## Week 6. Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition

## What is Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition?

1. Mean difference between two groups (group 1 and group 2): $\bar{Y}_{1}$ and $\bar{Y}_{2}$
2. It is a technique to decompose the mean difference $\left(=\bar{Y}_{1}-\bar{Y}_{2}\right)$ into two components:
(a) Coefficient effect
$=$ the rate effect,
$=$ the unexplained difference,
which quantifies how much the mean difference between two groups can be attributable to the different treatment on the same characteristics. This effect is often regarded as "discrimination." However, I strongly recommend you not to call it "discrimination."
(b) Endowment effect
$=$ the distributional effect,
$=$ the explained difference,
which quantifies how much the mean difference between two groups can be attributable to the different distributions between two groups.
3. For example, the mean earnings gap between whites and blacks can be attributed to (1) the difference in the proportion of highly educated workers between two races, and (2) the differentiated rewards to the same level of education between races.
4. It is always about the difference between "two" groups.
5. Detailed decomposition is possible but you should be cautious. There are identification problems.

## Statistical Explanation

Suppose you estimated the following model. One for white and the other for minority.

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{i}=a_{i}+\sum_{J} \sum_{K} b_{i j k} X_{i j k}+\epsilon \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We can predict mean wages for groups $w$ and $m$ based on estimations from two regression models. The mean wages of the groups at time $t$ can be expressed as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{Y}_{i}=a_{i t}+\sum_{J} \sum_{K} b_{i j k} \bar{X}_{i j k} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $i$ indexes groups $w$ (say, White) and $m$ (say, minority) and $t$ indexes time points. $Y_{i t}$ refers to the mean wage for group $i$. The $a$ term is an estimated constant, and $b$ represents the estimated coefficients. $\bar{X}$ refers to the mean values of the explanatory variables. Since the error term for a mean value is zero by the definition of OLS regression, I drop it from the equation. In case of $b$ and $\bar{X}, j$ indexes a $j$ th category containing a set of relevant dummy variables and $k$ indexes a $k$ th dummy variable in each $j$. For simplicity, I drop $j$ and $k$ subscripts henceforth in the remaining part. The wage gap between group $w$ and group $m,\left(Y_{w}-Y_{m}\right)$, can be calculated by substituting
the estimates for the right side of Equation 1, $\left(\left[a_{w}+\sum \sum b_{w} \bar{X}_{w}\right]-\left[a_{m}+\sum \sum b_{m} \bar{X}_{m}\right]\right)$. A BlinderOaxaca method breaks down this wage gap as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{Y}_{w}-\bar{Y}_{m}=\underbrace{\left[a_{w}-a_{m}\right]}_{\text {A1. Intercept Effect }}+\underbrace{\sum \sum\left[\left(b_{w}-b_{m}\right)\left(\frac{\bar{X}_{w}+\bar{X}_{m}}{2}\right)\right]}_{\text {A2. Coefficient Effect }}+\underbrace{\sum \sum\left[\left(\bar{X}_{w}-\bar{X}_{m}\right)\left(\frac{b_{w}+b_{m}}{2}\right)\right]}_{\text {A3. Endowment Effect }} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that instead of (a) $\left(\frac{\bar{X}_{w}+\bar{X}_{m}}{2}\right)$ and $\left(\frac{b_{w}+b_{m}}{2}\right)$, you can use (b) $\bar{X}_{w}$ and $b_{m}$, or (c) $\bar{X}_{m}$ and $b_{w}$ as shown below. In most cases, your result will be only slightly different by the choice of (a), (b), or (c). But sometimes the difference is substantial. Sensitivity test is usually recommended.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{Y}_{w}-\bar{Y}_{m}=\underbrace{\left[a_{w}-a_{m}\right]}_{\text {A1. Intercept Effect }}+\underbrace{\sum \sum\left(b_{w}-b_{m}\right) \bar{X}_{w}}_{\text {A2. Coefficient Effect }}+\underbrace{\sum \sum\left(\bar{X}_{w}-\bar{X}_{m}\right) b_{m}}_{\text {A3. Endowment Effect }} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

From this result you report the size of two effects:

1. Coefficient Effect $=\mathrm{A} 1+\mathrm{A} 2$
2. Endowment Effect $=\mathrm{A} 3$

You can compute this with Excel. Fortunately there is a Stata command.

