

INDEX

- Academic privilege for peer review documentation, 64
- Accommodation of students interests and abilities, 32; Title IX and, 33, 36, 37
- Accommodation to female athletes, 37
- Accuracy of data, 68
- Ackerman, N., 16
- Adoption, 49
- Adverse employment actions, pattern of, 63
- Adverse impact, 48, 73
- Adverse impact analysis, 78, 80
- Adverse impact ratio, 76, 77
- Affirmative action cases, 19, 20
- Affirmative action in college admissions: classroom education benefits of, 21; historical argument supporting, 21; legal history of, 22–24
- Affirmative action plans, 62, 63
- Affirmative action policies, periodic review of, 27
- Affirmative action programs, 19
- Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 68
- Agresti, A., 69, 82
- Alacbay, A., 37, 44
- Alito, S., 29
- Allison, P., 70, 82
- Alpha level, 78
- Americans with Disabilities Act, 68, 69
- Analysis of categorical outcomes, 68, 70
- Analysis of potential adverse impact, 73
- Analytical strategies of disparity, 67
- Anderson, D., 42, 44
- Anecdotal evidence, 11
- Appellate court's responsibility, 10
- Applicant file, information in, 55
- Applicant flow analysis, 62, 63
- Applicant flow data, statistical power, 77, 78
- Applicant flow database, 47, 49, 52–59, 62, 63
- Applicant flow process, 53
- Applicant pool, 70, 71, 76, 77, 81
- Applicant qualifications, data on, 48
- Applicants file, 55
- Application gathering for multiple job openings, 58
- Application to multiple openings, 55, 79
- Assignment of race/ethnicity and gender, 59
- Assumption of independent observations, 79
- Athletic benefits and opportunities, Title IX and, 32
- Athletic financial assistance, Title IX and, 32
- Athletic participation opportunities, Title IX and, 32
- Athletic programs, Title IX and, 31, 32
- Automated recruitment and selection systems, 79
- Bakewell v. Stephen F. Austin State University*, 95, 98, 101
- Bakke, A., 22
- Bakke* decision, 20, 22–25
- Baldus, D., 11, 16
- Baldwin, R., 87, 102
- Balzer, W., 88, 102
- Barbezat, D., 6, 10, 16
- Basic multiple regression model, 86
- Bazemore v. Friday*, 96, 97, 99, 101
- Belanger, A., 73, 82
- Bessey, B., 49, 50, 61, 66
- Bias in statistical results, 14
- Bickerstaff v. Vassar College*, 97
- Biddle, D., 78, 82
- Binding precedent, 23
- Bohannon, T., 88, 102
- Bok, D., 19, 29
- Bona fide occupational qualification (BFOQ), 8
- Bottom-line employment outcomes, 68
- Boudreau, N., 10, 16, 88, 102
- Boulahanis v. Board of Regents of Illinois State University*, 39, 40
- Bowen, W., 19, 29
- Braskamp, L., 10, 16, 87, 102
- Brown University, 36
- Brown v. Board of Education*, 29
- Browne, K., 11, 16
- Case law: importance in educational legal issues, 6; sex discrimination, 93–101
- Castaneda v. Partida*, 77

- Categorical outcomes, analysis of, 68, 70
 Center for Individual Rights, 23
Chalenor v. University of North Dakota, 40, 41
 Chang, M., 20, 21, 29, 30
 Chase, W., 73, 82
 Cheslock, J.J., 2, 31, 42–44
 Choice of variables, 88
 Christenson, B.A., 3, 47
 Chronister, J., 87, 102
 Civil Rights Act of 1964, 25. See also Title VII, 1964 Civil Rights Act
 Class action suit, 8
 Coefficient estimates, 90
 Coefficient of determination, 86
 Cohen, J., 78, 82
Cohen v. Brown University, 36, 38–41
 Cole, J., 11, 16
 Colorado State University, 37
 Combining statistics with law, 9; courts and statistics, 11, 12; logical dilemma, 12–15
 Comparison group, 76
 Compelling government interest, 24, 26; for affirmative action, 22
 Compensation determination, 92
 Compensation discrimination, 69
 Confidence levels, 77
 Confidentiality of individual information, 55, 58
Connecticut v. Teal, 48, 71, 77
 Continuous outcomes, 68–70
 Continuous variable, 86
 Controlling weight of policy interpretation, 40
Coser v. Collvier, 95, 99
 Court structure, 2, 9, 10
 Courts, statistics and, 11, 12
 Covariant observations, 79
- D'Agostino, R., 73, 82
 Darwin, C., 14
