DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 638 HE 002 626

AUTHOR Van Fleet, David D.
TITLE Salaries of Males and Females: A Sample of Conditions at the University of Akron.
INSTITUTION Akron Univ., Ohio.
REPORT NO AAUP-SRS-1
PUB DATE Dec 70
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Employment Patterns; *Faculty; *Higher Education; Salaries; *Salary Differentials; *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire surveyed AAUP member at Akron. Data were collected regarding highest degree attained, primary work activity, academic rank, college or division in which employed, experience in both the primary work activity and in related activities, age, sex and salary. The primary conclusion reached by this study is that a persistent and uniformly one-sided difference exists between the salaries of males and females in favor of males. The difference is not only persistent, i.e., remains despite consideration of the factors above, but is large enough to be important. The greatest difference was between mean salaries, 25.5%. The least difference, 8.5%, was found when groups were matched on four variables--highest degree held, primary work activity, academic rank, and college or division. The characteristics for a female with a terminal degree (doctorate) are almost identical to the characteristics for a male with only a masters degree. Data are presented in tables accompanying the text. (LR)

AAUP SPECIAL RESEARCH STUDY #1

SALARIES OF MALES AND FEMALES:
A SAMPLE OF CONDITIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

by

David D. Van Fleet, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Management
The University of Akron

December 1970

Foreword

This report presents the findings of a salary study conducted for The University of Akron Chapter of the American Association of University Professors. The study was initiated by Dr. Van Fleet and approved by the Executive Committee of the Chapter.

The investigator expresses his gratitude to all who cooperated and hopes that the study will provide valuable information and establish a pattern for research by other AAUP members.

SA[illegible]ES O[illegible]ALES [illegible]LE
A SAMPLE O[illegible]ITIO[illegible]AT THE [illegible]ERI[illegible]O[illegible]N

Introduction

American women have been gradually eroding the discrimination against them since the formation of this country. In 1920 women obtained the right to vote; and during World War I they entered the work force in increasing numbers and began to perform jobs previously performed only by men.[1] Concern over working conditions was evident in the creation of the Women-In-Industry Service in 1918 and in the Women's Bureau in 1920; but compensation was left to the "free enterprise" system.[2] Gradually, however, that area also became a matter of concern. In 1919 the first equal-pay law was enacted by a state; but as late as 1965, only 24 states had such laws.[3]

Concern and state laws were not sufficient for lessening the compensation differential, though -- in 1960 the differential in men's and women's incomes was greater than it had been ten years earlier.[4] Thus, in 1963 the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended to provide that men and women performing equal work should receive equal pay.[5] Also, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (especially Title VII) included elimination of sex as a factor in discrimination.[6] But the differential has persisted.[7] Studies by the Civil Service Commission[8] have revealed that women are generally in lower pay grades than their male counterparts who have comparable levels of education and years of service. Women who were found in higher pay grades than men had a higher education level and were somewhat older than the men.

But surely such practices would not be found in higher education. Education reduces prejudice -- doesn't it? Hence, college administrators would not be guilty of discrimination -- would they? They might indeed, according to studies of professional salaries conducted by the American Economic Association using data gathered by the National Science Foundation. In 1965 an AEA report stated: "Even when all six other factors in salary differences are simultaneously taken into account, . . . the net salary differences associated with sex remain statistically significant."[9] Again in 1968: "Even when account is taken of the different distributions of the sexes by other salary-influencing factors, the net effect of sex was to reduce the salaries of women 16 per cent below that of men in the professions generally and by [illegible] per cent in the economics profession."[10] And further: "The net difference [of sex] was highly significant statistically, and large enough to be important to those on the short end."[11] In 1970 a pattern similar to that reported in the Civil Service Commission's reports was found in a study of academic salaries.[12]

Findings

Do such differences exist at The University of Akron? To answer that question a survey of members of The University of Akron Chapter of AAUP was conducted. Questionnaires were sent to all AAUP members (approximately 300) and 156 were returned. Data were collected regarding highest degree attained, primary work activity, academic rank, college or division in which employed, experience in both the primary work activity and in related activities, age, sex, and salary.

