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**Abstract**

In this paper, I review the current literature on salary inequities along gender and race lines, as well as explore topics which relate to salary determination, such as negotiation, hiring practices, and trends in promotion and tenure. I then describe the salary data of faculty and staff and administrators at the University of Houston- Clear Lake, collected over the course of my internship, and analyze and discuss the data in context of the literature review. Finally, I make recommendations based on the literature which may help mitigate salary discrepancies at the university.

In the United States, colleges and universities are increasingly viewed as politically liberal institutions (Parker, 2019). The degree to which people consider this a problem varies, but among those who do, the prominent idea is that the infrastructure and curricula are distinctly left-leaning, and this political bent unfairly benefits women and racial minorities (Parker, 2019). However, the data simply do not back this up.

I completed my graduate internship at the University of Houston- Clear Lake’s Office of Student Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. A large portion of my time spent at my internship site was spent on a particular project requested by my internship supervisor and the head of the department–collecting, statistically analyzing, and synthesizing the publicly-available salary information of faculty and staff and administrators at the university during the year 2020. At the base level, my exploratory findings indicated some significant salary discrepancies along gender and race lines. I then delved deeper into the body of literature regarding salary disparities along these lines, as well as the various tangential aspects of workplace climate, both academic and not, which relate to those salary disparities.

In this paper, I will provide discussion of current research on the subjects of salary inequity, salary negotiation, hiring practices, and promotion and tenure. I will then present the collected data and statistical analysis in detail, and comment on the results and discuss consistencies between the literature and the salary data I have collected. Finally, I will provide a few general recommendations based on the research for the university which may help mitigate these salary discrepancies.

**Literature Review: Pay (In)Equity**

In this section, I will be discussing the body of literature regarding salary inequities, and related topics which have been linked to persistent salary inequities, such as differences in salary negotiation, hiring practices, and trends in promotion and tenure. Within each subsection, I will discuss in greater depth at least one article in which researchers analyze the given topic in the context of gendered differences, and at least one other article in which researchers analyze the same topic with the lens of racial and ethnic differences.

**Salary Inequities**

The gender pay gap, both inside and outside of universities, has been and continues to be a contentious topic in public discourse, and the subject of a significant amount of scientific research (Alkadry & Tower, 2006; Biasi & Sarsons, 2022; Carlin et al., 2013; Doucet et al., 2012; Ginther & Hayes, 2003; Lee & Won, 2014; Lips, 2013; Lysenko & Wang, 2020; Nettles & Perna, 1995; Rabovsky & Lee, 2018; Wiedman, 2020). Nettles and Perna (1995) noted significant discrepancies in average faculty salaries based on gender, with female faculty generally receiving salaries about eleven percent lower than those received by male faculty; regardless of how much progress has been made in alleviating the gender gap in pay in the United States, gender does still play a significant role predicting salary outcomes, even when position, rank, and experience are controlled for (Alkadry & Tower, 2006; Doucet et al., 2012; Lips, 2013).

Carlin et al. (2013) conducted an econometric study examining gendered wage discrepancies within faculty at a single university and studying a single discipline; using secondary data analysis, Carlin et al. (2013) examined how well various theories of gender discrepancies in wages fit with the actual data they collected. Carlin et al. (2013) found that male salaries were, on average, about 22 percent higher than those of their female counterparts, with approximate monthly salaries almost $1000 higher for men than for women.

Regarding discrepancy theories and explanatory factors, Carlin et al. (2013) found that peer reviews and objective academic productivity measures correlated strongly with male faculty’s salary outcomes but not with female faculty’s salary outcomes. This means that increasing productivity and positive peer relations have significant career benefits for male faculty, but not necessarily for female faculty. Carlin et al. (2013) apply hypotheses of invisibility and dynamic signaling to explain how female faculty are kept clustered in lower-ranked, lower-paid positions, which would mute the expected relationship between productivity and salary. Additionally, Carlin et al. (2013) examine their data using the occupational crowding hypothesis, finding that while it may not relate to the mismatch between female faculty’s productivity and salaries, it may help explain why women become overrepresented in lower-paying positions and occupations.

