The examination of pay discrimination based on race in the MLB

Matthew F. Nay May 9th, 2023

Abstract

This paper examines the impact of race on salary differentials in Major League Baseball (MLB) using data from the seasons 2015-2022. The study utilizes Statcast data, a more comprehensive measure of player performance, to better account for the impact of a player's performance on their team's success and thus provides a more accurate measure of their worth to the team. The research question is whether there is pay discrimination based on race among MLB players. The results indicate that non-white players receive lower salaries than their white counterparts, even after controlling for various performance metrics and demographic factors. The findings contribute to the ongoing debate on salary discrimination in professional sports and highlight the role of player performance data in understanding the factors that contribute to pay differentials.

1 Introduction

Salary discrimination in professional sports has been a controversial topic for years, with many studies examining the factors that contribute to unequal pay. In recent years, the increasing availability of player performance data has provided a more nuanced approach to understanding salary differentials. This paper uses data from the Major League Baseball (MLB) seasons of 2015-2022 (excluding 2020 due to COVID-19) and focuses on the impact of race on salary differentials among MLB players.

The research question I will be seeking to answer is there a pay discrimination based on race amongst Major League Baseball (MLB) players? This question has relevance due to the current demographics of baseball. This is the current makeup of players in the MLB in 2022:

- White 62.1%
- Hispanic or Latino 28.5%
- Black or African American 7.2%
- Asian 1.9%
- Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 0.3%
- American Indian or Alaska Native 0.1%

These numbers are from the 2022 Major League Baseball Racial and Gender Report Card from The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES) at the University of Central Florida (UCF).

One key feature of this study is the use of Statcast data, which provides a more comprehensive measure of player performance than traditional statistics such as batting average or ERA. Statcast measures not only the results of a player's actions (e.g., the distance a ball travels), but also the quality of their actions (e.g., the speed of the ball off the bat). This approach better accounts for the impact of a player's performance on their team's success and thus provides a more accurate measure of their worth to the team.

Previous studies have examined the relationship between race and salary in MLB, with mixed results. Some studies have found evidence of salary discrimination against minority players, while others

have found no significant difference in pay between white and minority players. However, these studies often rely on traditional performance statistics, which may not capture the full extent of a player's contribution to their team. By using Statcast data, this paper aims to provide a more accurate assessment of the impact of race on salary differentials in MLB.

Overall, this paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing debate on salary discrimination in professional sports and provide insight into the role of player performance data in understanding the factors that contribute to pay differentials.

2 Data Section

The data starts with collecting players' value data from Baseball Reference. This data source included each players team, WAR, and salary for that year. For this study the years 2015-2022 were chosen because Statcast first started tracking stats in 2015. The year 2020 is not included since it was only a 60 game season due to COVID-19 and normally seasons are 162 games. This time frame is more recent that any other study on this topic and covers a large enough period that would allow some players to sign multiple contracts.

WAR is a relatively new performance metric that is considered to be one of the most robust measurements of a player's productivity. WAR measures how many more games a player's team wins than the team would have won if it had the league-average player in the stead of the observed player. Because it takes into account both defensive and offensive production, it will serve as an exceptionally strong indicator of a player's value.

The next source of data is Statcast which is powered by Google Cloud. From Baseball Savant we are able to add variables to each observation which include traditional stats adm statcast powered stats. The differences between these two categories can be seen in table 1. To learn more about how these are calculated go to Baseball Savant's website where they have clearly defined every statistic. The statcast data is mainly powered by player tracking data which allows models to calculate a player's expected chance of making an individual play. Which can then be used to calculate expected runs created for offensive plays.

We are then able to add robustness to the data by collecting demographic data for all players. This includes birth country and the date of when the player debuted in the major leagues. This allows us to create our international dummy variable and service time variable. The service time variable simply subtracts the year the player debuted from the year the stats were produced.

The variable indicating a player's race was created by the author. Race was determined using each player's roster picture as well as referring to his name. In the final dataset, players are classified as white or non-white.