As indicated in Table I, the mean salary[13] of males was found to be 25.5 percent higher than that of females. The data in Table I further suggest that the sample is a reasonably good approximation of the total University population. The somewhat lower values of the sample reflect the greater relative proportion of females to males in the sample.[14]

By Age and Experience. This differential pay pattern is quite persistent. If the average 9-month salaries of females and males for different age groups is considered, the differential increases and then decreases (see Table II). Obviously, that is the result of experience -- obviously? Table III indicates that the relationship, as indicated by the correlation coefficient, between years of experience in the primary work activity is stronger for females than it is for males; on the other hand, the relationship for related activity is stronger for males. But the relationships for total experience are about the same. One possible explanation of these data is that, at lower age/experience levels, more females than males have only Master's degrees while at higher levels the proportions become more equal. The data in Table IV, however, suggest that this is not the case.

By Academic Rank. As indicated by the data in Table IV, female salary values are less than those of males at all ranks. The mean difference is least at the Associate Professor level; the median difference is least at the Assistant Professor level; and the high and low extreme differences are least at the Instructor level. As previously indicated, experience does not account for the differences since for all professorial levels the males have less average experience than the females.[15] Note also that age does not account for the differences unless one assumes that younger faculty should be paid more (the average age of males is less than that of females at all ranks); however, such an assumption would reflect an equally unacceptable basis of compensation. One further relationship reflected by the data in Table IV is the relatively greater proportion of females in the lower ranks, which may suggest discrimination in promotional policies.[16]

By Educational Level. If rank, experience, and age do not account for the salary differences, what about the degree level? The data in Tables V, VI, and VII indicate that, when only equivalent degree levels are considered, the pattern of differential pay by sex is maintained rank by rank. As indicated in Table V, the highest-paid female Full Professor or Associate Professor receives only slightly more than the mean male salary, even though the lowest-paid male receives less than the lowest-paid female. The data in Table VI reveal a remarkable pattern, however: The characteristics for a female with a terminal degree are almost identical to the characteristics for a male with only a Master's degree! When only Master's-degree holders are tabulated at the Instructor level, as in Table VII, very little change from the other data occurs.[17]

Some readers may be thinking that the presence of the notoriously underpaid female library staff in the data are drastically reducing the values for females and hence inflating the differences. First, the library staff has academic rank and receives tenure and so, rightfully, should be included. Second, the data in Table VIII indicate that little difference would result if the library staff were excluded. Therefore, the data for the library staff are included in all calculations.

TABLE I

SALARIES OF THE POPULATION* AND THE SAMPLE**
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Salary Characteristic	Population	Sample			
		Total	Female	Male	M-F Difference
High	22.5	21.8	17.7	21.8	+23.2%
Median	12.4	11.6	10.1	13.0	+28.7
Mean	12.8	12.4	10.6	13.3	+25.5
Low	7.5	7.0	7.0	7.5	+ 7.1

*From latest data submitted to Committee Z (Fall 1970).
**Includes Library staff.

TABLE II

FEMALE AND MALE SALARIES BY AGE GROUP
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Age Group	Average Salaries		
	Female	Male	M-F Difference
Under 30	8.5	10.4	+22.4%
30 - 34	9.7	11.6	+19.6
35 - 39	10.6	13.7	+29.2
40 - 44	10.1	14.2	+40.6
45 - 49	11.3	15.3	+35.4
50 - 54	10.4	15.5	+49.0
55 - 59	11.6	13.0	+12.1
60 - 64	14.5	16.2	[illegible]
65 and Over	-	18.1	
Correlation Coefficient	0.38	0.86	

NOTE: In these and succeeding tables, the "M-F Difference" column gives the percentage by which the male salary differs from the female salary. For example, +23.2% indicates that the salary given for males is 23.2% greater than that listed for females. Similarly, a minus (-) indicates that the male is paid less than the female.

