

## Faculty Salary (In)Equity: A Review of the Literature

Callie C. Womble

North Carolina State University at Raleigh, ccwomble@ncsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kent.edu/td>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Womble, Callie C. () "Faculty Salary (In)Equity: A Review of the Literature," *Trends in Diversity*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.kent.edu/td/vol1/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Division of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion at Digital Commons @ Kent State University Libraries. It has been accepted for inclusion in Trends in Diversity by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Kent State University Libraries. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@kent.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@kent.edu).

---

# Faculty Salary (In)Equity: A Review of the Literature

## **Cover Page Footnote**

For the purposes of this paper, the descriptors “Black” and “African American” will be used interchangeably.

## **Introduction**

Currently, there are over 7,000 postsecondary institutions in the United States (U.S.) (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). Faculty members, or postsecondary educators who teach classes at these institutions of higher learning, play a major role in creating a positive college student experience. As stated by Umbach & Wawrzynski (2005), “[t]he impact that a faculty member can have on the student experience can be seen in and out of the classroom” (p. 176). Accordingly, studies demonstrate that faculty members have the potential to increase student learning and engagement with course content (Smith, 1977; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005), serve as role models (Bettinger & Long, 2005), improve student self-concept (Woodside, Wong, & Weist, 1999), and augment further educational outcomes like intellectual growth (Endo & Harpel, 1982; Magolda, 1987). Furthermore, for certain historically marginalized groups of students, such as African American and Hispanic students, studies suggest that interactions with faculty members play an even more crucial role in shaping student perceptions of support and satisfaction as well as academic success (Anaya & Cole, 2001; Cole, 2008; Guiffrida, 2005). In short, research confirms that faculty members add value to postsecondary education.

Faculty members are compensated for their professional contributions with a salary. Similar to other professions, faculty salaries are determined by a number of individual characteristics, such as level of education, relevant credentials, expertise, prior experience, and productivity (E. P. Hoffman, 1976; Perna, 2001). By and large, the way postsecondary institutions distribute salaries has a weighty impact on institutional budgeting. Salaries are cited as one of the largest expenditures at colleges and universities (Buck, 1999; Evans, Evans, & Evans, 2002). According to the most recent data available, “instruction, including faculty salaries and benefits, is the largest single expense category at public and private nonprofit postsecondary institutions and the second largest category at private for-profit institutions” (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). In addition to the fiscal import, the distribution of salaries also conveys a message about institutional values and priorities.

Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch (2008) allude to these institutional values and priorities when they describe how institutions might choose to hire faculty members that require less expensive salaries:

A school could use only more costly “tenure-track” faculty, who are generally full time, who hold, or are on the path to holding, a permanent appointment with academic tenure, a guarantee of employment, or it could hire some lower cost faculty – part time or even full time, but temporary, “contingent” faculty who are not “tenure track.” [...] The key question

would be whether the research, public service, or other advantages of the tenure-track faculty member would be “worth” the added \$10,000 per course cost (p. 197).

As the availability of tenure-track positions continues to decline (Finkelstein, Martin Conley, & Schuster, 2016) and the market becomes more saturated with a surplus of talent (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2017), institutions are compelled to make complex decisions regarding faculty hiring. Such decisions are further complicated by the higher education industry’s professed value of diversity (American Council on Education Board of Directors, 2012; Hurtado, 2007). In the past twenty years, the U.S. faculty workforce has transformed from a White- male cadre to one that is more diverse (Finkelstein et al., 2016). While the representation of women and racial and ethnic minorities has increased in the academy, opportunities for diverse faculty candidates are still structured differently than for White males. For example, data demonstrates that women and racial and ethnic minorities are concentrated in less secure and lower paying faculty roles such as part-time and non-tenure track positions (Finkelstein et al., 2016). Other research discusses how the tenure process is biased against women and racial and ethnic minorities (Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; Winkler, 2000).

What’s more, even at the equivalent ranks, women and racial and ethnic minorities still earn lower salaries than their White male peers (Gregory, 2001;

Toutkoushian, 1998). The distribution of faculty salaries across racial and gendered lines provokes a critical question: Diversity is a professed value of the higher education industry, but is it a priority?