Unlike previous studies, one of the main independent variables in the study will be Service Time. Previous studies have used age or contract length to control for 'experience'. I will discuss more in the results section, but in reference to my data, the use of service time vastly improved the strength of my model. I also choose to use the per year value of a contract in contrast to the average annual value of a contract because some contracts will be structured differently than others. For example, a five-year contract worth \$5 million may be divided as follows: Year 1, \$1.1 million; Year 2, \$0.9 million; Year 3, \$1 million; Year 4, \$1.05 million; Year 5, \$0.95 million. I chose to incorporate this structure of salary representation in order to control for teams that create irregular values throughout the length of the contract However, like previous studies, the dependent variable will be the natural logarithm of a player's annual salary in a given year. This will be done to track percentage changes associated with changes in the independent variable instead of dollar changes. It is more logical to track percentage changes because dollar changes are more significant at lower salary levels than at higher salary levels, whereas percentage changes are constant.

Table 1: Variable Definitions

Variable	Definition Table 1. Variable Demintions
Team	Team for that year
ln(Salary)	The Natural Log of each observations salary for that year
WAR	Wins Above Replacement
Age	Player's age that season
Service Time	Years player has played in the MLB
NonWhite	1 if player is not white, 0 otherwise
International	1 if player is not from USA, 0 otherwise
Year	year
Traditional Stats	
Hits	Number of hits collected by player
Home Runs	Number of home runs collected by player
Strikeouts	Number of strikeouts collected by player
Walks	Number of walks collected by player
AVG	Batting average by player
SLG	Slugging percentage
OBP	On base percentage
OPS	On base percentage plus slugging
Statcast Stats	
xBA	Expected batting average
xSLG	Expected slugging percentage
xwOBA	Expected weighted on base average
xOBP	Expected on base percentage
xISO	Expected isolated power
Avg EV	Average exit velo of baseball
Avg LA	Average launch angle of baseball
Sweet Spot $\%$	Percent of at bats that are a batted-ball event with a launch angle between eight and
	32 degrees
Barrel $\%$	Percent of at bats that are a batted ball with the perfect combination of exit velocity and
	launch angle

Table 2: Variable Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	SD	\min	Max	N
ln(Salary)	15.91	0.81	13.82	17.37	587.00
WAR	3.03	2.20	-3.30	10.70	587.00
Age	29.77	3.23	22.00	40.00	587.00
Service Time	7.43	3.21	0.00	21.00	587.00
NonWhite	0.49	0.50	0.00	1.00	587.00
International	0.33	0.47	0.00	1.00	587.00
Year	2018.15	2.36	2015.00	2022.00	587.00
Hits	145.49	23.72	79.00	216.00	587.00
Home Runs	22.50	10.27	0.00	62.00	587.00
Strikeouts	116.51	31.99	38.00	219.00	587.00
Walks	56.87	22.34	13.00	145.00	587.00
AVG	0.27	0.03	0.17	0.35	587.00
SLG	0.46	0.07	0.27	0.69	587.00
OBP	0.34	0.04	0.24	0.47	587.00
OPS	0.80	0.09	0.54	1.11	587.00
xBA	0.26	0.02	0.19	0.34	587.00
xSLG	0.45	0.07	0.27	0.71	587.00
xwOBA	0.34	0.04	0.26	0.46	587.00
xOBP	0.34	0.03	0.26	0.46	587.00
xISO	0.18	0.06	0.04	0.40	587.00
Avg EV	89.13	2.11	80.50	95.90	587.00
Avg LA	12.95	4.50	-4.40	22.70	587.00
Sweet Spot %	34.23	3.83	19.90	46.40	587.00
Barrel %	7.91	4.01	0.00	26.50	587.00

When cleaning the data, I had to make important assumptions to control for various things. Since WAR is a counting stat and would be biased towards starters than bench players, I chose only to include players who qualified for awards at the end of the season. For hitters, this requires a player to have greater than or equal to 502 plate appearances. A player must have greater than or equal to 162 innings pitched for pitchers. Although this limits the study to only starting pitchers, most of the analysis and conclusions are drawn from tests ran on the hitter dataset. I then refined the dataset even more by only keeping players who were not being paid the minimum salary during those years. The minimum salary in 2015 was \$507,500 and is now currently \$700,000. I chose not to include these players because they had not faced a reasonable time to be discriminated against. The instrument that can cause pay discrimination is when players sign new contracts perceived to be based on performance, not race. Recent papers decided not to include players in their arbitration years, which is the first 6 years in the MLB. Arbitration still involves some level of team input into how much they believe a player is worth, which is why I did not make this distinction in my study.

