

Michael Frajman - mhf8621

CORE-GP 1011 – Statistical Methods

December 12, 2022

Memo: Statistical Findings for use in Safecorp Discrimination Lawsuit

Equal opportunity employment comes with equal opportunity to earn the same pay. Salary equity remains a goal to strive toward with the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics reporting in November 2021 that Black and Hispanic employees continue to be paid less than their White and Asian counterparts.¹ Several minority employees of Safecorp bank have filed a lawsuit alleging discrepancies in their pay compared to their non-minority co-workers. The following memo was prepared at the request of those complainants and their legal counsel and provides a statistical analysis of Safecorp's employee and salary data. The complainants seek to determine if they as minorities are being paid less than non-minorities at the company as well as find what other factors may be used to predict an employee's pay.

The Safecorp data includes the following information for each employee: (1) Annual salary, (2) Number of years spent working at the company, (3) Position at the company, (4) Status as a minority, (5) Sex, and (6) Highest grade level of education. The data was processed using the STATA statistical package. Table 1 included in appendix I of this memo summarizing how this information breaks down for minority and non-minority employees. Several tests for significance were performed to determine which factors were predictors for salary and if these factors are associated with minority status.

¹ US Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2021, November). *Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity*. Retrieved December 10 2022 from [https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/race-and-ethnicity/2020/home.htm#:~:text=The%20labor%20force%20participation%20rate%20for%20Asian%20adult%20men%20\(74.0,and%20Whites%20\(56.8%20percent\).](https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/race-and-ethnicity/2020/home.htm#:~:text=The%20labor%20force%20participation%20rate%20for%20Asian%20adult%20men%20(74.0,and%20Whites%20(56.8%20percent).)

The first major question that was explored was **if salaries for minority employees were truly lower than those for non-minority employees**. Of Safecorp's 474 employees, 21.9% identify as minorities. **It was found that the average annual salary for a minority employee was \$57427.88 while non-minorities made an average of \$72046.62** (see table 1). It can be stated with a **95% degree of certainty, that the average salaries for non-minority employees were significantly greater than those of minority employees**.

After determining that average salary did in fact vary significantly by status as a minority, **statistical analysis was performed to determine which employee characteristics could best predict salary**. All five employee characteristics (number of years, position, minority status, sex and grade level obtained) were modelled to determine how much they affect annual salary of an employee. Individually, all five were found to be significant in predicting salary. Table 2 lists by how much each characteristic affected annual salary. Using the above mentioned five characteristics this model was able to predict 73% of the variation in employee salary to a significant degree of certainty. The model found that if an employee is a minority, they will make on average \$4388.26 less than a non-minority employee each year. However, sex may be a stronger factor in predicting salary with, a woman predicted to make \$10965.61 less on average than a man. Conversely, occupying a managerial position and having more education indicates higher salaries on average.

These five characteristics were then compared between minority and non-minority employees to see if there was significant variation. Referring in order to the categories in table 1 which compares characteristics of employees by minority status: (1) the average number of years minority and non-minority employees have spent working at Safecorp are similar with no

significant difference found; (2) significant association was found between a person's minority status and the job position they hold within the company with only 3.9% of minorities occupying managerial positions compared to a much larger 21.6% of non-minorities; (3) minority and non-minority employees have comparable breakdowns by sex as no significant association; and (4) a significant difference was found between the average grade level obtained of minority and majority employees even though the numbers seem close at first glance with minorities completing 12.77 grades of school on average compared to 13.69 for non minorities. The differences in education level between the groups and the smaller number of minorities in higher level job positions are therefore worth noting given how these factors can predict higher salary. It should be stated that **all findings do not imply that these factors necessarily cause or explain the discrepancies in average salary observed between minorities and non-minorities, correlation does not imply causation.**

To conclude, non-minority employees of Safecorp do earn a greater amount of money on average than minority employees that is statistically significant. All employee characteristics Safecorp tracks are significant predictors of salary. Of those characteristics, job position was found to be significantly associated with minority status and highest average grade level of education was found to significantly differ depending on minority status. Even with this knowledge, this analysis makes no determination that any of these factor's are causes for the differences in salary between employees. This memo only states that differences exist and can be used to make predictions about salary. Further analysis would need to be performed to state with more confidence what other factors may influence things like the amount of education or career advancement minorities receive as well as examining Safecorp's human resource practices.