 Data: accuracy of, 68; use in law and statistics, 13
 Data analysis strategies, alternative, 3
 Data collection, avoidance of lawsuits by, 2
 Data maintenance: disparate impact claims, 48; disparate treatment claims, 48
 Deductive reasoning, 13
 Demographic characteristics of applicants, 72
 Dependent observations, 79
 Dependent variable, 85–87
- Dey, E., 21, 29
 Dichotomous decisions, 85
 Dichotomous outcomes, 70
 Differential selection rates, 63
 Disclosure of peer-review materials, 64
 Discovery in legal proceedings, 64
 Discrimination analysis, 78
 Discrimination cases in education: defending, 5; fairness of outcome, 11; importance of case law, 6; importance of statistics in, 6; mandatory precedent in, 10; proving, 5, 11; proving through statistical models, 11; statistical evidence in, 11
 Discrimination law, 7–9
 Discriminatory intent, 93
 Disparate impact, 8, 48, 71, 96
 Disparate impact model, 8
 Disparate treatment, 48, 93
 Disparate treatment claims, 48, 93
 Disparate treatment model, 8, 9, 11
 Disparity: analytical strategies of, 67; calculation of, 74, 76
 Disparity analysis, 77, 78, 80
 Diversity course requirement, 21
 Diversity in higher education: academic benefits of, 20, 25; benefits of, 20–22, 25; curricular additions and, 21; environment supporting, 20; majority student benefits from, 21; mission of institution and, 27; research supporting, 20, 21; transformative effect of, 20
 Diversity in primary education, 26
 Diversity of campuses, 19, 25
 Diversity of workforce, 62
 Diversity research, 21
 DuBois, W.E.B., 19
 Dummy code, 69
- Eckes, S.E., 2, 31, 35, 38, 40, 44
 EEO required reports, 62
EEOC v. Liggett, 94
 Effect size, 78
 Effective accommodation test, 36
 Ehrenberg, R., 42, 44
 Eight-factor availability analysis, 62
 80 percent rule, 77
 Employee benefits, 68
 Employee characteristics in employee history database, 49
 Employee directory, 50
 Employee history, 50, 51
 Employee history database, 47, 49–52, 58, 63

- Employee selection process, 63
- Employer identification of employee gender, 61
- Employment discrimination claims: employee history database and, 49; personnel system data and, 3, 47
- Employment discrimination class actions, 52
- Employment discrimination concepts, 3
- Employment discrimination litigation: compensation outcomes analysis in, 3; outcome variables considered, 69, 70; personnel selection decisions and, 67–69
- Employment litigation, data organization and maintenance in, 3
- Employment outcome, 69
- Employment practices review, 62
- Employment testing, 72
- Ende v. Board of Regents of Regency University*, 99
- Enforcement, Title IX, 35
- Enrichment of educational experience, 19
- Enrollment management, institutional research in, 2
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 69
- Equal employment opportunity (EEO) laws, 48; role of databases in compliance, 62–64
- Equal error variance across categories, 70
- Equal Pay Act, 7, 8, 16, 69, 93, 94, 95, 97, 99
- Equal protection clause, *Bakke* case and Fourteenth Amendment, 22
- Equity adjustment formula, 99
- Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA), 41–43
- Estimates of significance, 78
- Estimator tests, 78
- Ethnic stereotypes, 71
- Evidence: anecdotal, 11; exclusion of, 12; preponderance of, 12, 13, 96, 101; relevant, 12
- Exclusion of evidence, 12
- Executive Order 11246, 68
- Experimental research design, 72
- Explanatory proxy variables, 88
- Explanatory variables, 85–91, 96, 97
- External applicants, 71, 76
- Facially neutral employment practices, 48
- Faculty included in analysis, 87
- Fairness, legality and, 10, 11
- Favia v. Indiana University of Pennsylvania (Favia II)*, 37
- Federal civil service positions, 81
- Federal contractors, affirmative action for, 68
- Federal record keeping and recording requirements for race/ethnicity and gender data, 59, 60
- Federal Rules of Evidence, 12
