

Borjas, George

**Working Paper**

## Discrimination in HEW: Is the Doctor Sick or Are the Patients Healthy?

Working Paper, No. 3

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

George J. Stigler Center for the Study of the Economy and the State, The University of Chicago  
Booth School of Business

*Suggested Citation:* Borjas, George (1978) : Discrimination in HEW: Is the Doctor Sick or Are the Patients Healthy?, Working Paper, No. 3, The University of Chicago, Center for the Study of the Economy and the State, Chicago, IL

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/262405>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE ECONOMY AND THE STATE  
WORKING PAPER SERIES

DISCRIMINATION IN HEW:  
IS THE DOCTOR SICK OR ARE THE PATIENTS HEALTHY?

George J. Borjas\*

Working Paper No. 003

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE ECONOMY AND THE STATE  
The University of Chicago  
1101 East 58th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637

Center working papers are distributed informally and in limited number for comments only. They should not be quoted without the written permission of the author.

\*Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Economics, University of Chicago.

DISCRIMINATION IN HEW:

IS THE DOCTOR SICK OR ARE THE PATIENTS HEALTHY?

George J. Borjas

MAY 1978

DISCRIMINATION IN HEW:  
IS THE DOCTOR SICK OR ARE THE PATIENTS HEALTHY?

George J. Borjas\*

I. Introduction

Executive Orders No. 11246 and No. 11375 require that federal contractors with a contract larger than \$50,000 or fifty or more employees develop and enforce a written plan of affirmative action that guarantees equal employment opportunity. The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has been delegated the responsibility for carrying out these regulations and ensuring that no employment discrimination exists at the nation's universities. The higher education sector, in turn, has faced the task of convincing HEW that indeed no discrimination exists or risk losing all federal funds received by the particular universities.

A surprising development has been the fact that HEW is currently "suggesting" that universities perform sophisticated statistical analyses to determine whether or not wage discrimination exists at a particular institution. Thus, for example, the Chicago office of HEW has reviewed affirmative action plans at

---

\*University of California, Santa Barbara. This paper was written while I was a postdoctoral fellow in the Department of Economics at the University of Chicago. The research was partly supported by the Center for the Study of the Economy and the State. I am grateful to Jacob Mincer and Sherwin Rosen for encouragement and helpful discussions; to Gary Becker and George Stigler for directing my attention to the analysis of the labor market structure in the federal government; and to D. Gale Johnson for providing me with a large amount of materials concerning the agreements reached between several universities and HEW.

six universities and has requested detailed statistical analyses from four institutions.<sup>1</sup> These requests are included in the "Conciliation Agreements" reached between universities and HEW. These agreements ascertain that the affirmative action programs at the institutions are in compliance with the requirements of the Executive Orders once the universities carry out a detailed list of programs and actions covering its hiring practices of women and minorities. In particular, the Conciliation Agreements tend to be quite explicit in terms of the statistical analysis the universities must carry out to determine the extent of wage discrimination. For example, in the Conciliation Agreement between the University of Michigan and HEW (1978) the section concerning faculty salaries states that:

The University is committed to achieving equity in pay between men and women and minority and non-minority employees in every faculty and academic staff category. In order to effect this commitment, the University will analyze its employment records and the qualifications of personnel. Professional job related criteria will be identified as base line variables for use in the analysis. Base line variables shall be quantified and include: department, rank, time in rank, measure(s) of length of professional experience. Other valid base line, quantifiable variables may be included; provided, however, that prior to inclusion the University shall consult with OCR regarding inclusion of these variables.

Upon identifying appropriate base line variables, the University will perform a two tier analysis of faculty and academic staff salaries.

The first tier analysis will consist of a statistical or other empirically verifiable analysis (such as multiple regression) of faculty and academic staff salaries to identify wage discrepancies. The second tier analysis will develop narrative justifications of wage discrepancies located in the first tier analysis and/or develop remedial salary awards. In no case will assertions, verbal or written, unsupported by specific comparative analysis be considered as justification for wage discrepancies.

