgery Residency Program Social Media Presence During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JB JS Open Access*. 2021;6(4):e21.00073. doi:10.2106/JBJS.OA.21.00073
19. Nelson DB, White PT, Rajaram R, Antonoff MB. Showcasing Your Cardiothoracic Training Program in the Virtual Era. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2021;111(4):1102-1110. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2021.01.022
20. Yong TM, Pappas MA, Ray GS, McManus TG, Coe MP. Analyzing the Proliferation of Social Media Use Among Orthopaedic Surgery Residency Programs. *JB JS Open Access*. 2021;6(3):e21.00017. doi:10.2106/JBJS.OA.21.00017
21. Carmody JB, Rosman IS, Carlson JC. Application Fever: Reviewing the Causes, Costs, and Cures for Residency Application Inflation. *Cureus*. 2021;13(3):e13804. doi:10.7759/cureus.13804
22. Pasadhika S, Altenbernd T, Ober RR, Harvey EM, Miller JM. Residency interview video conferencing. *Ophthalmology*. 2012;119(2):426-426.e5. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2011.09.032
23. Daram SR, Wu R, Tang SJ. Interview from anywhere: feasibility and utility of web-based videoconference interviews in the gastroenterology fellowship selection process. *Am J*

Gastroenterol. 2014;109(2):155-159. doi:10.1038/ajg.2013.278

24. Tseng J. How Has COVID-19 Affected the Costs of the Surgical Fellowship Interview Process? *J Surg Educ*. 2020;77(5):999-1004. doi:10.1016/j.jsurg.2020.05.018
25. Chen S. CME Project Survey Analysis. Published March 9, 2021. Accessed March 9, 2021. https://github.com/melmschr/CMEproject/blob/main/survey_analysis.ipynb
26. Sullivan GM, Artino AR Jr. Analyzing and Interpreting Data From Likert-Type Scales. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2013;5(4):541-542. doi:10.4300/JGME-5-4-18
27. Shreffler J, Platt M, Thé S, Huecker M. Planning virtual residency interviews as a result of COVID-19: insight from residency applicants and physicians conducting interviews. *Postgrad Med J*. Published online January 26, 2021. doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2020-139182
28. Seifi A, Mirahmadizadeh A, Eslami V. Perception of medical students and residents about virtual interviews for residency applications in the United States. *PloS One*. 2020;15(8):e0238239-e0238239. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0238239
29. Marbin J, Hutchinson YV, Schaeffer S. Avoiding the Virtual Pitfall: Identifying and Mitigating Biases in Graduate Medical Education Videoconference Interviews. *Acad Med*. Published online January 2021. doi:10.1097/acm.0000000000003914
30. Hoffman DL, Novak TP, Schlosser A. The Evolution of the Digital Divide: How Gaps in Internet Access May Impact Electronic Commerce. *J Comput-Mediat Commun*. 2000;5(3). doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2000.tb00341.x
31. Jackson DA. Digital Redlining: How Major American Communication Companies Are Controlling Who Gets Broadband Access or Not. Atlanta Black Star. Published April 6, 2017. Accessed October 17, 2021. https://atlantablackstar.com/2017/04/06/digital-redlining-major-american-communication-companies-controlling-gets-broadband-access-not/

32. Rohde SC, White EM, Yoo PS. Residency Program Use of Social Media in the COVID-19 Era: An Applicant's Perspective. *J Surg Educ*. 2021;78(4):1066-1068. doi:10.1016/j.jsurg.2020.12.011
33. Irwin TJ, Riesel JN, Ortiz R, Helliwell LA, Lin SJ, Eberlin KR. The Impact of Social Media on Plastic Surgery Residency Applicants. *Ann Plast Surg*. 2021;86(3):335-339. doi:10.1097/SAP.0000000000002375
34. *EMRA and CORD Student Advising Guide*. Accessed October 17, 2021. http://www.emra.org/books/msadvisingguide/msag-2022-guidance/
35. Consensus Statement on the 2020-2021 Residency Application Process. Accessed October 17, 2021. http://www.emra.org/be-involved/be-an-advocate/working-for-you/residency-application-process/
36. Pletcher SD, Chang CWD, Thorne MC, Malekzadeh S. The Otolaryngology Residency Program Preference Signaling Experience. *Acad Med*. Published online 9000. https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/9000/The_Otolaryngology_Residency_Program_Preference.96517.aspx
37. About the supplemental ERAS application. AAMC. Accessed October 17, 2021. https://students-residents.aamc.org/applying-residencies-eras/about-supplemental-eras-application
38. Gaini RR, Patel KM, Khan SA, Singh NP, Love MN. A rise in social media utilization by U.S. neurology residency programs in the era of COVID-19. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. 2021;207:106717. doi:10.1016/j.clineuro.2021.106717
39. Walk CT, Gerardo R, Parikh PP. Increasing Social Media Presence for Graduate Medical Education Programs. *Am Surg*. Published online July 10, 2021:00031348211031848.

