

Standard Errors for the Blinder–Oaxaca Decomposition

Ben Jann

Department of Sociology
ETH Zurich
jann@soz.gess.ethz.ch

3rd German Stata Users Group Meeting
Berlin, April 8 2005

Outline

1 Motivation

- The Econometrics of Discrimination
- What about Standard Errors?

2 Results

- New Variance Estimators
- A New Stata Command
- Bootstrap results

The Decomposition Problem

- Explanation of the difference in (mean) outcome between two groups.
- Popular example: Male–Female wage differential.
- Research questions
 - How much of the differential can be explained by group differences in characteristics?
 - How much of the differential may be due to, e.g., discrimination?

The Three-Fold Division (Winsborough/Dickinson 1971)

Based on the regression model

$$Y_j = X_j\beta_j + \epsilon_j, \quad E(\epsilon_j) = 0, \quad j \in \{1, 2\}$$

the mean outcome difference $R = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_2 = \bar{X}_1'\hat{\beta}_1 - \bar{X}_2'\hat{\beta}_2$
can be decomposed as

$$R = (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)'\hat{\beta}_2 + \bar{X}_2'(\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2) + (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)'(\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2)$$

differences in differences in interaction
endowments coefficients

\bar{Y} : sample mean of outcome variable (e.g. log wages)

\bar{X} : mean vector of regressors (e.g. education, experience, etc.)

The Two-Fold Division

$$R = (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)' \beta^* + [\bar{X}_1'(\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta^*) + \bar{X}_2'(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_2)]$$

"explained" part (Q) "unexplained" part (U)

where β^* is a set of benchmark coefficients (i.e. the coefficients from the non-discriminatory wage structure).
Examples for β^* are:

- $\beta^* = \hat{\beta}_1$ or $\beta^* = \hat{\beta}_2$ (Oaxaca 1973; Blinder 1973)
- $\beta^* = 0.5\hat{\beta}_1 + 0.5\hat{\beta}_2$ (Reimers 1983)
- coefficients from the pooled sample (Neumark 1988)

Alternative Specification (Oaxaca/Ransom 1994)

The two-fold decomposition can also be expressed as

$$R = (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)'[W\hat{\beta}_1 + (I - W)\hat{\beta}_2] \quad (\text{explained part}) \\ + [\bar{X}_1'(I - W) + \bar{X}_2'W](\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2) \quad (\text{unexplained part})$$

where W represents a matrix of relative weights given to the coefficients of the first group ($I =$ identity matrix).

Examples:

- $W = I$ corresponds to $\beta^* = \hat{\beta}_1$, $W = 0$ to $\beta^* = \hat{\beta}_2$
- $W = 0.5I$ corresponds to $\beta^* = 0.5\hat{\beta}_1 + 0.5\hat{\beta}_2$
- $W = (X_1'X_1 + X_2'X_2)^{-1}X_1'X_1$ is equivalent to using the coefficients from the pooled sample as β^*

Sampling Variances?

- The computation of the decomposition components is straight forward: Estimate OLS models and insert the coefficients and the means of the regressors into the formulas.
- However, deriving standard errors for the decomposition components seems to cause problems. At least, hardly any paper applying these methods reports standard errors or confidence intervals.
- This is problematic because it is hard to evaluate the significance of reported decomposition results without knowing anything about their sampling distribution.

Approaches to Estimating the Standard Errors

- An obvious solution is to use the bootstrap technique.
- However, bootstrap is slow and it would be desirable to have easy to compute asymptotic formulas.
- Previously proposed estimators (Oaxaca/Ransom 1998; Greene 2003:53–54) produce biased results in most applications because they assume fixed regressors (as will be shown below).
- Thus, new unbiased variance estimators for the components of the three-fold and the two-fold decomposition will be presented in the following.

Step I: Variance of Mean Prediction

How can the sampling variance of the mean prediction $\bar{Y} = \bar{X}'\hat{\beta}$ be estimated?

- If the regressors are fixed, then \bar{X} is constant. Thus:

$$\widehat{V}(\bar{X}'\hat{\beta}) = \bar{X}'\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta})\bar{X}$$

- In most applications, however, the regressors and therefore \bar{X} are stochastic. Fortunately, \bar{X} and $\hat{\beta}$ are uncorrelated (as long as $\text{Cov}(\epsilon, X) = 0$ holds). Thus:

$$\widehat{V}(\bar{X}'\hat{\beta}) = \bar{X}'\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta})\bar{X} + \hat{\beta}'\widehat{V}(\bar{X})\hat{\beta} + \text{tr}\left(\widehat{V}(\bar{X})\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta})\right)$$

(proof in the Appendix).