### **Statement of the Problem**

While faculty salary differentials are expected due to varying levels of appropriate characteristics (i.e. education, relevant credentials, expertise, prior experience, and productivity), even after controlling for differences in these characteristics, data shows that women and racial and ethnic minorities consistently earn less than White males at every faculty rank (Gregory, 2001; Toutkoushian, 1998). Moreover, notable salary differences are also present between faculty members who teach at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and faculty members who teach at Historically White Colleges and Universities (HWCUs) (Provasnik & Shafer, 2004). In all of the aforementioned instances the faculty members belonging to personal or institutional identity groups that have historically been marginalized (i.e. women, racial and ethnic minorities, and HBCUs) are systemically disadvantaged in comparison to faculty members belonging to personal or institutional identity groups that have historically received unearned benefits (i.e. White males and HWCUs). In social justice literature, these phenomena described above are referred to as oppression and privilege respectively (Adams, 2000).

### **Philosophical Assumptions and Goals**

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the nuanced topic of faculty compensation in higher education. Intrinsicly, this paper is not concerned with equality, but rather equity. Equality focuses on identical treatment or sameness (Raphael, 1946). Applying an equality lens to the issue of faculty salaries asks the question: Are all faculty members earning equivalent salaries? Equity, instead, focuses on just treatment, or fairness (Raphael, 1946). Applying an equity lens to the issue of faculty salaries asks the question: Are all faculty members earning unbiased salaries? This paper recognizes that faculty members may have dissimilar levels of appropriate characteristics, which also may lead to unequal, yet equitable, salaries. Conversely, this paper reviews and synthesizes the literature on experiences of inequity in faculty salaries. Previous studies have demonstrated that certain groups of faculty members are unjustly earning less than is warranted (Gregory, 2001; Provasnik & Shafer, 2004; Toutkoushian, 1998). Thus, these groups of faculty members are inequitably compensated for their contributions in comparison with their peers. Aligned with previous scholarship, this paper ascertains that pay inequity is a serious social justice issue (McCann, 1994). Hence, this paper is purposefully titled *Faculty Salary (In)Equity: A Review of The Literature*. The emphasis on (in)equity is a deliberate political statement that highlights the absence of equity.

Moreover, critical race theory (CRT) conceptually guides this paper. CRT

is an interdisciplinary theoretical perspective that examines the relationships between race, racism, and power in U.S. society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1998). The theory is unified by its five central tenets, which are racial realism, differential racialization, interest convergence, intersectionality, and the unique voice of color, respectively (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Racial realism acknowledges that racism is a permanent and deeply entrenched component of American society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Here, racism is defined as “a system of ignorance, exploitation, and power used to oppress [Blacks], Latinos, Asians, Pacific Americans, American Indians and other people on the basis of ethnicity, culture, mannerisms, and color” (Marable, 1995, p. 5). Differential racialization identifies race as a social construction, that is, “the dominant society racializes different minority groups at different times, in response to shifting needs such as the labor market” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 9). Interest convergence states that racial equity will only be advanced when the interests of people of color align with White interests (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Intersectionality contends that social identities can intersect and overlap causing multilayered experiences with racism and other forms of identity-based oppression (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). For instance, a Black woman may be discriminated against because of her race or her Black womanhood (Crenshaw, 1991). Finally, the unique voice of color affirms that the lived, racialized experiences of racial and ethnic minorities, can describe race and racism in ways



that Whites are unaware (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Applying a CRT perspective to the issue of pay inequity highlights how race, racism, and power influence faculty compensation.

In view of its assumptions, the remainder of this paper is divided into two main sections. Section one will present a critical review and synthesis of the literature pertaining to salary inequities experienced by different groups of faculty members. This first section will focus on four broad categories of literature: (1) the history of faculty salary research, (2) the impetus for faculty salary (in)equity research, (3) faculty salary inequities by sex and race, and (4) faculty salary inequities at HBCUs. Next, section two will offer several implications for policy, practice, and future research.

### **Critical Review and Synthesis of the Literature**

#### **A Brief History of Faculty Salary Research**

Since as early as the 1910s, researchers have documented and investigated how much faculty members were being paid (Dabney, 1914). A good deal of those initial studies confirmed many of the empirical relationships between faculty salary and other characteristics that still hold true today (Henderson & Jorgensen, 1954; Reeves, 1932; Trabue, 1952). For example, in 1928 Reeves found a positive relationship between total endowment income and average faculty salary among 32 liberal arts colleges— that is, institutions with larger endowments also paid their faculty members more (as cited in Reeves, 1932).

Decades later, Ehrenberg (2002) reported similar findings in their discussion of declining faculty salaries at public colleges and universities relative to their private institution counterparts. In addition, amongst the original studies, Kelly (1949) used data from 1,351 full-time faculty members in 147 colleges and universities of all types to determine that faculty pay scales increased on the basis of rank more than length of service. Boudreau et al. (1997) and Barbezat & Donihue (1998) echoed parallel verdicts in their investigations of faculty rank.

