3. Bayer and Astin's salary data for 1968–69 were based on a questionnaire item in which respondents were asked to indicate their institutional salaries by checking one of nine income categories ranging from "below $7,000" to "$30,000 and over." This item did not invite response error in the manner of the 1972–73 item.
4. The 1972–73 faculty data used as a basis for this comment were collected by the American Council on Education's former Office of Research under a grant from the Research Applied to National Needs (RANN) Division of the National Science Foundation. Access to the data was achieved through the Council's Division of Educational Statistics, Washington, D.C. I thank the Computer Center of the College of William and Mary for the use of data processing facilities.

Faia faults the article by Helen Astin and me for errors in procedure, results, and interpretation which are apparently his, not ours. He is, however, correct in that we did encounter some difficulty in our survey with a small number of the responses to the item requesting salary data from academic personnel. A few of the 53,000 respondents elected not to disclose their salaries in the survey, and 15 percent overlooked reporting whether their designated salaries were on an academic year (9 to 10 months) or a calendar year (11 to 12 months) basis. A trace, 409 individuals out of 53,000 respondents, or 0.77 percent, reported salaries in excess of $70,000, some of which were clearly spurious although others in this salary range can be presumed to be correct inasmuch as our sample included many chief administrative officers as well as eminent scholars. Faia's reported proportion of 1.5 percent above this salary level would appear to mistakenly include those who omitted the salary item.

The brevity required for our *Science* article precluded detailed description of the full procedure we employed to draw our subsample for the analyses. We were aware of the possible misreporting of salaries in the high ranges, however, and all salaries in excess of $40,000 were analyzed for their presumed consistency with the respondents' rank, degree level, length of service, publication productivity, or administrative responsibilities. In the subsample of 4998 cases used in our analysis, 12 men and 6 women who had incomes above this level were retained in the sample under the presumption that their incomes were reasonable, given their status and roles. All respondents who did not report their salary, or did not report the basis of their salary, were excluded from our subsample. The resulting subsample standard deviation on income was $6410, not Faia's erroneous $10,601 which apparently was derived by including coded omitted responses to the salary item (scored as "100" and thus possibly analyzed by him as $100,000 salaries).

We also did not interpret our findings with respect to the poor predictive results of salaries for women by adopting Christopher Jencks's "luck" explanation (*1*). Nor is a "situation of virtual anarchy" a necessary "only" feasible interpretation of such results, as Faia claims. An alternative explanation which we suggested is that a low multiple correlation coefficient could be obtained if some institutions had instituted broad corrective actions to adjust their women faculty members' salaries while others had done little or nothing by 1972–73 in response to recent antibias legislation.

It nevertheless remains perplexing as to why Faia's results with respect to one of the prediction equations would deviate so substantially from ours, particularly inasmuch as he has employed our data. Faia's attempt to replicate our earlier 1968–69 study with our 1972–73 data, collected by us for the same purpose, has until this time resulted in only an early press release, subsequently picked up by the semi-popular press, which he cites in his letter. Only if he reports his study in full in a refereed scholarly journal, where peer appraisal by the scientific community might take precedence over media publicity, might the discrepant results which he claims be more adequately understood.

ALAN E. BAYER

Department of Sociology,
Institute for Social Research,
Center for the Study of Education,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee 32306

References

1. C. Jencks *et al.*, *Inequality: a Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (Basic Books, New York, 1972).

Mixed Blessing

The *Science* cover of 12 September raises a curious coincidence. The caption for the distressing photograph of the dead chestnut reminds us that the tree's death was caused by the fungus *Endothia parasitica*, a species whose extracellular products enjoy the incongruous distinction of being the subject of a food additive regulation, under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The federal regulation for fermentation-derived, milk-clotting enzymes [number 121.1199 (CFR 21)] provides for the use in cheese manufacture of the enzyme produced by pure culture fermentation of *E. parasitica*. Pathogenic for some trees, apparently, but beneficial to man.

DONALD H. WILLIAMS

Dairy and Food Industries
Supply Association, Inc.,
5530 Wisconsin Avenue, NW,
Washington, D.C. 20015