# GEOGRAPHIC TRENDS ASSOCIATED WITH GENDER COMPOSITION AND COMPENSATION FOR UMC CLERGY

REGIONAL VARIATIONS DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF GENDER PAY GAPS, AUGUST 2017

#### Magaela C. Bethune, MS, MPA

While The United Methodist Church (UMC) membership is comprised 58% of women (Goodrich, 2017), women made up 28.4% of UMC clergy positions in 2015. This is only a slight increase from 2003 and 2008 figures, which estimated clergywomen's representation to be 24% (Moy, 2010). While women remain underrepresented in clergy roles overall, there is variation in how clergy are distributed by gender across the country. Further, there is regional variation in how clergywomen are compensated, in comparison to clergymen. Led by the General Commission on the Status and Role of Women (GCSRW), a recent study used 2015 nationwide data provided by Wespath Benefits and Investments<sup>1</sup> to determine geographic trends in clergywomen's compensation. Researcher Magaela C. Bethune<sup>2</sup> used quantitative analytical methods to examine the influence of gender and geography on the composition and compensation of UMC clergy.

#### **DEMOGRAPHICS**

In 2015, 11,235 U.S. clergypersons were included in a sample provided by Wespath; 28.4% were women, and 71.6% were men. The membership types of clergypersons included 43.4% full-time local pastors; 3.4% deacons; 50.3% elders; and, 2.9% associate members. Across the U.S., 35.5% of clergypersons were from the Southeastern jurisdiction; 20.7% North Central; 19.4% South Central; 16.9% Northeastern; and, 7.5% Western. On average, clergypersons were 54.2 years old, had a length of service of 19.8 years, and received an annual salary of \$57,512.

### GENDER DISTRIBUTION ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

Clergywomen of The United Methodist Church are generally underrepresented across the nation.

Gender composition of UMC clergypersons in the U.S. differs across jurisdictions<sup>3</sup>. Gender composition of clergypersons also differs across conference areas<sup>4</sup>, with the proportion of women ranging from 13.3% to 49.1%. Table 1 details the gender distribution of clergy across the country, highlighting key differences across all conferences, within and between jurisdictions. Clergywomen are underrepresented in the Southeastern

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Wespath Benefits and Investments is an agency of The United Methodist Church.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Magaela C. Bethune is a PhD candidate and researcher in the Department of Human and Organizational Development at Vanderbilt University, and is trained in community-based research methods and approaches.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Chi-square analyses show that the gender composition of UMC clergypersons in the U.S. differs significantly across jurisdictions,  $X^2(4, 11,235)$  81.25, p<.001.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Chi-square analyses show that the gender composition of UMC clergypersons in the U.S. differs significantly across conference areas,  $X^2(53, 11,235)$  297.01, p<.001.

Jurisdiction, which is the largest, while the Western and Northeastern Jurisdictions had relatively higher proportions of clergywomen, when compared to other jurisdictions. Clergywomen were statistically significantly underrepresented in the following annual conferences (relative to all other conferences): Alabama-West Florida, Holston, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Alabama, Northwest Texas, South Georgia, Susquehanna, and Western Pennsylvania.

Clergywomen were underrepresented geographically – relative to other conferences within the respective jurisdictions – in the following conferences: California Pacific (relative to the Western Jurisdiction), Kentucky, North Alabama, and South Georgia (relative to the Southeastern Jurisdiction), Northwest Texas (relative to the South Central Jurisdiction), Susquehanna, West Virginia, and Western Pennsylvania (relative to the Northeastern Jurisdiction) and Indiana (relative to the North Central Jurisdiction).

#### GENDER PAY GAPS DIFFER BY CONFERENCE AND JURISDICTION

Women, who make up 28.4% of UMC clergy, received 24% of the \$822 million in compensation (e.g., salary, housing allowance, parsonage) paid to UMC clergy in 2015. With few exceptions, a significant pay gap characterizes most jurisdictions across all types of compensation<sup>5</sup>. Tables 2 through 5 list the average salary, total compensation, housing allowance, and parsonage, respectively, by gender for each jurisdiction.

