

**Catalogue No. 95-14**

**THE WAGE GAP BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN:  
AN UPDATE**

Product Registration Number 75F0002M

May 1995

David Coish, Household Surveys Division

Alison Hale, Household Surveys Division

The SLID Research Paper Series is intended to document detailed studies and important decisions for the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics. These research papers are available in English and French. To obtain a summary description of available documents or to obtain a copy of any, please contact Philip Giles, Manager, SLID Research Paper Series, by mail at 11-D8 Jean Talon Building, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1A 0T6, by INTERNET ([GILES@STATCAN.CA](mailto:GILES@STATCAN.CA)), by telephone (613) 951-2891, or by fax (613) 951-3253.



## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Recent studies show that the wage gap between men and women is shrinking. In the case of recent university graduates it has closed completely. But for the workforce as a whole, the gap remains sizeable - even after taking into account such factors as education level, field of specialization, years of work experience and hours worked.

This research paper follows up on the initial article in the flagship publication "Dynamics of Labour and Income - 1994 Report". The analysis remains the same as in the initial article, but detailed variable groupings, regression, and decomposition results which were not originally given, are included here. This supporting documentation is contained within the Appendices at the end.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Other Studies	1
3. Methodology of the study	3
4. On Average, Men Make \$3.64 More Per Hour Than Women	4
4.1 Course of Study Makes a Difference to Earnings	6
5. Little of the Wage Gap is Explained	7
5.1 Decomposition	7
5.2 Results	8
5.3 What is Unexplained	10
6. Summary	11
6.1 Future Directions	11
7. References	14
APPENDICES	
I. Variable Groupings	16
II. Regression Results	18
III. Decomposition Results	20



## **1. Introduction**

Most research into gender difference in earnings reveals a wide gap that is narrowing over time. Typically, most of the gap is unexplained, even with controls for differences in demographic, educational and other factors.

Yet a recent Statistics Canada release (Wannell and Caron, 1994) suggests that 1990 female university graduates have a higher hourly wage than their male counterparts two years after graduation. This finding takes into account hours worked, experience, education and tenure, and looks at both full and part-time earners.

One might be tempted, then, to dismiss gender wage differentials as a "non-issue" or problem of the past. But this recent study prompts several additional questions. Does the situation for female university graduates reflect an improvement for women in general? Presuming that a wage gap persists in the labour force at large, is it explained by human capital differences (for example, years of work experience, years of education, major field of study) and demographics (age, marital status, province of residence)? In this regard, SLID's information on years of work experience is valuable since it is rarely captured by surveys.

This study looks at the hourly wage gap between men and women aged 15 to 69, and employed in January 1993. It attempts to explain the gap by a number of human capital and demographic characteristics, and looks at residual factors requiring explanation.

## **2. Other studies**

Previous studies on the earnings of men and women provide a backdrop to this analysis but there are important differences among them. For example, some

examine annual earnings, others hourly wage rates. Some look at specific subpopulations such as university graduates, instead of all workers. Labour market and demographic variables differ across studies, as do time periods. So it is not surprising that results vary from study to study. To put the present analysis into context, some recent research is considered below.

In 1994, Christofides and Swidinsky used 1989 Labour Market Activity Survey (LMAS) data to examine wage differentials among the employed (excluding students). They found that less than 30% of the difference between each combination of gender and visible minority status was explained by productivity factors: "[the] unexplained residuals [were] conventionally attributed to labour market discrimination"(Christofides and Swidinsky,1994:35). Productivity factors included demographics, human capital, occupation and industry.

Wannell and Caron's 1994 study examined earnings differentials for 1982, 1986 and 1990 postsecondary graduates using National Graduate Survey data. The study uncovered an earnings gap between male and female graduates working full time at the time of the survey. This was true for both university and community college graduates with similar education, work experience, and age profiles. However, once length of time at current job and hours of work had been accounted for, and all earners had been considered, 1990 female university graduates actually had a higher hourly wage in 1992 than male graduates. For community college graduates, a 3.5% difference favouring men remained. The control for hours worked was implemented after it was discovered that women employed full-time worked, on average, three hours less than men if they were university graduates; four hours less if community college graduates.

