
**THE REALITY
OF INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION IN
METROPOLITAN AMERICA – 1999**

ALFRED W. BLUMROSEN

Thomas A Cowan Professor of Law, Rutgers Law School,
Director, Intentional Discrimination Project, Rutgers Law School

RUTH G. BLUMROSEN

Adjunct Professor of Law, Rutgers Law School,
General Advisor, Intentional Discrimination Project, Rutgers Law School

This study was supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation to Rutgers University.

The views expressed are those of the authors,
not necessarily those of the Foundation or the University.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

§1. PROF. ALFRED W. BLUMROSEN

ALFRED W. BLUMROSEN is the Thomas A. Cowan Professor of Law, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, specializing in Labor and Employment law. He received his BA and JD degrees from the University of Michigan, and has taught at Rutgers Law School since 1955. In 1965, he studied the enforcement of the New Jersey Civil Rights Law in "Anti-Discrimination Laws in Action in New Jersey: A Law-Sociology Study." 19 Rutgers Law Review 187. Beginning in 1965, he assisted in organizing the EEOC and served as its first Chief of Conciliations and Director of Federal State Relations, a Special Attorney in the Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Consultant to Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment Standards Arthur Fletcher (OFCCP) 1969-71; Acting Director, Michigan Civil Rights Commission, 1972, organized programs on the 10th and 20th anniversaries of the Civil Rights Act, 1975 and 1984; consultant to EEOC Chair Eleanor Holmes Norton, 1977-79 concerning Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, Affirmative Action Guidelines. In 1995, he advised the U.S. Department of Labor concerning the "affirmative action-reverse discrimination" controversy, and reviewed programs of the EEOC for the Citizens Commission on Civil Rights. In 1998 he received a grant from the Ford Foundation to investigate the extent of current intentional employment discrimination.

He was Of Counsel to Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays & Handler, (New York, NY) 1979-1982 advising employers on equal opportunity matters; Counsel to NAACP in *Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Atonio*, 109 S.Ct. 2115 (1989) [concerning the interpretation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act] and in *NAACP v. Meese*, 615 F. Supp. 200 (D.D.C) 1985) [seeking injunction against rescission of consent decrees involving affirmative action]; Counsel to mainly white female employees challenging a discriminatory layoff in *Chrapliwy v. Uniroyal*, 670 F.2d 760 (7th Cir. 1982) cert. denied, 103 S. Ct.2428 (1983), and counsel to the mainly white male employees, seeking equal pay in *Klask v. Northwest Airlines*, 57 FEP Cases 1147, 1152 (D. Minn. 1989, 91).

He has written MODERN LAW: THE LAW TRANSMISSION SYSTEM AND EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY, (1993,

University of Wisconsin Press); **BLACK EMPLOYMENT AND THE LAW** (1971, Rutgers University Press), and numerous law review articles, including "Strangers in Paradise: *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.* and the Concept of Employment Discrimination." (1972) which has been cited by the U. S. Supreme Court in two decisions. His essay "Six Conditions for Meaningful Self Regulation" was awarded the Ross Prize by the American Bar Association in 1983. In 1993, he was a Fulbright Scholar in South Africa, where he examined whether U.S. equal employment experience would be useful in the post-apartheid period. In 1995, he was a resident scholar at the Rockefeller Institute Conference and Study center in Bellagio, Italy.

§2. PROF. RUTH G. BLUMROSEN

RUTH GERBER BLUMROSEN is adjunct Professor of Law at Rutgers Law School, Newark New Jersey, and former associate Professor at Rutgers Graduate School of Management. She received her BA and Law degrees from the University of Michigan. She assisted in the establishment of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1965, where she was acting director of compliance. She was consultant to EEOC Chair Eleanor Holmes Norton in 1979-80, concerning guidelines under the Equal Pay Act and wage discrimination issues, U.S. EEOC, Hearings on Job Segregation and Wage Discrimination. She participated in development of EEOC policy statement on impact of layoffs on minorities and women. She was consultant on Equal Employment Opportunity, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1980-81; Advisor, New Jersey Commission on Sex Discrimination in the Statutes, prepared analysis of state pay practices which was basis for action by Governor's Task Force on Equitable Compensation, 1974-77, a member and Hearing Officer, New Jersey Governor's Committee on minority and female opportunities in state contracting, 1991-93. In 1993, she was a Fulbright Scholar in South Africa, examining whether U.S. equal employment experience would be useful in the post-apartheid period. In 1995, she was a resident scholar at the Rockefeller Institute Conference and Study center in Bellagio, Italy. She has published in the field of wage discrimination including Wage Discrimination, Job Segregation and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 12 University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform 397 (1979), cited by U.S. Supreme Court in *County of Washington v. Gunther*, 452 U.S. 161 (1981); Wage Discrimination, Job Segregation: The Survival of a Theory, 14 Univ. of Michigan Journal of Law Reform 1 (1981); Wage Discrimination Revisited, 8 Women's Rights Law Reporter 109 (1984); Remedies for Wage Discrimination, 20 Univ. of Mich. Journal of Law Reform, 99, (1986). She has also written on the concept of work sharing as alternative to layoffs, and the use of unemployment compensation to facilitate part time employment. She is co-author of Downsizing and Employee Rights, 50 Rutgers Law Review 943 (1998). She has litigated under New Jersey Anti-Discrimination laws in the case which established the federal constitutionality of state fair housing laws (*Levitt v. New Jersey*, 31 N.J. 514, 363 U.S. 418 (1960), and has represented male flight attendants denied their rights under the Equal Pay act in *Klask v. Northwest Airlines*, 57 FEP Cases 1147, 1152 (D. Minn. 1989, 91).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Donald Dale (Assistant Professor, Muhlenberg College) and Stacy Dale (Consultant) prepared the statistical computations, provided the statistical tables on which the analysis was based, and the Technical Appendix.