Correspondingly, some of the empirical relationships revealed during this foundational period may have also changed over time. For instance, Reeves (1928, as cited in Reeves, 1932) concluded that institutional size had little effect on the percentage of current educational expenditures used for faculty salaries. At the time of this literature review, no single study was identified that addressed this specific question. However, research shows that higher education boards now utilize peer institution data when benchmarking to counteract the effect of institutional size on various factors including expenditures (Barak & Kniker, 2002). Thus, it is a rational assumption that the aforesaid pattern Reeves discovered might have changed over time.

### **The Impetus for Faculty Salary (In)equity Research**

In the 1970s researchers became interested in exposing faculty salary inequities across sex and race (Gordon, Morton, & Braden, 1974; E.P. Hoffman, 1976; Johnson, & Stafford, 1974). Scholars suggest that the influx of interest in

faculty salary inequity during this decade was sparked by post-civil rights legislation, more specifically the Equal Opportunity Act of 1972 (Equal Opportunity Act) and the Equal Pay Act (Barbezat, 2002; Megdal & Ransom, 1985). The Equal Opportunity Act was an amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII). Title VII made it illegal for employers to discriminate against employees on the basis of sex, race, color, national origin, and religion (American Association of University Women, n.d.) The Equal Opportunity Act extended Title VII's governance to include educational institutions (Barbezat, 2002). Its accompanying report states “[t]he time has come for Congress to correct the defects in its own legislation. The promises of equal job opportunity made in 1964 must [now] be made realities . . . .” (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d.a). Contrariwise, the Equal Pay Act required that workplaces give men and women employees equal pay for equal work (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d.b). It should be noted here that this ideology (i.e. equal pay for equal work) is aligned with the equity, or fairness, perspective that was articulated previously. Considering this growing national attention to employment practices, as an industry higher education shifted its attention as well. While researchers had studied faculty pay for over 50 years, this turning point prompted them to begin benchmarking salary differentials by specific identity makers such as sex and race.

## **Faculty Salary Inequities by Sex and Race**

The early studies on faculty salary inequities yielded mixed results. First, it was evident that female faculty members were not receiving equal pay for equal work. After controlling for age, race, years at the university, education, rank, and department, Gordon, Morton, & Braden (1974) found that female faculty members at a large urban university earned 11 percent less than male faculty members with the same characteristics. Additionally, and perhaps more intriguingly, in the same study, it was also found that Blacks earned 13 percent more than their White peers (Gordon, Morton, & Braden, 1974). This second finding was counterintuitive considering the definitions of privilege and oppression that were provided earlier in this paper.

More recent scholarship reveals some comparable disparities in faculty salaries. For instance, using the 5,057 viable questionnaire responses from the 1984 national Carnegie survey of faculty, Bellas (1993) found that the faculty salary structure might not operate identically for men and women, resulting in a faculty gender pay gap. In this pay gap, female faculty members earned less than their male colleagues even after controlling for levels of education, previous workforce participation, current employment characteristics, and professional achievement (Bellas, 1993). Analogous findings were also reported in several other studies over a 15-year time span (Barbezat, 1991; Benjamin, 1999; Langton & Pfeffer, 1994; Perna, 2001; Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005; Umbach, 2007).

The breadth and depth of the evidence corroboration illustrates the pervasiveness of gender inequity in faculty salaries. It is also important to note that scholars have coined different phrases when describing this inequity. In addition to the terminology ‘gender pay gap’, which arguably has a bold connotation, scholars have also called this differential a “salary disadvantage” (Benjamin, 1999, p. 60), “wage variation” (Langton & Pfeffer, 1994, p. 237) and an “unexplained sex difference” (Perna, 2001, p. 303).

To reinforce, the differential in salary earned by female and male faculty members is ubiquitous even after controlling for appropriate background characteristics (i.e. education, relevant credentials, expertise, prior experience, and productivity) as well as institutional characteristics and academic discipline (Barbezat, 1991; Benjamin, 1999; Langton & Pfeffer, 1994; Perna, 2001; Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005; Umbach, 2007). While some research suggests the gender gap is less prevalent for younger female faculty members, this trend has not been consistent in other age groups (Perna, 2001). Currently, there is no consensus in the literature regarding the reason for this difference in pay. As such, researchers have developed conflicting notions. Some suggest that the gender gap is indicative of gender discrimination in higher education (Barbezat, 1991) or gender discrimination within specific academic disciplines (Ginther, & Hayes, 2003). Others highlight how the gap is interconnected with how women are treated more broadly in society (Benjamin, 1999). For illustration, Benjamin