An earlier analysis by Wannell (1989) looked at 1982 graduates two and five years after graduation. A gap between men and women with similar education, work



experience, field of study, and degree level existed among university and community college graduates. This study did not consider hours worked or tenure. Differences in human capital and demographic characteristics accounted for only one-third of the earnings gap for university graduates, and one-fifth for community college graduates. Gender differences in major field of study contributed most to the earnings differential. Like the 1994 study, this model included an indicator of public sector employment to assess the impact of target group programs and the stated merit principle of hiring and advancement. They tended to be an equalizing factor.

Finally, Morissette (1991) found that larger firms, on average, paid higher wages, yet the probability of working for a larger firm was lower for women than for men. Even when observable characteristics of workers, occupation and industry were controlled, the wage gap between large and small firms was greater than 20%. Hence, structural barriers to women's entry into large firms may be at the root of some of the wage discrepancy.

Results from these studies tend to support the conclusion that women are in a disadvantaged position in the labour force. Wannell and Caron's study proves the exception. This prompts a close look at SLID results - do they show that working women received lower wages than men in 1993?

### **3. Methodology of the study**

A weighted least squares regression was run for each sex. The natural log of the hourly wage rate is the dependent variable. A consequence of the use of the logarithm is minimization of the impact of extreme upper values. In addition, hourly wages above \$100 were excluded.

The analysis was restricted to those employed at the time of the survey. All employees were included; a full-year, full-time restriction was not necessary because hourly wage, not annual earnings, was examined. In all, data for 11,685 individuals were used.

The independent demographic and human capital variables initially chosen were age, province of residence, marital status, mother tongue, visible minority status, years of schooling, major field of study (university), major field (non-university), mother's level of education, father's level of education, and years of work experience. The latter is not usually captured by surveys and is a welcome addition to the study of gender wage differentials.

Chi-square tests were done to determine whether the relationship of each independent variable to wage was significant at the 5% level. This was the case for all except mother tongue, so this variable was dropped. All remaining variables were significant at the .01 level.

Small cell counts required collapsing of certain categories, based on similarities in mean wage across groups.

#### **4. On average, men make \$3.64 more per hour than women**

The average hourly wage for those employed full- or part-time in January 1993 was \$13.23 for women and \$16.87 for men. This .78 female-male ratio compares with Christofides and Swidinsky's 1989 ratio of .77, restricted to white women and white men. Hourly wages for all full-year, full-time workers in 1992 were \$14.55 and \$18.38, respectively, producing a marginally higher ratio of .79.

When annual earnings are used, ratios are lower because women are much more likely to work part time and part year. To control for this, female-to-male annual earnings ratios are restricted to full-time, full-year workers. Survey of Consumer Finances data reveal a female-to-male annual earnings ratio of .72 in 1992 for full-time, full-year workers, up from .70 in 1991, and .64 in 1982 (Statistics Canada, 1994a). What has contributed to these rising ratios?

Women's labour force participation rose from 1982 to 1992, while men's fell (Table). In 1992, women constituted 45% of those employed (Statistics Canada, 1994c). The proportion of women with university degrees also increased during this period (Statistics Canada, 1989; 1993). While men are still more likely to have a degree, women now account for over one-half of university degrees granted (Statistics Canada, 1994b). Continuation of this trend will further shrink the education gap.

Table  
**Selected Trends**

	Men	Women
	%	%
Participation rates		
1982	77.0	51.7
1992	73.8	57.6
With university degrees		
1982	10.8	7.0
1992	13.3	10.4

*Source: Labour Force Survey*

With rising education and labour force participation, as well as fewer children in the home, women are approaching the human capital levels of their male cohorts.

As they approach parity, do unexplained factors (including discrimination) account for a growing share of the shrinking wage gap?

#### **4.1 Course of study makes a difference to earnings**

A few key characteristics are shown to be significantly related to lower wages for each sex. Youth (under 35) and mature working age (55 to 69); single status; residence in Quebec and the Atlantic and Prairie provinces; visible minority status; low level of schooling; and little work experience are all linked to lower wages for men. For women, the characteristics are youth (under 25), single status, residence in Quebec and the Atlantic and Prairie provinces, a low level of schooling, and little work experience.

At the other extreme, higher wages for men are associated with higher levels of schooling and a degree in the physical sciences (including engineering) or commerce. Important traits for women are higher levels of schooling and a university degree in education, physical sciences or health, or a community college diploma in health.<sup>1</sup>

A hypothetical profile of two individuals with different characteristics illustrates the results of the analysis. A single woman aged 56, residing in Quebec, not a visible minority, with 16 years of schooling and 29 years of work experience, having studied commerce in university, and whose parents have both completed high school, has an expected hourly wage of \$18.32. For a man in comparable circumstances, the predicted wage is \$19.86. Thus the female-to-male wage ratio is .92.