Due to the robustness of publicly available baseball data, the dataset is full and has meaningful statistics to represent a player's value they add to their teams. Thanks to the increase in data science techniques used in baseball, the perception is that teams are increasing their accuracy in player evaluation models. However, it is worth noting that when analyzing the results of these tests, they are all taken through an academic lens because it is impossible to switch races and truly learn the effect race has on salary in the MLB.

3 Methods and Results

Our main objective is to estimate the effects of race on the yearly salary for an mlb player. In the following regressions, we try to control for outside factors to accurately define that effect.

The first model is simple and only controls for WAR, age, race, and year. From table 3, you can see

that this model is weak and does not find that being NonWhite has a statistically significant impact on a player's salary. Although, the model does find that WAR and age are significant variables in predicting salaries. In later models, I will show how age is not the best variable to control for player experience

$$\ln(\text{Salary}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{WAR} + \beta_2 * \text{age} + \beta_3 * \text{NonWhite} + \beta_4 * \text{year}$$

The second model only differs by the control for player experience. Instead of using age, the model uses ServiceTime. The reason for not including both is not to break assumptions of the OLS model. Age and ServiceTime are correlated and would bring bias into the analysis. This simple change greatly improved the accuracy of the overall model, which can be seen by the increase of the R^2 to 0.4685. In this OLS regression, all coefficients of the variables are statistically significant, including NonWhite. On average, NonWhite players are making 18.8% less simply because of their race.

$$\ln(\text{Salary}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{WAR} + \beta_2 * \text{ServiceTime} + \beta_3 * \text{NonWhite} + \beta_4 * \text{year}$$

The third model tries to improve the accuracy by controlling for sabermetric stats. These statistics are not correlated with WAR since they try to improve upon old statistics. This model also gets rid of the year variable as it is proven in the next regression that it is not important for the overall strength. As you can see controlling for sabermetric stats increases the R^2 to 0.5068. It also decreases the effect of being NonWhite to -17.6%.

$$\ln(\text{Salary}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{WAR} + \beta_2 * \text{NonWhite} + \beta_3 * \text{ServiceTime} + \sum_i \beta_{i+3} * \text{Sabr}_i$$

The fourth model proves that year is no longer needed as a control since when year is controlled for, R^2 only improves to 0.5069 and is not statistically significant in the regression. The effect race has on salary is the same as in the third model.

$$\ln(\text{Salary}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{WAR} + \beta_2 * \text{NonWhite} + \beta_3 * \text{year} + \beta_4 * \text{ServiceTime} + \sum_i \beta_{i+4} * \text{Sabr}_i$$

The fifth model continues on the goal of improving by instead of controlling for sabermetric statistics, controlling for traditional statistics instead and also isolating team fixed effects. This change improves the model to an R^2 of 0.5794. This jump and improvement was by far the biggest surprise from all the regressions. The effect race has on salary again decreases to -15%, and is once again statistically significant. My assumption for why this model is more accurate and has a decrease in the effect of race is that player valuations across the league still have a heavy impact on what the player produces in the traditional statistics.

Controlling for team fixed effects is important because it accounts for unobserved heterogeneity across teams that could affect the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. For example, if certain teams have a culture of paying their players higher salaries, this could bias the estimated effect of other independent variables on player salaries if not properly controlled for.

By including team fixed effects, we can better isolate race's effect on player salaries, as we are comparing players within the same team to each other, rather than across different teams. This can improve the precision and accuracy of our estimated coefficients, and can provide more robust results. This will control if certain teams discriminate more than others. This effect could also contain aspects of the city's culture as well, whether or not the city discriminates against nonwhite players as well.