doi:10.1177/00031348211031848

40. Clay Pruett J, Deneen K, Turner H, et al. Social Media Changes in Pediatric Residency Programs During COVID-19 Pandemic. *Acad Pediatr*. 2021;21(7):1104-1107. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2021.06.004

41. ERAS Statistics. AAMC. Accessed October 17, 2021. https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/interactive-data/eras-statistics-data

Table 1: Characteristics of survey respondents

Characteristic	% of Respondents
Degree Pursued (n=158)	
MD	71.5 (113/158)
MD/PhD	4.4 (7/158)
MD/MPH	4.4 (7/158)
DO	17.0 (27/158)
DO/MPH	0.6 (1/158)
Other	1.9 (3/158
Gender (n=158)	
Female	58.9 (93/158)
Male	38.6 (61/158)
Non-Binary	1.2 (2/158)
Prefer Not to Answer	1.2 (2/158)
Ethnicity (n=158)	
Non-Hispanic White	60.1 (95/158)
Asian	15.8 (25/158)
Hispanic/Latino	13.3 (21/158)
Non-Hispanic Black/African American	3.8 (6/158)
Multiracial[a]	3.8 (6/158)
Other	0.6 (1/158)
Prefer Not to Answer	2.5 (4/158)
Match Result (n=158)	
Matched	95.6 (151/158)
Unmatched	3.8 (6/158)
Prefer Not to Answer	0.6 (1/158)

Geographic Region (n=158)[b]	
South	43.0 (68/158)
Midwest	26.6 (42/158)
West	23.4 (37/158)
Northeast	5.7 (9/158)
International	1.3 (2/158)
Specialty Pursued (n=158)	
Non-surgical Specialties or Translational Year	75.3 (119/158)
Surgical Specialties	22.2 (35/158)
Both	2.5 (4/158)
Number of Specialities Pursued (n=158)	
1	79.1 (125/158)
2	18.4 (29/158)
>2	2.5 (4/158)

[a]*Multiracial includes all participants that selected more than one race or ethnicity*

[b]*West – Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington; South – Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington, D.C., West Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas; Midwest – Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota; Northeast – Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania*

Table 2: General applicant perspectives on a virtual Match[a]

Statement	% Disagree, *[95% CI]*	% Neutral, *[95% CI]*	% Agree, *[95% CI]*
Overall, I am satisfied with my residency application/virtual interview experience this year. (n=156)	18.6 (29/156), *[12.5-24.7]*	8.3 (13/156), *[4.0-12.7]*	**73.1 (114/156)** ***[66.1-80.0]***
I feel that the virtual setting allowed more students to 'hoard' interviews. (n=157)	9.6 (15/157), *[5.0-14.2]*	16.6 (26/157), *[10.7-22.4]*	**73.9 (116/157),** ***[67.0-80.8]***
The virtual setting made it difficult to be myself when interacting with programs. (n=157)	44.6 (70/157), *[36.8-52.4]*	18.5 (29/157), *[12.4-24.5]*	36.9 (58/157), *[29.4-44.5]*
The virtual setting decreases an applicant's ability to show genuine interest in a program. (n=154)	35.1 (54/154), *[27.5-42.6]*	16.2 (25/154), *[10.4-22.1]*	48.7 (75/154), *[40.8-56.6]*
The lack of in-person away rotations limited my ability to assess residency programs. (n=157)	26.1 (41/157), *[19.2- 33.0]*	22.3 (35/157), *[15.8-28.8]*	**51.6 (81/157),** ***[43.8-59.4]***
The virtual setting allowed me to effectively evaluate my 'fit' within a program. (n=157)	36.9 (58/157), *[29.4-44.5]*	22.9 (36/157), *[16.4-29.5]*	40.1 (63/157), *[32.5-47.8]*
The virtual setting made the ranking process challenging. (n=157)	23.6 (37/157) *[16.9-30.2]*	14.0 (22/157), *[8.6-19.4]*	**62.4 (98/157),** ***[54.8-70.0]***
The virtual setting increases financial access to interviews. (n=157)	X[b]	1.9 (3/157), *[0-4.1]*	**98.1 (154/157),** ***[95.9-100]***