Race and ethnicity also continue to play a predictive role in salary outcomes, functioning as a feature in income disparity and social stratification (Akee et al., 2019; Bloome & Western, 2011; Cheng et al., 2019; Intrator et al., 2016; Manduca, 2018; Nettles & Perna, 1995). Akee et al. (2019), in a life course study of income inequality and socioeconomic mobility, found that White and Asian Americans tend to report the highest incomes, and American Indian, Black, and Hispanic Americans tend to report the lowest incomes. Akee et al. (2019) also found that White and Asian Americans tend to have lower within-group mobility than other racial/ethnic groups, though those groups had lower overall socioeconomic mobility than White and Asian Americans. Similarly, Cheng et al. (2019) and Manduca (2018) found that any narrowing of the racial earnings gap is related primarily to the deteriorating economic positions of White workers near the lower end of the socioeconomic scale, rather than increased prosperity among their counterparts of color. Bloome & Western (2011) reported similar findings from their cohort study, looking into the social mobility of Black and White men born between the 1940s and the 1960s–educational mobility increased for Black men, but economic mobility declined for men of both races.

**Individual Salary Negotiation**

One potential link to persistent differences in salary which researchers have looked into is salary negotiation. Previous studies have suggested that individual salary negotiations necessarily have differential impacts on those in social minority positions, such as women and people of color (Biasi & Sarsons, 2022; Hernandez et al., 2019; Lee & Won, 2014). As opposed to the use of collective bargaining power for determining salary schedules, flexible pay via individual salary negotiation is strongly impacted by individual-level implicit factors–such as initial likelihood of individual negotiation taking place, implicit bias on part of the employer, and perceptions of differences in social power.

Biasi and Sarsons (2022) studied this relationship between flexible pay and the wage gap amongst public school teachers in Wisconsin–chosen because a particular state law went into effect in 2011, which reduced the collective bargaining power of teachers’ unions and incentivized school districts to adopt individual flexible salary plans, making the state a useful source of comparative salary data. This study worked in two ways: first, a quantitative analysis of differences in teachers’ salaries, followed by a qualitative survey in order to help explain potential differences in negotiation (Biasi & Sarsons, 2022). Biasi and Sarsons (2022) focused on public school teachers, but they noted that the basis of their argument–that teachers’ salaries tend to be less equitable when schools and school districts are allowed more flexible salary negotiations with individual faculty members–could apply to teachers in all academic lanes.

Biasi and Sarsons (2022) found that generally, within institutions which moved from collectively-negotiated strict salary schedules to flexible salaries that are partially reliant upon individual negotiation, female teachers earned less on average than male teachers, even after controlling for factors like seniority, experience, and overtime taken. The difference was particularly noticeable in schools headed by male principals as opposed to female principals, and in districts with male superintendents as opposed to female superintendents (Biasi & Sarsons, 2022).

Regarding the survey data, Biasi and Sarsons (2022) found that female teachers were more than twenty percent less likely than male teachers to have attempted salary negotiation at the start of their current jobs, and that when they did attempt negotiation, female teachers were more than ten percent less likely than male teachers to report that negotiation as successful. In comparison to men, women were less likely to report being satisfied with their salaries, but they were more likely to report being uncomfortable with negotiating for higher salaries and more likely to believe that attempting negotiation was useless, though these factors do not wholly explain the gendered difference in actual negotiation attempts (Biasi & Sarsons, 2022). Again, these differences were much more pronounced when teachers worked under a male principal or superintendent (Biasi & Sarsons, 2022).

The implications here are very interesting, in relation to both the quantitative effect of a lack of collective bargaining power and the qualitative effect of gendered differences in negotiation. There is also the element of potential gendered socialization effects on those differences in negotiation–working with the idea that young boys are more socialized with the expectation that they should fight for what they want, and that young girls are more socialized to acquiesce and appease, these differences in socialization processes could help explain the differences in both rate and comfort with salary negotiation in the workplace.