Most jurisdictions reflect substantial gender pay gaps across types of compensation.

Further analysis revealed that, in many annual conference regions, there are statistically significant differences in clergywomen and clergymen's salary, housing allowance, parsonage, and/or total compensation<sup>6</sup>. Tables 6 through 9 list the average salary, total compensation, housing allowance, and parsonage, respectively, by gender for each of the annual conferences. Noted are the conferences in which women receive significantly less compensation.

#### GENDER DISPARITIES IN COMPENSATION PERSIST IN SOME REGIONS

Factors, such as length of service, age of clergy, and membership type might contribute to how clergy members are compensated. Overall – when length of service, age, membership type, and jurisdiction are all held steady - clergywomen still receive, on average, a salary that is almost \$4,000 less than clergymen<sup>7</sup>. Analyses were performed to see if, when key factors – age, length of service, and membership type – were controlled, gender still significantly predicted four types of compensation for *each jurisdiction*. Tables 2 through 5 highlight the jurisdictions, for which gender pay gaps persist, even as these key factors are also considered.

Analyses were also performed to see if, when key factors – age, length of service, and membership type – were controlled, gender still significantly predicted four types of compensation for *each annual conference region*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Independent sample t-tests were performed for each *jurisdiction* to examine is the mean difference in clergywomen and clergymen's salaries, housing allowances, parsonage, and total compensation were statistically significantly different.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Independent sample t-tests were performed for each *annual conference region* to examine is the mean difference in clergywomen and clergymen's salaries, housing allowances, parsonage, and total compensation were statistically significantly different.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Multiple regression analysis was used to test if, when controlling for age, years of service, membership type, and jurisdiction – gender was still a significant predictor of 2015 salary for all UMC clergy. Results of the regression indicate that ten predictors were all significant, and explained 23.9% of the variance in salary, ( $R^2$ =.24, F(10, 11,225)=354.40, p<.001).

Tables 6 through 9 highlight the annual conferences, for which gender pay gaps persist, even as these key factors are also considered.

## ANNUAL CONFERENCE REGIONS WITH SIGNIFICANT GENDER PAY GAPS, WHEN KEY FACTORS ARE CONTROLLED:

SALARY: Arkansas, East Ohio, Florida, Great Plains, Illinois Great Rivers, Indiana, Missouri, North Alabama, North Georgia, North Texas, Rio Texas, South Carolina, South Georgia, Susquehanna, Virginia, and West Ohio.

TOTAL COMPENSATION: Alabama-West Florida, Arkansas, East Ohio, Florida, Great Plains, Holston, Illinois Great Rivers, Indiana, Missouri, North Alabama, North Georgia, South Carolina, South Georgia, Susquehanna, Virginia, West Ohio, and Western North Carolina.

HOUSING: Alabama-West Florida, Eastern Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Missouri, and North Carolina.

PARSONAGE: Arkansas, East Ohio, Great Plains, Illinois Great Rivers, Indiana, Rio Texas, South Carolina, Susquehanna, West Ohio, and Western North Carolina.

#### **CONCLUSIONS:**

There are many variables to consider when analyzing compensation among clergy. Length of service, age, and membership type were controlled in this study. However, education and previous work experience before entering the ministry, as well as race and ethnicity, were not considered. Given the large sample size, as well as the rigorous statistical analysis, it is reasonable that the *trends* that are reported are valid and reliable for gender compensation comparisons. Moreover, we hope this study will encourage annual conferences to examine their own compensation practices toward the goal of equity for all in The United Methodist Church.