(1999) cites lack of mobility, few professional alternatives, and childrearing responsibilities as societal disadvantages that are disproportionately experienced by women. As Benjamin (1999) states, “[a]s long as society imposes these relative disadvantages on women, universities can successfully offer women terms of employment that would not be acceptable to similarly qualified men” (p. 62). After conducting descriptive and regression analyses on a sample of 9,626 full-time faculty members who completed the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Perna (2001) offers what is possibly the most unique interpretation of the faculty gender pay gap. She suggests that the gap might illustrate how more-experienced women entered the academic labor market at lower initial salaries due to gender inequities, and maintain that salary differential even with promotion. As Perna (2001) postulates, “the absence of unexplained sex differences in salaries among the “younger” faculty at each academic rank is a sign of progress” (p. 301). However, other recent scholarship challenges this hypothesis. For instance, Porter, Toutkoushian, and Moore (2008) use data from the 1988, 1993, 1999, and 2004 iterations of the National Study on Postsecondary Faculty to study pay inequities for recently hired faculty members. In their analyses, the authors find that “a gender-based pay disparity does emerge over time as reflected in the significant unexplained wage gaps by gender” (p. 482).

While many studies have examined the gender pay gap, considerably less scholarship has focused on the impact of race and ethnicity on faculty salaries.

As stated by Toutkoushian (1998), “relatively few empirical studies at either the institutional or national level have addressed whether there are unexplained differences in faculty pay by race/ethnicity” (p. 514). The lack of attention to potential racial disparities in faculty salary is astonishing for two main reasons. First, the Gordon, Morton, & Braden (1974) study revealed a captivating occurrence that is not consistent in other labor markets; Black faculty members had higher salaries than their White peers. Taking this into account, it is presumptive that higher education and economics scholars would have unceasingly probed this occurrence to determine if such findings remained true across time. A petite level of interest emerged; nevertheless, the literature divulges that no such swell of analysis transpired (Hearn, 1999; Toutkoushian, 1998). Secondly, as CRT explains, the U.S. is a racialized society. Therefore, from a CRT predisposition, is it difficult to conceive how scholars have not scrutinized the faculty salaries by race and ethnicity more thoroughly.

Of those that have pursued this line of inquiry, the Black-White binary has been the prevalent conceptualization of race. Most studies tend to dichotomize faculty members into two broad racial categories such as “Black/Non-Black” or “White/Non-White”, or three broad racial categories: White, Black, or Other (Koch & Chizmar, 1973, E.P. Hoffman, 1976; Riggs & Dwyer, 1995). This conceptualization is logical due to the origins of faculty salary equity research and the CRT tenet differential racialization. As mentioned previously, post-civil

rights legislation prompted the original faculty salary equity studies (Barbezat, 2002; Megdal & Ransom, 1985). During this time frame, the dominant way the labor market operated was within the Black-White binary (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). In essence, this was an example of differential racialization as race was constructed to fit the needs of the labor market. Albeit commonsensical, this dominant conceptualization of race is also problematic. By definition, the Black-White binary is limited and exclusive because it does not acknowledge the varied racialized experiences of other historically marginalized groups such as Latinos and Native Americans. As described by the fifth tenet of CRT, much can be gained from uplifting voices that are traditionally silenced. It should also be noted that not all faculty salary equity studies follow the Black-White binary. For example, using data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Toutkoushian (1998) instead analyzed salary inequities by five race/ethnicity categories: Hispanic, Asian, non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic White, and “other race”. In this analysis, some noteworthy salary inequities persisted by race. For example, Hispanic men earned about 4-6% less than White men after controlling for field and human capital measures (Toutkoushian, 1998). In addition, on average Asian men earned more than White men, but the differential was explained by field and human capital. At the intersection of subdominant race and gender, some thought-provoking results also prevailed. Interestingly, White women earned less than Black women after controlling for human capital



characteristics (Toukoushian, 1998).

The findings from racial equity studies on faculty salaries are inconsistent at best (Guillory, 2001; Renzulli, Grant, & Kathuria, 2006; Toutkoushian, Bellas, & Moore, 2007). In some studies, earnings differentials between White and Black faculty members were observed; however, they were smaller than were expected in the general labor market among White-Black professionals overall (Barbezat, 1991; Riggs & Dwyer, 1995). At large, the lack of research on this topic prevents substantial synthesis in this area. As reiterated by Hearn (1999), “it is impossible to draw firm conclusions about relative salaries for similarly situated minorities and nonminorities” (p. 394).