Biasi and Sarsons’ (2022) research dealt primarily with accounting for gender discrepancies in salaries, but similar phenomena regarding bargaining and negotiation have been observed when accounting for race-based discrepancies in salaries. Hernandez et al. (2019) researched the influence of race in salary negotiations, utilizing three related studies to analyze the mechanisms by which employers’ and jobseekers’ approaches to salary negotiation are influenced by race.

The first study had participants reading one of two versions of a resume, with the only manipulated difference being the race of potential jobseeker in a photograph at the top of each resume, after which participants completed surveys measuring racial bias via the social dominance orientation (SDO) scale, and the perceived likelihood of their particular jobseeker negotiating their starting salary (Hernandez et al., 2019). The results indicated that among those with higher SDO scores, participants viewed the Black jobseeker as significantly less likely to negotiate than the White jobseeker (Hernandez et al., 2019). The two subsequent related studies by Hernandez et al. (2019) yielded concurrent results, with high-SDO participants rating Black jobseekers as negotiating more than White jobseekers, and then offering Black jobseekers consecutively lower starting salaries for each attempt at negotiation. The implication here is that Black jobseekers are not expected to negotiate and are subsequently punished for violating that expectation, whether or not this punishment is conscious or intentional.

This particular study only utilized men in order to avoid gender confounds (Hernandez et al., 2019), but the intersection of race and gender would pose an interesting study in the context of salary negotiations, as the potential for compounded negative impacts of gendered and racialized expectations of non-negotiation for salaries may be particularly high for women of color.

**Hiring Practices**

Another cluster of factors driving salary and income disparity revolve around hiring practices. Generally speaking, hiring networks favor White people, and particularly White men (Eaton et al., 2019; Gaddis, 2015; Nunez-Smith et al., 2012; Silva, 2018; Wolfinger et al., 2009). Discrepancies in hiring practices would logically impact the presence of salary inequities–as might seem obvious, one has to have a job to have a salary. Additionally, differences in employers’ implicit biases and explicit practices could affect employees’ starting salaries, which would put already-disadvantaged workers at an even lower starting point.

Silva (2018) conducted a sociological study of racial differences in the benefits of referrals for jobseekers. Using a survey measure of implicit bias resistant to social desirability, Silva (2018) then utilized a form of audit study design, asking participants–all of them White–to evaluate two jobseekers’ resumes with relatively equal credentials and their employee referral forms, to gauge how likely they would be to recommend an interview with them, and to suggest starting salaries and likelihood of promotion if the jobseeker were to be hired. Silva (2018) found that Black jobseekers benefited in one specific condition–when they were referred by a White person, and when the participant evaluating them scored low on the implicit bias measure. White jobseekers, on the other hand, benefitted from a same-race referral, regardless of the implicit bias score of the participant evaluating them (Silva, 2018). The implication here is that Black jobseekers come into the workforce at a distinct disadvantage, with a lack of access to the benefits of referrals compounded by lowered returns on those referrals. From an academic standpoint, Gaddis (2015) used a similar study design and found similar results, with Black graduates from top-tier universities gaining lower career option returns for their education level than equally-qualified White graduates.

Looking more specifically at academic positions–perceptions on the part of potential employers and existing faculty still matter. Eaton et al. (2019) conducted another kind of audit study, asking tenured STEM faculty at various public research universities to judge one of eight nearly identical post-graduate CVs, with the only difference between them being the indicated race and gender of the potential applicant. Eaton et al. (2019) asked the faculty participants to evaluate the given CVs on competence, hireability, and likeability. The participants in this study generally judged White and Asian candidates as the most competent and hireable, with Black female and Hispanic female candidates fairly consistently deemed the least competent and least hireable (Eaton et al., 2019). Female candidates were also consistently rated as more likeable than male candidates, regardless of race (Eaton et al., 2019). Studies like this–and like Lysenko and Wang’s (2020) research, similarly indicating academic hiring discrepancies for women and Black jobseekers looking for employment in STEM fields–make clear how much implicit gender-based and race-based perceptions matter in the hiring process. These discrepancies in the hiring process may then help explain both the relative lack of certain racial minority groups in academia and the clustering of those who are in academia both into and out of specific fields.

