ERRATA SHEET (Issued March 31, 1993)

Virginia United Methodist Annual Conference
COMMISSION ON THE STATUS AND ROLE OF WOMEN (COSROW)
Report on Research Activities
to
Bishop Thomas B. Stockton
March 26, 1993

TOPIC 1: Salary Study

1. Due to a computational error, some of the numbers in the Press Release dated March 26 have changed, however, the primary findings and conclusions remain the same. The error involved 4 clergy for which adjustments had not been made to provide full-time equivalent salary computations. Using the Annual Conference Journal, it was possible to calculate the full-time equivalent salary for 1 of the 4. The other 3 were dropped from the study to avoid problems of skewing the data. As a result of this adjustment, the number of clergy in the study changed from 572 to 569. These adjustments resulted 1) in a slight increase in average salaries and merit for the impacted groups and 2) a smoother trend regarding the salary differentials between experience and gender groups. For a corrected copy of the Salary Study, contact: Les Solomon

2. In tables 3 to 6, "Years in Appointment" should be changed to under.

3. Using the Mann-Whitney test for significance, the following presents tests for the salary and merit information found in tables 1 and 2.

Years under Appointment	N=	Male N=	Female N=	Test: Salary	Test: Merit
03-05	23	15	8	.10	.10
06-08	55	40	15	.10	.10
09-11	71	63	8	.025	.025
12-14	55	47	5	.05	.05
15-17	81	78	3	.05	.05
18-20	45	45	0	NA	NA
21-23	44	42	2	.16	.14
>23	195	195	0	NA	NA
TOTAL	569	525	44	.001*	.001*

* These represent all clergy in the study population with the exception of those with 18-20 and >23 years under appointment categories. These two groups were eliminated because there were no female clergy in the groups.

TOPIC 2: Systemic Stress among Clergy and Spouses: The Preliminary Report on this topic is located under Topic 3 instead of Topic 2.

TOPIC 3: Systemic Stress among Church Lay Professionals: Question 45, line 2: Substitute "Church Lay Professional" for "Staff Parish Committee."

survey did not have category of hysterectomy

COSROW PRESS RELEAS
March 31, 1993

FEMALE CLERGY EARNINGS FAR SMALLER THAN E

Female clergy earn far less than their male coun
Annual Conference according to a comprehensive s
Commission on the Status and Role of Women (COSR
controlled for differences in experience (years
clergy earned from $1,475 to $10,164 less than t

TABLE 1. Average Salary Differences between Male and Female Clergy by Years under Appointment: 1992

Years under Appointment	1992 Salary Male	1992 Salary Female	Difference
03-05	$24,932	$23,457	($ 1,475)
06-08	$26,860	$25,231	($ 1,629)
09-11	$29,966	$26,446	($ 3,520)
12-14	$31,488	$27,446	($ 4,042)
15-17	$34,452	$28,290	($ 6,162)
18-20	$37,125	NA	NA
21-23	$42,040	$31,877	($10,163)
>23	$42,307	NA	NA

NOTE: There were no full connectional clergy with less than 3 years under appointment.

The study examined the salaries of all full connectional clergy assigned to charges in the Virginia Annual Conference in 1992. Thus, the study includes 569 clergy, 44 of whom were females. The study excludes retired ministers assigned to charges, clergy in provisional status, clergy assigned to cabinet and/or administrative positions with the Annual Conference, persons on leaves of absence or special assignments and clergy whose full-time equivalent salary could not be determined.

Salary equity has been one of the concerns of the Commission for several years. However, it has been only in the last few years that the number of female clergy has been large enough to track with any degree of confidence.

COSROW found a consistent pattern of rewarding male clergy and restraining female clergy within each of the groupings. As a part of the study, COSROW reviewed the average merit increases for all 569 clergy. "Merit" was defined as the difference between one's 1992 salary and the equitable salary level ($21,150 in 1992) divided by the number of years of service. The merit increases for all clergy with the same number of years under appointment were

ranked according to quartiles (25 percent in each group). From this, COSROW determined the "Track" (from Fastest to Slowest) for each clergy.