Appendix I – Tables

Table 1 - Characteristics and means for minority and non-minority employees of Safecorp

Characteristic	Minority (n = 104)	Non-minority (n = 370)
Annual salary (mean)	\$57427.88	\$72046.62*
Years at company (mean)	15.95	17.15
Position (%)		
Clerical	83.7	74.6**
Custodial	12.5	3.8
Manager	3.9	21.6
Sex (%)		
Male	61.5	52.4
Female	38.5	47.6
Highest grade completed (mean)	12.77	13.69***

* $p < .1$ for an independent one-tailed samples test of the difference of means between minorities and non-minorities.

** $p < .05$ for a chi-square test of the association of this characteristic with minorities versus non-minorities comparison.

*** $p < .05$ for an independent two-tailed samples test of the difference of means between minorities and non-minorities.

Table 2 – The average variation in salary each characteristic predicts in the regression analysis of annual salary

Characteristic	Average effect on salary (\$)
1 additional year at company	-212.20
Identifying as a “minority”	-4388.26
Identifying as “female”	-10965.61
1 additional grade of education	+2916.88
Having a managerial role	+44957.17
Having a clerical role	-8759.84

All characteristics were deemed significant with $p < 0.05$

Appendix II – STATA Output

```
.
. *-----EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS-----
. * descriptive statistics used in table
. *-----
```

. * frequency table for MINORITY, check if there are "missings"

```
. tabulate minority, missing
```

Employee's minority status	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
"Non-minority"	370	78.06	78.06
"Minority"	104	21.94	100.00
Total	474	100.00	

```
.
. * frequency table for SEX, check if there are "missings"
. tabulate sex, missing
```

Employee's sex	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
"Male"	258	54.43	54.43
Female	216	45.57	100.00
Total	474	100.00	

```
.
. * two way table comparing SEX and MINORIY
. tabulate sex minority, column
```

```
+-----+
| Key          |
+-----+
| frequency    |
| column percentage |
+-----+
```

Employee's sex	Employee's minority status		Total
	"Non-mino"	"Minority"	
"Male"	194	64	258
	52.43	61.54	54.43
Female	176	40	216
	47.57	38.46	45.57
Total	370	104	474
	100.00	100.00	100.00

```
.
. * two way table comparing POSITION and MINORITY
. tabulate position minority, column
```

```
+-----+
| Key          |
+-----+
| frequency    |
| column percentage |
+-----+
```

Employee's position at Safecorp	Employee's minority status		Total
"Non-mino	"Minority		
Clerical	276	87	363
	74.59	83.65	76.58
Custodial	14	13	27
	3.78	12.50	5.70
Manager	80	4	84
	21.62	3.85	17.72
Total	370	104	474
	100.00	100.00	100.00

```
.
. * comparing MINORITY by statistics of ANNUAL_SAL
. tabstat annual_sal, statistics( mean sd median count min max ) by(minority)
```

Summary for variables: annual_sal
Group variable: minority (Employee's minority status)

minority	Mean	SD	p50	N	Min	Max
"Non-minority"	72046.62	36088.19	59850	370	31500	270000
"Minority"	57427.88	22843.28	53250	104	32700	200000
Total	68839.14	34151.32	57750	474	31500	270000

```
.
. * comparing MINORITY by statistics of YR WORK
. tabstat yr_work, statistics( mean sd median count min max ) by(minority)
```

Summary for variables: yr_work
Group variable: minority (Employee's minority status)

minority	Mean	SD	p50	N	Min	Max
"Non-minority"	17.15405	10.08181	17	370	0	35
"Minority"	15.95192	9.978014	14.5	104	0	34
Total	16.8903	10.06094	17	474	0	35

```
.
. * comparing MINORITY by statistics of HIGHEST education achieved
. tabstat highest, statistics( mean sd median count min max ) by(minority)
```