**Promotion and Tenure**

Another area of academia in which there are discrepancies which may contribute to pay inequity is promotion and tenure–generally, women and people of color do not get promoted or granted tenure at the same rate as White men (Ginther & Hayes, 2003; Nettles & Perna, 1995; Nunez-Smith et al., 2012; Oleschuk, 2020; Weisshaar, 2017). As lower-ranked faculty tend to earn less, differences in promotion rates on gendered or racial lines would logically lead to differences in average salary along those same lines.

Gender discrepancies in promotion and tenure rates have been observed and analyzed scientifically since the 1990s; Nettles and Perna (1995) found that, despite having higher levels of career productivity, female faculty were less likely to be promoted than male faculty, and were less likely to reach full professorship. More contemporary research has produced similar results, with female faculty consistently lagging behind male faculty in promotion and tenure rates (Ginther & Hayes, 2003; Oleschuk, 2020; Weisshaar, 2017; Wolfinger et al., 2009).

A particularly interesting recent article dealt with a very contemporary phenomenon–the instances of gendered promotion and tenure disparities during the COVID-19 pandemic. Oleschuk (2020) outlines how long-standing discrepancies in both paid and unpaid (i.e.- domestic) labor have come into sharp relief during the lockdown period of the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in significant gendered differences in research output among university faculty. As evidenced by journal submissions, preprint servers, and records of new project initiations, female faculty have lagged behind male faculty during the lockdown period; the overall number of journal submissions actually increased during the pandemic lockdown, but the number of those authored or co-authored by women sharply decreased (Oleschuk, 2020). The implication is that, in general, gendered work-family conflicts became exacerbated–female faculty still felt the increased burdens of balancing remote work, child or elder care, and domestic labor, while male faculty used their extra time to work more rather than to participate in more domestic responsibilities.

Given the importance research and publishing have on promotion and tenure decisions, the gendered discrepancies in labor distribution favor men, as male faculty are more likely to have a stay-at-home spouse to whom they can defer domestic labor and childcare than are female faculty (Lips, 2013; Oleschuk, 2020). Demands for unpaid labor subsequently provide just another obstacle for female faculty applying for tenure, as they have less available time than their male counterparts to spend on the paid labor that will be used for judging those applications.

Discrepancies in rates of promotion and tenure also continue to exist on racial and ethnic lines. Nettles and Perna (1995) found that Black and Hispanic faculty at American universities were significantly less likely than faculty of other races to receive tenure, even when they had higher levels of teaching career productivity than White faculty.

A particular study of medical schools in the United States found that Hispanic and Black faculty fell behind White faculty in promotion from assistant to associate professor, and from associate to full professor (Nunez-Smith et al., 2012). Using sociodemographic and career trajectory data from the Association of American Medical College Faculty Roster, Nunez-Smith et al. (2012) compared mean and median promotion rates among White, Black, and Hispanic faculty. Nunez-Smith et al. (2012) found that not only did most American academic medical centers have significant numerical differences in race among faculty–with White individuals making up more than ninety percent of the faculty–but promotion rates for Black and Hispanic faculty were both significantly lower than those for White faculty, even at academic medical centers with greater proportions of faculty identifying with historically underrepresented racial/ethnic groups. Many academic medical centers did not promote any racial minority faculty during the study period at all, with this particularly occurring at larger institutions (Nunez-Smith et al., 2012).

These particular relationships illustrate how no system of judgment truly exists in a vacuum, and even processes which would ideally produce equitable results are still subject to societal pressures.

**Analysis: 2020 Salary Data from University of Houston- Clear Lake**

For the purposes of this research and data analysis, employees are separated into two groups: faculty, and staff and administrators. I recorded descriptive statistics and t-test statistics for each group; the significance level for the performed t-tests is set to 0.05, as is the standard for social science data analysis. I have also calculated effect size for each t-test result, for more detailed analysis of the strength of the relationships between those being measured, with an effect size less than .2 considered trivial. The two groups have been statistically analyzed independently, with any between-group comparisons made only in discussion.