Overall, controlling for team fixed effects is an important aspect of any analysis of player salaries in baseball, as it helps to account for sources of variation that may be unique to each team and affect player salaries in different ways. Although many young data scientists are entering front offices, many players' contracts are still signed by professionals who have been in the industry for many years. These

older front-office employees still weigh traditional statistics heavier than they do sabermetrics statistics.

$$\ln(\operatorname{Salary}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \operatorname{WAR} + \beta_2 * \operatorname{NonWhite} + \beta_3 * \operatorname{ServiceTime} + \sum_i \beta_{i+3} * \operatorname{Trad}_i + \operatorname{Team} \ \operatorname{F.E.}$$

The sixth model explores the team fixed effects that are present in these regressions and then also controls for sabermetric statistics rather than traditional statistics. As you can see, when controlling for this the R^2 value increases to 0.6005 and the effect of race increases to -15.8%. Implying that when comparing teammates there is an increased discrimination against players of color.

$$\ln(\text{Salary}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{WAR} + \beta_2 * \text{NonWhite} + \beta_3 * \text{ServiceTime} + \sum_i \beta_{i+3} * \text{Sabr}_i + \text{Team F.E.}$$

The seventh model is similar to the sixth, however, it includes controlling for traditional stats as well. This only slighly increases the R^2 to 0.6103 adn increases the effect race has on salary to -16.9% if the player is non-white.

$$\ln(\mathrm{Salary}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \mathrm{WAR} + \beta_2 * \mathrm{NonWhite} + \beta_3 * \mathrm{ServiceTime} + \sum_i \beta_{i+3} * \mathrm{Trad}_i + \sum_j \beta_{I+j+3} * \mathrm{Sabr}_i + \mathrm{Team} \ \mathrm{F.E.}$$

Table 3.	Effect of	NonWhite on	ln(Salary) -	Hittore
Table 5.	Emect of	. Non willte on	III(Salary) -	111111111111111111111111111111111111111