---

<sup>1</sup>These facts were made available to me by Mr. Paul Turner, an Equal Opportunity Specialist at the Chicago office of HEW.

Thus universities are required to conduct analyses such as multiple regression to determine whether there exist racial or sexual wage differentials. If these are found, and if the university is unable to justify them, the university is required to provide remedial salary awards on current salaries and on two years back pay.<sup>2</sup> This paper is not an attempt to document what these affirmative action programs have done to improve the economic position of minorities and women.<sup>3</sup> It is, instead, an attempt to turn the table around and ask what would happen if HEW were to perform a statistical analysis similar to the ones that universities are currently carrying out. Thus the paper poses the empirical question of whether the doctor swallows his or her own medicine. Put differently, does "discrimination", as defined by the statistical analysis ordered by the Conciliation Agreements, exist at HEW?

The empirical analysis presented in this paper is based on a one percent random sample of HEW employees collected by the Civil Service Commission.<sup>4</sup> To be in the sample, the individual had to be a permanent full-time employee of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as of July, 1977. Moreover,

---

<sup>2</sup>It is important to note that the Conciliation Agreements reached between universities and HEW cover not only faculty employees but non-instructional workers as well. Moreover, the universities are also instructed to conduct the same statistical analysis for the latter group.

<sup>3</sup>See Sowell (1975) for an analysis of affirmative action programs in the higher education sector.

<sup>4</sup>The original data set is called the Central Personal Data File and contains a record for each and every federal civil servant.

since the salary figures available in the data are full-time salaries, no labor supply differentials exist among individuals and the discrimination coefficients estimated in this paper are for HEW's permanent full-time labor force.

The analysis will use the procedure that has become traditional in estimating wage differentials across sex or race groups after standardizing for skills. The procedure was introduced into the discrimination literature by Oaxaca (1973) and is one which causes the residual wage differential--that not explained by differences in observable personal characteristics--to be called "discrimination". It is not my purpose here to defend the procedure since its many drawbacks have been pointed out by Oaxaca and by Polachek (1975). Instead, I will simply inquire into what happens to wage differentials at HEW if the procedure is followed.<sup>5</sup>

Section II presents a brief descriptive look at HEW and gives the basic wage regressions estimated for the agency. It also presents regressions showing that General Schedule ratings differ systematically by sex and race. Section III gives a more detailed accounting of the sex/race wage differentials at HEW and compares them to those found in the total economy and/or the private sector in the major studies in the literature. Section IV summarizes the empirical results and states some policy implications.

---

<sup>5</sup>Note that I am abstracting from the more general question of discrimination in the federal government. Both Long (1976) and Smith (1977) have studied the problem and have found substantial discrimination, though less than in the private sector. A discussion of programs designed to improve the economic position of women and minorities in several government agencies, including HEW, is provided by Eccles (1976).



II. Basic Results

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has the largest budget of any agency in the federal government. In July 1977 its employment of full-time permanent workers was 140,164, an increase of over 100 percent since 1961.

Black and female employment at various times in the last decade was:<sup>6</sup>

1968	% BLACK	% FEMALE
1966	20.3	57.7
1971	22.4	59.5
1976	23.3	61.0

Thus the percentage of women and blacks employed by HEW has always been relatively high but did not increase very much in the last few years.

Table 1 presents estimates of current (July 1977) wages and wage differentials at HEW. It can be seen that the gross wage differentials are sizeable and not very different from those found in the economy as a whole. For example, the chapter on the economic status of women in the 1973 Economic Report of the President reported that the adjusted (for differences in hours worked) female/male wage ratio was 66.1 percent. At HEW the similar statistic is 64.9 percent. Similarly, in his analysis of 1970 U.S. Census data for males, Freeman (1974) reports a black/white earnings ratio of .64. The respective statistic for HEW is .73. Finally, Freeman also reports the female black/white wage ratio to be .86 in 1970, while the HEW statistic for 1977 was .87.