**Data Collection**

The current data analysis utilized only the publicly-available salary information of faculty, staff, and administrators from UHCL. All salary information used for the purposes of this research was collected through OpenPayrolls.com, a public research site which provides access to compensation records released in accordance with public record and salary transparency laws, and dates from the year 2020.

The complete datasets for university faculty and for university staff and administrators can be found attached alongside this paper.

**Faculty**

Of UHCL’s 304 faculty members in the year 2020, 30 of them had salary data which, upon analysis, were noted as mathematical outliers–this leaves the total number of faculty members with non-outlying salary data at 274. The characteristics of outlying faculty members have been noted, but outlying data was not utilized in any further statistical calculations. It may also be of interest that without outliers, faculty is evenly split by gender.

I feel it should be noted that all faculty members with outlying salary data fell below the group’s lower quartile boundary–that is, all of their salaries for the year 2020 fell at or below $5,965.55–that 26 of the 30 held adjunct positions, and that 25 of the 30 identified as female.

***Descriptive Statistics***

As noted, discounting mathematical outliers, there is an even split between genders amongst faculty. There is not such an even split between racial and ethnic categories–of the 274 faculty members, 177 of them identify as White. The next most populous racial/ethnic group is Asian faculty, with 53 members, followed by Hispanic faculty with 25 members, Black faculty with 18 members, and Pacific Islander faculty with one member.

The average salary for a faculty member at UHCL in the year 2020 was $75,953.90. The average salary for male faculty members was $83,020.86, and the average salary for female faculty members was $68,886.94–a difference of $14,133.92. The average salary for White faculty members was $74,267.41; the average salary for Asian faculty members was $92,665.04; the average salary for Hispanic faculty members was $62,833.46; the average salary for Black faculty members was $62,463.06; and the average salary for Pacific Islander faculty members was $59,618.04.

***T-Test Statistics***

Regarding differences between the salary outcomes of gendered groups, there is a statistically significant difference between male faculty and female faculty (*p* < .0001), with a moderate effect size (*d* = .47).

Regarding differences between the salary outcomes of racial/ethnic groups, the significance of the differences has been calculated in comparison with White faculty, as White faculty both make up the numerical majority and are considered the sociopolitical majority and thus a cultural ‘baseline’ among racial/ethnic groups in the United States.

There is a statistically significant difference in salary outcomes between White faculty and Asian faculty (*p* < .0001), with a moderate-to-large effect size (*d* = .67). The difference in salary outcomes between White faculty and Hispanic faculty is not statistically significant (*p* > .05), with a small-to-moderate effect size (*d* = .35); the difference in salary outcomes between White faculty and Black faculty is also not statistically significant (*p* > .05), with a small-to-moderate effect size (*d* = .36). As there is only one faculty member identified as Pacific Islander, a t-test comparison with this group was not mathematically feasible.

**Staff and Administrators**

Of UHCL’s 463 staff members and administrative employees (subsequently referred to as staff/admin, for brevity) in the year 2020, 25 of them had salary data which, upon analysis, were noted as mathematical outliers, and one in addition had salary data which was known to be incomplete for the year. The characteristics of said staff/admin have been noted, but their salary data was not used in any further statistical calculations–leaving the total number of staff/admin with calculable data at 437.

Regarding outliers, it should be noted that all staff/admin with outlying salary data fell above the group’s upper quartile boundary–that is, all of their salaries for the year 2020 fell at or above $97,157.30–that all of them held the highest or second-highest administrative position in their particular departments, that 15 of the 25 identified as male, and that 14 of the 25 identified as White.

***Descriptive Statistics***

As noted, discounting mathematical outliers and incomplete data, there are 437 staff/admin recorded at UHCL in the year 2020; 311 identify as female, and 126 identify as male. Regarding racial/ethnic groups, 195 of the staff/admin identify as White, 130 as Hispanic, 70 as Black, 35 as Asian, three as American Indian, one as Pacific Islander, and three as an unspecified race/ethnicity.