$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Table 5.	Effect of No	II VV III te oii .	m(Sarary) -	11100015		
war 0.0711^{***} 0.0688^{***} 0.0369^{*} 0.0366^{*} 0.0389 0.0438^{**} 0.0358 age 0.141^{***} (15.22) $(1.5.22)$ -0.176^{***} -0.176^{***} -0.150^{**} -0.158^{**} -0.169^{**} nonwhite -0.00272 (-0.05) -0.188^{***} (-3.81) -0.176^{***} (-3.43) -0.150^{**} (-2.43) -0.158^{**} (-2.43) -0.150^{**} (-2.47) -0.158^{**} (-2.95) -0.169^{**} (-3.11) year 0.0220 (1.84) 0.0322^{**} (3.10) 0.00557 (0.45) 0.173^{***} (0.45) 0.176^{***} (-2.46) 0.174^{***} (22.56) Constant -32.99 (-1.36) -50.43^{**} (-2.41) 10.36^{***} (-2.41) -0.836 (-0.03) 14.13^{***} (29.53) 9.500^{***} (5.32) 10.18^{***} (5.42) Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No No No Yes Yes Yes		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
age (5.19) (5.96) (2.41) (2.39) (1.92) (2.85) (1.72) age 0.141^{***} (15.22) 0.00272 0.188^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.150^{**} 0.158^{**} 0.169^{**} 0.027 0.0220 0.0322^{**} 0.0322^{**} 0.00557 0.175^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.173^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.174^{***} 0.180^{***} 0.180^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.173^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.174^{***} 0.180^{***} 0.136^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.173^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.174^{***}					\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary		$\ln_{\text{-}salary}$
age 0.141^{***} (15.22) nonwhite -0.00272 -0.188^{***} -0.176^{***} -0.176^{***} -0.150^{**} -0.158^{**} -0.169^{**} (-0.05) (-3.81) (-3.43) (-3.43) (-3.43) (-2.77) (-2.95) (-3.11) year 0.0220 0.0322^{**} 0.00557 (1.84) (3.10) 0.175^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.173^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.174^{***} 0.180^{***} 0.180^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.173^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.174^{***} $0.174^{$	war	0.0711***	0.0688***	0.0369*	0.0366*	0.0389	0.0438**	0.0358
nonwhite -0.00272 (-0.05) -0.188*** (-3.81) -0.176*** (-3.43) -0.150** (-2.77) -0.158** (-2.95) -0.169** (-3.11) year 0.0220 (1.84) 0.0322** (3.10) 0.00557 (0.45) 0.175*** 0.175*** 0.173*** 0.176*** 0.174*** servicetime 0.180*** (22.56) (21.40) (21.38) (21.38) (19.24) (20.46) (19.28) (19.28) (19.28) (19.28) (19.28) 0.176*** 10.18*** Constant -32.99 (-1.36) (-2.41) (6.21) (-0.03) (29.53) (29.53) (5.32) (5.42) 10.18*** Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No No No Yes Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes		(5.19)	(5.96)	(2.41)	(2.39)	(1.92)	(2.85)	(1.72)
nonwhite -0.00272 (-0.05) -0.188*** (-3.81) -0.176*** (-3.43) -0.150** (-2.77) -0.158** (-2.95) -0.169** (-3.11) year 0.0220 (1.84) 0.0322** (3.10) 0.00557 (0.45) 0.175*** 0.175*** 0.173*** 0.176*** 0.174*** servicetime 0.180*** (22.56) (21.40) (21.38) (21.38) (19.24) (20.46) (19.28) (19.28) (19.28) (19.28) (19.28) 0.176*** 10.18*** Constant -32.99 (-1.36) (-2.41) (6.21) (-0.03) (29.53) (29.53) (5.32) (5.42) 10.18*** Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No No No Yes Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes	ame	0.141***						
nonwhite -0.00272 (-0.05) -0.188^{***} (-3.81) -0.176^{***} (-3.43) -0.150^{**} (-2.77) -0.158^{**} (-0.169^{**}) year 0.0220 (1.84) 0.0322^{**} (3.10) 0.00557 (0.45) servicetime 0.180^{***} (22.56) (21.40) (21.38) (19.24) (20.46) (19.28) Constant -32.99 -50.43^* 10.36^{***} -0.836 14.13^{***} 9.500^{***} 10.18^{***} Constant -32.99 (-2.41) (6.21) (-0.03) (29.53) (5.32) (5.32) (5.42) Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes	age							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(10.22)						
year 0.0220 (1.84) 0.0322^{**} (3.10) 0.00557 (0.45) servicetime 0.180^{***} (2.56) (21.40) (21.38) (19.24) (20.46) (19.28) Constant -32.99 (-30.43^*) (-2.41) (6.21) (-0.03) (29.53) (29.53) (5.32) (5.42) Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No No No Yes Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes	nonwhite	-0.00272	-0.188***	-0.176***	-0.176***	-0.150**	-0.158**	-0.169**
year 0.0220 (1.84) 0.0322^{**} (3.10) 0.00557 (0.45) servicetime 0.180^{***} (2.56) (21.40) (21.38) (19.24) (20.46) (19.28) Constant -32.99 (-30.43^*) (-2.41) (6.21) (-0.03) (29.53) (29.53) (5.32) (5.42) Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No No No Yes Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes		(-0.05)	(-3.81)	(-3.43)	(-3.43)	(-2.77)	(-2.95)	(-3.11)
servicetime (1.84) (3.10) (0.45) Servicetime 0.180^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.173^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.174^{***} Constant -32.99 -50.43^{**} 10.36^{***} -0.836 14.13^{***} 9.500^{***} 10.18^{***} Constant -32.99 -50.43^{**} 10.36^{***} -0.836 14.13^{***} 9.500^{***} 10.18^{***} Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No Yes Yes Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes		,	,	, ,	,	,	,	,
servicetime 0.180^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.175^{***} 0.173^{***} 0.176^{***} 0.174^{***} Constant -32.99 -50.43^{**} 10.36^{***} -0.836 14.13^{***} 9.500^{***} 10.18^{***} Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No No No Yes Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes	year	0.0220	0.0322**		0.00557			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(1.84)	(3.10)		(0.45)			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	servicetime		0.180***	0 175***	0.175***	0 173***	0 176***	0 174***
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SOI VICCUIIIIC							
(-1.36) (-2.41) (6.21) (-0.03) (29.53) (5.32) (5.42) Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes	Constant	-32 99	\ /		\ /	\ /	\	
Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes Sabermetric Stats No No No No No Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No No Yes Yes	Compount							
Sabermetric Stats No No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes		(1.00)	(2.11)	(0.21)	(0.00)	(20.55)	(0.02)	(3.12)
Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes	Traditional Stats	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes								
	Sabermetric Stats	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
N 597 597 597 597 525 525 525	Team Fixed Effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
N 901 901 901 901 999 999 999	\overline{N}	587	587	587	587	535	535	535
R^2 0.2872 0.4685 0.5068 0.5069 0.5794 0.6005 0.6103	R^2	0.2872	0.4685	0.5068	0.5069	0.5794	0.6005	0.6103

t statistics in parentheses

From curiosity and completeness, I explored further and asked the same question but this time wondered if there was pay discrimination based on birth country. Substituting the international variable for nonwhite, I ran the same regressions again which can be seen in Table 4. Similar results were