### **Faculty Salary Inequities at HBCUs**

To emphasize the complexity of faculty compensation in higher education, I will now discuss faculty salary inequities at HBCUs. While some evidence suggests that certain faculty of color, in the aggregate, experience salary parity with White faculty members or even pay advantage, this finding does not hold true at HBCUs (Renzulli, Grant & Kathuria, 2006; Toutkoushian, Bellas & Moore, 2007). To contextualize, there are currently 105 HBCUs across the U.S., which represent about three percent of the nation’s institutions of higher education (United Negro College Fund, n.d.). While small in number, HBCUs are a vital component of the American higher education system. Founded in the ninetieth century with a specific focus on the needs of Black students, HBCUs

were created in response to racism against African Americans in the U.S. (Kim, 2002). At a time when Black students were considered intellectually inferior and were not allowed to be educated with White students, HBCUs arose (Kim, 2002). Academics disagree on the true driving force of HBCUs' emergence. Some scholars believe HBCUs were created to serve Black students and help them become productive members of American society (Gasman, 2013). Others are more apprehensive about the true motivations. For instance, as Evans, Evans & Evans (2002) allege, "HBCUs were not designed to succeed, rather they were established to appease Black people or to serve as "holding institutions" so that Black students would not matriculate in HWCUs" (p.3). Today, HBCUs are celebrated for both culturally affirming and psychologically supporting African American students (United States Department of Education, 2014). As the stated by the United Negro College Fund (n.d.), "HBCUs are experts at educating African Americans". HBCUs also play a central role in the fostering faculty diversity in higher education. Nationally, Black faculty members comprise only 5.3 percent of all full-time faculty members at U.S., and they are most heavily concentrated at HBCUs (Gasman, 2013; Ranking the Nation's Leading Liberal Arts Colleges on Their Levels of Black Faculty, 2007).

Despite the documented value of HBCUs as postsecondary institutions, faculty members who teach at these institutions continue to earn less than faculty at other institutional types (Buck, 1999; Gasman, 2013; Provasnik & Shafer,

2004; Renzulli, Grant, & Kathuria, 2006). Longitudinal data from *Historically Black Colleges and Universities 1976-2001* show that HBCU faculty salaries have increased at a disproportionately lower rate than other colleges (Provasnik & Shafer, 2004). At present, it is estimated that salary disparities experienced by HBCU faculty members range between \$18,000/year and \$53,000/year (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2011). Unfortunately, HBCU faculty salary disparities do not decrease with promotion. At the highest academic rank, full professor, HBCU faculty members still only earn a little more than half of what their peers earn (Gasman, 2013). Some research suggests that gender pay equity is greater at HBCUs (Renzulli, Grant, & Kathuria, 2006). However, researchers ascribe the gender equity to a larger systematic disadvantage. Renzulli, Grant, & Kathuria (2006) suggest that the faculty gender pay gap might seem less pronounced at HBCUs because pay for all faculty members at HBCUs is lower than all faculty members at HWCUs.

One atypical study regarding HBCU faculty pay equity is also worth noting. Using cross-sectional salary data of 285 tenure track and tenured faculty members at a southern, public HBCU, Riggs & Dwyer (1995) found that Black men in leadership roles with top economic power discriminate against other race-sex groups in terms of salary. The authors discovered that “non-Blacks, particularly non-Black females [were] paid at salaries substantially lower than Black males, after controlling for rank, years in rank, the market, discipline,

having a doctorate or not, and experience” (Riggs & Dwyer, 1995, p. 235). Such findings are striking because they illustrate what McCall (2001) coins “complex inequalities”, or the intricate relationships between pay inequities by gender, class, and race.

To recapitulate, the literature unequivocally establishes a large pay inequity experienced by faculty members at HBCUs in comparison with faculty members at HWCUs. Although not mentioned explicitly in the literature, problematizing the initial purpose of HBCUs unveils one potential hypothesis for this disparity. As articulated, some scholars believe that HBCUs were not designed to be efficacious, but rather serve as holding institutions (Evans, Evans & Evans, 2002). This perspective reflects the abovementioned CRT tenet interest convergence. From a CRT perspective, the interests of HBCU faculty members, of whom are largely Black, will only be advanced when they align with White society interests. If the White society interest in developing HBCUs was to merely separate Black students from White students, and not to create prosperous, sustainable institutions of higher learning, the pay inequity experienced by HBCU faculty members is inherently by design.

### **Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research**

In light of the literature that has been reviewed and synthesized, this paper offers several implications for policy, practice, and future research.

## **Policy**

To start, the demand for improved policies is apparent. Overwhelmingly, the literature exhibits how higher education has not been accountable to federal legislation that requires equitable pay. With the swelling national awareness concerning higher education accountability to students (Alexander, 2000; Heller, 2001; Huisman & Currie, 2004) this paper suggests that similar awareness be spotlighted on accountability to faculty members. Policymakers should develop and enforce stricter policies that implore equitable pay for faculty members.