TABLE III

FEMALE AND MALE SALARIES BY EXPERIENCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Years of Experience	Average Salary		
	Female	Male	M-F Difference
Primary Work Activity:			
0 - 4	9.7	11.5	+18.6%
5 - 9	10.0	12.9	+29.0
10 - 14	10.3	13.1	+27.2
15 - 19	10.6	15.2	+43.4
20 - 24	12.1	15.8	+30.6
25 - 29	11.6	12.6	+ 8.6
30 - 34	10.4	15.2	+46.2
35 - 39	14.4	14.6	+ 1.4
40 or More	-	-	-
Correlation Coefficient	0.81	0.60	
Related Work Activity:			
0 - 4	10.5	12.8	+21.9%
5 - 9	10.4	13.0	+25.0
10 - 14	11.1	14.8	+33.3
15 - 19	10.9	16.1	+47.7
20 - 24	15.5	16.2	+ 4.5
25 or More	-	-	-
Correlation Coefficient	0.53	0.38	
Total Work Experience:			
0 - 4	8.5	11.1	+36.6%
5 - 9	9.9	11.9	+20.2
10 - 14	9.8	13.1	+33.7
15 - 19	9.9	13.6	+37.4
20 - 24	11.4	15.1	+32.5
25 - 29	11.2	14.3	+27.7
30 - 34	10.9	13.2	+21.1
35 - 39	14.4	15.4	+ 6.9
40 or More	-	16.6	-
Correlation Coefficient	0.87	0.88	

TABLE IV

SALARY AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS BY RANK AND BY SEX

Characteristic	Professor		Associate		Assistant		Instructor		All Ranks*		Total
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	
Salary ($0,000):											
High	17.7	21.8	14.7	17.0	12.5	15.6	10.5	11.5	17.7	21.8	21.8
Median	16.8	17.8	13.1	14.6	10.9	11.5	8.5	9.5	10.1	13.0	11.6
Mean	15.1	17.5	13.2	14.4	10.3	11.7	8.6	9.7	10.6	13.3	12.4
Low	9.0	14.5	11.6	12.2	7.4	10.2	7.0	7.5	7.0	7.5	7.0
Highest Degree:											
Terminal	3	18	3	30	5	22	0	1	12	71	83
Professional	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	6	6
Master's	0	0	3	0	14	14	16	14	37	28	65
Bachelor's	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Years of Experience:											
Primary Activity	34	20	15	12	15	8	5	7	13	12	12
Related Activity	1	8	7	5	4	4	4	1	4	5	5
Ave. Age (Years)	58	48	48	43	44	38	35	31	43	40	40
PERCENT of Total in Each Rank	17%	83%	15%	85%	33%	67%	52%	48%	33%	67%	-

*The "Total" column does not equal the sum of the other columns because some incomplete questionnaires were not classifiable by rank but were, nonetheless, included in totals where possible.

TABLE V

SALARY AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS
OF ASSOCIATE AND FULL PROFESSORS BY SEX--
TERMINAL DEGREE HOLDERS ONLY

Characteristic	Full Professor		Associate	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Average Salary ($0,000):				
High	17.7	21.8	14.7	17.0
Median	17.2	17.8	13.3	14.5
Mean	17.1	17.4	13.6	14.3
Low	16.4	14.5	13.0	12.2
Average Years of Experience:				
Primary Work Activity	34	20	6	13
Related Work Activity	1	9	10	5
Average Age (Years)	58	48	43	42

TABLE VI

SALARY AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS
OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS BY SEX AND ACADEMIC DEGREE

Characteristic	Terminal Only		Master's Only	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Average Salary ($0,000):				
High	12.5	15.6	11.2	13.0
Median	11.0	11.6	10.5	11.1
Mean	11.2	12.1	9.1	11.2
Low	10.0	10.2	7.4	10.3
Average Years of Experience:				
Primary Work Activity	11	7	16	11
Related Work Activity	6	4	4	6
Average Age (Years)	40	36	48	41

TABLE VII

SALARY AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF INSTRUCTORS BY SEX:
MASTER'S DEGREE HOLDERS ONLY

Characteristic	Female	Male
Average Salary ($0,000):		
High	10.5	11.5
Median	8.5	9.4
Mean	8.6	9.7
Low	7.0	7.5
Average Years of Experience:		
Primary Work Activity	5	6
Related Work Activity	4	1
Average Age (Years)	35	31