If all groups were represented equally, each of the four tracks would have the same number of clergy (25 percent). However, when viewed separately for males and females and controlling for years under appointment, there is a nearly consistent pattern of rewarding males and restraining females. For instance, if there was an equal distribution of "Fastest" and "Slowest" track females (highest and lowest quartiles), the study would have found 11 (44/4 = 11) females in each group. Rather, COSROW found there were only 4 fast track females and 20 slow track females. In fact, all of the female groupings were under (0 to 20 percent) the 25 percent target for the fastest track and all female groupings were above (33 to 67 percent) the 25 percent target for the slowest track. In all, 8 percent of the females were in the fastest track and 45 percent were in the slowest track.

In contrast, 27 percent of the males were in the "Fastest" track and 23 percent were in the "Slowest" track. The highest percentage of males in the fastest track (40%) were those with the least experience (3-5 years). On the other side, only one (18-20 years) of the eight male groupings had more than their proportionate share of clergy in the slowest track.

TABLE 2. Percent of Fastest and Slowest Track Male and Female Clergy by Years under Appointment: 1992

Years under Appointment	MALE-Fastest Track	MALE-Slowest Track	FEMALE-Fastest Track	FEMALE-Slowest Track
03-05	40 %	13 %	0 %	50 %
06-08	28 %	23 %	20 %	33 %
09-11	25 %	20 %	12 %	50 %
12-14	30 %	21 %	0 %	50 %
15-17	26 %	23 %	0 %	67 %
18-20	27 %	24 %	NA	NA
21-23	29 %	26 %	0 %	50 %
>23	25 %	24 %	NA	NA
AVERAGE	27 %	23 %	8 %	45 %

Virginia is not alone in this pattern of discrimination. In a similar study conducted by the South Carolina Annual Conference last year, the average salary for women clergy was $1,675 less than for male clergy, the average age of the males was 2 years younger than that of the women, and the salary differential tends to increase as the years in the system increases. Although the numbers may differ between South Carolina and Virginia, the three patterns are identical.

As noted in the South Carolina study, "it is important to remember how salaries are set in United Methodism. Charge Conferences (ie. local churches) set [their] salaries but the Bishop and the Cabinet appoint the ministers to the churches. Therefore, one body controls the salary, while another body controls who shall receive the salary. If discrimination for or against women is proven, one may still have difficulty determining which body is more responsible for the discrimination." The same holds true for the Virginia Annual Conference.

This pattern of discrimination also creates problems for churches that might be quite receptive to having a female clergy. If there were more female "Fast Trackers," more females would have an opportunity to qualify, salary-wise, for appointment to some of the churches currently out of their reach. However, only one of the female clergy appointed to charges makes over $35,000. Therefore, over 150 churches, representing over 55 percent of the total Virginia Annual Conference church membership, will not have the opportunity for several years to have a female clergy, unless they are appointed as an associate minister. Currently, eight of the 44 female clergy are associates.

In the past, it has been easy to dismiss the perception of a female salary problem within the Virginia Annual Conference for lack of information. Now, however, COSROW's findings document that the problem is serious and wide-spread. These findings raise several disturbing questions: Are the female clergy less qualified, are female clergy more reluctant to accept appointments that offer higher salaries, are "fast track" female clergy leaving the appointment system for either professional or personal reasons, or, as is more likely the case, are there inherent patterns of gender-bias on the part of either the churches or the cabinet?

COSROW recommends several actions to be implemented this year. First, the Cabinet must ensure that its appointments eliminate gender-bias. Second, the Annual Conference must help educate the laity in local churches to be open to the appointments of qualified person, regardless of race or gender. Third, the Annual Conference must continue to monitor the careers of female clergy--both inside and outside the appointment process--to ensure that the local church, cabinet, and the Annual Conference are not responsible for putting the careers and calling of female clergy at undue risk.