Step II: Variance of Difference in Mean Prediction

As long as the two samples are independent, the variance estimator for the group difference in mean predictions immediately follows as:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{V}(R) &= \widehat{V}(\bar{X}'_1\widehat{\beta}_1 - \bar{X}'_2\widehat{\beta}_2) \\ &= \widehat{V}(\bar{X}'_1\widehat{\beta}_1) + \widehat{V}(\bar{X}'_2\widehat{\beta}_2) \\ &= \bar{X}'_1\widehat{V}(\widehat{\beta}_1)\bar{X}_1 + \widehat{\beta}'_1\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_1)\widehat{\beta}_1 + \text{tr}\left(\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_1)\widehat{V}(\widehat{\beta}_1)\right) \\ &\quad + \bar{X}'_2\widehat{V}(\widehat{\beta}_2)\bar{X}_2 + \widehat{\beta}'_2\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2)\widehat{\beta}_2 + \text{tr}\left(\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2)\widehat{V}(\widehat{\beta}_2)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Step III: Three-Fold Decomposition

Similarly:

$$\widehat{V}([\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2]' \hat{\beta}_2) = (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)' \widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_2) (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) \\ + \hat{\beta}_2' \left[\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_1) + \widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2) \right] \hat{\beta}_2 + \text{tr}(\cdot)$$

$$\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2' [\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2]) = \bar{X}_2' \left[\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_1) + \widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_2) \right] \bar{X}_2 \\ + (\hat{\beta}_2 - \hat{\beta}_2)' \widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2) (\hat{\beta}_2 - \hat{\beta}_2) + \text{tr}(\cdot)$$

$$\widehat{V}([\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2] [\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2]) = (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)' \left[\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_1) + \widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_2) \right] (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) \\ + (\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2)' \left[\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_1) + \widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2) \right] (\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2) + \text{tr}(\cdot)$$

Step IV: Two-Fold Decomposition

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{V}(Q) &= \text{tr}(\cdot) + \\ &+ (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)' \left[W\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_1)W' + (I - W)\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_2)(I - W)' \right] (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) \\ &+ [W\hat{\beta}_1 + (I - W)\hat{\beta}_2]' \left[\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_1) + \widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2) \right] [W\hat{\beta}_1 + (I - W)\hat{\beta}_2]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{V}(U) &= \text{tr}(\cdot) + \\ &+ [(I - W)'\bar{X}_1 + W'\bar{X}_2]' \left[\widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_1) + \widehat{V}(\hat{\beta}_2) \right] [(I - W)'\bar{X}_1 + W'\bar{X}_2] \\ &+ (\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2)' \left[(I - W)'\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_1)(I - W) + W'\widehat{V}(\bar{X}_2)W \right] (\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2)\end{aligned}$$

(Note: W is assumed fixed.)

The `oaxaca` Command

The proposed formulas are implemented in a new post-estimation command called `oaxaca`. The syntax is:

```
oaxaca est1 est2 [, se fixed[(varlist)] eform  
other options ]
```

where `est1` and `est2` are the names of stored estimates.

`se` requests standard errors
`fixed` identifies fixed regressors
`eform` transforms all results to exponentiated form

Other options: detailed decomposition for individual regressors/groups of regressors, specify W , use β^* from pooled model, adjust for selection terms

```
. quietly regress lnwage educyrs exp exp2 tenure boss if female==0
. estimates store male
. quietly regress lnwage educyrs exp exp2 tenure boss if female==1
. estimates store female
. oaxaca male female, se
(high estimates: male; low estimates: female)
```

Results of linear decomposition:

lnwage	Pred. H	Pred. L	R=H-L	E	C	CE
Total	3.725382	3.483212	.2421702	.0950089	.1330691	.0140922
Std. error	.006801	.0106372	.0126255	.0088171	.0112131	.0068167

H: mean prediction high model; L: mean prediction low model
R: raw differential; E: differential due to endowments
C: diff. due to coefficients; CE: diff. due to interaction

Explained ($Q = E + W*CE$):

lnwage	W=0	W=1	W=.5
Total	.0950089	.1091011	.102055
Std. error	.0088171	.0075205	.007452

Unexplained ($U = C + [I-W]*CE$):

lnwage	W=0	W=1	W=.5
Total	.1471613	.1330691	.1401152
Std. error	.012253	.0112131	.0112391

Empirical Application

- The accuracy of the proposed estimators can be demonstrated by Monte-Carlo experiments under ideal conditions.
- But how do the estimators perform on „real“ data compared to, e.g., bootstrap estimators?
- Application: Decomposition of the **gender wage gap** using data from the Swiss Labor Force Survey 2000 (SLFS; Swiss Federal Statistical Office).

Sample: Employees aged 20–62, working fulltime, only one job. Dependent variable: Log hourly wages.