Summary for variables: highest
Group variable: minority (Employee's minority status)

minority	Mean	SD	p50	N	Min	Max
"Non-minority"	13.69459	2.942304	15	370	8	21
"Minority"	12.76923	2.555142	12	104	8	19
Total	13.49156	2.884846	12	474	8	21

```
.
. *-----
. *-----Are salaries for minority employees lower than those for majority employees?-----
. *-----
.
. * use a two sample hypothesis test, use z distribution N > 100
. * ttest for MINORITY (2 categories grouped) and ANNUAL_SAL (continuous)
. * is mean salary for minority and non-minority workers the same or non-minority is larger?
. * alpha 0.05, p= 0.0001 < 0.1, reject null, mean non-minority salary is larger than minority
```

```
. ttest annual_sal, by(minority)
```

Two-sample t test with equal variances

Group	Obs	Mean	Std. err.	Std. dev.	[95% conf. interval]	
"Non-min	370	72046.62	1876.136	36088.19	68357.36	75735.88
"Minorit	104	57427.88	2239.967	22843.28	52985.44	61870.33
Combined	474	68839.14	1568.622	34151.32	65756.8	71921.47
diff		14618.74	3734.222		7280.981	21956.49

diff = mean("Non-min") - mean("Minorit") t = 3.9148
H0: diff = 0 Degrees of freedom = 472

Ha: diff < 0 Ha: diff != 0 Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9999 Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0001 Pr(T > t) = 0.0001

```
.
. *-----What characteristics are associated with salary?-----
. *-----
.
. * use multivariate regression/correlation between ANNUAL_SAL (continuous) and other variables
(grouped and continuous)
.
. * create dummy variables for POSITION since it has 3 categories
. * clerical = 1, custodial = 2, manager = 3
. * dummy variable MANAGER, "manager" = 1, "custodial" and "clerical" = 0
. generate manager = 1 if position == 3
(390 missing values generated)

. replace manager = 0 if position != 3
(390 real changes made)

.
. * dummy variable CLERICAL, "clerical" = 1, "custodial" and "manager" = 0
. generate clerical = 1 if position == 1
(111 missing values generated)

. replace clerical = 0 if position != 1
(111 real changes made)

.
. * multivariate regression for ANNUAL_SAL using all variables with POSITION replaced by dummies
. regress annual_sal yr_work minority sex highest manager clerical
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	474
Model	4.0273e+11	6	6.7122e+10	F(6, 467)	=	210.47
Residual	1.4894e+11	467	318919389	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.7300
				Adj R-squared	=	0.7266
Total	5.5167e+11	473	1.1663e+09	Root MSE	=	17858

annual_sal	Coefficient	Std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf. interval]	
yr_work	-212.1985	81.97024	-2.59	0.010	-373.2746	-51.12228
minority	-4388.26	2054.785	-2.14	0.033	-8426.029	-350.491
sex	-10965.61	1918.129	-5.72	0.000	-14734.85	-7196.381
highest	2916.881	392.0631	7.44	0.000	2146.455	3687.308
manager	44957.17	4937.237	9.11	0.000	35255.22	54659.12
clerical	-8759.841	3975.592	-2.20	0.028	-16572.11	-947.5763
_cons	37771.15	5597.02	6.75	0.000	26772.69	48769.61

```
.
. * correlation matrix for regression of ANNUAL_SAL
. pwcorr annual_sal yr_work minority sex highest manager clerical, obs sig star (5)
```

	annual~l	yr_work	minority	sex	highest	manager	clerical
annual_sal	1.0000						
	474						
yr_work	-0.0841	1.0000					
	0.0674						
	474	474					
minority	-0.1773*	-0.0495	1.0000				
	0.0001	0.2821					
	474	474	474				
sex	-0.4499*	0.0665	-0.0757	1.0000			
	0.0000	0.1485	0.0999				
	474	474	474	474			
highest	0.6606*	-0.0474	-0.1329*	-0.3560*	1.0000		
	0.0000	0.3033	0.0038	0.0000			
	474	474	474	474	474		
manager	0.8042*	-0.0021	-0.1926*	-0.3137*	0.6053*	1.0000	
	0.0000	0.9640	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		
	474	474	474	474	474	474	
clerical	-0.6977*	0.0078	0.0885	0.4059*	-0.3914*	-0.8393*	1.0000
	0.0000	0.8648	0.0541	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	
	474	474	474	474	474	474	474

