

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 068

HE 004 428

AUTHOR Haywood, C. Robert
TITLE Report on Comparative Salaries for Men and Women at Washburn University of Topeka.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 71
NOTE 3p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Educational Finance; Females; *Higher Education; Males; Research Projects; *Salaries; *Salary Differentials; *Teacher Salaries; Wages
IDENTIFIERS *Washburn University of Topeka (Kansas)

ABSTRACT

This document reports on comparative salaries for men and women at Washburn University of Topeka, Kansas. A standard multiple linear regression equation was developed from data supplied. Using the factors of years at Washburn, degree, and rank, a "line of best fit" formula was developed which would predict a salary that could be anticipated based on the Washburn pay schedule for the 1971-72 year for full time teaching, male faculty members. The resulting parameters were applied to women's salaries. Neither study indicated that the single factor of sex is a factor in determining salaries. A more significant finding was the revelation that some individual salaries, both male and female, were significantly at variance for the "line of best fit." (Author/MJM)

ED 080068

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT ON COMPARATIVE SALARIES
FOR MEN AND WOMEN AT WASHBURN
UNIVERSITY OF TOPEKA

Last fall the American Association of University Women, Kansas Division, requested that Washburn University develop a model for a comparison survey of faculty salaries by sex. Working with Terry D. McAdam, Associate Professor of Mathematics, and Homer Sykes, of the Computer Department, a standard multiple linear regression equation was developed from data supplied. Other models were considered, but this seemed to be the most useful.

A less sophisticated study of the salaries the year before had shown inconclusive results. We found no significant correlation between curricular types and salary increments. Meaningful generalizations relative to the variable of sex in salary were also hard to make. This is perhaps best illustrated by the correlations relative to 1970 and 1969 salaries and sex which were of low or no significance at -0.305 and -0.252 respectively. Specifically, the minimum and maximum salaries for male Professors were both higher and lower than that of women although the median salary for men was \$474.00 less than women. The Associate Professor level found the same maximum salary, lower median salary for women, and high minimum salary for women. On the Assistant Professor level the men led in all categories. But on the Instructor level women had higher maximum and median salaries but lower minimum. A chart of the matrix correlation of that study is attached.

Finding this evidence hard to interpret, we decided to find "a line of best fit." That is to say, using the factors of years at Washburn, degree and rank we developed a formula which would "predict" a salary that could be anticipated based on Washburn pay schedule for the 1971-72

854 1500 H

year for full-time teaching, male faculty members. Administrators, coaches and librarians, both male and female, were excluded from consideration in this study. The formula relating to annual salary was:

$$\text{Salary} = a_0 + a_1x \text{ years} + a_2x \text{ degree} + a_3x \text{ rank}$$

Eighty-one males were in the study. The "line" of best fit resulted in parameters as follows:

$$a_0 = 6360.806$$

$$a_1 = 5.597$$

$$a_2 = 522.145$$

$$a_3 = 1459.756$$

When applied to women's salaries, it was found that twelve of the thirty women were above the "line of best fit." It would be necessary to have fewer than ten or more than twenty to be statistically significant. Or another way to put it, it would be necessary to have more than twenty below the "line" to be significantly lower than men at a 5% level of significance. In testing the hypothesis that the probability is 0.5 that a randomly selected salary is above or below the "predicted" salary, the data are not sufficient to assume that these results did not simply occur by accident.

Neither study would indicate that the single factor of sex is a factor in determining salaries. A more significant finding was the revelation that some individual salaries, both male and female, were significantly at variance from the "line of best fit." This is certainly the kind of input into salary considerations that an administrator can use with some sense of objectivity.

-- C. Robert Haywood
August 31, 1971

Matrix Correlation on All Categories
for the University

| <u>Var. 1</u> | <u>Var. 2</u> | <u>R</u> |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------|
| Degree | Tenure | +0.156 |
| Degree | Rank | +0.606 |
| Degree | Curricular Type | -0.035 |
| Degree | Sex | -0.144 |
| Degree | Salary - 69 | +0.614 |
| Degree | Salary - 70 | +0.610 |
| Degree | Percent Increase | -0.010 |
| Degree | Student Evaluation | -0.002 |
| Degree | Role | +0.256 |
| Tenure | Rank | +0.633 |
| Tenure | Curricular Type | +0.004 |
| Tenure | Sex | +0.162 |
| Tenure | Salary - 69 | +0.435 |
| Tenure | Salary - 70 | +0.441 |
| Tenure | Percent Increase | -0.099 |
| Tenure | Student Evaluation | +0.012 |
| Tenure | Role | +0.350 |
| Rank | Curricular Type | +0.003 |
| Rank | Sex | -0.116 |
| Rank | Salary - 69 | +0.821 |
| Rank | Salary - 70 | +0.832 |
| Rank | Percent Increase | -0.036 |
| Rank | Student Evaluation | +0.031 |
| Rank | Role | +0.440 |
| Curricular Type | Sex | -0.038 |
| Curricular Type | Salary - 69 | +0.032 |
| Curricular Type | Salary - 70 | +0.050 |
| Curricular Type | Percent Increase | +0.294 |
| Curricular Type | Student Evaluation | +0.097 |
| Curricular Type | Role | +0.044 |
| Sex | Salary - 69 | -0.305 |
| Sex | Salary - 70 | -0.252 |
| Sex | Percent Increase | +0.016 |
| Sex | Student Evaluation | -0.112 |
| Sex | Role | -0.066 |
| Salary - 69 | Salary - 70 | +0.991 |
| Salary - 69 | Percent Increase | -0.051 |
| Salary - 69 | Student Evaluation | +0.032 |
| Salary - 69 | Role | +0.466 |
| Salary - 70 | Percent Increase | +0.023 |
| Salary - 70 | Student Evaluation | +0.051 |
| Salary - 70 | Role | +0.478 |
| Percent Increase | Student Evaluation | +0.148 |
| Percent Increase | Role | -0.025 |
| Student Evaluation | Role | +0.003 |