- Feinberg, S., 75, 82
- Female athletes, ratio to female students, 33, 37, 38
- Fidell, L., 70, 83
- Field, H., 72, 82
- Financial hardship defense, Title IX, 37
- Finkelstein, M., 89, 102
- Fisher, F., 87, 102
- Fisher's exact test, 3, 67, 73, 75, 78, 79
- Fisher's formula, 73, 74
- Fisk University, 19
- Fixed margins, 73
- Focal group, 69, 73, 76, 78, 79
- Former employees: inconsistent records of gender for, 61; inconsistent records of race/ethnicity for, 61
- Four-fifths rule, 67, 76, 77
- Fourteenth Amendment, 25; equal protection clause, 38
- Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools*, 35
- Frazier v. Consolidated Rail Corporation*, 100
- Frequent applicants, 79, 80
- Frizell, J.A., 3, 85
- Full-time faculty, 87, 96
- Galton, F., 14
- Ganeneder, B., 87, 102
- Gatewood, R., 72, 82
- Gender data, 59, 61, 62
- Gender discrimination, 40
- Gender equity in college sports, 32
- Gender inference from documents in personnel file, 61
- Gender stereotypes, 71
- Geographical regions, 78
- Gilmartin, K., 76, 82, 92, 102
- Granberry v. Jet Blue Airways*, 64
- Grant, C., 34, 45
- Gratz, J., 24
- Gratz v. Bollinger*, 20, 24, 25, 27, 29
- Gray, M., 87, 102

- Griffin v. Board of Regents of Regency University*, 100
- Grossman, P., 64, 66
- Groups of interest, 70
- Grutter, B., 25
- Grutter v. Bollinger*, 20, 24–27, 29
- Gujarati, D., 102
- Gurin, G., 21, 29
- Gurin, P., 20, 21, 29
- Gutman, A., 48, 66, 67, 83
- Haignere, L., 87, 102
- Hakuta, K., 30
- Hamacher, P., 24, 25
- Hamermesh, D., 87, 102
- Harper, E., 87, 102
- Harris, M.S., 2, 19, 35, 44
- Hartka, E., 92, 102
- Harvard University, 19
- Hays, S., 75, 82
- Hazelwood School District v. United States*, 75, 93, 100
- Higher education: discrimination cases decided, 85; minimization of legal claims by, 1; sports data disclosure, 41, 42
- Hiring managers, 53, 55
- Hiring officials, 53
- History and continuing practice, Title IX, 33
- Hoffman, E., 17, 89, 100, 103
- Holmes, O.W., 1, 4
- Homoscedasticity, 88
- Hopwood v. Texas*, 23
- Houch v. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*, 93–95
- Howard, R., 88, 103
- Hunt, H., 14, 16
- Hurtado, S., 21, 29
- Hyer, P., 87, 88, 103
- Illinois State University, 39
- Inconsistent legal decisions, 10
- Inconsistent records of race/ethnicity: based on self-identification, 60; of former employees, 61; resurvey of employee, 61
- Independent variables, 85, 91, 97
- Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 37
- Inductive reasoning, 13
- Inferential analysis, 73, 85
- Information in applicant file, 55
- Information in qualifications databases, 58, 59
- Information in vacancy announcement, 53
- Institutional databases, 87
- Institutional research office: data gathering by, 1; legal issues affecting, 3
- Institutional research studies leading to lawsuits, 6, 7
- Institutional researchers, 43; mistakes when reporting data, 32
- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 42
- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Survey Fall Staffing Survey, 61
- Intentional discrimination, 93
- Internal applicants, 76
- Internal promotion, 71
- International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. U.S.*, 93
- Internet applicant, 72
- Interval scale, 69
- Interview of job candidate, 55
- Job applicants, 53
- Job description, 53
- Job interviewers, 53
- Job relevance of data in qualifications database, 59
- Johnson, J., 44
- Jones, J., 30
- Jones, L., 2, 4
- Jurisdiction, 2
- Jurisprudence, 2
- Jurists, understanding of statistics by, 12
- Kaplin, W., 6, 8, 16, 29
- Kelley v. Board of Trustees*, 39–41
- Kennedy, P., 103
- Key knowledge, skills or abilities, 53, 55, 58
- King, A., 77, 82
- Kirk, A.B., 3
- Lamber, J., 36, 44
- Landy, F., 66
- Langston, I., 10, 16, 87, 102
- Lavin-McEleney v. Marist College*, 94, 99
- Law combined with statistics. See Combining statistics with law
- Lawsuits in higher education, 5