For a copy of the summary of the study and other findings, please contact:

Dr. Les Solomon
COSROW Statistician
8047 Fairfax Road
Alexandria, VA 22308
703 768-6233

TABLE 3.1: Age for Selected Demographic Groups: 1992
(Part 1 of 2)

COLUMN NO:		TOTAL YEARS UNDER APPOINTMENT 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	AREA 8	9	GENDER 10	11
TOTAL:		569	23	55	71	55	81	284	178	391	44	525
MEAN TOTAL	MEAN	48	39	39	41	41	44	55	48	48	44	48
	>59	88	0	0	3	1	2	82	26	62	3	85
	55-59	93	2	6	2	2	2	79	29	64	6	87
A	50-54	74	4	2	5	4	13	46	22	52	4	70
G	45-49	78	2	4	6	6	17	43	26	52	8	70
E	40-44	94	1	6	17	12	25	33	32	62	5	89
	35-39	89	2	14	25	26	21	1	22	67	12	77
	30-35	45	6	21	13	4	1	0	17	28	4	41
	<30	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	6
PERCENT												
	>59	15	0	0	4	2	2	29	15	16	7	16
	55-59	16	9	11	3	4	2	28	16	16	14	17
A	50-54	13	17	4	7	7	16	16	12	13	9	13
G	45-49	14	9	7	8	11	21	15	15	13	18	13
E	40-44	17	4	11	24	22	31	12	18	16	11	17
	35-39	16	9	25	35	47	26	0	12	17	27	15
	30-35	8	26	38	18	7	1	0	10	7	9	8
	<30	1	26	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	1

COLUMN TITLES:

1 Total

YEARS IN APPOINTMENT

2 3- 5
3 6- 8
4 9-11
5 12-14
6 15-17
7 >17

AREA

8 Metropolitan
9 Non-Metropolitan

GENDER

10 Female
11 Male

TABLE 3: Age for Selected Demographic Groups: 1992 (CON'T)
(Part 2 of 2)

	SALARY										TRACK			
COLUMN NO:	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
TOTAL:	8	7	25	24	44	51	89	102	140	79	145	141	141	142
MEAN	54	54	55	54	52	52	49	45	46	44	47	48	48	50
TOTAL														
>59	2	1	7	7	9	10	16	5	23	8	12	23	24	29
55-59	2	2	7	5	9	15	11	18	13	11	19	21	20	33
A 50-54	2	3	5	4	8	8	12	10	13	9	24	17	18	16
G 45-49	2	1	4	1	11	8	18	11	14	8	23	18	18	14
E 40-44	0	0	2	7	6	4	19	25	25	6	28	21	27	18
35-39	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	27	33	13	23	30	16	20
30-35	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	18	17	12	9	14	10
<30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	2	4	2
PERCENT														
>59	25	14	28	29	20	20	18	5	16	10	8	16	17	20
55-59	25	29	28	21	20	29	12	18	9	14	13	15	14	23
A 50-54	25	43	20	17	18	16	13	10	9	11	17	12	13	11
G 45-49	25	14	16	4	25	16	20	11	10	10	16	13	13	10
E 40-44	0	0	8	29	14	8	21	25	18	8	19	15	19	13
35-39	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	26	24	16	16	21	11	14
30-35	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	13	22	8	6	10	7
<30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	1	3	1

COLUMN TITLES:

1992 SALARY

12 >$64,999
13 $60,000-64,999
14 $55,000-59,999
15 $50,000-54,999
16 $45,000-49,999
17 $40,000-44,999
18 $35,000-39,999
19 $30,000-34,999
20 $25,000-29,999
21 <$25,000

TRACK:

22 1 = Fastest Track
23 2
24 3
25 4 = Slowest Track

TABLE 4: Years under Appointment for Selected Demographic Groups
(Part 1 of 2)

COLUMN NO:		TOTAL 1	YEARS OF APPOINTMENT 2	3	4	5	6	7	AREA 8	9	GENDER 10	11
TOTAL:		569	23	55	71	55	81	284	178	391	44	525
MEAN	MEAN	20	4	7	10	13	16	28	19	20	9	21
TOTAL												
	>39	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	2	15	0	17
	35-39	43	0	0	0	0	0	43	12	31	0	43
Y	30-35	61	0	0	0	0	0	61	17	44	0	61
E	25-29	58	0	0	0	0	0	58	21	37	0	58
A	20-24	76	0	0	0	0	0	76	26	50	2	74
R	15-19	110	0	0	0	0	81	29	30	80	3	107
S	10-14	107	0	0	52	55	0	0	31	76	15	92
	5- 9	83	9	55	19	0	0	0	36	47	18	65
	< 5	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	6	8
PERCENT												
	>39	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4	0	3
	35-39	8	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	8	0	8
Y	30-35	11	0	0	0	0	0	21	10	11	0	12
E	25-29	10	0	0	0	0	0	20	12	9	0	11
A	20-24	13	0	0	0	0	0	27	15	13	5	14
R	15-19	19	0	0	0	0	100	10	17	20	7	20
S	10-14	19	0	0	73	100	0	0	17	19	34	18
	5- 9	15	39	100	27	0	0	0	20	12	41	12
	< 5	2	61	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	2

COLUMN TITLES:

1 Total

YEARS IN APPOINTMENT

2 3- 5
3 6- 8
4 9-11
5 12-14
6 15-17
7 >17

AREA

8 Non-Metropolitan
9 Metropolitan

GENDER

10 Female
11 Male

TABLE 4: Years under Appointment for Selected Demographic Groups (Part 2 of 2)

	SALARY										TRACK			
COLUMN NO:	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
TOTAL:	8	7	25	24	44	51	89	102	140	80	145	141	141	142
MEAN	31	29	31	29	28	26	22	17	15	12	20	20	20	19
TOTAL														
>39	2	0	3	3	0	0	4	2	2	1	4	5	5	3
35-39	1	0	6	2	8	9	6	4	5	2	11	11	10	11
Y 30-35	1	3	5	7	11	9	8	5	9	3	16	15	14	16
E 25-29	1	4	5	3	7	10	6	9	11	2	13	16	16	13
A 20-24	3	0	4	5	12	8	22	9	7	6	20	19	18	19
R 15-19	0	0	2	4	5	11	27	32	21	8	28	27	27	28
S 10-14	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	29	50	13	28	25	27	27
5- 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	32	34	21	20	21	21
< 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4	3	3	4
PERCENT														
>39	25	0	12	13	0	0	4	2	1	1	3	4	4	2
35-39	13	0	24	8	18	18	7	4	4	3	8	8	7	8
Y 30-35	13	43	20	29	25	18	9	5	6	4	11	11	10	11
E 25-29	13	57	20	13	16	20	7	9	8	3	9	11	11	9
A 20-24	38	0	16	21	27	16	25	9	5	8	14	13	13	13
R 15-19	0	0	8	17	11	22	30	31	15	10	19	19	19	20
S 10-14	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	28	36	16	19	18	19	19
5- 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	23	43	14	14	15	15
< 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	3	2	2	3

COLUMN TITLES:

1992 SALARY

12 >$64,999
13 $60,000-64,999
14 $55,000-59,999
15 $50,000-54,999
16 $45,000-49,999
17 $40,000-44,999
18 $35,000-39,999
19 $30,000-34,999
20 $25,000-29,999
21 <$25,000

TRACK:

22 1 = Fastest Track
23 2
24 3
25 4 = Slowest Track

TABLE 5: Summary Characteristics for Selected Demographic Groups (Part 1 of 3)