Another woman from Quebec, not a visible minority, aged 22, with only seven years of schooling and four years of work experience, has a predicted wage of \$5.88 versus \$8.19 for a man in similar circumstances (.72 ratio).

## **5. Little of the wage gap is explained**

### **5.1 Decomposition**

A statistical technique known as "decomposition" breaks the wage gap into an explained and a residual, or unexplained, component. The former is the amount of the wage gap explained by human capital and demographic differences between men and women.

The unexplained portion is split into two parts: "male advantage" and "female disadvantage." The former gives the proportion of the wage gap resulting from rewards unrelated to men's characteristics and accomplishments; the latter reveals lower than expected returns for women's traits.

The decomposition model can be stated as:

$$\ln w_m - \ln w_f = B(x_m - x_f) + x_m (b_m - B) + x_f (B - b_f)$$

Where:

$w$  = mean wage for males ( $w_m$ ) and females ( $w_f$ )

$x$  = vector of characteristics (explanatory variables) for males and females

$B$  = vector of estimated regression coefficients weighted by male and female

proportions for study population =  $p_m b_m + p_f b_f$

$B (x_m - x_f)$  = explained component

$x_m (b_m - B) + x_f (B - b_f) =$  unexplained component consisting of:

$$x_m (b_m - B) = \text{male advantage}$$

$$x_f (B - b_f) = \text{female disadvantage}$$

The left side of the equation is the difference between the mean natural log wage of males and that of females. On the right, the first term,  $B(x_m - x_f)$  gives the portion of the wage differential due to differences in human capital and demographic characteristics between men and women. For example, if a higher proportion of men graduate from university with degrees in high earning fields, the "explained" component of the wage gap increases. A high proportion of women in low wage fields also increases the explained part. However, high proportions of women in high wage fields, and high proportions of men in low wage fields, reduce the explained component.

The last two terms together represent the portion of the wage gap that is not explained by human capital and demographic differences. The first of these two terms is the "male advantage," or portion of the wage gap reflecting returns for males beyond that expected based on human capital and demographics alone. The last term represents the female disadvantage, or returns below those expected.

## 5.2 Results

Only a small proportion of the wage gap is "explained" by differences in characteristics (12%). In fact, \$3.21 of the \$3.64 hourly wage gap (88%) remains unexplained by factors such as differences in work experience, education, or demographic characteristics. If there were no unexplained component, the female-male ratio would be .97. Instead, it is .78.

The portion of the wage gap explained in this study is notably lower than others. Christofides and Swidinsky's model explained 27% of the wage difference between white men and white women. These authors included occupation, industry, and firm size in their model. In Wannell's 1989 study of the more homogeneous graduate population, the explained portion ranged from 18% for community college, to 35% for university graduates. Wannell and Caron's 1994 study explained the entire wage gap for university graduates by differences in human capital, controlling for hours worked and tenure, and including all earners. In contrast, community college graduates continued to have low proportions of the gap explained.

Table 2

<b>Explanatory factor</b>	<b>% of net explained difference</b>
0 to 2 years work experience	60.42
Physical sciences major: university	32.64
3 to 9 years work experience	30.07
30 to 39 years work experience	19.88
18.5 or more years schooling	19.08
15 to 24 years of age	14.87
Commerce major: university	14.59
40 or more years work experience	13.76
20 to 29 years work experience	13.51
Education major: University	-9.98
Health major: University	-12.41
13 to 14.5 years schooling	-18.81
9.5 or less years of schooling	-31.56
Health major: Nonuniversity	-53.06

Table 2 shows the influence of several human capital and demographic factors on the wage gap. Among the various human capital and demographic factors widening the wage gap in the SLID analysis, the most important is a low level of work experience (two years or less). A large proportion of women have a low level of experience, coupled with lower wages.

Women who have completed a college program in health are likely to enjoy relatively high earnings for non-university graduates. Because women are 10 times more likely than men to have this major, this diploma contributes most to the narrowing of the explained earnings gap.

Among university graduates, high wages are associated with the physical sciences, including engineering. The proportion of men with such degrees is almost three times that of women. However, the prevalence of women with university degrees in education and health, both providing high remuneration, narrows the gap.