TABLE VIII

SALARY AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF FEMALES:
INCLUDING AND EXCLUDING LIBRARY STAFF

Characteristic	Including Library Staff	Excluding Library Staff
Average Salary ($0,000):		
High	17.7	17.7
Median	10.1	10.4
Mean	10.6	10.8
Low	7.0	7.0
Average Years of Experience:		
Primary Work Activity	13	12
Related Work Activity	4	4
Average Age (Years)	43	44

By "Matched" Groups. The above data indicate that, when females and males are "matched" on the basis of rank and degree level, a persistent salary difference in favor of the males exists. What if more variables are considered? The data in Table IX indicate that the pattern continues. When groups are "matched" on the basis of four variables -- highest degree attained, primary work activity, academic rank, and college or division -- almost without exception female salaries are less than those of similar males. In the two groups where the difference does not exist or is in favor of the females, an interesting situation exists. For instance, in Group H, the females are older with two to three times the experience of the males and yet they earn only 5 percent more. This same pattern exists in Group I except that, even with this tremendous difference in experience, the females earn the same salaries as the males. In all other groups "matched" on these four variables, the females earn less than their male counterparts; and in most cases the females are older and more experienced. The weighted average of these differences is 8.5 percent if Groups H and I are included and 11 percent if they are excluded.

By "Matched" Pairs. If further "matching" is performed, the general pattern is maintained. As indicated by the data in Table X, "matched" pairs of males display a greater variation in salaries than do "matched" pairs of females (this is consistent with the over-all sample data, too). This could indicate that more variables are considered in determining the salary of males than in determining the salary of females. The female-male "matched" pairs, however, display about the same average difference (+8.7% in favor of males) as did the "matched" groups, even though in three of the twelve instances the female was the higher paid.

Respondent's Comments on Questionnaires

While the data thus far presented are the only quantifiable aspects of this study, several questionnaires had comments on them which should also be mentioned. The comments are listed here with a brief "first reaction" of the writer to each of them.

1. COMMENT: Several respondents commented on the "check one" instruction beside the sex category.
RESPONSE: No, this was not intended to be humorous; it was an error.

2. COMMENT: "We better push for an increase in salary of 20% for next year and 20% for the following if we are not to get behind some workers in the 'working class.'"
RESPONSE: When did we start competing with them? Monetary competition with other work groups is not intended to be an objective of the AAUP -- only equitable standards in compensation. If equity means that pipe-fitters receive higher pay than college faculty, then so be it.

3. COMMENT: "I still think AAUP is more interested in the young (relatively inexperienced) teacher than in the stable, reliable, experience faculty."
RESPONSE: If the "stable, reliable, experienced" faculty actively attended and participated in AAUP activities, this statement could not be true (unless there simply are very few such faculty). Also, can a 40-year-old person with 12-17 years of experience (the sample averages) be regarded as young and relatively inexperienced? Depends upon your perspective, does it not?

TABLE IX

SALARY AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF GROUPS, "MATCHED" ACCORDING TO DEGREE, RANK, COLLEGE, AND PRIMARY WORK ACTIVITY, BY SEX

Group		Average Age (Years)	Average Years of Experience		Average Salary ($0,000)	M-F Difference
			Primary	Related		
A	Females	33	4	5	8.3	+12%
	Males	30	4	1	9.4	
B	Females	35	5	2	8.9	+ 1
	Males	29	4	1	9.0	
C	Females	58	11	18	11.2	+16
	Males	53	4	22	13.0	
D	Females	53	21	0	10.3	+ 6
	Males	48	20	0	10.9	
E	Females	46	9	0	9.5	+17
	Males	38	4	1	11.1	
F	Females	41	4	9	8.4	+18
	Males	28	2	2	9.9	
G	Females	48	7	21	13.3	+11
	Males	40	17	14	14.8	
H	Females	48	25	0	12.5	- 5
	Males	35	8	4	11.9	
I	Females	53	24	4	9.0	0
	Males	41	9	6	9.0	
J	Females	41	9	9	10.8	+ 8
	Males	35	6	4	11.7	
K	Females	43	8	4	13.0	+ 8
	Males	43	13	2	14.0	