	TOTAL	YEARS UNDER APPOINTMENT						AREA		GENDER	
COLUMN NO:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
TOTAL:	569	23	55	71	55	81	284	178	391	44	525
NUMBER:											
Female:	44	8	15	8	8	3	2	14	30	44	0
Clergy Couple:	18	2	4	1	4	2	5	5	13	7	11
RACE:											
Black:	23	2	2	2	2	4	11	7	16	1	22
Asian:	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3
Hispanic:	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
Associate Ap't:	20	5	6	2	4	1	2	1	19	8	12
Metropolitan:	391	15	29	47	43	60	197	0	391	30	361
1 Point Charge:	469	14	36	57	44	68	250	114	357	32	437
PERCENT											
Female:	8	35	27	11	15	4	1	8	8	100	0
Clergy Couple:	3	9	7	1	7	2	2	3	3	16	2
RACE:											
Black:	4	9	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	2	4
Asian:	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Hispanic:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Associate Ap't:	3	22	11	3	7	1	1	1	5	18	2
Metropolitan:	69	65	53	66	78	74	69	0	100	68	69
1 Point Charge:	83	61	65	80	80	84	88	64	91	73	83
CHARGE SIZE:	764	315	309	322	419	437	647	401	558	323	524

COLUMN TITLES:

1 Total

YEARS IN APPOINTMENT

2 3- 5
3 6- 8
4 9-11
5 12-14
6 15-17
7 >17

AREA

8 Non-Metropolitan
9 Metropolitan

GENDER

10 Female
11 Male

TABLE 5: Summary Characteristics for Selected Demographic Groups
(Part 2 of 3)

COLUMN NO:	SALARY 12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
TOTAL:	8	7	25	24	44	51	89	102	140	79
NUMBER:										
Female:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	21
Clergy Couple:	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	8	3
RACE:										
Black:	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	11	6
Asian:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Hispanic:	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Associate Ap't:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	5
Metropolitan:	8	7	22	22	36	40	62	77	77	40
1 Point Charge:	8	7	25	24	44	50	83	97	98	43
PERCENT										
Female:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	27
Clergy Couple:	0	0	0	4	0	2	2	3	6	4
RACE:										
Black:	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	8	7
Asian:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Hispanic:	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
Associate Ap't:	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	7
Metropolitan:	100	100	88	92	82	78	70	75	55	51
1 Point Charge:	100	100	100	100	100	98	93	95	70	57
CHARGE SIZE:	1643	1272	1191	903	823	630	505	379	311	258

COLUMN TITLES:

1992 SALARY	
12	>$64,999
13	$60,000-64,999
14	$55,000-59,999
15	$50,000-54,999
16	$45,000-49,999
17	$40,000-44,999
18	$35,000-39,999
19	$30,000-34,999
20	$25,000-29,999
21	<$25,000

TABLE 5: Summary Characteristics for Selected Demographic Groups
(Part 3 of 3)

COLUMN NO:	TRACK 22	23	24	25
TOTAL:	145	141	141	142
NUMBER:				
Female:	4	7	13	20
Clergy Couple:	3	4	5	5
RACE:				
Black:	3	3	5	12
Asian:	1	0	1	1
Hispanic:	0	2	0	0
Associate Ap't:	5	4	8	3
Metropolitan:	127	103	93	67
1 Point Charge:	138	126	121	84
PERCENT				
Female:	3	5	9	14
Clergy Couple:	2	3	3	4
RACE:				
Black:	2	2	4	8
Asian:	1	0	0	1
Hispanic:	0	1	0	0
Associate Ap't:	3	3	5	3
Metropolitan:	88	73	66	48
1 Point Charge:	95	89	86	60
CHARGE SIZE:	797	535	394	302

COLUMN TITLES:

TRACK:

22 1 = Fastest Track

23 2

24 3

25 4 = Slowest Track

TABLE 6: Summary Salary Characteristics for Selected Demographic Groups
(Part 1 of 2)

	TOTAL	YEARS UNDER APPOINTMENT					
COLUMN NO:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TOTAL:	569	23	55	71	55	81	284
Salary/ Member:	$90	$98	$114	$108	$87	$94	$79
Salary:	$35,740	$24,419	$26,416	$29,575	$30,900	$34,223	$41,373
Merit/Year:	$770	$845	$740	$842	$748	$820	$741
TRACK:							
NUMBER:							
1 = Fastest	145	6	14	19	14	20	72
2	141	6	13	16	13	21	72
3	141	5	14	18	14	20	70
4 = Slowest	142	6	14	18	14	20	70
PERCENT:							
1 = Fastest	25	26	25	27	25	25	25
2	25	26	24	23	24	26	25
3	25	22	25	25	25	25	25
4 = Slowest	25	26	25	25	25	25	25

	AREA		GENDER	
COLUMN NO:	8	9	10	11
TOTAL:	177	391	44	525
Salary/ Member:	$92	$88	$94	$89
Salary:	$31,418	$37,707	$26,052	$36,551
Merit/Year:	$584	$854	$565	$787
TRACK:				
NUMBER:				
1 = Fastest	17	128	4	141
2	38	103	7	134
3	48	93	13	128
4 = Slowest	75	67	20	122
PERCENT:				
1 = Fastest	10	33	9	27
2	21	26	16	26
3	27	24	30	24
4 = Slowest	42	17	45	23

1 Total
YEARS IN APPOINTMENT
2 3- 5
3 6- 8
4 9-11
5 12-14
6 15-17

AREA
8 Non-Metropolitan
9 Metropolitan
GENDER
10 Female
11 Male

TABLE 6: Summary Salary Characteristics for Selected Demographic Groups (Part 2 of 2)

COLUMN NO:	SALARY 12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TOTAL:	8	7	25	24	44	51	89
Salary/ Member:	$47	$56	$55	$64	$64	$75	$83
Salary:	$68,532	$61,636	$57,834	$52,572	$47,683	$42,929	$37,457
Merit/ Year:	$1,613	$1,411	$1,276	$1,188	$1,036	$941	$892
TRACK:							
NUMBER:							
1 = Fastest	8	7	22	18	16	14	25
2	0	0	3	6	24	20	30
3	0	0	0	0	4	14	27
4 = Slowest	0	0	0	0	0	3	7
PERCENT:							
1 = Fastest	100	100	88	75	36	27	28
2	0	0	12	25	55	39	34
3	0	0	0	0	9	27	30
4 = Slowest	0	0	0	0	0	6	8

COLUMN NO:	SALARY (CON'T) 19	20	21	TRACK 22	23	24	25
TOTAL:	102	140	79	145	141	141	142
Salary/ Member:	$97	$107	$107	$73	$86	$96	$104
Salary:	$32,447	$27,483	$23,675	$45,597	$37,732	$32,502	$26,910
Merit/Year:	$780	$544	$332	$1,310	$844	$592	$320
TRACK:							
NUMBER:							
1 = Fastest	23	10	1	145	0	0	0
2	28	22	6	0	141	0	0
3	35	49	13	0	0	141	0
4 = Slowest	16	59	59	0	0	0	142
PERCENT:							
1 = Fastest	23	7	1	100	0	0	0
2	27	16	8	0	100	0	0
3	34	35	16	0	0	100	0
4 = Slowest	16	42	75	0	0	0	100

1992 SALARY

12	>$64,999	20	$25,000-29,999
13	$60,000-64,999	21	<$25,000
14	$55,000-59,999		
15	$50,000-54,999	TRACK:	
16	$45,000-49,999	22	1 = Fastest Track
17	$40,000-44,999	23	2
18	$35,000-39,999	24	3

TABLE 7. Average Merit Increase by Track and Years under Appointment: 1992

Years under Appointment	N=	Fastest Track	Mean	Slowest Track
03-05	23	$1,418	$845	$540
06-08	55	$1,338	$740	$344
09-11	71	$1,438	$842	$325
12-14	55	$1,313	$748	$324
15-17	81	$1,377	$820	$332
18-20	45	$1,446	$839	$313
21-23	44	$1,514	$929	$380
>23	195	$1,129	$676	$263

NOTE: The middle two tracks are not shown.