When crafting such policies, it is advisable that policymakers summon a multidisciplinary team of experts to vet potential policies. As the literature shows, faculty member pay inequities are complex and should not be analyzed from a monolithic viewpoint (Hearn, 1999; Riggs & Dwyer, 1995; Toutkoushian, Bellas & Moore, 2007). Multidisciplinary teams can help examine potential policies from numerous perspectives. Also, borrowing research from public health, multidisciplinary teams have been shown to improve effectiveness (Buljac-Samardzic, Dekker-van Doorn, van Wijngaarden, & van Wijk, 2010; Lemieux-Charles & McGuire, 2006).

## **Practice**

Additionally, there are two main implications for the practice of higher education. First, pay inequities evoke the following questions: How are we socializing our faculty members? Why do women, underrepresented racial and

ethnic minorities, and HBCU faculty members accept lower salaries for equal work? What aspect of our institutional and field culture allows or encourages these practices? This paper recommends that faculty members use these questions to as preliminary guide to critically examine their own work cultures. If inequitable practices are uncovered, this paper also recommends faculty members to take action by contacting their institution's Equal Opportunity Officer (EOO). The EOO is "an institutional officer whose job function is to help assure (under federal law) that applicants, employees, and students are afforded equal opportunity to education and/or employment regardless of factors such as race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, disability, or sexual orientation" (North Carolina State University Human Resources, n.d.).

Further, CRT fundamentally emphasizes activism in addition to scholarship (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; J. L. Hoffman & Bresciani, 2010). Critical race theorists are not only interested in studying race, racism, and power; they are also committed to applying their theoretical and empirical knowledge to real-world problems. The application of CRT encourages the creation of programs that transform the sociocultural dynamics of America. Thus, a CRT perspective would advise those interested in pay equity for HBCU faculty members to find shared values with White society and develop programming to accomplish both groups' goals. An example of this might be establishing a

program that incentivizes salary increases for HBCU faculty members that agree to serve dual appointments at HBCUs and HWCUs.

### **Future Research**

There is room for more and better-quality research on faculty salary inequities. Most of the research on faculty salary inequities focuses on the gender pay gap. The amount, scope, intensity, and longevity of efforts centered on gender pay equity demonstrate that this is a significant issue to higher education researchers. Conversely, the research concerning racial inequities in faculty salaries is underwhelming. Few studies investigate this issue, and those that do primarily focus on simplistic constructions of race. Similarly, the limited and even lack of investigation regarding pay equity for racial and ethnic minority faculty members and HBCU faculty members also demonstrates the lack of prioritization of these marginalized groups. As affirmed by Crenshaw (1989; 1991) feminism is often a White woman's discourse. When researchers examine issues exclusively on the basis of gender or sex, the primary beneficiaries are White women. Applying this perspective to higher education insinuates that current scholarship has only benefited the advancement of White women faculty members. More research should seek to understand pay equity across race and ethnicity as well as institutional type. This enlargement of research efforts would expand how we view faculty pay equity and communicate the message that we

care about diverse populations. An intersectional approach is warranted to better understand and support all faculty members, especially those on the margins.

Finally, most of the research on faculty salary inequities also looks at salary as a singular study outcome. As such, these studies chiefly present the financial impact of faculty salary inequity. While the monetary outlook is indeed important, including other variables such as job satisfaction and quality of life can provide a more holistic model. As researchers are developing their pay equity studies, they should consider including diverse outcomes to gain a better understanding of how salary inequity impacts faculty members. Equally, more researchers should include a qualitative aspect to their studies. Hearing the actual stories of the faculty members experiencing salary inequities can provide an additional layer of real world context and empower disadvantaged faculty members to be the masters of their own narratives in contemporary scholarship.

### **References**

Adams, M. (2000). *Readings for diversity and social justice*. Psychology Press.

Alexander, F. K. (2000). The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 411-431.