TABLE X

CHARACTERISTICS OF PAIRS "MATCHED" ACCORDING TO DEGREE, RANK, COLLEGE, AND PRIMARY WORK ACTIVITY

Pair	Sex	Age	Experience			Salary	Difference*
			Primary	Related	Total		
1	M	5 years younger	same	substantially less	less	lower	12.7%
	M	older	same	more	more	higher	
2	M	5 years younger	same	substantially less	less	lower	25.5
	M	older	same	more	more	higher	
3	M	5 years younger	slightly less	slightly less	less	lower	15.6
	M	older	more	more	more	higher	
4	M	10 years younger	slightly less	same	slightly less	higher	7.7
	M	older	more	same	more	lower	
5	M	15 years younger	same	slightly more	slightly more	higher	35.7
	M	older	same	less	less	lower	
6	M	10 years younger	more	less	same	higher	2.5
	M	older	less	more	same	lower	
7	M	5 years younger	same	same	same	higher	6.3
	M	older	same	same	same	lower	
8	M	5 years younger	same	same	same	higher	18.9
	M	older	same	same	same	lower	
9	M	same	1 year	none	same	higher	28.0
	M	same	none	1 year	same	lower	

TABLE X (Continued)

Pair	Sex	Age	Experience: Primary	Experience: Related	Experience: Total	Salary	Difference*
10	M	same	same	same	same	higher	13.1%
	M	same	same	same	same	lower	
11	M	same	same	same	same	higher	1.3
	M	same	same	same	same	lower	
	AVERAGE MALE DIFFERENCE: 15.2%						
12	F	10 years younger	slightly less	slightly more	same	higher	0.9%
	F	older	more	less	same	lower	
13	F	5 years younger	same	same	same	lower	2.2
	F	older	same	same	same	higher	
14	F	same	less	more	same	higher	10.9
	F	same	more	less	same	lower	
	AVERAGE FEMALE DIFFERENCE: 4.7%						
15	F	same	2 years	same	slightly less	lower	+ 6.4%
	M	same	3 years	same	more	higher	
16	F	10 years older	more	less	slightly less	lower	+ 9.0
	M	younger	only $\frac{1}{2}$ of female's	more	more	higher	
17	F	same	more	less	same	higher	- 0.9
	M	same	only $\frac{1}{2}$ of female's	more	same	lower	

TABLE X (Continued)

Pair	Sex	Age	Experience: Primary	Experience: Related	Experience: Total	Salary	Difference*
18	F	5 years older	same	same	same	higher	-14.9%
	M	younger	same	same	same	lower	
19	F	15 years older	same	same	same	higher	- 2.1
	M	younger	same	same	same	lower	
20	F	5 years younger	none	some	some	lower	+18.8
	M	older	none	none	none	higher	
21	F	5 years older	same	more	more	lower	+ 5.4
	M	younger	same	less		higher	
22	F	5 years older	more	same	more	lower	+26.5
	M	younger	less	same	less	higher	
23	F	10 years older	more	same	more	lower	+ 4.6
	M	younger	less	same	less	higher	
24	F	10 years older	slightly more	same	slightly more	lower	+15.2
	M	younger	less	same	less	higher	
25	F	10 years older	more	less	more	lower	+17.1
	M	younger	only $\frac{1}{4}$ of female's	more	less	higher	
26	F	15 years older	more	same	more	lower	+18.7
	M	younger	less	same	less	higher	
	AVERAGE MALE-FEMALE DIFFERENCE: +8.7%						

*For pairs of the same sex, the "Difference" column indicates the percentage by which the higher salary differs from the lower salary; for male-female pairs, the percentage by which the male's salary differs from the female's salary.

4. COMMENT: "Did anyone ever consider this on the basis of 'the sole support of a household'? This item they seem to neglect!"