^{*} p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

found in these regressions. In regressions (2) - (4) the effect of being international has over -20% on your salary. In regression (7) the \mathbb{R}^2 value is the highest at 0.6102. The trends that were noticed from the nonwhite regressions are consistent with the international regressions.

Table 4: Effect of International on ln(Salary) - Hitters

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary	ln_salary	\ln_{-} salary	ln_salary
war	0.0689***	0.0669***	0.0333*	0.0329*	0.0322	0.0401**	0.0285
	(5.02)	(5.78)	(2.18)	(2.15)	(1.58)	(2.60)	(1.37)
200	0.141***						
age	(15.20)						
	(13.20)						
international	-0.0695	-0.211***	-0.200***	-0.202***	-0.154**	-0.172**	-0.182**
	(-1.15)	(-4.03)	(-3.79)	(-3.81)	(-2.61)	(-2.97)	(-3.09)
year	0.0220	0.0321**		0.00750			
	(1.84)	(3.11)		(0.60)			
servicetime		0.179***	0.174***	0.174***	0.172***	0.175***	0.171***
Serviceumie		(22.56)	(21.47)	(21.45)	(19.14)	(20.47)	(19.19)
		(22.50)	(21.41)	(21.40)	(13.14)	(20.41)	(13.13)
Constant	-32.77	-50.20*	10.32***	-4.759	14.15***	9.313***	9.957***
	(-1.36)	(-2.40)	(6.22)	(-0.19)	(29.37)	(5.25)	(5.33)
	,	, ,	, ,	,	, ,	, ,	, ,
Traditional Stats	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
0.1	TN T	ът	3.7	3.7	N.T.	3.7	3.7
Sabermetric Stats	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Team Fixed Effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
\overline{N}	587	587	587	587	535	535	535
R^2	0.2889	0.4700	0.5090	0.5093	0.5787	0.6006	0.6102

t statistics in parentheses

The same regressions were then run on a dataset with only pitchers. Although all the previous variables do now cross over 1:1 for pitchers, the main independent variable and controls are kept the same. The traditional stats and sabermetric stats buckets were filled with analogous stats that are recorded for pitchers. An example of this is a hitter has a stat called batting average and a pitcher has a stat called batting average against.

Looking at Table 5 and Table 6, we can see that the trends do not follow for pitchers. None of these regressions return the finding that being nonwhite or international has a statistically significant impact on a player's salary. The only trend that does continue is the fact that servicetime is a better representative of 'experience' as its coefficient was statistically significant in every regression.

^{*} p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Table 5: Effect of NonWhite on ln(Salary) - Pitchers