## Stata command

1. The personal earnings gap between whites and blacks is $.2665 \log$ dollars.
. tabstat lnpincome, by(black)


## 2. OLS Regression without Covariates

If you estimate an OLS model without any control variables except female, you get the following result. Here is the coefficient of black is the mean difference in earnings between whites and blacks.

| Inpincome \| | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| black \| | -. 2664713 | . 0277216 | -9.61 | 0.000 | -. 3208088 | -. 2121337 |
| _cons I | 10.5726 | . 008724 | 1211.90 | 0.000 | 10.5555 | 10.5897 |

3. OLS Regression with Covariates

If you estimate an OLS model without an interaction, you get the following result. The coefficient of black becomes substantially reduced $(=-.1056)$ compared to the basic model (-.2665). Usually we say that the control variables account for $60 \%$ of racial earnings gap (= $(-.26647+.10558) /-.26647)$.

| Source \| | SS | df | MS | Number of obs |  | 15,348 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 15339) | 503.24 |
| Model \| | 3377.83676 | 8 | 422.229595 | 5 Pro | > F | 0.0000 |
| Residual \| | 12869.7402 | 15,339 | . 839020813 | 3 R-s | uared | 0.2079 |
|  |  |  |  |  | R -squared | 0.2075 |
| Total \| | 16247.577 | 15,347 | 1.05868098 | Root MSE |  | . 91598 |
| Inpincome \| | Coef. | Std. Err. | t P | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| black \| | -. 1018714 | . 0254998 | -3.99 | 0.000 | -. 1518541 | -. 0518888 |
| female \| | -. 65128 | . 0148911 | -43.74 | 0.000 | -. 6804683 | -. 6220916 |
| edu |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | . 2672748 | . 042582 | 6.28 | 0.000 | . 1838089 | . 3507406 |
| 3 | . 4894489 | . 0416642 | 11.75 | 0.000 | . 4077821 | . 5711157 |
| 4 | . 8708241 | . 0420922 | 20.69 | 0.000 | . 7883185 | . 9533297 |
| 5 \| | 1.237103 | . 0435773 | 28.39 | 0.000 | 1.151686 | 1.322519 |
| \| 1.2371031 .3000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| age \| | . 0103045 | . 0026002 | 3.96 | 0.000 | . 0052077 | . 0154012 |
| married \| | -. 0213489 | . 0222227 | -0.96 | 0.337 | -. 064908 | . 0222102 |
| _cons \| | 9.820821 | . 1121696 | 87.55 | 0.000 | 9.600956 | 10.04069 |

4. Simple Decomposition

Below is the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition results. Explained is the endowment effect and Unexplained is the coefficient effect.

| Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition |  |  |  | Number | bs | 15,348 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1: black }=0 \\ & \text { 2: black }=1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inpincome | Coef. | Std. Err | z | $\mathrm{P}>\mid \mathrm{z}$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| Differential \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prediction_1 \| | 10.5726 | . 0088174 | 1199.06 | 0.000 | 10.55532 | 10.58989 |
| Prediction_2 \| | 10.30613 | . 0236947 | 434.96 | 0.000 | 10.25969 | 10.35257 |
| Difference \| | . 2664713 | . 0252821 | 10.54 | 0.000 | . 2169193 | . 3160232 |
| Decomposition \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explained \| | . 169037 | . 0142391 | 11.87 | 0.000 | . 1411288 | . 1969451 |
| Unexplained \| | . 0974343 | . 0247042 | 3.94 | 0.000 | . 0490151 | . 1458536 |

5. Detailed Decomposition 1
$($ ref $=$ edu1 $($ LTHS $)$ for a set of education dummy variables)

Below is the detailed decomposition results. The components of Explained and Unexplained are decomposed into each variable.