COSROW DATA DICTIONARY: 1992 SALARY STUDY
Virginia Annual Conference
Commission on the Status and Role of Women

CODE	TYPE	DEFINITION
CLCODE	C-4	Abbreviated CLergy CODE. First 3 digits are for the first 3 letters of the person's last name and the last digit is for the first letter of the first name. Jo Smith = SMIJ. Used for locational and sorting purposes.
SAL92	N-5	The 1992 SALary as shown in the Conference Journal. Verified using the 1993 move list. In the event clergy were working less than full time, their salary was adjusted to indicate the full-time equivalent salary. In the case of 3 male clergy whose salary was below the equitable salary, it was impossible to determine the full-time equivalent salary. Thus, they were dropped from the study.
TRACK	C-2	The TRACK ranking for each clergy. Using MERIT, data were rank-ordered and classified according to quartiles. 1 = Fastest track (top 25 percent) 2 = Fast track (next 25 percent) 3 = Slow track (next 25 percent) 4 = Slowest track (bottom 25 percent)
MERIT	C-4	A measure of the annual increase in salary. Calculated according to: (SAL92 - Equitable Salary)/YAPT.
CLCOUP	C-2	CLergy COUPle identifies clergy couples under appointment. Only clergy assigned to charges are assigned codes. There is a unique number assigned to each clergy couple.
AGE	N-2	The AGE of the clergy as indicated on the move list.
YAPT	N-2	The number of Years under APpoinTment as shown in the Conference Journal. Verified using the 1993 move list.
REL	C-1	The RELationship of the clergy to the Annual Conference as shown in the Conference Journal. Verified using the 1993 move list. Currently, only those in full connection (F) are included completely in the database.
CHAR_SZ	N-1	The CHARge SiZe shows the number of points in the charge.

RACE	C-1	The RACE of the clergy. Codes are: "B" = Black "A" = Asian "H" = Hispanic "O" = Other
GENDER	C-1	The GENDER of the clergy. Codes are: "F" = Female "M" = Male
ASSOC	C-1	The clergy appointed as ASSOCiates to charges. Those with a "1" are associates.
AREA	C-1	The AREA indicates whether or not the charge is located in a metropolitan area as classified by the U.S. Government office of Management and Budget. The "Metropolitan" designation attempts to measure the socio-economic integration of an area to a major city. Measured at the county level on the basis of commuting and labor force characteristics. Codes are: "0" = Nonmetropolitan "1" = Metropolitan
DIST	C-4	The DISTrict in which a charge is located. Each district is indicated according to the first 4 letters of its name.
CLNAME	C-20	The CLergy NAME.
CHARGE	C-20	The CHarge NAME. Currently, 2 or more point charges are coded as "CHARGE".
CHRSZ_AD	N-4	The ADjusted SiZe of a CHARge. In the cases of more than one clergy assigned to a charge, this is an adjusted membership size that allocates number of members among the clergy according to the ratio of the individual clergy's salary to the total salary of all clergy at that charge. See SAL_PM.
SAL_PM	N-4	The clergy salary paid per member. In the event of one clergy at a charge, the formula was SAL92/CHSIZE; in the event of more than one clergy at a charge, the formula was SAL92/CHRSZ-AD.
CHSIZE	N-4	The membership size of a charge as shown in the Conference Journal. Verified using the 1993 move list.