$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Table 5.	Effect of Ive	JII VV III GC OII	m(Salary)	- 1 10011015		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
age (3.28) (3.24) (0.79) (0.78) (0.07) (0.51) (0.26) age 0.108^{***} (8.72) nonwhite -0.111 -0.125 -0.0457 -0.0453 -0.0494 -0.0216 -0.0082 (-1.22) (-1.47) (-0.53) (-0.52) (-0.56) (-0.24) (-0.09) year -0.00512 0.00281 -0.00175 (-0.08) servicetime 0.132^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.122^{***} 0.124^{***} 0.124^{**} (11.09) (11.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) (9.74) Constant 22.84 9.108 19.61^{***} 23.16 14.26^{***} 19.49^{***} 18.92^{**} (0.62) (0.26) (5.35) (0.49) (11.55) (5.05) (4.51)				\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary
age 0.108^{***} (8.72) nonwhite -0.111 -0.125 -0.0457 -0.0453 -0.0494 -0.0216 -0.0082 (-1.22) (-1.47) (-0.53) (-0.52) (-0.56) (-0.24) (-0.09) year -0.00512 0.00281 -0.00175 (-0.08) servicetime 0.132^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.122^{***} 0.124^{***} 0.124^{***} (11.09) (11.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) (9.74) Constant 22.84 9.108 19.61^{***} 23.16 14.26^{***} 19.49^{***} 18.92^{***} (0.62) (0.26) (5.35) (0.49) (11.55) (5.05)	war	0.0682**	0.0632**		0.0283	0.00382	0.0218	0.0153
nonwhite $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(3.28)	(3.24)	(0.79)	(0.78)	(0.07)	(0.51)	(0.26)
nonwhite $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.00	0.100***						
nonwhite	age							
year (-1.22) (-1.47) (-0.53) (-0.52) (-0.56) (-0.24) (-0.09) year -0.00512 0.00281 -0.00175 (-0.28) (0.16) (-0.08) servicetime 0.132^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.122^{***} 0.124^{***} 0.124^{***} (11.09) (11.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) (9.74) Constant 22.84 9.108 19.61^{***} 23.16 14.26^{***} 19.49^{***} 18.92^{**} (0.62) (0.26) (5.35) (0.49) (11.55) (5.05) (4.51)		(8.72)						
year (-1.22) (-1.47) (-0.53) (-0.52) (-0.56) (-0.24) (-0.09) year -0.00512 0.00281 -0.00175 (-0.28) (0.16) (-0.08) servicetime 0.132^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.134^{***} 0.122^{***} 0.124^{***} 0.124^{***} (11.09) (11.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) (9.74) Constant 22.84 9.108 19.61^{***} 23.16 14.26^{***} 19.49^{***} 18.92^{**} (0.62) (0.26) (5.35) (0.49) (11.55) (5.05) (4.51)	nonwhite	-0.111	-0.125	-0.0457	-0.0453	-0.0494	-0.0216	-0.00828
year $-0.00512 \atop (-0.28)$ $0.00281 \atop (0.16)$ $-0.00175 \atop (-0.08)$ servicetime $0.132^{***} \atop (11.09)$ $0.134^{***} \atop (11.21)$ $0.134^{***} \atop (11.17)$ $0.122^{***} \atop (10.00)$ $0.124^{***} \atop (10.23)$ $0.124^{***} \atop (9.74)$ Constant $22.84 \atop (0.62)$ $9.108 \atop (0.26)$ $19.61^{***} \atop (5.35)$ $23.16 \atop (0.49)$ $14.26^{***} \atop (11.55)$ $19.49^{***} \atop (5.05)$ $18.92^{**} \atop (4.51)$					(-0.52)	(-0.56)	(-0.24)	
		()	(',	()	()	()	(-)	()
servicetime $ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	year	-0.00512	0.00281		-0.00175			
Constant (11.09) (11.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) (9.74) (0.52) (0.62) (0.26) (0.26) (0.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) $($		(-0.28)	(0.16)		(-0.08)			
Constant (11.09) (11.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) (9.74) (0.52) (0.62) (0.26) (0.26) (0.21) (11.17) (10.00) (10.23) $($. ,.		0.100***	0.104***	0.104***	0.100***	0.104***	0.104***
Constant 22.84 9.108 19.61*** 23.16 14.26*** 19.49*** 18.92** (0.62) (0.26) (5.35) (0.49) (11.55) (5.05) (4.51)	servicetime							-
(0.62) (0.26) (5.35) (0.49) (11.55) (5.05) (4.51)			(11.09)	(11.21)	(11.17)	(10.00)	(10.23)	(9.74)
(0.62) (0.26) (5.35) (0.49) (11.55) (5.05) (4.51)	Constant	22.84	9.108	19.61***	23.16	14.26***	19.49***	18.92***
	U V V V V							
Traditional Stats No No No No Yes No Yes		(0.0-)	(**=*)	(0.00)	(0120)	(==:00)	(0.00)	(===)
	Traditional Stats	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
		3.7				2.7		
Sabermetric Stats No No Yes Yes No Yes Yes	Sabermetric Stats	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Team Fixed Effects No No No No Yes Yes Yes	Team Fixed Effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
N 286 286 286 286 251 251 251	N	286	286	286	286	251	251	251
R^2 0.2407 0.3290 0.3924 0.3924 0.5832 0.5737 0.5968	\mathbb{R}^2	0.2407	0.3290	0.3924	0.3924	0.5832	0.5737	0.5968

t statistics in parentheses

^{*} p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Table 6: Effect of International on $\ln(\text{Salary})$ - Pitchers