American Association of University Women. (n.d.). *Know Your Rights: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/what-we-do/legal-resources/know-your-rights-at-work/title-vii/>



- American Council on Education Board of Directors. (2012). On the importance of diversity in higher education. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/BoardDiversityStatement-June2012.pdf>
- Anaya, G., & Cole, D. G. (2001). Latina/o student achievement: Exploring the influence of student-faculty interactions on college grades. *Journal of college student development*, 42(1), 3-14.
- Barak, R. J., & Kniker, C. R. (2002). Benchmarking by state higher education boards. *New directions for higher education*, 2002(118), 93-102.
- Barbezat, D. A. (1991). Updating estimates of male-female salary differentials in the academic labor market. *Economics Letters*, 36(2), 191-195.
- Barbezat, D. A., & Donihue, M. R. (1998). Do faculty salaries rise with job seniority?. *Economics Letters*, 58(2), 239-244.
- Barbezat, D. A. (2002). History of pay equity studies. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2002(115), 9-40.
- Bellas, M. L. (1993). Faculty salaries: Still a cost of being female?. *Social Science Quarterly*, 74(1), 62-75.
- Benjamin, E. (1999). Disparities in the salaries and appointments of academic women and men. *Academe*, 60-62.
- Bettinger, E. P., & Long, B. T. (2005). Do faculty serve as role models? The impact of instructor gender on female students. *American Economic Review*, 152-157.
- Boudreau, N., Sullivan, J., Balzer, W., Ryan, A. M., Yonker, R., Thorsteinson, T., & Hutchinson, P. (1997). Should faculty rank be included as a predictor variable in studies of gender equity in university faculty salaries?. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(3), 297-312.
- Buck, J. (1999). HBCU salaries—A tale of the good, bad and ugly. *University Faculty Voice*, 4, 4-5.
- Buljac-Samardzic, M., Dekker-van Doorn, C. M., van Wijngaarden, J. D., & van Wijk, K. P. (2010). Interventions to improve team effectiveness: a systematic review. *Health Policy*, 94(3), 183-195.

- Chronicle of Higher Education. (2011). Average salaries of full-time faculty members, 2011-2012. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Average-Salaries-of-Full-Time-Faculty/133361/>
- Cole, D. (2008). Constructive criticism: The role of student-faculty interactions on African American and Hispanic students' educational gains. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(6), 587-605.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum.*, 139.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford law review*, 1241-1299.
- Dabney, C.W. (1914). Salaries of College Teachers. *Journal of Education*, 102-102.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2002). *Studying ourselves: The academic labor market* (No. w8965). National bureau of economic research.
- Endo, J. J., & Harpel, R. L. (1982). The effect of student-faculty interaction on students' educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 16(2), 115-138.
- Evans, A. L., Evans, V., & Evans, A. M. (2002). Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Education*, 123(1), 3.
- Finkelstein, M., Martin Conley, V., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *Taking the measure of faculty diversity*. (). New York, NY: TIAA Institute.
- Gasman, M. (2013). The changing face of historically Black colleges and universities. *Center for Minority Serving Institutions, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia*.
- Ginther, D. K., & Hayes, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in salary and promotion

- for faculty in the humanities 1977–95. *Journal of Human Resources*, 38(1), 34-73.
- Gordon, N. M., Morton, T. E., & Braden, I. C. (1974). Faculty salaries: Is there discrimination by sex, race, and discipline?. *The American Economic Review*, 419-427.
- Gregory, S. T. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status, and future. *Journal of Negro Education*, 124-138.
- Guiffrida, D. A. (2005). Othermothering as a framework for understanding African American students' definitions of student-centered faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 701-723.
- Guillory, E. A. (2001). The Black professoriate: Explaining the salary gap for African-American female professors. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 4(3), 225-244.
- Hearn, J. C. (1999). Pay and performance in the university: An examination of faculty salaries. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(4), 391-410.
- Heller, D. E. (2001). *The states and public higher education policy: Affordability, access, and accountability*. JHU Press.
- Henderson, A. D., & Jorgensen, R. E. (1954). Organization, Administration, and Financing of Post-High-School Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 331-340.
- Hoffman, E. P. (1976). Faculty salaries: Is there discrimination by sex, race, and discipline? Additional evidence. *The American Economic Review*, 196-198.
- Hoffman, J. L., & Bresciani, M. J. (2010). Assessment work: Examining the prevalence and nature of learning assessment competencies and skills in student affairs job postings. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 47(4), 487-504.
- Huisman, J., & Currie, J. (2004). Accountability in higher education: Bridge over troubled water?. *Higher Education*, 48(4), 529-551.