- Lee, B., 6, 8, 16, 29
 Lee, J., 16
 Legacies, admissions policies giving preference to, 28
 Legal jargon, 13
 Legal precedent, 10
 Legal system: probability science in, 1; statistics in, 1
 Legality, fairness and, 10, 11
 Lempert, R., 6, 16
 Levin, B., 89, 102
 Limitation on student enrollment, 19
 Lindemann, B., 64, 66
 Linear regression, 100
 Liu, C., 16
 Lobsenz, R., 77, 82
 Logistic regression analysis, 76, 80, 85
 Louisiana State University, 38
 Luna, A.L., 5, 27, 30, 85, 86
- McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 93
 McLaughlin, D., 82
 McLaughlin, G., 87, 88, 103
 Maher, K.M., 3, 47
 Mandatory affirmative action, 68
 Mandatory precedent, 10, 23
 Mantel-Haenzel test, 74, 78
 Masked variable, 99
 Measurement of student interest in sports participation, 34
Mecklenburg v. Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education, 97, 99
 Meier, P., 73, 77, 82
Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 26
Miami University Wrestling Club v. Miami University, 40
 Michigan cases, 19, 24–27
 Michigan Law School, 25, 26
 Milem, J., 20, 30
 Minimum sample size requirements, 78
 Minimum sum of squared residuals, 86
 Monetary damages, 35
 Monitoring of hiring practices, 62
 Montgomery, J., 88, 103
 Moore, N., 10, 16
 Morris, S., 77, 82
 Most favored group, 76
 Mueller, L.M., 3, 47
 Muffo, J., 10, 16, 87, 102
 Multicollinearity, 88–91, 98
 Multiple-model approach, 100
 Multiple regression analysis, 3, 68, 85, 89, 90, 93, 97, 101, 102
 Multiple regression model, 89
 Multiple regression procedures, 99
 Multiple steps of employee selection process, 63
 Murphy, K., 75, 82
 Myers, B., 75, 82
- Name of employee as gender identification, 61
 National Center for Education Statistics, 61
 National Women's Law Center, 35
Neal v. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities, 40
 Non-tenure-track positions, 87, 96
 Nonautocorrelation, 88
 Nontraditional work schedules, 68
 Normally distributed error terms, 70
 Null hypothesis, 77
- Observational data, 72, 73
 Observational research design, 72
 Observational studies, 73
 O'Connor, S.D., 29
 Office for Civil Rights, 2, 31, 34, 35, 40
 Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), 69, 72
 Office of Management and Budget, 60
 Office of Personnel Management, 60
 Office of Postsecondary Education, 41
 Omitted variable bias, 88–91
 One-equation method, 89, 90, 92, 99
 One-equation regression model, 92
 One-tailed hypothesis testing, 75, 78
 Online recruitment databases, 55
 Openings file, 53, 54
 Organization of applicant flow database, 55
 Organizational risk, identification of, 62
Ottaviani v. State University of New York at New Paltz, 96, 97
 Outcome of selection process, 70, 71
 Outcome variables, 69
 Outliers, 88
- Paetzold, R., 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 15, 17
 Palmer, C., 82
Palmer v. George P. Schultz, 100
Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, 26

- Part-time positions, 87, 95, 96
- Pascarella, E., 21, 30
- Past discrimination, database of evidence of, 28
- "Path of Law, The," 1
- Pattern and practice claims of hiring and compensation discrimination, 58
- Pay equity cases, 92
- Payroll database, 49
- Payroll records, 49
- Pederson v. Louisiana State University*, 38
- Peer-review materials, 64
- Penk v. Oregon State Board of Higher Education*, 64, 96
- Performance appraisal, 68
- Personnel action consistency, 70
- Personnel actions in employee history database, 49
- Personnel decisions based on qualifications database, 59
- Personnel records of employment decisions, 70
- Personnel system data, employment discrimination allegations and, 3
- Persuasive precedent, 10
- Piaget, J., 21, 30
- Point-scale system for admissions, 24
- Positions included in population sample, 87
- Potential adverse impact, analysis of, 73
- Potentially tainted variables, 88
- Powell, L., 20, 22–25