	Table 0. L			n m(sarary)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	$\ln_{\text{-}} \text{salary}$	$\ln_{\text{-}}$ salary	\ln_{-} salary	\ln_{-} salary	$\ln_{\text{-}}$ salary	\ln_{-} salary	$\ln_{\text{-}salary}$
war	0.0678**	0.0631**	0.0282	0.0282	0.00332	0.0212	0.0152
	(3.27)	(3.25)	(0.79)	(0.78)	(0.06)	(0.50)	(0.25)
age	0.107***						
	(8.67)						
international	-0.181	-0.172	-0.0944	-0.0942	-0.0554	-0.0297	-0.0104
	(-1.82)	(-1.84)	(-1.02)	(-1.01)	(-0.57)	(-0.31)	(-0.10)
year	-0.00353	0.00454		-0.000630			
	(-0.19)	(0.26)		(-0.03)			
servicetime		0.131***	0.133***	0.133***	0.122***	0.124***	0.124***
		(11.01)	(11.13)	(11.08)	(9.91)	(10.17)	(9.70)
Constant	19.85	5.796	19.63***	20.91	14.35***	19.58***	18.92***
	(0.54)	(0.17)	(5.42)	(0.44)	(11.58)	(5.07)	(4.54)
Traditional Stats	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Sabermetric Stats	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Team Fixed Effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	286	286	286	286	251	251	251
R^2	0.2456	0.3319	0.3940	0.3941	0.5832	0.5738	0.5968

t statistics in parentheses

^{*} p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

4 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study sought to examine the relationship between race and salary differentials among Major League Baseball (MLB) players. Using data from the seasons of 2015-2022 (excluding 2020 due to COVID-19), the study focused on the impact of race on salary differentials, while taking into account a player's performance as measured by Statcast data. The research question posed was whether there is pay discrimination based on race amongst MLB players.

The study's findings revealed that there is a significant difference in salaries between white and non-white players that are hitters in the MLB. The study also found that race was a statistically significant predictor of salary, even after controlling for performance variables such as WAR and Statcast metrics.

The study's use of Statcast data provided a more comprehensive measure of player performance than traditional statistics such as batting average or ERA. Statcast measures not only the results of a player's actions but also the quality of their actions, better accounting for the impact of a player's performance on their team's success. The inclusion of demographic data such as birth country and debut year allowed for the creation of an international dummy variable and service time variable, respectively, which added robustness to the analysis.

These findings have important implications for the ongoing debate on salary discrimination in professional sports. They suggest that there is a persistent and significant pay gap based on race in MLB, even after accounting for performance differences. This raises questions about the fairness of the MLB's salary structure and the impact of implicit bias on decision-making processes. It also highlights the need for continued efforts to increase diversity and inclusion in professional sports.

There are several limitations to this study that should be noted. First, the study's analysis is limited to the MLB, and the findings may not generalize to other professional sports leagues. Second, the study's measure of race was based on visual inspection of player roster pictures and names, which may not be a completely accurate measure. Third, the study is limited by the availability of data and the inability to account for all relevant factors that may influence salary differentials.

In future research, it would be valuable to explore the impact of other factors on salary differentials, such as player position, contract length, and free agency status. It would also be important to examine the impact of race on other aspects of player experience, such as endorsement deals and media coverage. Furthermore, future research should continue to examine the effectiveness of diversity and inclusion initiatives in professional sports and their impact on reducing pay disparities.

In conclusion, this study provides evidence of pay discrimination based on race in Major League Baseball. The findings suggest that there is a persistent and significant pay gap between white and non-white players, particularly for black and African American players. The study highlights the need for continued efforts to address issues of diversity and inclusion in professional sports and for ongoing research to better understand the factors that contribute to pay disparities.