The virtual setting allowed me to attend more interviews because of reduced financial constraints. (n=157)	6.4 (10/157), *[2.5-10.2]*	15.9 (25/157), *[10.2-21.6]*	**77.7 (122/157), *[71.2-84.2]***
I felt that I had the resources to successfully complete my residency interviews. (n=155)	5.8 (9/155), *[2.1-9.5]*	9.0 (14/155), *[4.5-13.5]*	**85.2 (132/155), *[79.6-90.8]***
My school provided adequate physical space for virtual interviews. (n=132)	30.3 (40/132), *[22.5-38.1]*	9.8 (13/132), *[4.8-14.9]*	**59.8 (79/132), *[51.5-68.2]***
My school provided adequate coaching and/or guidance on how to prepare for virtual interviews. (n=150)	18.7 (28/150), *[12.4-24.9]*	18.0 (27/150), *[11.9-24.1]*	**63.3 (95/150), *[55.6-71.0]***
My school provided adequate electronic equipment (webcams, lights, etc.) for virtual interviews. (n=118)	**66.1 (78/118), *[57.6-74.6]***	12.7 (15/118), *[6.7-18.7]*	21.2 (25/118), *[13.8-28.6]*

[a]*Bolded text indicates statistically significant result (P < 0.05)*

[b]*0 responses for this answer choice*

Table 3: Applicant perspectives on helpfulness of residency program resources[a]

Statement	% Unhelpful, *[95% CI]*	% Neutral, *[95% CI]*	% Helpful, *[95% CI]*
Social Media Platform			
Facebook (n=48)	35.4 (17/48), *[21.9-48.9]*	58.3 (28/48), *[44.4-72.3]*	6.3 (3/48), *[0-13.1]*
Instagram (n=110)	11.8 (13/110), *[5.8-17.9]*	19.1 (21/110), *[11.7-26.4]*	**69.1 (76/110), *[60.5-77.7]***
LinkedIn (n=19)	63.2 (12/19), *[41.5-84.8]*	31.6 (6/19), *[10.7-52.5]*	5.3 (1/19), *[0-15.3]*
Twitter (n=74)	5.4 (4/74), *[0.3-10.6]*	16.2 (12/74), *[7.8-24.6]*	**78.4 (58/74), *[69.0-87.8]***
TikTok (n=17)	**70.6 (12/17), *[48.9-92.2]***	23.5 (4/17), *[3.4-43.7]*	5.9 (1/17), *[0-17.1]*
Programming			
Virtual away rotations/information sessions before interviews (n=94)	10.6 (10/94), *[4.4-16.9]*	16.0 (15/94), *[8.6-23.4]*	**73.4 (69/94), *[64.5-82.3]***
Virtual social hours before/after interviews (n=154)	11.0 (17/154), *[6.1-16.0]*	11.7 (18/154), *[6.6-16.8]*	**77.3 (119/154), *[70.7-83.9]***
Residency open houses (n=101)	8.9 (9/101), *[3.4-14.5]*	25.7 (26/101), *[17.2-34.3]*	**65.3 (66/101), *[56.1-74.6]***
Interview day presentations by program	2.6 (4/154),	13.0 (20/154),	**84.4 (130/154),**