---

<sup>6</sup>These data were obtained from various issues of the Federal Civilian Workforce Statistics Monthly Release, Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government, Study of Employment of Women in the Federal Government, and Equal Employment Opportunity Statistics, all published by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.



TABLE 1  
MEAN WAGES AT HEW\*

Variable	Male	White Male	Black Male	Female	White Female	Black Female
W	19595.4	20897.3	15333.5	12710.0	13395.8	11642.2
ln(W)	9.782	9.857	9.537	9.387	9.436	9.309
No. of observations	547	419	128	895	545	350

\* W denotes annual, full-time earnings reported by the agency.

Of course, part of these differentials are due to different characteristics across groups. To standardize for these characteristics in a simple fashion, Table 2 pools the four groups and controls for education, labor force experience, region, veteran status, retired military dummy and health; and then adds dummies indicating the race/sex status of the individual, the omitted group being black females. Columns 1 and 2 of Table 2 present equations with the logarithm of annual full-time earnings as the dependent variable. In column 1, the traditional specification of experience (i.e., experience and experience squared) is followed. Column 2 utilizes the additional information given by the data on current job tenure and replaces the experience variable by current job tenure, CURRENT, and labor force experience prior to the current job, PREVIOUS.<sup>7</sup> It would, of course, be optimal to know whether in the case of women PREVIOUS represents labor market experience or time spent in the household.<sup>8</sup> However, information on experience in other jobs or even marital status is not collected in the Central Personnel Data File.

The results are quite interesting. In the simpler equation using total experience (column 1), it can be seen that white males earn about 23 percent more than white females, 14 percent more than black males, and a large 31 percent more than black females even after standardization.<sup>9</sup> Thus wage differentials at HEW are far from trivial. We can go a step beyond these results and

---

<sup>7</sup>The exact specification used for these variables is derived in Borjas (1978).

<sup>8</sup>Presumably market experience and time spent in the household have different effects on market earnings. See Mincer and Polachek (1974) for a thorough discussion of this issue.

<sup>9</sup>t-tests were carried out on each of these statistics. In every case the estimated test statistic was well over 2.

TABLE 2  
HEW REGRESSIONS\*

Variable	DEPENDENT=ln(W)				DEPENDENT=GS grade			
	Coeff.	t	Coeff.	t	Coeff.	t	Coeff.	t
CONSTANT	7.9648		7.9317		-6.2501		-6.5982	
EDUC	.0772	(24.01)	.0758	(25.35)	.7603	(23.93)	.7529	(25.45)
EXPER	.0378	(15.88)	--	--	.2751	(12.36)	--	--
EXPER <sup>2</sup>	-.0006	(-10.56)	--	--	-.0049	(-9.71)	--	--
PREVIOUS	--	--	.0162	(5.83)	--	--	.0888	(3.34)
CURRENT	--	--	.0613	(20.51)	--	--	.4607	(16.99)
PREVIOUS <sup>2</sup>	--	--	-.0003	(-3.22)	--	--	-.0017	(-2.16)
CURRENT <sup>2</sup>	--	--	-.0012	(-13.67)	--	--	-.0096	(-12.41)
X <sup>PREVIOUS</sup> CURRENT	--	--	-.0006	(-5.03)	--	--	-.0062	(-5.40)
NORTH	-.0944	(-3.88)	-.0793	(-3.53)	-.7227	(-3.45)	-.5857	(-3.00)
MIDWEST	-.1001	(-4.21)	-.0989	(-4.53)	-.5965	(-2.91)	-.5339	(-2.80)
SOUTH	-.1072	(-4.74)	-.1024	(-4.92)	-.7489	(-3.79)	-.6362	(-3.45)
WEST	-.0773	(-3.38)	-.0594	(-2.82)	-.6858	(-3.37)	-.4788	(-2.53)
RETIRED MILITARY	.7975	(2.74)	1.0514	(3.90)	--	--	--	--
VETERAN	-.0094	(-.40)	-.0310	(-1.43)	-.2243	(-1.06)	-.4326	(-2.19)
HEALTH	-.0764	(-1.80)	-.0473	(-1.21)	-.7453	(-2.10)	-.4945	(-1.50)
WHITE MALE	.3108	(12.46)	.2778	(12.06)	2.7348	(12.10)	2.5239	(12.01)
BLACK MALE	.1751	(5.43)	.1514	(5.11)	1.6274	(5.22)	1.5771	(5.45)
WHITE FEMALE	.0837	(4.11)	.0889	(4.75)	.7556	(4.33)	.8117	(5.00)
R <sup>2</sup>	.563		.632		.539		.604	