	Wo	men	Men		Total
	n	Percent	n	Percent	N
NORTH CENTRAL					
DAKOTAS	25	29.8%	59	70.2%	84
DETROIT	52	30.6%	118	69.4%	170
EAST OHIO	62	26.2%	175	73.8%	237
ILLINOIS GREAT RIVERS INDIANA <sup>ac</sup>	64 71	25.4% 19.8%	188 288	74.6% 80.2%	252 359
IOWA <sup>bd</sup>	88	37.9%	144	62.1%	232
MINNESOTAbd	54	40.6%	79	59.4%	133
NORTHERN ILLINOIS <sup>bd</sup>	76	38.4%	122	61.6%	198
WEST MICHIGAN	38	33.6%	75	66.4%	113
WEST OHIO	104	27.2%	279	72.8%	383
WISCONSIN <sup>b</sup>	58	36.0%	103	64.0%	161
NORTH CENTRAL TOTAL	692	29.8%	1630	70.2%	2322
NORTHEASTERN <sup>f</sup>					
BALTIMORE-WASHINGTONbd	118	41.5%	166	58.5%	284
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA	54	30.7%	122	69.3%	176
GREATER NEW JERSEY	66	28.0%	170	72.0%	236
NEW ENGLAND <sup>bd</sup>	57	39.9%	86	60.1%	143
NEW YORK	61	33.2%	123	66.8%	184
PENINSULA-DELAWAREbd	45	41.3%	64	58.7%	109
SUSQUEHANNAac	42	21.4%	154	78.6%	196
UPPER NEW YORK <sup>bd</sup>	78	41.1%	112	58.9%	190
WEST VIRGINIA <sup>c</sup>	38	23.0%	127	77.0%	165
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIAac	31	14.0%	190	86.0%	221
NORTHEASTERN TOTAL	590	31.0%	1314	69.0%	1904
SOUTH CENTRAL					
ARKANSAS	44	22.7%	150	77.3%	194
CENTRAL TEXAS	51	29.1%	124	70.9%	175
GREAT PLAINS <sup>bd</sup>	111	34.0%	215	66.0%	326
LOUISIANA	42	28.2%	107	71.8%	149
MISSOURI	60	28.2%	153	71.8% 78.7%	213
NEW MEXICO  NORTH TEXAS <sup>bd</sup>	13 76	21.3% 36.5%	48 132	63.5%	61 208
NORTHWEST TEXAS <sup>ac</sup>	10	13.3%	65	86.7%	75
OKLAHOMA	59	24.5%	182	75.5%	241
RIO TEXAS <sup>d</sup>	65	34.6%	123	65.4%	188
TEXAS	85	24.5%	262	75.5%	347
SOUTH CENTRAL TOTAL	616	28.3%	1561	71.7%	2177
SOUTHEASTERN®		20.071		1 = 11 / 1	
ALABAMA-WEST FLORIDA <sup>a</sup>	39	19.0%	166	81.0%	205
FLORIDA	72	23.9%	229	76.1%	301
HOLSTON <sup>a</sup>	63	22.9%	212	77.1%	275
KENTUCKYac	33	16.7%	165	83.3%	198
MEMPHIS	25	22.1%	88	77.9%	113
MISSISSIPPI <sup>a</sup>	50	19.8%	202	80.2%	252
NORTH ALABAMA <sup>ac</sup>	42	18.4%	186	81.6%	228
NORTH CAROLINA	79	26.2%	222	73.8%	301
NORTH GEORGIA	109	26.7%	299	73.3%	408
SOUTH CAROLINA	93	28.1%	238	71.9%	331
SOUTH GEORGIA <sup>ac</sup>	34	17.4%	161	82.6%	195
TENNESSEE	47	27.0%	127	73.0%	174
VIRGINIA	138	27.8%	358	72.2%	496
WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA <sup>d</sup>	148	29.0%	362	71.0%	510
SOUTHEASTERN TOTAL	972	24.4%	3015	75.6%	3987
WESTERN <sup>f</sup>		22.227		CC ==:	
ALASKA UNITED METHODIST	4	33.3%	8	66.7%	12
CALIFORNIA PACIFICS	72	40.9%	104	59.1%	176
CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC <sup>c</sup>	73	30.5%	166	69.5%	239
DESERT SOUTHWEST <sup>b</sup>	33	39.3%	51	60.7%	84
OREGON IDAHOb	32	44.4%	40	55.6%	72
PACIFIC NORTHWEST <sup>bd</sup>	54	49.1%	56	50.9%	110
ROCKY MOUNTAIN <sup>b</sup> YELLOWSTONE <sup>b</sup>	49 7	39.2% 25.9%	76 20	60.8% 74.1%	125 27
WESTERN TOTAL	324	38.3%	521	61.7%	845
US TOTAL	3194	28.4%	8041	71.6%	11235

<sup>a</sup>the lower proportion of women represented in these conferences, relative to all U.S. jurisdictions, is statistically significant.