RESPONSE: While both marriage and breeding involve special responsibilities, they are the individual's responsibilities -- not those of the organization. No organization should reward (through higher salaries) those activities. Indeed, given the current state of population growth and eco-catastrophy, the University might do society a service by rewarding those who do not choose to marry and breed! In any event, the single person, and especially the single female, has been discriminated against for too long in our society; and it is time to put an [illegible] that discrimination. Also, the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, in guidelines adopted by the Labor Department, prohibit: "Making any distinction between married and unmarried persons of one sex unless the same distinctions are made between married and unmarried persons of the opposite sex. . . . [and] Denying employment to women with young children unless the same exclusionary policy exists for men."[19]

5. COMMENT: "How about doing a survey investigating discrimination in salary on the basis of discipline? Why is it that fields serving the industrial (rubber) interests . . . are better compensated than those serving humanitarian interests . . . ?"

RESPONSE #1: In 1968 at educational institutions (on an academic year basis), the average of four social sciences (psychology, economics, sociology, and political science) was 6.5 percent higher than the average of three natural sciences (chemistry, physics, and biology).[18] The salary data released last summer indicate that at The University of Akron, these same social sciences were paid 8.2 percent less than the same three natural sciences. The one- or two-year difference in the data would probably not account for this difference, although the local labor market competition (i.e., the natural scientist could work directly for industry) might account for at least part of the difference.

RESPONSE #2: Perhaps the difference is not so much an act of prostitution to industrial interests as it is a general reflection of our society's sense of values (on a local basis, of course; otherwise, the same pattern would be reflected nationally). After all, in a society where a man is judged by materialistic affluence, one could expect greater rewards for developing expertise in areas which directly serve the god of productivity and materialism. Maybe we need to re-order our values so that equity will be served by remuneration of "humanitarian interests" at least as well as we remunerate "materialistic interests"?

6. COMMENT: "Any accurate 'matching' should also include publication or research record!"

RESPONSE #1: A study by Helen Astin (The Woman Doctorate) states that the data "suggest that women who report experiences with employer discrimination are professionally active and . . . productive (as scholars). Therefore one cannot interpret their complaints as a form of rationalization or as an excuse for their failure to achieve recognition."[20]

RESPONSE #2: Since such factors are supposedly important in promotion, one would expect that their effects would correlate rather highly with academic rank, especially when rank and experience are "matched." Thus, they have been indirectly considered.

RESPONSE #3: Such factors are rather unlikely to account for the initial differences (i.e., the greater salary of males versus females when neither has a terminal degree or any experience) which were found in this study.

7. COMMENT: "Of course there is discrimination in salaries and promotion policies, not only here but everywhere else, and don't you believe anyone who says otherwise. You might solve the discrimination problem by having a fixed salary schedule, but this would cause more harm than good because it would remove the incentive to 'produce' under the present system.

The trouble with the questionnaire is that it doesn't allow for differences in quality of teaching-effectiveness in the classroom, participation in University committees, professional organizations, writing, etc., etc. Once you measure these factors, the study will be more meaningful."

RESPONSE #1: See the three responses to the preceding comment (#6).

RESPONSE #2: This writer would agree that a fixed schedule is not now desirable; however, the "incentive" value of the current salary system is highly questionable. One measure of the economic incentive of a professional salary system is the overlap of pay grades: With substantial overlap, there is little economic incentive to advance since pay is not very different from one pay grade to the next. As indicated in Table XI, the existing salary system provides more economic incentive for males than it does for females, even though in total it provides relatively little incentive except to move from Instructor to Assistant Professor.

RESPONSE #3: Yes, quality of teaching is important. To this writer's knowledge, however, no reliable and valid measure of this factor is used in salary administration. Yet, the factors mentioned would have to be rather unique and important to account for the uniformly one-sided and persistent salary differences found in this study.

TABLE XI

OVERLAP OF PAY GRADES*

Salaries for Which Overlap is Computed	Overlap Between the Ranks of: Instructor and Asst. Professor	Asst. and Assoc. Professor	Assoc. and Full Professor
Entire Faculty**	35.3%.	86.7%	63.1%
Sample Data:			
Females	60.8	29.0	65.5
Males	24.1	70.8	34.2

*While some overlap seems desirable, especially in professional salary systems, with substantial overlap there is little economic incentive to advance to the higher pay grade (rank), as pay differs little from one pay grade to the next.