\* Key to Variables: EDUC=years of completed schooling; EXPER=age-EDUC-6; CURRENT=years of civilian service in the federal government; PREVIOUS=EXPER-CURRENT; NORTH, MIDWEST, SOUTH, WEST=1 if individual lives in respective region--left out is District of Columbia area; RETIRED MILITARY=1 if individual is retired from the military; VETERAN=1 if individual is a veteran; HEALTH=1 if agency reported that individual has some kind of handicap.

standardize for the components of total experience across individuals. These results are presented in column 2. The regressions indicate that white males earn 19 percent more than white females, 13 percent more than black males and 28 percent more than black females. Thus the standardization for current job tenure diminished the unexplained male-female wage differential by only about 3 or 4 percentage points. Therefore, the findings indicate that substantial unexplained race/sex wage differentials exist even at HEW.

The reader might now be wondering exactly how these differentials are achieved given the strict Civil Service pay rules. For example, consider the pay structure facing white collar workers in the federal government. Most of these individuals will be covered by the General Schedule (GS) pay system. The GS consists of 18 grades each of which is defined by law in terms of the skills and responsibilities associated with the job. The data set provides a unique opportunity to establish that indeed discrimination may well work by placing "equally" qualified individuals in lower job categories simply because of sex or race. This is done in columns 3 and 4 of Table 2. Again, column 3 uses total experience whereas column 4 uses current and previous tenure. The sample is restricted to the 1,287 individuals (89.3 percent of the total sample) who are classified as GS employees. The dependent variable is the GS grade assigned each employee by HEW. As can be seen, women and blacks are systematically assigned lower grades than men and whites. For example, in column 3 the results indicate that white males have a grade that is about one level above that of black males, about 2 levels above that of white females, and 2.7 levels above that of black females! If we standardize for current job tenure (column 4), the results indicate that white males are placed about one level above black males, 1.7 levels

above white females, and 2.5 levels above black females. That is, controlling for current job tenure slightly diminishes male-female grade differentials, but does not affect black-white differences. In summary, the results indicate that males are placed about 1.5 to 2 grades higher than females, and that blacks are placed about 1 grade below whites.

### III. Decomposition of Wage Differential

Although the simple analysis conducted in the previous section provides convincing evidence that unexplained wage differentials exist at HEW, the methodology can be improved somewhat. In particular, only the intercepts were allowed to vary across sex and race groups when, in fact, slope parameters may also differ. This can be remedied by estimating the equations within each sex-race group. These results can then be used to ask what would males (whites) earn if they faced the female (black) wage structure. These predicted earnings can, in turn, be used to decompose the gross wage differential into that part due to differences in group characteristics and into the unexplained component which has traditionally been identified with "discrimination". Again note that the purpose of the analysis is not to defend the methodology as providing a correct way of estimating discrimination coefficients, but to ask how would HEW fare if it were to conduct its own internal analysis.