| Blinder-Daxaca decomposition |  |  |  | Numbe | f obs | 15,348 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1: black }=0 \\ & \text { 2: black }=1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lnpincome | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|z\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| Differential \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prediction_1 | 10.5726 | . 0088174 | 1199.06 | 0.000 | 10.55532 | 10.58989 |
| Prediction_2 | 10.30613 | . 0236947 | 434.96 | 0.000 | 10.25969 | 10.35257 |
| Difference | . 2664713 | . 0252821 | 10.54 | 0.000 | . 2169193 | . 3160232 |
| Explained \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | . 0650001 | . 0093827 | 6.93 | 0.000 | . 0466105 | . 0833898 |
| edu | . 1067261 | . 0092775 | 11.50 | 0.000 | . 0885425 | . 1249098 |
| age | . 0014545 | . 0008633 | 1.68 | 0.092 | -. 0002376 | . 0031466 |
| married | -. 0041438 | . 006112 | -0.68 | 0.498 | -. 016123 | . 0078354 |
| Total | . 169037 | . 0142391 | 11.87 | 0.000 | . 1411288 | . 1969451 |
| Unexplained \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | -. 2251413 | . 0271768 | -8.28 | 0.000 | -. 2784069 | -. 1718758 |
| edu | -. 0098657 | . 1011814 | -0.10 | 0.922 | -. 2081776 | . 1884462 |
| age | -. 199828 | . 3225986 | -0.62 | 0.536 | -. 8321096 | . 4324537 |
| married | -. 049026 | . 0347166 | -1.41 | 0.158 | -. 1170693 | . 0190173 |
| _cons | . 5812953 | . 3414981 | 1.70 | 0.089 | -. 0880287 | 1.250619 |
| Total | . 0974343 | . 0247042 | 3.94 | 0.000 | . 0490151 | . 1458536 |

6. Detailed Decomposition 2
(ref $=$ edu4(BA) for a set of education dummy variables)

As you see the result of Detailed Decompositions 1 and 2 are different. The unexplained effect of education was -.0099 in Decomposition 1 but it now became . 0457222 in Decomposition 2. The unexplained effect of the constant has also been changed between two models. This is the identification problem of the detailed Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition. As you change the reference group, the effect size of the unexplained part also changes.

| . oaxaca lnpincome female edu1 edu2 edu3 edu5 age married, by(black) w(1) detail(edu:edu*) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition | Number of obs $=15,348$ |


| Inpincome \| | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Differential \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prediction_1 \| | 10.5726 | . 0088174 | 1199.06 | 0.000 | 10.55532 | 10.58989 |
| Prediction_2 \| | 10.30613 | . 0236947 | 434.96 | 0.000 | 10.25969 | 10.35257 |
| Difference \| | . 2664713 | . 0252821 | 10.54 | 0.000 | . 2169193 | . 3160232 |
| Explained \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | . 0650001 | . 0093827 | 6.93 | 0.000 | . 0466105 | . 0833898 |
| edu | . 1067261 | . 0092775 | 11.50 | 0.000 | . 0885425 | . 1249098 |
| age \| | . 0014545 | . 0008633 | 1.68 | 0.092 | -. 0002376 | . 0031466 |
| married \| | -. 0041438 | . 006112 | -0.68 | 0.498 | -. 016123 | . 0078354 |
| Total \| | . 169037 | . 0142391 | 11.87 | 0.000 | . 1411288 | . 1969451 |
| Unexplained |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | -. 2251413 | . 0271768 | -8.28 | 0.000 | -. 2784069 | -. 1718758 |
| edu | . 0457222 | . 0480695 | 0.95 | 0.342 | -. 0484923 | . 1399367 |
| age | -. 199828 | . 3225986 | -0.62 | 0.536 | -. 8321096 | . 4324537 |
| married \| | -. 049026 | . 0347166 | -1.41 | 0.158 | -. 1170693 | . 0190173 |
| _cons \| | . 5257074 | . 330021 | 1.59 | 0.111 | -. 1211219 | 1.172537 |
| Total \| | . 0974343 | . 0247042 | 3.94 | 0.000 | . 0490151 | . 1458536 |

edu: edu1 edu2 edu3 edu5

## Identification Problem

See the PDF slides and read Kim's (2013) Sociological Methodology paper.

Decomposition of the change over time between two groups
See the PDF slides and read Kim's (2010) Sociological Methods and Research paper.