- Practical significance, 100
- Practical significance criteria, 79
- Practical significance tests, 67
- Practically significant disparity, 69
- Precedent, 23
- Predictive validity of data in qualifications database, 59
- Preferential treatment based on race, 23
- Preponderance of evidence, 12, 13, 96, 101
- Presseisen v. Swarthmore College*, 96–101
- Preventing Lawsuits: The Role of Institutional Research*, 2, 4
- Prima facie case, 8, 9, 35, 89, 90, 93, 94, 96, 100; statistics in, 2
- Primary education and affirmative action, 26
- Probability, 74, 76; use in statistics, 13
- Promotions, mean time between, 63
- Protected class member, 49, 69
- Protected class variable, 69, 70
- Protected group, 90
- Public posting of employment position, 71
- Qualifications database, 47, 49, 58, 59
- Quota system: for admissions, 25, 28; under Title IX, 41
- Race/ethnicity data, 59–61
- Racial set-aside admissions program, 22
- Random chance, 86
- Randomization test, 100
- Rank as variable, 97, 98
- Rating and selection process of job applicants, 53
- Record keeping, 72
- Referent group, 69, 73, 76, 78, 79
- Referral file, 58
- Regression analysis, 6, 14, 85, 87, 94–97, 99, 101
- Regression model, 86, 88, 90, 91, 98, 99
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 68
- Reinstatement of female athletic teams, 36, 38
- Relevant evidence, 12
- Relevant workforce, 52
- Reliability of data, 68
- Residual error, 86, 88
- Resumes, 55, 58, 59
- Retrospective data, 72, 73, 78
- Reverse discrimination, under Title IX, 39
- Roberts, J.G., 26, 29
- Roberts v. Colorado State Board of Agriculture*, 37, 38
- Rosenthal, W., 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 17
- Roth, J.H., 2, 19
- Rules of evidence, statistical analysis and, 1
- Sabo, D., 34, 45
- Sacks, J., 73, 77, 82
- Safe harbors, 40; Title IX, 35
- Salary analysis, 87
- Salary discrimination lawsuits, 9
- Salary equity cases, 89
- Salary equity model, 87
- Salary equity studies, 1, 2
- Salary remedies, 93
- Sample population, 95
- Sample size, 78
- Sampling error, 77
- Sampling models, 73
- School assignment by race, 26

- Scope, employee history database, 52
- Selection decisions across two groups, 3
- Self-critical analysis, 62–64
- Self-critical analysis privilege, 64
- Self-identification of gender, 61
- Self-identification of race/ethnicity, 60
- Separate qualifications based on race, 23
- Shippen, B.S., Jr., 3, 85
- Siler-Khodr v. University of Texas Health Science Center San Antonio*, 101
- Similarly situated applicants, 75, 76
- Simpson, W., 6, 9, 11, 14, 17
- Single-model approach, 100
- Single variable, 85
- Siskin, B., 48, 66, 73, 82
- Smart, J., 88, 103
- Smith v. University of Washington Law School*, 23, 24
- Smith v. Virginia Commonwealth University*, 96, 98
- Snyder, J., 87, 88, 103
- Sobel v. Yeshiva University*, 96–100
- Social justice, diversity and, 21
- Spaulding v. University of Washington*, 95
- Standard deviation, 15, 75
- Standard errors, 70, 78
- Standard of proof, 13
- Standards for collection and reporting of race and ethnicity data, 60
- Standing, Title IX, 39
- Statistical analysis, 97; discrimination claims and, 69; usefulness in law, 1
- Statistical disparities in selection procedure, 70
- Statistical evidence, 9, 37, 96; demonstration of compliance with, 2, 3; as proof of discrimination, 14
- Statistical inference, 13
- Statistical jargon, 13
- Statistical power, 75, 77, 78, 89
- Statistical reasoning, of court, 2
- Statistical results: bias in, 14; probative value of, 6, 12
- Statistical significance, 75–78, 87, 92, 94, 100
- Statistical significance tests, 3, 73, 79
- Statistical test, 78
- Statistically significant relation, 70
- Statistically significant disparity, 69
- Statistics: in legal environment, 2; practice of law and, 2
- Statistics combined with law. *See* Combining statistics with law
- Statistics of Discrimination, The: Using Statistical Evidence in Discrimination Cases*, 4