The estimated regressions are shown in Appendix Tables A-1 and A-2. Table A-1 provides the regressions using total labor force experience, while Table A-2 presents the regressions holding job tenure constant. Table A-3 gives the average characteristics for each of the four subsamples. The procedure used to decompose the gross wage differential is best understood by means of an



example. In particular, suppose one is interested in decomposing the gross 42 percent wage differential between white males and white females into that part due to differences in characteristics and that part due to discrimination.<sup>10</sup> To do this, one can ask what female earnings would be if they faced the male wage structure (i.e., the male regression coefficients). An unbiased estimate of this wage is obtained by predicting female earnings using male regression coefficients and female characteristics. The difference between this predicted wage and the actual female wage is due to differences in structures and is usually attributed to discriminatory practices by the firm. Alternatively, one could have asked what male wages would be if they faced the female wage structure, and again the portion due to "discrimination" is given by the difference of the predicted male wage and the actual male wage. Clearly the answers given by the two methods will not, in general, be identical but they do provide a (hopefully) narrow range for the estimates.

The gross wage differential and the results of the decomposition (using the regressions presented in the Appendix) are shown in Table 3. To provide a detailed and systematic breakdown of the results, Table 3 gives the decomposition separately for each sex and race group, using both available sets of weights, and specifying the regressions either with total experience (columns 1 and 3) or with previous and current tenure (columns 2 and 4). The gross differential between white males and females is .42. Although there are differences in the percentage of this differential that is due to "discrimination" according to the

---

<sup>10</sup>The 42 percent figure is obtained as the difference between the mean logarithm of white male earnings and the mean logarithm of white female earnings.

TABLE 3\*

DECOMPOSITION OF SEXUAL AND RACIAL WAGE DIFFERENCES AT HEW

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<b>A. SEX DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WHITE MALES AND FEMALES</b>				
	Male Structure		Female Structure	
Gross Differential	.4208	.4208	.4208	.4208
Due to Characteristics	.2024	.2184	.1851	.2533
% Due to Characteristics	48.1%	51.9%	44.0%	60.2%
% Due to Discrimination	51.9%	48.1%	56.0%	39.8%
<b>B. SEX DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BLACK MALES AND FEMALES</b>				
	Male Structure		Female Structure	
Gross Differential	.2278	.2278	.2278	.2278
Due to Characteristics	-.0033	-.0093	.0444	.0351
% Due to Characteristics	0%	0%	19.5%	15.4%
% Due to Discrimination	100%	100%	80.5%	84.6%
<b>C. RACE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE WHITES AND BLACKS</b>				
	White Structure		Black Structure	
Gross Differential	.3203	.3203	.3203	.3203
Due to Characteristics	.2076	.2094	.1986	.2102
% Due to Characteristics	64.8%	65.4%	62.0%	65.6%
% Due to Discrimination	35.2%	34.6%	38.0%	34.4%
<b>D. RACE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FEMALE WHITES AND BLACKS</b>				
	White Structure		Black Structure	
Gross Differential	.1273	.1273	.1273	.1273
Due to Characteristics	.0321	.0283	.0611	.0489
% Due to Characteristics	25.2%	22.2%	48.0%	38.4%
% Due to Discrimination	74.8%	77.8%	52.0%	61.6%

\* See text for explanation of methodology.



specification of the regression and the set of weights used, it can be seen that at least 40 percent of the gross differential cannot be explained by observable differences in characteristics and, using the traditional approach, can be attributed to discrimination. The results do not improve if we decompose the wage differentials between black males and females: at least 80 percent of the gross differential is due to discrimination. Thus the results indicate the strong prevalence of sex discrimination at HEW.

The results concerning race discrimination (shown in panels C and D of Table 3) are not very different qualitatively. In comparing male whites and blacks we find a 32 percent gross wage differential. The results in Table 3 indicate that about a third of this differential is due to discrimination. Similarly, in comparing female whites and blacks, between half and 75 percent of the wage differential can be attributed to discrimination.

Perhaps it is best at this point to remind the reader of the dollar magnitudes that can be attributed to discrimination. For example, consider the difference between white males and white females and take the most favorable discrimination coefficient from HEW's point of view. That is, suppose only 39.8% of the wage gap is due to discrimination. The arithmetic dollar wage gap between the two groups is \$7501.5, of which approximately \$2986 cannot be explained by observable differences in individual characteristics.