- b the higher proportion of women represented in these conferences, relative to all U.S. conferences, is statistically significant.
- <sup>c</sup> the *lower* proportion of women represented in these conferences, *relative to conferences in the same jurisdiction*, is statistically significant.
- d the higher proportion of women represented in these conferences, relative to conferences in the same jurisdiction, is statistically significant.
- ethe lower proportion of women represented in these jurisdictions, relative to all U.S. jurisdictions, is statistically significant.
- bthe higher proportion of women represented in these jurisdictions, relative to all U.S. jurisdictions, is statistically significant.

Average Salary of U.S. Clerg	ymen and Clergywomen, by Juri	isdiction, 2015	
		Average Salary, USD	
	Gen	ider	
	Men	Women	Overall
North Centralab	56651.11	49868.26	54629.69
Northeasternab	53718.17	48846.82	52208.60
South Centralab	66823.04	53524.16	63060.01
Southeasternab	63480.63	51303.90	60512.04
Westerna	49882.24	47417.19	48937.06

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>In these jurisdictions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's 2015 salaries.

bin jurisdictions, gender was still a significant predictor of salary, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.

Table 3			
Average Total Compensatio	n of U.S. Clergymen and Clergy	women, by Jurisdiction, 2015	
	Ave	rage Overall Compensation (U	JSD)
	Ger	nder	
	Men	Women	Overall
North Central <sup>ab</sup>	71632.96	62775.98	68993.41
Northeastern <sup>ab</sup>	68594.77	62629.85	66746.40
South Central <sup>ab</sup>	85235.66	68451.01	80486.30
Southeastern <sup>ab</sup>	79764.05	64354.02	76007.20
Westerna	69367.18	65132.97	67743.65

aln these jurisdictions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's overall compensation (i.e., salary, housing, and/or parsonage). bln these jurisdictions, gender was still a significant predictor of overall compensation, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.

Average nousing Allowance	of U.S. Clergymen and Clergyw	<u> </u>	
	Av	erage Housing Allowance, U	SD
	Ger	nder	
	Men	Women	Overall
North Centralab	19432.41	16415.99	18571.35
Northeastern	21022.80	19542.94	20509.31
South Centralab	23151.93	18207.63	21717.87
Southeasternab	19577.78	16256.17	18765.83
Westerna	23484.11	21383.96	22713.69

aln these jurisdictions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's 2015 housing allowance.

bln these jurisdictions, gender was still a significant predictor of the housing allowance, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.

Table 5 Parsonage of U.S. Clergyme	en and Clergywomen, by Jurisdict	ion, 2015	
		Average Parsonage, USD	
	Ger	nder	
	Men	Women	Overall
North Centralab	13893.69	12568.59	13502.53
Northeastern <sup>ab</sup>	13311.19	12130.36	12964.78
South Central <sup>ab</sup>	15508.50	13527.56	14978.81
Southeasternab	15350.34	13323.44	14895.77
Western	12326.11	12145.86	12250.60

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>In these jurisdictions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's parsonage.

In these jurisdictions, gender was still a significant predictor of parsonage, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.