The larger proportion of women in the lower earning age group (15 to 24), increases the difference. But, because many men have either many years of schooling (18.5 or more), which is positively correlated with high earnings, or few (9.5 years or less), their educational attainment has polarized influences on the wage gap.

### **5.3 What is unexplained?**

Almost 90% of the total wage gap is unaccounted for by measured human capital and demographic differences between men and women. Of this, male advantage and female disadvantage account for almost equal proportions (45% and 43%, respectively). There is a larger portion of women than men in the lower earning levels of work experience (three to nine years). However, while men with three to



nine years' experience also make less money than their more experienced counterparts, the difference is not as pronounced as for women. This unexplained difference in remuneration for equal work experience contributes to a widening of the gap.

The relationship between age groups and wage is also different for the sexes. Men aged 25 to 34 are much more likely to have lower wages than men aged 35 to 54, while women in the younger cohort are only slightly more likely to have lower wages than women in the next group. Although a positive relationship between age and wage exists for both sexes until the 55-to-69 cohort, the relationship is less marked for females. This undoubtedly reflects strong recent educational gains by younger cohorts of women. Hence, the advantage of greater years of work experience for older cohorts is offset by the better educational profile for younger women. This is more pronounced for women because their recent educational gains have been stronger than men's.

Being single is a stronger negative wage predictor for men than for women, and the proportion of singles is slightly greater among men. Christofides and Swidinsky found that marital status was the "most important element of the unexplained component in the white male-white female comparison" (Christofides and Swidinsky, 1994: 45). Although important here, it is not the most important influence.

## **6. Summary**

In January 1993, the female-male wage ratio was .78. Several factors, some common to both sexes and others specific to each, are significant predictors of lower or higher wages. Low levels of work experience, youth, being single, few years of schooling, and residence in Quebec and the Atlantic or Prairie provinces,

are factors contributing to lower wages for both men and women. For both, high levels of schooling lead to higher wages as does a university degree in the physical sciences or commerce. Factors associated with lower wages for men only are belonging to a visible minority and being of mature working age. For women, having a university degree in any field other than social sciences, or a community college diploma in health, leads to higher wages.

Overall, human capital and demographic differences between the sexes account for only 12% of the wage gap. The remainder, or unexplained portion, is due to unmeasured factors, one of which may be systemic discrimination.

### **6.1 Future directions**

Future studies of the wage gap could consider the effect of having children, and the age of the youngest child. Although these can be viewed as proxy measures for work experience, they may also exhibit independent influences. A similar study could be done with controls for occupation and industry, and for part-time and full-time status.

Upcoming data on supervisory and managerial responsibilities from SLID's 1994 labour interview will enable further analysis of several gender occupational differences. For instance, have women achieved equal representation in management and supervisory functions? Are they concentrated in lower management positions? Who is receiving an opportunity to manage or supervise? Finally, what is the eventual impact of such opportunities on wages and promotions?

**Note**

1 R-squared values are .41 for men and .33 for women. (Without the work experience variable the values are somewhat lower at .39 for men and .30 for women.) This compares with Wannell's 1989 findings of .30 for male university graduates, and .08 for male community college graduates employed full time five years after graduation, and .29 and .31 for employed female graduates. In Christofides and Swidinsky's analysis, which included occupation and industry, the values were .42 and .45 for white men and white women, respectively. An r-squared value is an indicator of goodness of fit of the model specified. The higher the value (up to 1.0), the better the fit between wage and the human capital and demographic variables selected.

When public sector employment (including government service, educational service and hospitals) is added to the regression, results suggest that it is more advantageous for women to be employed in the public sector than for men. This variable becomes the most significant for women with a .31 b-coefficient, while the .16 value for men is also significant. The model also fits better with r-squared values of .38 for women and .42 for men.

Controls for occupation and industry, including the public sector variable, however, are excluded from further analysis. Occupation and industry are not human capital or demographic variables, and their inclusion may mask earnings discrimination because of a matching process of workers and jobs that is conditioned by gender (Wannell, 1989).

## 7. References

Christofides, L.N. and R. Swidinsky. "Wage determination by gender and visible minority status: Evidence from the 1989 LMAS." *Canadian Public Policy*. 20, no.1 (1994):34-51.

Cotton, J. "On the decomposition of wage differentials." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. 70, no.2 (May 1988):236-243.