The reader will now be wondering how these estimates compare with those obtained in the private sector and/or the total economy. A brief survey of empirical results in the literature is given in Table 4, which contains information on the gross wage gap (defined as the difference in the logarithm of wages across groups), the sample used, and the percent of the wage gap which is due to discrimination. By and large, the comparison of men to women or blacks to whites leads to gross wage differentials in the range of 40 percent, not at all

TABLE 4

ESTIMATES OF DISCRIMINATION FROM OTHER STUDIES\*

I. <u>SEX DIFFERENCES</u>				
STUDY	SAMPLE	GROSS WAGE GAP	% OF GAP DUE TO DISCRIMINATION	VARIABLES HELD CONSTANT
OAXACA (1973)	SEO	Whites = 43%	58.4%	Education, Experience, Class of Worker, Industry, Occupation, Health, Labor Supply, Migration, Marital Status, Children, Size of Urban Area, Region.
		Blacks = 40%	55.6%	
MINCER and POLACHEK (1974)	NLS, SEO	White Married=42%	33%	Education, Home Time, Current Tenure, Other Experience, Formal Training, Migration, Labor Supply, Children.
		White Single=15%	50%	
SMITH (1977)	CPS, 1975 Private Sector	All Women=44%	67.1%	Education, Experience, Marital Status, Region, Occupation, Veteran, Size of Urban Area, Union, Labor Supply.
II. <u>RACE DIFFERENCES</u>				
LONG (1976)	Census, 1970 Private Sector	Males=38%	88.3%	Education, Age, Marital Status, Labor Supply, Region.
SMITH (1977)	Census, 1970 Private Sector	Males = 38%	71.1%	Education, Experience, Marital Status, Spanish, Health, Labor Supply, Occupation.
		Females=16%	36.7%	

\* In order to simplify the presentation the estimates from other studies were boiled down to a single summary statistic. In the case where the author reported different results due to the use of different weights, a simple average of the two estimates is reported. Long's (1976) study does not report the gross black/white wage differential, only the adjusted one, 33.5%. Smith (1977), using the same data set, reports the gross wage ratio to be .38. The estimate given in the table is calculated from this information.

unlike those presented in Table 1 for HEW. The proportions of the wage gap which cannot be explained by observed personal characteristics vary widely across studies of the sex wage differential. For example, consider the Oaxaca (1973) study. He finds, after standardizing for a very large set of variables, that about 58 percent of the white male/female wage gap is due to discrimination.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, Mincer and Polachek (1974) find that by controlling for the fact that women have a discontinuous labor force history (and thus fewer incentives for market human capital investments) about two-thirds of the male/female wage differential can be explained by differences in personal characteristics.<sup>12</sup> I find that slightly less than half of the wage gap is due to unexplained differences in HEW. Thus my results are about half way between the bounds provided by the Mincer and Polachek (1974) and Oaxaca (1973) studies.

In terms of racial differences, the results are somewhat mixed. It seems that about 80 percent of the male black/white wage differential in the private sector cannot be explained by differences in individual characteristics, whereas the respective statistic for HEW is about 35 percent. On the other hand, Smith (1977) finds that only about a third of the private female black/white differential is due to discrimination, while in HEW the relevant statistic is between 50 and 75 percent.

---

<sup>11</sup>Oaxaca also reports results which exclude occupation and industry dummies. He finds that it is the industrial categories which help to explain a large part of the wage gap and that occupation does not affect significantly the percentage of the wage gap due to discrimination. Since I concentrate the analysis on individuals in the public sector I am already controlling for industry. Moreover by standardizing for job tenure I partly account for the effects of marital status on labor force experience. Thus the regressions are roughly comparable.

<sup>12</sup>Landes (1977) finds that practically the whole male/female wage gap can be explained by differences in personal characteristics once the regression standardizes for rough estimates of differences in turnover rates by sex.