Log wages	Men		Women	
	Coef.	Mean	Coef.	Mean
Education	0.0754 (0.0023)	12.0239 (0.0414)	0.0762 (0.0044)	11.6156 (0.0548)
Experience	0.0221 (0.0017)	19.1641 (0.2063)	0.0247 (0.0031)	14.0429 (0.2616)
Exp. ² /100	-0.0319 (0.0036)	5.1125 (0.0932)	-0.0435 (0.0079)	3.0283 (0.1017)
Tenure	0.0028 (0.0007)	10.3077 (0.1656)	0.0063 (0.0014)	7.6729 (0.2013)
Supervisor	0.1502 (0.0113)	0.5341 (0.0086)	0.0709 (0.0193)	0.3737 (0.0123)
Constant	2.4489 (0.0332)		2.3079 (0.0564)	
R^2	0.3470		0.2519	
N. of cases	3383		1544	

Decomposition and Standard Errors

	Value	BS	STO	FIX
Differential (R)	0.2422	0.0122	0.0126	0.0107
Explained (Q):				
$W = 0$	0.0950	0.0094	0.0088	0.0059
$W = I$	0.1091	0.0076	0.0075	0.0031
$W = 0.5I$	0.1021	0.0078	0.0075	0.0033
$W = W^*$	0.1144	0.0081	0.0076	0.0026
Unexplained (U):				
$W = 0$	0.1472	0.0122	0.0123	0.0122
$W = I$	0.1331	0.0113	0.0112	0.0111
$W = 0.5I$	0.1401	0.0112	0.0112	0.0112
$W = W^*$	0.1277	0.0104	0.0104	0.0103

BS = bootstrap standard errors, STO = stochastic regressors assumed,
FIX = fixed regressors assumed

Summary

- Standard errors for the Blinder–Oaxaca decomposition are rarely reported in the literature. However, relatively simple estimators do exist.
- These estimators seem to work quite all right on real data (using bootstrap estimates as a benchmark).
- Neglecting the stochastic nature of the regressors yields a considerable underestimation of the standard errors for the „explained“ part of the differential.
- Outlook
 - Unsolved problem: The estimates may be biased if W is stochastic.

Proof I

LEMMA: The variance of the product of two uncorrelated random vectors is:

$$V(u_1' u_2) = \mu_1' \Sigma_2 \mu_1 + \mu_2' \Sigma_1 \mu_2 + \text{tr}(\Sigma_1 \Sigma_2)$$

where $u_j \sim (\mu_j, \Sigma_j)$, $j = 1, 2$

PROOF:

$$E(x + y) = E(x) + E(y), \quad E(xy) = E(x)E(y) + \text{Cov}(x, y)$$

Thus, if u_1 and u_2 are uncorrelated:

$$E(u_1' u_2) = \mu_1' \mu_2, \quad E(u_j u_j') = \mu_j \mu_j' + \Sigma_j$$

Proof II

and

$$\begin{aligned} E([u'_1 u_2]^2) &= E(u'_1 u_2 u'_2 u_1) = \text{tr}(E(u_1 u'_1 u_2 u'_2)) \\ &= \text{tr}(E(u_1 u'_1) E(u_2 u'_2)) \\ &= \text{tr}((\mu_1 \mu'_1 + \Sigma_1)(\mu_2 \mu'_2 + \Sigma_2)) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mu_1 \mu'_1 \mu_2 \mu'_2) + \text{tr}(\mu_1 \mu'_1 \Sigma_2) \\ &\quad + \text{tr}(\Sigma_1 \mu_2 \mu'_2) + \text{tr}(\Sigma_1 \Sigma_2) \\ &= (\mu'_1 \mu_2)^2 + \mu'_1 \Sigma_2 \mu_1 + \mu'_2 \Sigma_1 \mu_2 + \text{tr}(\Sigma_1 \Sigma_2) \end{aligned}$$

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned} V(u'_1 u_2) &= E([u'_1 u_2]^2) - [E(u'_1 u_2)]^2 \\ &= \mu'_1 \Sigma_2 \mu_1 + \mu'_2 \Sigma_1 \mu_2 + \text{tr}(\Sigma_1 \Sigma_2) \end{aligned}$$

References I

- ▶ Blinder, A. S. (1973) Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Estimates *The Journal of Human Resources* 8(4):436–455.
- ▶ Greene, W. H. (2003) *Econometric Analysis*, 5th edn.
- ▶ Neumark, D. (1988) Employers' Discriminatory Behavior and the Estimation of Wage Discrimination *The Journal of Human Resources* 23:279–295.
- ▶ Oaxaca, R. (1973) Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets *International Economic Review* 14:693–709.
- ▶ Oaxaca, R., and M. R. Ransom (1994) On discrimination and the decomposition of wage differentials *Journal of Econometrics* 61:5–21.

References II

- ▶ Oaxaca, R. L., and M. Ransom (1998) Calculation of approximate variances for wage decomposition differentials *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement* 24:55–61.
- ▶ Reimers, C. W. (1983) Labor Market Discrimination Against Hispanic and Black Men *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 65:570–579.
- ▶ Winsborough, H. H., and P. Dickinson (1971) Components of Negro-White Income Differences *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section*:6–8.