Morissette, R. *Canadian Jobs and Firm Size: Do Smaller Firms Pay Less?* Research Paper Series no.35. Ottawa: Analytical Studies Branch, Statistics Canada, 1991.

Statistics Canada. *Earnings of Men and Women 1992*. Catalogue 13-217. Ottawa, 1994a.

---. *Universities: Enrolment and Degrees 1991* (Last Edition). Catalogue 81-204, Ottawa, 1994b.

---. *Women in the Labour Force. 1994 Edition*. Target groups project. Catalogue 75-507E. Ottawa, 1994c.

---. *Labour Force Annual Averages 1992*. Catalogue 71-220. Ottawa, 1993.

---. *Labour Force Annual Averages 1981-1988*. Catalogue 71-529. Ottawa, 1989.

Wannell, T. "Male-female earnings gap among recent university graduates." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 75-001E)2, no.2 (Summer 1990):19-31.

---. *The Persistent Gap: Exploring the Earnings Differential Between Recent Male and Female Postsecondary Graduates*. Research Paper Series no.26. Ottawa: Analytical Studies Branch, Statistics Canada, 1989.

Wannell, T. and N. Caron. *The Gender Earnings Gap Among Recent Postsecondary Graduates, 1984-92*. Research Paper Series no.68. Ottawa: Analytical Studies Branch, Statistics Canada, 1994.

## **APPENDIX I - VARIABLE GROUPINGS**

### **Age:**

15-24, 25-34, 35-54 (reference), 55-69.

### **Region/Province of Residence:**

Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario (reference), Manitoba and Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia.

### **Marital Status:**

married (reference), common law, divorced, separated, widowed, and single.

### **Visible Minority Status:**

visible minority, not visible minority (reference) .

### **Years of Schooling:**

0-9.5, 10-12.5 (reference), 13-14.5, 15-18.5, 18.5 and over, and Don't Know.

### **Major Field of Study - University:**

Educational, recreation, and counselling;

Fine and applied Arts, and Humanities and related;

Social Sciences and related (Reference);

Commerce, management, and business administration;

Agricultural and biological sciences, Engineering and applied sciences, Engineering and applied sciences technology, Mathematics and physical sciences;

Health professions, sciences and technology.

Those with no specialization were set to missing.

**Major Field of Study - Non-University:**

Educational, recreation, and counselling;

Fine and applied Arts, and Humanities and related;

Social Sciences and related;

Commerce, management, and business administration;

Agricultural and biological sciences;

Engineering and applied sciences, and Engineering and applied

sciences technology (Reference);

Mathematics and physical sciences;

Health professions, sciences and technology.

Again, those with no specialization were set to missing.

**Mother's and Father's Education:**

Elementary school (reference);

Some high school;

Completed high school;

Trade/vocational school;

Post-secondary certificate or diploma;

University Degree.

**Years of Work Experience:**

0-2, 3-9, 10-19 (reference), 20-29, 30-39, 40+, and Don't Know.

**APPENDIX II - REGRESSION RESULTS**

Variable	Male B-coefficient	Male Standard Error	Female B-coefficient	Female Standard Error
Intercept	2.826**	.019	2.487**	.019
Age1524	-.287**	.028	-.201**	.026
Age2534	-.137**	.017	-.020	.016
Age5569	-.132**	.029	-.057*	.028
Atlantic	-.208**	.022	-.191**	.024
Quebec	-.058**	.015	-.059**	.016
Mansask	-.210**	.022	-.143**	.024
Alberta	-.093**	.020	-.069**	.022
BC	.038*	.018	.038*	.019
CLU	-.007	.021	-.012	.024
Divorced	-.025	.037	-.087	.037
Separated	-.007	.032	.009	.026
Widowed	.007	.087	-.153*	.045
Single	-.191**	.017	-.089**	.018
YS09-9.5	-.163**	.020	-.265**	.027
YS13-14.5	.124**	.016	.134**	.017
YS15-18.5	.203**	.017	.261**	.019
YS18.5+	.317**	.029	.316**	.036
YS-DK	-.110	.035	-.199*	.041
Vismin	-.256**	.021	-.132	.022
YW0-2	-.353**	.027	-.324**	.024
YW3-9	-.098**	.019	-.185**	.018
YW20-29	.050	.019	.075*	.021
YW30-39	.090*	.023	.071	.038
YW40+	.130	.042	.125	.082