- Hurtado, S. (2007). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 185-196.
- Johnson, G. E., & Stafford, F. P. (1974). The earnings and promotion of women faculty. *The American Economic Review*, 888-903.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Des Jarlais, C. D. (1994). Barriers to tenure for women and minorities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(4), 335-353.
- Kelly, F.J. (1949) Salaries of College Teachers." *Higher Education* 5: 187-89;
- Kim, M. M. (2002). Historically Black vs. White institutions: Academic development among Black students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(4), 385-407.
- Koch, J. V., & Chizmar, J. F. (1976). Sex discrimination and affirmative action in faculty salaries. *Economic Inquiry*, 14(1), 16-24.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education?. *International journal of qualitative studies in education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Langton, N., & Pfeffer, J. (1994). Paying the professor: Sources of salary variation in academic labor markets. *American sociological review*, 236-256.
- Lemieux-Charles, L., & McGuire, W. L. (2006). What do we know about health care team effectiveness? A review of the literature. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 63(3), 263-300.
- Magolda, M. B. (1987). The affective dimension of learning: Faculty-student relationships that enhance intellectual development. *College Student Journal*.
- Marable, M. (1992). *Black America*. Westfield, NJ: Open Media.
- McCall, L. (2001). *Complex inequality: Gender, class, and race in the new economy*. Psychology Press.
- McCann, M. W. (1994). *Rights at work: Pay equity reform and the politics of legal mobilization*. University of Chicago Press.

- Megdal, S., & Ransom, M. (1985). Longitudinal changes in salary at a large public university: What response to equal pay legislation? *American Economic Review*, 75(2), 271-274.
- National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2017). *Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: 2015*. (No. Special Report NSF 17-306). Arlington, VA:
- North Carolina State University Human Resources. (n.d.). Term Details - Equal Opportunity Officer (EOO). Retrieved from [https://www.ncsu.edu/human\\_resources/glossary/details.php?id=73](https://www.ncsu.edu/human_resources/glossary/details.php?id=73)
- Perna, L. W. (2001). Sex differences in faculty salaries: A cohort analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 283-307.
- Porter, S. R., Toutkoushian, R. K., & Moore III, J. V. (2008). Pay inequities for recently hired faculty, 1988-2004. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31(4), 465-487.
- Provasnik, S., & Shafer, L. L. (2004). *Historically black colleges and universities, 1976 to 2001. ED TAB*. (No. NCES 2004-062). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Ranking the Nation's Leading Liberal Arts Colleges on Their Levels of Black Faculty. (2007). Ranking the Nation's Leading Liberal Arts Colleges on Their Levels of Black Faculty. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, (57), 14-16. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.prox.lib.ncsu.edu/stable/25073754>
- Raphael, D. D. (1946). Equality and equity. *Philosophy*, 21(79), 118-132.
- Reeves, F. W. (1932). Finance and Business Management in Institutions of Higher Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 2(2), 116-133.
- Renzulli, L. A., Grant, L., & Kathuria, S. (2006). Race, Gender, and the Wage Gap Comparing Faculty Salaries in Predominately White and Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Gender & Society*, 20(4), 491-510.
- Riggs, G. D., & Dwyer, L. (1995). Salary Discrimination by Black Males?.

*American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 54(2), 231-237.

Smith, D. G. (1977). College classroom interactions and critical thinking. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69(2), 180.

Toutkoushian, R. K. (1998). Racial and marital status differences in faculty pay. *Journal of Higher Education*, 513-541.

Toutkoushian, R. K., Bellas, M. L., & Moore, J. V. (2007). The interaction effects of gender, race, and marital status on faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education*, 572-601.

Toutkoushian, R. K., & Conley, V. M. (2005). Progress for women in academe, yet inequities persist: Evidence from NSOPF: 99. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 1-28.

Trabue, M. R. (1952). College Teachers at Work. *Review of Educational Research*, 233-237.

Umbach, P. D. (2007). Gender equity in the academic labor market: An analysis of academic disciplines. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 169-192.

Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153-184.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.a). Equal Pay/Compensation Discrimination. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/equalcompensation.cfm>

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.b). *Milestones: 1972*. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/history/35th/milestones/1972.html>

United Negro College Fund (n.d.). *About HBCUs*. Retrieved from [http://www.uncf.org/sections/MemberColleges/SS\\_AboutHBCUs/about.hbcu.asp](http://www.uncf.org/sections/MemberColleges/SS_AboutHBCUs/about.hbcu.asp)

United States Department of Education (2014). *The HBCU Value Proposition*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/hbcu-value-proposition>

- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *The Condition of Education 2015* (NCES 2015-144), Expenses of Postsecondary Institutions.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2015* (NCES 2016-014), Table 105.50.
- Weisbrod, B. A., Ballou, J. P., & Asch, E. D. (2008). *Mission and money: Understanding the university*. Cambridge University Press.
- Winkler, J. A. (2000). Faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion: Barriers for women. *The Professional Geographer*, 52(4), 737-750.
- Woodside, B. M., Wong, E. H., & Weist, D. J. (1999). The effect of student-faculty interaction on college students' academic achievement and self concept. *Education*, 119(4), 730.