The average salary for staff/admin at UHCL in the year 2020 was $45,287.74. The average salary for male staff/admin was $49,215.04; the average salary for female staff/admin was $43,696.61–a difference of $5,518.43. The average salary for White staff/admin was $47,759.62; the average salary for Hispanic staff/admin was $38,844.51; for Black staff/admin, the average salary was $47,468.02; for Asian staff/admin, the average salary was $51,893.29; for American Indian staff/admin, the average salary was $47,805.15; for Pacific Islander staff/admin, the average salary $39,517.89; and for staff/admin with unspecified race/ethnicity, the average salary was $35,289.47.

***T-Test Statistics***

There is a statistically significant difference between average salary outcomes for male staff/admin and female staff/admin (*p* = .0034), with a small-to-moderate effect size (*d* = .31).

Again, the t-test comparisons for racial/ethnic groups are measured between staff/admin identified as White and those identified with each other recorded racial/ethnic group. There is a statistically significant difference between average salary outcomes for White and Hispanic staff/admin (*p* < .0001), with a moderate effect size (*d* = .53). No other differences between salary outcomes for White staff/admin and those of other racial/ethnic groups are statistically significant (*p* > .05), though the relations have varying effect sizes (White and Black, *d* = .02; White and Asian, *d* = .24; White and American Indian, *d* = .002; White and Unspecified, *d* = .78). Again, as only one staff/admin member identified as Pacific Islander, a t-test comparison using this group was not mathematically feasible.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

As noted above, both faculty and staff/admin demonstrated significant salary outcome differences based on employee gender. This is consistent with the research, which shows longstanding gender differences in salary both inside and outside of academia (Alkadry & Tower, 2006; Biasi & Sarsons, 2022; Carlin et al., 2013; Doucet et al., 2012; Ginther & Hayes, 2003; Lips, 2013; Lysenko & Wang, 2013; Murphy & Oesch, 2016; Nettles & Perna, 1995; Rabovsky & Lee, 2018; Wiedman, 2020). Discrepancies found in the UHCL data do exist on multiple levels which might influence the differences found between male and female faculty and staff/admin.

One discrepancy among faculty is the gendered differences in ranking: though the actual number of male and female faculty at UHCL is equal, a higher proportion of male faculty have full professorship (22.63%) than do female faculty (15.33%), and a much higher proportion of female faculty hold non-tenure adjunct positions (12.41%) than do male faculty (5.12%). This is consistent with much of the existing research on promotion and tenure, which indicates that male faculty receive tenure-track positions more quickly and are promoted at higher rates than female faculty (Nettles & Perna, 1995; Weisshaar, 2017; Wolfinger et al., 2009).

Additionally, male faculty at UHCL are generally clustered within the higher-paying colleges–the College of Business (average salary = $113,648.27), and the College of Science and Engineering (average salary = $82,556.82)–while female faculty are generally clustered in the lower-paying colleges–the College of Human Sciences and Humanities (average salary = $60,498.40), and the College of Education (average salary = $53,471.32). This gives rise to the question as to *why* those particular colleges pay so differently on average. Employers may feel a greater need to offer higher starting salaries for business and STEM faculty in order to lure them away from industry, in a way that does not correlate with their practices for hiring human science and education faculty, but that does not necessarily explain why those colleges have such gender differences in faculty makeup. The occupational crowding theory suggests that women are socially funneled into jobs with lower perceived productivity, which subsequently award them lower salaries, while also leaving the occupations with higher perceived productivity for men (Carlin et al., 2013). Recent research has also indicated that people moving their careers into female-dominated occupations, wherein at least sixty percent of the workers are female, contend with cultural devaluation accompanied by significantly lower wages (Murphy & Oesch, 2016)–from these two theories, it logically follows that faculty and staff at female-dominated schools would generally receive lower pay than those at male-dominated schools, which would then enhance the gender gap in their salaries.