- Steel, L., 72, 82
- Steps in selection process, 71
- Stevens, L., 35, 37, 45
- Strag v. Board of Trustees, Craven Community College*, 94, 95
- Student retention, diversity and, 21
- Students classified by race, 26
- Subgroup sample sizes, 78
- Subjective nature of higher education, 6
- Subpooling, 76
- Substantial proportionality, 34–38, 40, 42; Title IX, 33
- Suggs, W., 32, 35, 45
- Sum of squared errors, 86
- Summary judgment, motion for, 40
- Survival analysis, 71
- Tabachnick, B., 70, 83
- Tainted variables, 89
- Terenzini, P., 20, 21, 30
- Three-prong test for compliance with Title IX, 33
- Threshold of significance, 75
- Time frame of analysis, 78
- Time period covered by employee history database, 52
- Title as inference of gender, 61
- Title IX: accommodation of students interests and abilities, 33, 36, 37; application to intercollegiate athletics, 2, 32; athletic benefits and opportunities, 32; budget constraints and, 39, 40; burden of proof, 35; case law, 31, 35–41; compliance with, 33, 35, 41, 43; creation of new teams for underrepresented gender, 38; damages for violation of, 35; data analysis for noncompliance, 34; data for demonstrating compliance with, 31, 32; downsizing of program under, 40; elimination of teams under, 39, 40; enforcement, 35; Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA), 41–43; female-initiated cases, 36, 38; financial hardship defense, 37; gender discrimination under, 40; gender proportionality, 41; grievance procedures, 35; history and continuing practice, 33; male-initiated cases, 36, 38, 39, 41; original policy interpretation, 31, 32; policy clarifications, 31, 33–35, 41; policy interpretation, 37, 40; program

- expansion for underrepresented gender, 34, 36, 37; quota system under, 41; reinstatement of female teams, 36; reverse discrimination under, 39; safe harbors, 35, 40; scope, 31; standing, 39; statistical evidence, 37; substantial proportionality, 33
- Title VII, 1964 Civil Rights Act, 7–9, 11, 16, 68, 93, 94, 95, 97, 101; cases, 5; disparate impact, 48; disparate treatment, 48, 93; EEO-1 report, 60; employment discrimination practices, 48; regression analysis in cases, 3
- Toutkoushian, R., 16, 17, 88, 89, 100, 103
- Traditional applicant flow data analysis, 3, 70–77
- Training opportunities, 68
- Transactional employee history database, 63
- Trial court's responsibility, 10
- Trippi, J., 48, 66, 73, 82
- Two-equation method, 89, 92
- Two-question format for collection of race/ethnicity data, 60
- Two-tailed hypothesis testing, 75
- Two-tailed significance test, 78
- Two to three standard deviations rule, 77
- 2×2 contingency tables, 72
- Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 72, 76, 78
- University of California at Davis, 22
- University of Illinois, 39
- University of Michigan, 24, 27; affirmative action cases, 2, 19, 24–27
- University of North Dakota, 40
- University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC*, 64
- University of Texas Law School, 23
- University of Washington, 94
- Upton, G., 73, 83
- U.S. Department of Education, 61
- Use of Data in Discrimination Issues Cases*, 2, 4
- Utilization analysis, 62
- Vacancy announcement, 53
- Variable relations, 70
- Variables in employee history database, 50
- Violations of key assumptions, 90
- Visual observation for identification: of gender, 61; of race/ethnicity, 60
- Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio*, 95
- Washington, B.T., 19
- Webster, A., 88, 103
- Whitt, E., 20, 30
- Wilkins v. University of Houston*, 99
- Willborn, S., 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 15, 17
- Withdrawals, 80, 81
- Witt, D., 30
- Work history of employees or groups, 63
- Work schedules, nontraditional, 68
- Wren, C., 7, 10, 17
- Wren, J., 7, 10, 17
- Yancey, B., 2, 4, 102
- Yates, F., 73, 83
- Zabell, S., 73, 77, 82
- Zink, D., 67, 83