#### IV. Summary and Policy Implications

This paper has documented the existence of large wage differentials in HEW even after standardizing for skills. These unexplained wage differentials have been attributed to discrimination in studies of the private sector or the economy as a whole. In particular, it was shown that among HEW employees a wage gap of \$2986 between white men and women could not be explained by differences in individual characteristics. Similarly, a wage gap of \$1945 between white men and black men working for HEW remains unexplained.

The question, of course, remains whether these differentials truly measure the extent of discrimination. This raises a delicate problem if we consider the policy implications of one extreme way of interpreting the wage differential. Suppose, for example, that HEW argues that it does not discriminate against women and blacks and that the whole unexplained wage gap could be explained if only we could quantify unobserved productivity differences. This may well be true but it certainly raises an important question concerning HEW's handling of observed wage differentials in the higher education sector. Why is it not possible that these wage differentials also be due to unobserved productivity differences?

Let me summarize by restating the purpose of this paper. My point was not to accuse HEW of discriminatory practices. It was simply to point out that the statistical procedures universities are currently carrying out to comply with the Conciliation Agreements can be easily applied to HEW wage data and that this analysis reveals a wage structure within HEW which follows roughly the same patterns that the agency is vigorously attacking in the private sector.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Borjas, George J., "Job Mobility and Earnings Over the Life Cycle," NBER Working Paper No. 233, February 1978.
- Eccles, Mary E., "Race, Sex, and Government Jobs: A Study of Affirmative Action Programs in Federal Agencies," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976.
- Freeman, Richard B., "Labor Market Discrimination: Analysis, Findings, and Problems," in Frontiers of Quantitative Economics, Volume II, ed. M.D. Intrilligator and D.A. Kendrick, North Holland Publishing Company, 1974.
- Landes, Elisabeth M., "Sex-Differences in Wages and Employment: A Test of the Specific Capital Hypothesis," Economic Inquiry, October 1977.
- Long, James E., "Employment Discrimination in the Federal Sector," Journal of Human Resources, Winter 1976.
- Mincer, Jacob and Polachek, Solomon, "Family Investments in Human Capital: Earnings of Women," Journal of Political Economy, March/April 1974.
- Oaxaca, Ronald, "Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets," International Economic Review, October 1973.
- Polachek, Solomon W., "Potential Biases in Measuring Male-Female Discrimination," Journal of Human Resources, Spring 1975.
- Smith, Sharon P., Equal Pay in the Public Sector: Fact or Fantasy, Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, 1977.
- Sowell, Thomas, Affirmative Action Reconsidered: Was It Necessary in Academia?, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, 1975.
- U.S. Civil Service Commission, Federal Civilian Workforce Statistics Monthly Release, Washington, various issues.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government, Washington, various issues.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Study of Employment of Women in the Federal Government, Washington, various issues.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Equal Employment Opportunity Statistics, Washington, November 1976.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Civil Rights, "Agreement with the University of Michigan," dated January 9, 1978.
- U.S. President, Economic Report of the President, Washington, 1973.



TABLE A-1

## EARNINGS FUNCTIONS BY RACE AND SEX

VARIABLE	<u>WHITE MALE</u>		<u>BLACK MALE</u>		<u>WHITE FEMALE</u>		<u>BLACK FEMALE</u>	
	COEFF.	t	COEFF.	t	COEFF.	t	COEFF.	t
CONSTANT	8.0475		7.9389		8.0011		8.1408	
EDUC	.0783	(15.06)	.0814	(7.78)	.0866	(15.65)	.0698	(9.53)
EXPER	.0601	(11.99)	.0434	(4.79)	.0387	(11.40)	.0202	(4.46)
EXPER <sup>2</sup>	-.0009	(-8.10)	-.0004	(-2.39)	-.0007	(-8.96)	-.0002	(-1.66)
NORTH	-.1063	(-2.42)	.0001	(.00)	-.1397	(-4.03)	.0018	(.03)
MIDWEST	-.1783	(-3.78)	.0060	(.04)	-.1252	(-3.74)	-.0038	(-.09)
SOUTH	-.1427	(-3.27)	-.0450	(-.47)	-.1533	(-4.93)	.0141	(.30)
WEST	-.1477	(-3.52)	.1157	(1.54)	-.1656	(-4.36)	.0494	(1.23)
RETIRED MILITARY	.7128	(2.44)	--	--	--	--	--	--
VETERAN	-.0565	(-1.72)	-.1682	(-2.28)	-.0974	(-1.89)	-.0328	(-.27)
HEALTH	-.0297	(-.41)	-.2036	(-1.01)	-.0951	(-1.50)	-.1788	(-2.19)
R <sup>2</sup>	.568		.488		.459		.327	