It is impossible to account for potential negotiation practices in regards to how much influence they may have had in regards to the 2020 UHCL salary data. However, local work factors tie in with previous research, in that Texas is considered a right-to-work state, so any collective bargaining power held by teachers is low. I do not know the particular methods that UHCL used to determine faculty salaries, but if, as the results of Biasi and Sarsons’ (2022) research imply, decreased strength of collective bargaining power relates significantly to increased gender salary differences, then their results with teachers at public schools may be replicated by faculty in higher education that similarly lack strong collective bargaining. It is also not inconceivable that the results might apply to non-teaching school staff/admin, if they also lack this collective bargaining power.

One troubling phenomenon I found is the numerical differences based on race/ethnicity among faculty and staff/admin are fairly large. White teachers numerically dominate the faculty at UHCL, regardless of particular college. Additionally, faculty members from other racial/ethnic groups are not equitably spread out between the colleges, with Asian faculty clustered in the College of Business and the College of Science and Engineering, and with Hispanic and Black faculty members clustered in the two other colleges. Similar to the gendered clustering impacting gender differences in average salary, the racial clustering may also impact race-based differences in average salary–the racial/ethnic group with the highest average salary, Asian faculty, are clustered in the higher-paying colleges, and Hispanic and Black faculty are clustered in the lower-paying colleges, resulting in lower average salaries.

Hispanic and Black faculty seem to have been clustered out of the College of Science and Engineering, with five Hispanic faculty and zero Black faculty. This falls in line with recent research conducted by Eaton et al. (2020) and Lysenko and Wang (2020) regarding the presence and career outcomes of racial minorities in STEM faculty, as well as the difficulties they face based on racial bias from those senior faculty and administrators who influence their salaries.

One more somewhat troubling set of data involves the significance of discrepancies regarding the Hispanic population among UHCL faculty and staff/admin. Regarding faculty, the difference in salary compared with White faculty is not statistically significant–however, the numerical difference in faculty population is startling, with only 25 Hispanic faculty members to 177 White faculty members. Additionally, while the numerical discrepancy among staff/admin is not as severe, the salary difference between White staff/admin and Hispanic staff/admin *is* statistically significant, rounding out to approximately $9,000 difference through the year 2020–and the strength of the relationship between race/ethnicity and salary outcomes is moderate, indicating real practical significance to the effect. Furthermore, Hispanic staff/admin are generally clustered into lower-paying jobs with lower levels of perceived skill, such as custodial staff, facilities and maintenance workers, and office assistants, while White staff/admin appear in a larger variety of staff/admin occupations with a larger range of salaries.

These phenomena are particularly troubling because UHCL prides itself on being a designated Hispanic-Serving Institution (UHCL Staff, 2020). While this designation depends more on enrollment of Hispanic students than on the hiring and equitable treatment of Hispanic faculty and staff/admin, it still seems like something which could and should be improved upon by the university given this designation. After all, students and junior faculty and staff/admin have increasingly better outcomes when they see more senior faculty and staff/admin whose identities they share (Lee & Won, 2014; Sanders et al., 2009). One way in which the university could better serve its Hispanic student body would be to better serve its Hispanic faculty and staff/admin.

Finally, I would like to propose a few changes which could assist in minimizing gender- and race-based salary inequities. The first would be to provide negotiation training to racial and gender-minority faculty and staff/admin–if, as Biasi and Sarsons (2022) results indicate, individual negotiations have a strong impact on salary outcomes, and part of the gender difference in individual negotiations relate to gender differences in discomfort with the negotiation process, then providing education and training to faculty and staff/admin may help mitigate discrepancies based on salary negotiation. Related to this, as suggested by Hernandez et al. (2019), it would be prudent to make sure those who are recommending starting salaries and salary bonuses receive implicit bias training, so as to better recognize how their actions may be inadvertently producing discrepancies in salary outcomes and reproducing the racial and gender income gap.

Another proposal I would make would be to revise practices used to judge performance, and to grant promotions for staff/admin and tenure for professors. As explained earlier, even when these judgments seem to be made using the most objective standard applicable–things like quality of work, or frequency and prestige of publication–they are impacted by outside forces, which can put minority faculty and staff at a disadvantage when it comes to actually producing the work required for promotion and tenure.
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