	Average Salary (USD)			
	Gender			
	Men	Women	Total	
ALABAMA-WEST FLORIDA <sup>a</sup>	68954.60	51270.00	65590.21	
ALASKA UNITED METHODIST	57280.25	46871.75	53810.75	
ARKANSAS <sup>ab</sup>	69483.28	51914.73	65498.66	
BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON <sup>a</sup>	58042.24	53977.64	56353.43	
CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	53017.76	52915.31	52975.85	
CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC	51319.45	49440.36	50745.50	
CENTRAL TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	71897.72	55205.94	67033.26	
DAKOTAS <sup>a</sup>	53940.90	46971.00	51866.52	
DESERT SOUTHWEST	48956.94	47252.85	48287.48	
DETROIT	55753.37	52642.71	54801.88	
EAST OHIOab	47092.08	41595.47	45654.15	
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA <sup>a</sup>	55090.06	48905.26	53192.45	
FLORIDAab	66456.69	55214.82	63767.60	
GREAT PLAINS <sup>ab</sup>	69731.47	63323.97	67549.78	
GREATER NEW JERSEY <sup>a</sup>	54390.64	48752.29	52813.81	
HOLSTON <sup>ab</sup>	57543.55	48631.10	55501.79	
ILLINOIS GREAT RIVERSab	74116.76	63426.91	71401.88	
INDIANAab	61056.60	52139.76	59293.10	
IOWA <sup>a</sup>	56550.45	51853.98	54769.03	
KENTUCKY <sup>a</sup>	52290.24	42642.18	50682.23	
LOUISIANAª	65102.52	50547.55	60999.78	
MEMPHIS <sup>a</sup>	58910.74	50601.96	57072.51	
MINNESOTA	48516.46	46496.20	47696.20	
MISSISSIPPI <sup>a</sup>	58611.08	47415.66	56389.77	
MISSOURIab	58757.29	47415.00	55472.22	
NEW ENGLAND <sup>a</sup>		48445.42		
NEW MEXICO <sup>a</sup>	52171.16	48797.54	50686.08	
	61030.75		58423.67	
NEW YORK <sup>a</sup>	56784.57	49644.23	54417.39	
NORTH ALABAMA <sup>ab</sup>	64123.32	48489.48	61243.40	
NORTH CAROLINA®	63996.57	52412.43	60956.22	
NORTH GEORGIA <sup>ab</sup>	69562.95	50248.50	64402.96	
NORTH TEXAS <sup>ab</sup>	67851.31	47920.87	60569.03	
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	52629.80	50258.75	51719.70	
NORTHWEST TEXAS	56319.52	54613.30	56092.03	
OKLAHOMA <sup>a</sup>	65756.96	53634.14	62789.13	
OREGON IDAHO	45547.87	41981.91	43963.00	
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	48943.95	46807.57	47895.18	
PENINSULA-DELAWARE	50997.38	46796.47	49263.06	
RIO TEXAS <sup>ab</sup>	58655.46	49895.31	55626.69	
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	47404.68	41698.16	45167.73	
SOUTH CAROLINA <sup>ab</sup>	69444.80	56127.81	65703.17	
SOUTH GEORGIA <sup>ab</sup>	68143.20	54028.47	65682.17	
SUSQUEHANNAab	58796.90	51084.45	57144.23	
TENNESSEE <sup>a</sup>	59862.32	48010.72	56661.03	
TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	73648.26	54863.08	69046.71	
UPPER NEW YORK <sup>a</sup>	49307.55	45947.14	47928.02	
VIRGINIA <sup>ab</sup>	57723.35	48473.28	55149.74	
WEST MICHIGAN <sup>a</sup>	55199.53	49533.55	53294.16	
WEST OHIOab	52670.90	44561.53	50468.87	
WEST VIRGINIA	45413.03	41315.84	44469.44	
WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA <sup>a</sup>	66791.31	54923.75	63347.39	
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA <sup>a</sup>	52123.49	45057.16	51132.29	
WISCONSIN <sup>a</sup>	54257.15	49080.95	52392.43	
YELLOWSTONE	41759.70	40435.57	41416.41	

aln these annual conference regions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's 2015 salaries.
bln these annual conference regions, gender was still a significant predictor of salary, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.