YWDK	.136**	.023	.143**	.020
MFU-Educ	.140*	.036	.275**	.033
MFU-FA/Hum	.005	.037	.155*	.034
MFU-Comm	.215**	.030	.207*	.044
MFU-Phy Sc.	.271**	.028	.296**	.047
MFU-Hlth	.265	.079	.435**	.050
MFNU-Educ	.021	.064	-.058	.034
MFNU-FA/Hum	-.013	.032	-.061	.029
MFNU-SocSc	.124	.042	.055	.042
MFNU-Comm	.019	.025	.010	.019
MFNU-Phy Sc	-.057	.028	-.003	.038
MFNU-Hlth	.107	.056	.234**	.022
DadEd-Shs	.006	.018	.012	.018
DadEd-Chs	.026	.019	.027	.020
DadEd-Tr/Voc	-.082	.029	.015	.032
DadEd-PSCD	-.007	.030	.004	.031
DadEd-UD	-.047	.026	.089*	.026
MomEd-SHS	.053	.018	.030	.0190
MomEd-CHS	.050	.019	.057	.020
MomEd-Tr/Voc	.055	.035	-.017	.036
MomEd-PSCD	.014	.024	.029	.025
MomEd-UD	.075	.033	-.054	.035

\* significant at .05

\*\* significant at .01

R-squared: Males=.41

Females=.33

**APPENDIX III -DECOMPOSITION RESULTS**

Variable	B*	Character Difference	Male Advantage	Female Disadvantage
Intercept	2.660	0	.1659	.1730
Age1524	-.245	.0043	-.0067	-.0078
Age2534	-.079	-.0003	-.0179	-.0184
Age5569	-.095	-.0016	-.0030	-.0024
Atlantic	-.200	.0001	-.0006	-.0006
Quebec	-.059	-.0015	.0002	.0002
Mansask	-.178	.0008	-.0023	-.0026
Alberta	-.081	-.0002	-.0011	-.0012
BC	.038	-.0003	-.0000	-.0000
CLU	-.009	-.0000	.0002	.0002
Divorced	-.056	.0003	.0007	.0009
Separated	.001	-.0000	-.0003	-.0005
Widowed	-.071	.0011	.0003	.0016
Single	-.142	-.0007	-.0131	-.0133
YS09-9.5	-.213	-.0092	.0053	.0033
YS13-14.5	.129	-.0055	-.0009	-.0012
YS15-18.5	.231	-.0002	-.0072	-.0075
YS18.5+	.317	.0056	.0000	.0000
YS-DK	-.154	.0006	-.0011	-.0010
Vismin	-.195	-.0003	-.0052	-.0053
YW0-2	-.339	.0176	.0017	.0025
YW3-9	-.141	.0088	.0084	.0116
YW20-29	.062	.0039	-.0024	-.0016
YW30-39	.081	.0058	.0009	.0003
YW40+	.128	.0040	.0001	.0000

YWDK	.139	.0078	.0002	.0004
MFU-Educ	.206	-.0029	-.0018	-.0029
MFU-FA/Hum	.078	-.0011	-.0019	-.0031
MFU-Comm	.212	.0043	.0002	.0001
MFU-Phy Sc.	.283	.0095	-.0007	-.0002
MFU-Hlth	.348	-.0036	-.0004	-.0013
MFNU-Educ	-.018	.0005	.0003	.0013
MFNU-FA/Hum	-.036	.0007	.0007	.0012
MFNU-SocSc	.090	-.0004	.0006	.0008
MFNU-Comm	.015	-.0013	.0002	.0006
MFNU-Phy Sc	-.030	-.0005	-.0012	-.0007
MFNU-Hlth	.169	-.0155	-.0006	-.0066
DadEd-Shs	.009	-.0000	-.0006	-.0006
DadEd-Chs	.027	-.0002	-.0001	.0001
DadEd-Tr/Voc	-.034	-.0001	-.0022	-.0022
DadEd-PSCD	-.002	-.0000	-.0002	-.0003
DadEd-UD	.020	-.0002	-.0056	-.0065
MomEd-SHS	.042	-.0001	.0024	.0026
MomEd-CHS	.053	-.0004	.0018	-.0035
MomEd-Tr/Voc	.020	-.0001	.0011	.0013
MomEd-PSCD	.021	-.0002	-.0006	-.0007
MomEd-UD	.012	-.0000	.0028	.0029
Total		0.0292	0.1129	0.1074
Percentage of Total		11.7	45.3	43.0