```
.
. * YR_WORK, MINORITY, SEX, HIGHEST, CLERICAL are all associated with ANNUAL_SAL
.
. *-----
. /*-----Do minority and majority employees differ with respect to the characteristics that
> *are associated with salary?----- */
. *-----
.
. * differ = ttest or anova (one continuous)
. * association = chi square (two grouped)
.
. /* use various statistical tests comparing means of minority and non-minority categories of
> MINORITY with other variables*/
.
. * determine significance between MINORITY (grouped 2 category) and YR_WORK (continuous)
. * use 2 sample hypothesis test, z distribution
. * p > alpha for two tailed test so accept null hypothesis, no significant difference
. ttest yr_work, by(minority)
```

Two-sample t test with equal variances

Group	Obs	Mean	Std. err.	Std. dev.	[95% conf. interval]	
"Non-min	370	17.15405	.5241283	10.08181	16.1234	18.18471
"Minorit	104	15.95192	.9784248	9.978014	14.01145	17.8924
Combined	474	16.8903	.4621145	10.06094	15.98224	17.79835
diff		1.202131	1.116445		-.991686	3.395948

```
diff = mean("Non-min) - mean("Minorit)          t = 1.0767
H0: diff = 0                                     Degrees of freedom = 472
```

```
Ha: diff < 0          Ha: diff != 0          Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.8589    Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.2821    Pr(T > t) = 0.1411
```

```
.
. * determine significance between MINORITY (grouped 2 category) and POSITION (grouped 3
category)
. *p < alpha so associated
```



```
. tabulate minority position, chi2 column expected
```

+-----+				
Key				
+-----+				
frequency				
expected frequency				
column percentage				
+-----+				
Employee's minority status	Employee's position at Safecorp			Total
	Clerical	Custodial	Manager	
"Non-minority"	276	14	80	370
	283.4	21.1	65.6	370.0
	76.03	51.85	95.24	78.06
"Minority"	87	13	4	104
	79.6	5.9	18.4	104.0
	23.97	48.15	4.76	21.94
Total	363	27	84	474
	363.0	27.0	84.0	474.0
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Pearson chi2(2) = 26.1718 Pr = 0.000

```
.
. * determine significance between MINORITY (grouped 2 category) and SEX (grouped 2 category)
. * p > alpha so not associated
. tabulate minority sex, chi2 column expected
```

+-----+				
Key				
+-----+				
frequency				
expected frequency				
column percentage				
+-----+				
Employee's minority status	Employee's sex		Total	
	"Male"	Female		
"Non-minority"	194	176	370	
	201.4	168.6	370.0	
	75.19	81.48	78.06	
"Minority"	64	40	104	
	56.6	47.4	104.0	
	24.81	18.52	21.94	
Total	258	216	474	
	258.0	216.0	474.0	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	

Pearson chi2(1) = 2.7139 Pr = 0.099

```
.
. * determine significance between MINORITY (grouped 2 category) and HIGHEST (continuous)
. * use 2 sample hypothesis test, z distribution
. * p < alpha for two tailed, so reject null, there is significant difference
. ttest highest, by(minority)
```

Two-sample t test with equal variances

-----+-----						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. err.	Std. dev.	[95% conf. interval]	
-----+-----						
"Non-min	370	13.69459	.1529631	2.942304	13.39381	13.99538
"Minorit	104	12.76923	.2505523	2.555142	12.27232	13.26614

```

-----+-----
Combined |      474      13.49156      .1325054      2.884846      13.23119      13.75193
-----+-----
diff |      .9253638      .3176764      .3011288      1.549599
-----+-----
diff = mean("Non-min) - mean("Minorit)          t =      2.9129
H0: diff = 0          Degrees of freedom =      472

      Ha: diff < 0          Ha: diff != 0          Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9981      Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0038      Pr(T > t) = 0.0019

.
. *-----
. /*---Do differences in characteristics of minority and majority employees "explain"
> the lower salaries of minority employees?----- */
. *-----
.
. * No/Not necessarily, correlation does not mean causation
.

```