	Average Overall Compensation (USD)			
	Gender			
	Men	Women	Overall	
ALABAMA-WEST FLORIDAab	87352.64	63231.31	82763.70	
ALASKA UNITED METHODIST <sup>b</sup>	76547.38	61567.75	71554.17	
ARKANSAS <sup>ab</sup>	85603.45	64401.57	80794.78	
BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON <sup>a</sup>	78618.95	73876.52	76648.50	
CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	71069.22	70691.25	70914.60	
CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC	73302.52	70096.77	72323.36	
CENTRAL TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	89680.27	67977.10	83355.34	
DAKOTAS <sup>a</sup>	67857.29	57393.12	64742.95	
DESERT SOUTHWEST	71611.61	66824.42	69730.93	
DETROIT	70337.58	65616.13	68893.38	
EAST OHIOab	59324.92	51333.11	57234.24	
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA <sup>a</sup>	72881.25	62835.57	69799.06	
FLORIDAab	85823.31	71741.46	82454.90	
GREAT PLAINS <sup>ab</sup>	86723.19	78532.10	83934.20	
GREATER NEW JERSEY <sup>a</sup>	68374.12	60503.65	66173.06	
HOLSTON <sup>ab</sup>	70580.65	59633.40	68072.73	
ILLINOIS GREAT RIVERSab	91339.10	78060.52	87966.76	
INDIANA <sup>ab</sup>	77028.24	65695.10	74786.86	
IOWA <sup>a</sup>	69991.05	64499.12	67907.91	
KENTUCKY <sup>a</sup>	66703.37	53826.52	64557.23	
LOUISIANAª	82820.05	65172.79	77845.65	
MEMPHIS <sup>a</sup> MINNESOTA	74887.11	64504.80	72590.14	
	66777.78	63624.30	65497.42	
MISSISSIPPI <sup>a</sup>	74673.59	60649.52	71891.04	
MISSOURIab	75321.87	60617.35	71179.75	
NEW ENGLAND <sup>a</sup>	65752.01	60371.96	63607.52	
NEW MEXICO <sup>a</sup>	78832.48	61007.08	75033.62	
NEW YORK <sup>a</sup>	71320.93	62640.56	68443.20	
NORTH ALABAMA <sup>ab</sup>	79731.81	60487.98	76186.89	
NORTH CAROLINA <sup>a</sup>	79525.47	65040.95	75723.88	
NORTH GEORGIA <sup>ab</sup>	89685.60	67513.63	83762.20	
NORTH TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	92040.18	67890.43	83216.24	
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	67876.64	63420.26	66166.11	
NORTHWEST TEXAS	73416.05	66479.90	72491.23	
OKLAHOMA <sup>a</sup>	81638.65	66572.73	77950.31	
OREGON IDAHO	60156.93	56076.16	58343.25	
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	64753.39	62143.50	63472.17	
PENINSULA-DELAWARE <sup>a</sup>	66615.00	60156.47	63948.63	
RIO TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	75014.49	63981.35	71199.84	
ROCKY MOUNTAIN <sup>a</sup>	68067.07	59879.37	64857.49	
SOUTH CAROLINA <sup>ab</sup>	85370.58	70067.62	81070.96	
SOUTH GEORGIA <sup>ab</sup>	84202.12	65271.79	80901.45	
SUSQUEHANNAab	73709.13	63872.81	71601.35	
TENNESSEE <sup>a</sup>	76964.02	59603.94	72274.80	
TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	96451.10	71409.59	90317.01	
UPPER NEW YORK <sup>a</sup>	62304.86	57861.83	60480.88	
VIRGINIAab	72661.23	60480.29	69272.18	
WEST MICHIGAN <sup>a</sup>	70219.13	61965.97	67443.73	
WEST OHIOab	66822.80	55661.03	63791.93	
WEST VIRGINIA	56436.20	51737.00	55353.96	
WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA <sup>ab</sup>	82123.20		77549.25	
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA®		66361.61		
	65160.11	55374.74	63787.50	
WISCONSIN <sup>a</sup>	69664.72 55537.45	63382.86 51499.29	67401.69 54490.52	

aln these annual conference regions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's overall compensation (i.e., salary, housing, and/or parsonage).

blin these annual conference regions, gender was still a significant predictor of overall compensation, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.