**Based on the salary data released to Committee Z, Fall 1970.

Conclusions

The primary conclusion reached in this study is that, on the basis of the sample obtained, a persistent and uniformly one-sided difference exists between the salaries of males and those of females at The University of Akron and that difference is in "favor" of the males. That difference is not only persistent but also large enough to be important to the females (for the sample as a whole the mean difference was 25.5 percent; for the "matched" pairs, 8.7 percent).

A second major conclusion is that the pattern of salary differences is not solely the result of differences in total, primary, or related experience; degree attainment; academic rank; the college or division in which the individuals are employed; the primary work activity of the individuals; or age. To the extent that quality of teaching, publications, and research are used heavily in promotion, those factors also do not account for this pattern since they would be indirectly reflected in rank and experience. To the extent that those factors are not so important in promotions, they may account for the pattern at the higher ranks; however, those factors are very unlikely to account for the observed differences between males and females at the Instructor level, where the faculty hold only Master's degrees and have little or no experience.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, the investigator recommends that The University of Akron Chapter of the AAUP take the following actions:

1. Send a copy of this report to all Department Heads, Deans, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs to inform them of the situation as indicated by this study.
2. Urge those officials to review all salaries within their colleges and/or departments in an effort to eliminate any inequities which may, for whatever reason, exist in the salaries of females.
3. Request either Committee W or Committee Z to conduct a similar study two years hence in an effort to determine whether similar inequities exist at that time.

Endnotes

[1]Sinclair Lewis, "Woman Labor is a Success," PRINTERS INK (September 8, 1967), pp. 51f.

[2]Margaret Mead and Frances B. Kaplan, editors. AMERICAN WOMEN: THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 3.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid., pp. 56-57.

[5]EQUAL PAY UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARD ACT (U. S. Department of Labor; Wage, Hour, and Public Contracts Division, 1966).

[6]Mead, op. cit., p. 167.

[7]See, for example, Donald J. McNulty, "Differences in Pay Between Men and Women Workers," MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW (December 1967), Vol. 90, No. 12.

[8]See ECONOMIC INDICATORS RELATING TO EQUAL PAY (U. S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1963), Pamphlet 9; and WOMEN IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE (U. S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1959), Pamphlet 4.

[9]"The Structure of Economists' Employment and Salaries, 1964," AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW (December 1967), Vol. 55, No. 4, Part 2, p. 63. The six factors were: type of employer, years of experience, primary work activity, level of highest degree, age, and economic specialty.

[10]"Studies of the Structure of Economists' Salaries and Income," AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW (December 1968), Vol. 58, No. 5, Part 2, p. xxv.

[11]Ibid., p. 68.

[12]Virginia Higgins, Report #1 of the Committee on the Status of Women of the Kansas State Teacher's College Chapter of AAUP, May 1970. Cited in Ann Sutherland Harris, "The Second Sex in Academe," AAUP BULLETIN (September 1970), Vol. 56, No. 3, p. 291.

[13]All salary data in this study are reported on a 9-month basis.

[14]The sample contained 33 percent females whereas the University population contains about 22 percent. The 22 percent figure was obtained from THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON GENERAL BULLETIN, 1970-1971 ISSUE, pp. 291-96, and is comparable to national levels as reported by Harris, op. cit., p. 289.

[15]This is similar to the results obtained at Kansas State Teacher's College: "women had longer average periods of service at all ranks except that of professor." Higgins, loc. cit.

[16]Harris, op. cit., p. 290, reports that the percentage of females in an academic rank decreases with higher ranks; and John B. Parrish, "Women in Top Level Teaching and Research," AAUW JOURNAL (January 1962), Vol. 55, No. 2, p. 106, states, "Women tend to be concentrated in the lower ranks in the leading institutions."

[17]The writer is forced to raise the question of why an individual -- male or female -- with a terminal degree is only an Instructor and not the highest paid one at that!

[18]"Summary of American Science Manpower, 1968," REPORT NSF 70-5 (Washington: National Science Foundation's National Registry of Scientific and Technical Personnel), January 1970, pp. 2-3.

[19]Cited in James C. McBrearty, "Women in Revolt: Assault on Employment Myths," ARIZONA REVIEW (November 1970), Vol. 19, No. 11, p. 10. Emphasis added by this writer.