TABLE A-2

## EARNINGS FUNCTIONS BY RACE AND SEX

VARIABLE	WHITE MALE		BLACK MALE		WHITE FEMALE		BLACK FEMALE	
	COEFF.	t	COEFF.	t	COEFF.	t	COEFF.	t
CONSTANT	8.0293		7.8172		7.9008		8.1702	
EDUC	.0779	(15.07)	.0783	(7.64)	.0888	(18.51)	.0605	(9.19)
PREVIOUS	.0375	(5.58)	.0282	(2.93)	.0172	(4.54)	-.0049	(-.96)
CURRENT	.0730	(12.68)	.0859	(6.64)	.0650	(15.53)	.0555	(9.30)
PREVIOUS <sup>2</sup>	-.0004	(-2.33)	-.0001	(-.34)	-.0004	(-3.92)	.0004	(2.14)
CURRENT <sup>2</sup>	-.0013	(-8.40)	-.0017	(-4.74)	-.0013	(-10.89)	-.0011	(-6.16)
X PREVIOUS CURRENT	-.0012	(-4.22)	-.0007	(-1.45)	-.0008	(-5.12)	-.0002	(-.68)
NORTH	-.0954	(-2.23)	.0405	(.37)	-.1201	(-3.98)	.0083	(.19)
MIDWEST	-.1783	(-3.88)	.0414	(.36)	-.1159	(-4.01)	-.0004	(-.00)
SOUTH	-.1428	(-3.35)	-.0097	(-.11)	-.1403	(-5.22)	.0350	(.86)
WEST	-.1427	(-3.49)	.1278	(1.78)	-.1116	(-3.38)	.0327	(.93)
RETIRED MILITARY	.7192	(2.46)	--	--	--	--	--	--
VETERAN	-.0582	(-1.78)	-.2086	(-2.99)	-.0713	(-1.71)	-.1036	(-.98)
HEALTH	-.0177	(-.25)	-.2149	(-1.14)	-.0485	(-.88)	-.1118	(-1.55)
R <sup>2</sup>	.593		.564		.601		.486	



TABLE A-3

## AVERAGE CHARACTERISTICS BY RACE AND SEX

VARIABLE	WHITE MALE	BLACK MALE	WHITE FEMALE	BLACK FEMALE
EDUC	15.554	13.520	13.611	12.911
EXPER	19.064	18.262	18.569	16.623
EXPER <sup>2</sup>	499.420	501.928	525.547	396.654
PREVIOUS	5.788	6.410	8.662	7.277
CURRENT	13.277	11.852	9.906	9.346
PREVIOUS <sup>2</sup>	94.344	104.264	168.774	115.829
CURRENT <sup>2</sup>	266.155	225.477	171.928	145.837
X <sup>PREVIOUS</sup> X <sup>CURRENT</sup>	69.461	86.094	92.422	67.494
NORTH	.136	.078	.152	.109
MIDWEST	.112	.070	.169	.154
SOUTH	.136	.125	.213	.126
WEST	.153	.227	.117	.177
RETIRED MILITARY	.002	0.0	0.0	0.0
VETERAN	.456	.508	.062	.014
HEALTH	.041	.023	.033	.031