	Average Housing Allowance, USD			
	Ger	nder		
	Men	Women	Overall	
ALABAMA-WEST FLORIDAab	21037.99	14322.82	20009.54	
ALASKA UNITED METHODIST	32000.00	24000.00	30000.00	
ARKANSAS <sup>a</sup>	18301.47	14256.52	17278.05	
BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON	23402.16	23747.27	23541.26	
CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	22876.75	21661.68	22390.73	
CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC	26151.72	25332.65	25916.24	
CENTRAL TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	22498.86	15490.82	20910.37	
DAKOTAS	18481.56	17622.50	18325.36	
DESERT SOUTHWEST	23554.51	20765.48	22490.28	
DETROIT <sup>a</sup>	19479.85	11672.29	16747.20	
EAST OHIO <sup>a</sup>	16825.11	11087.50	15513.66	
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIAab	21687.05	16393.92	20140.74	
FLORIDA <sup>a</sup>	27655.07	23250.11	26735.35	
GREAT PLAINS <sup>a</sup>	18484.68	15679.26	17495.89	
GREATER NEW JERSEY	20049.36	4800.00	19032.73	
HOLSTON <sup>a</sup>	14427.95	11951.60	13932.73	
ILLINOIS GREAT RIVERS	16056.11	12625.00	15232.64	
INDIANA	21123.06	17160.75	20462.68	
IOWA	16048.17	15056.58	15651.53	
KENTUCKY				
	20311.87	17839.78	19914.57	
LOUISIANA	21025.87	16336.05	19508.57	
MEMPHIS	18685.93	15069.14	17765.29	
MINNESOTA	22401.72	19513.59	21091.99	
MISSISSIPPIab	21338.73	15216.71	19660.11	
MISSOURIab	22188.80	16091.28	20283.33	
NEW ENGLAND	17524.00	13446.00	16582.92	
NEW MEXICO	24122.07	22800.00	24033.93	
NEW YORK	23448.09	17782.43	21244.78	
NORTH ALABAMA	18629.02	14025.69	17722.30	
NORTH CAROLINA <sup>ab</sup>	18264.57	14649.44	17203.61	
NORTH GEORGIA <sup>a</sup>	22681.27	19611.93	21809.58	
NORTH TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	28065.38	22895.61	26135.33	
NORTHERN ILLINOIS <sup>a</sup>	22647.93	16636.91	20994.90	
NORTHWEST TEXAS	27259.37	17133.33	25878.55	
OKLAHOMA	16725.81	15049.81	16410.33	
OREGON IDAHO	17771.13	16222.45	17050.81	
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	19159.58	19458.30	19298.64	
PENINSULA-DELAWARE	19306.14	16059.67	18062.81	
RIO TEXAS	19675.19	19095.00	19489.23	
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	23660.57	21187.00	22746.42	
SOUTH CAROLINA	16329.72	15040.14	15970.59	
SOUTH GEORGIA <sup>a</sup>	17258.97	11750.00	16184.05	
SUSQUEHANNA	17674.82	17273.00	17614.55	
TENNESSEE <sup>a</sup>	19221.51	14193.30	17863.89	
TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	31864.78	20679.59	28876.95	
UPPER NEW YORK <sup>a</sup>	17748.33	13221.50	15822.02	
VIRGINIA	17677.28	16334.55	17313.03	
WEST MICHIGAN	18810.50	16500.00	18553.78	
WEST OHIO <sup>a</sup>	18161.64	14071.06	17122.23	
WEST VIRGINIA	7800.00	16000.00	9850.00	
WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA	15915.94	14101.65	15479.95	
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA	15729.58	17733.33	16130.33	
WISCONSIN YELLOWSTONE	18601.00 18692.78	18489.63 16333.33	18559.88 18102.92	

aln these annual conference regions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's 2015 housing allowance.
bln these annual conference regions, gender was still a significant predictor of the housing allowance, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.