directors/department chairs (n=154)	*[0.1-5.1]*	*[7.7-18.3]*	***[78.7-90.1]***
Formal interviews with faculty (n=155)	1.9 (3/155), *[0-4.1]*	10.3 (16/155), *[5.5-15.1]*	**87.7 (136/155),** ***[82.6-92.9]***
Formal interviews with residents (n=152)	1.3 (2/152), *[0-3.1]*	8.6 (13/152), *[4.1-13.0]*	**90.1 (137/152),** ***[85.4-94.9]***
Informal breakout rooms with residents during interview day (n=155)	7.7 (12/155), *[3.5-11.9]*	11.0 (17/155), *[6.0-15.9]*	**81.3 (126/155),** ***[75.2-87.4]***
Informal conversations with other applicants outside of interview day (n=117)	10.3 (12/117), *[4.8-15.8]*	37.6 (44/117), *[28.8-46.4]*	52.1 (61/117), *[43.1-61.2]*
Resident/faculty social media accounts (n=104)	8.7 (9/104), *[3.3-14.1]*	37.5 (39/104), *[28.2-46.8]*	53.8 (56/104), *[44.3-63.4]*
Virtual second looks (n=68)	16.2 (11/68), *[7.4-24.9]*	45.6 (31/68), *[33.8-57.4]*	38.2 (26/68), *[26.7-49.8]*
Website Element			
Virtual tours (n=147)	7.5 (11/147), *[3.2-11.7]*	21.8 (32/147), *[15.1-28.4]*	**70.7 (104/147),** ***[63.4-78.1]***
Resident testimonials (n=148)	6.1 (9/148), *[2.2-9.9]*	21.6 (32/148), *[15.0-28.3]*	**72.3 (107/148),** ***[65.1-79.5]***
Rotation/didactics schedule (n=152)	4.6 (7/152), *[1.3-7.9]*	21.1 (32/152), *[14.6-27.5]*	**74.3 (113/152),** ***[67.4-81.3]***
Call schedule (n=148)	4.7 (7/148),	20.3 (30/148),	**75.0 (111/148),**

	[1.3-8.2]	*[13.8-26.7]*	***[68.0-82.0]***
Resident benefits (e.g., salary/stipends, insurance, vacation, etc.) (n=152)	4.6 (7/152), *[1.3-7.9]*	18.4 (28/152), *[12.3-24.6]*	**77.0 (117/152), *[70.3-83.7]***
Information about the area (n=153)	0.7 (1/153), *[0-1.9]*	9.8 (15/153), *[5.1-14.5]*	**89.5 (137/153), *[84.7-94.4]***
Graduates' post-residency fellowship/job placement (n=153)	3.3 (5/153), *[0.5-6.1]*	13.7 (21/153), *[8.3-19.2]*	**83.0 (127/153), *[77.1-89.0]***
Surgical case data (i.e., case numbers/types) (n=82)	8.5 (7/82), *[2.5-14.6]*	24.4 (20/82), *[15.1-33.7]*	**67.1 (55/82), *[56.9-77.2]***
Current residents' bios/photos (n=151)	4.0 (6/151), *[0.9-7.1]*	21.9 (33/151), *[15.3-28.4]*	**74.2 (112/151), *[67.2-81.2]***
Faculty bios/photos (n=150)	6.0 (9/150), *[2.2-9.8]*	30.7 (46/150), *[23.3-38.0]*	**63.3 (95/150), *[55.6-71.0]***

[a]*Bolded text indicates statistically significant result ($P < 0.05$)*

Table 4: Applicant perspectives on future residency application cycles[a]

Statement	% Disagree, *[95% CI]*	% Neutral, *[95% CI]*	% Agree, *[95% CI]*
Applicants should only be permitted to APPLY to a limited number of programs. (n=153)	**56.9 (87/153), *[49.0-64.7]***	15.0 (23/153), *[9.4-20.7]*	28.1 (43/153), *[21.0-35.2]*
Applicants should only be permitted to INTERVIEW at a limited number of programs. (n=153)	27.5 (42/153), *[20.4-34.5]*	9.8 (15/153), *[5.1-14.5]*	**62.7, 96/153 *[55.1-70.4]***
Applicants should have a mechanism to indicate genuine interest in a program, commonly referred to as a token system. (n=149)	17.5 (26/149), *[11.4-23.5]*	22.8 (34/149), *[16.1-29.6]*	**59.7, 89/149 *[51.9-67.6]***
Residency programs should continue to provide virtual interviews as an option even when in-person interviews are offered. (n=153)	11.8 (18/153), *[6.7-16.9]*	19.6 (30/153), *[13.3-25.9]*	**68.6, 105/153 *[61.3-76.0]***

[a]*Bolded text indicates statistically significant result ($P < 0.05$)*