ALABAMA-WEST FLORIDA ALASKA UNITED METHODIST ARKANSASab BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS DAKOTAS	Ger Men 15601.51 11627.40 15461.87 14118.33 13334.35 13095.98	Women 13937.69 11594.67 12501.70	Overall 15288.32 11615.13
ALASKA UNITED METHODIST ARKANSAS <sup>ab</sup> BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS	15601.51 11627.40 15461.87 14118.33 13334.35	13937.69 11594.67	15288.32
ALASKA UNITED METHODIST ARKANSAS <sup>ab</sup> BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS	11627.40 15461.87 14118.33 13334.35	11594.67	
ARKANSASªb BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS	15461.87 14118.33 13334.35		11615.13
BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS	14118.33 13334.35	12501.70	
CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS	13334.35		14887.08
CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS	13334.35	13112.06	13687.07
CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC CENTRAL TEXAS		13433.06	13377.94
CENTRAL TEXAS	15055.50	12689.48	12955.27
	15791.26	13856.61	15153.96
	13094.66	11858.32	12754.22
DESERT SOUTHWEST	12081.50	10915.75	11498.63
DETROIT	13978.09	13475.27	13829.60
EAST OHIOab	11472.58	10300.68	11175.14
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA	13866.24	12538.27	13455.20
FLORIDA <sup>a</sup>	15972.50	14116.34	15494.94
GREAT PLAINS <sup>ab</sup>	16999.45	15598.37	16530.02
GREATER NEW JERSEY	13613.64	12635.90	13336.24
HOLSTON	13274.04	12235.02	13038.16
ILLINOIS GREAT RIVERSab	18329.58	15650.93	17644.34
INDIANAab	14405.87	12978.43	14109.19
IOWA <sup>a</sup>	13954.06	13128.08	13643.77
KENTUCKY	12271.62	11584.72	12179.35
LOUISIANA	15222.70	14159.28	14980.41
MEMPHIS	14540.86	12418.45	14116.38
MINNESOTA <sup>a</sup>	12180.13	10925.80	11779.81
MISSISSIPPI	15229.23	13896.86	15013.37
MISSOURIa	13831.54	12030.68	13356.89
NEW ENGLAND <sup>a</sup>	13062.01	12065.57	12652.62
NEW MEXICO <sup>a</sup>	15199.24	12356.73	14504.40
NEW YORK <sup>a</sup>	14167.06	12375.91	13570.01
NORTH ALABAMA <sup>a</sup>	15205.09	12369.35	14720.03
NORTH CAROLINA <sup>a</sup>	15068.12	13089.52	14603.76
NORTH GEORGIA <sup>a</sup>	16582.39	13228.46	15781.77
NORTH TEXAS	14599.61	13085.17	14112.82
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	13223.35	12769.83	13036.09
NORTHWEST TEXAS	13185.47	11211.00	12953.18
OKLAHOMA <sup>a</sup>	15643.13	13399.49	15059.78
OREGON IDAHO	10976.63	10547.25	10792.61
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	11655.28	11644.85	11649.96
	12930.88	11560.22	12324.20
PENINSULA-DELAWARE <sup>a</sup> RIO TEXAS <sup>ab</sup>	13848.21	11843.73	
	11001.56		13155.07
ROCKY MOUNTAIN		11368.07	11168.15
SOUTH CAROLINA®	17021.08	14854.15	16416.58
SOUTH GEORGIA <sup>a</sup>	16660.66	14413.65	16341.94
SUSQUEHANNAab	14676.55	12770.84	14260.36
TENNESSEE	15374.92	13471.83	15006.58
TEXAS <sup>a</sup>	16985.52	13952.30	16313.21
UPPER NEW YORK <sup>a</sup>	12360.67	11665.19	12069.18
VIRGINIAª	14203.75	12116.25	13685.68
WEST MICHIGAN <sup>a</sup>	13235.65	12083.77	12766.86
WEST OHIOab	12544.66	11048.38	12152.49
WEST VIRGINIA	11376.39	10555.67	11188.20
WESTERN NORTH CAROLINAab	16626.58	13501.63	15753.85
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA <sup>a</sup>	13001.15	11593.26	12838.43
WISCONSINa	13295.79	12055.00	12873.39

aln these annual conference regions, there was a statistically significant difference in clergywomen and clergymen's parsonage.
bln these annual conference regions, gender was still a significant predictor of parsonage, even when length of service, current age, and membership type were held steady.