Steven Blumrosen provided computer expertise and editing assistance.

Lynn Walker Huntley, President, Southern Education Association, made the project possible.

The Ford Foundation provided financial assistance and human support.

The Rutgers Law School faculty and staff in Newark provided us with wonderful education and support for more than forty five years.

The University of Michigan provided an extraordinary learning environment, particularly at the Michigan Daily and the Law School, that has been the foundation of our work.

The Russell Sage Foundation supported an interdisciplinary experiment between the Law School and the Sociology Department of Rutgers in the 1950's that is reflected in this study. The Rockefeller Foundation provided a thoughtful month in Belagio where some of these ideas germinated.

The thousands of men and women involved in the implementation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on all sides of all issues, whose lives we shared.

The millions of men and women whose efforts made the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its implementation an evolving achievement of American democracy.

DEDICATION

To the memory of all those who shared in the adoption of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 that prohibited slavery and provided that “schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§3. SUMMARY TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I REPORT ON THE NATION

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION: AN OVERVIEW OF INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION
CHAPTER 2	THE FOUNDATIONS OF THIS STUDY
CHAPTER 3	THE SENSE OF REALITY CONCERNING JOB DISCRIMINATION
CHAPTER 4	THE EEO-1 DATA BASE
CHAPTER 5	MEASURING AND PROVING INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION
CHAPTER 6	INTENTIONAL DISCRIMINATION DEMONSTRATED BY STATISTICS
CHAPTER 7	THE FOUR DEGREES OF INTENTIONAL DISCRIMINATION
CHAPTER 8	ANTICIPATING EXPLANATIONS FOR LIMITED EMPLOYMENT OF MINORITIES OR WOMEN

PART II THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT OF VISIBLE INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION

CHAPTER 9	MINORITIES AND WOMEN
CHAPTER 10	BLACKS, HISPANICS, ASIANS, NATIVE AMERICANS
CHAPTER 11	DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BLACKS
CHAPTER 12	DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HISPANICS
CHAPTER 13	DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ASIAN-PACIFIC ORIGIN WORKERS
CHAPTER 14	DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN - A MORE DETAILED ANALYSIS
CHAPTER 15	DISCRIMINATION BY INDUSTRIES – FORTY AND TWO HUNDRED SIX
CHAPTER 16	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, REVERSE DISCRIMINATION AND THE STATISTICAL- LEGAL METHODOLOGY OF THIS STUDY
CHAPTER 17	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
APPENDIX A -	EEO-1 INSTRUCTIONS AND FORM
APPENDIX B -	SIC CODES
APPENDIX C -	TECHNICAL APPENDIX

§4. FULL TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR PARTS I & II

PART I REPORT ON THE NATION

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION: AN OVERVIEW OF INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION

- §1. *Basic Findings*
- §2. *The Objectives Of This Study*
- §3. *The Materials Studied – “Visible” Workers Identified By Employers*
- §4. *Past Failures – A Bi-Partisan Story*
- §5. *The Source Of The Data For The Study*
- §6. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 2 THE FOUNDATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- §1. *Measuring And Evaluating Equal Employment Opportunity*
- §2. *The Basic Methodology Of This Study*
- §3. *The “Sore Thumb” Analysis Describes Reality – It Is Not A “Fair,” “Neutral,” Or “Non-Discriminatory” Approach.*
- §4. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 3 THE SENSE OF REALITY CONCERNING JOB DISCRIMINATION

- §1. *A Statistical Setting for Individual Stories about Discrimination.*
- §2. *Perceptions of Reality*
- §3. *The Reality Revealed by Employer Reports*
- §4. *Improvement In Minority/ Female Job Opportunities – 1975-1999*
- §5. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 4 THE EEO-1 DATA BASE

- §1. *Accounting for Establishments That Failed to File EEO-1 Reports.*
- §2. *Accuracy and Reliability of the EEO-1 Statistics.*
- §3. *Applying Standard Statistical Principles to the Data to Identify Intentional Discrimination Under Supreme Court Decisions in Employment Discrimination Matters.*
- §4. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 5 MEASURING AND PROVING INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION

- §1. *Professional Standards Applicable to Management’s Employment Decisions*
- §2. *Intentional Discrimination under the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1991.*
- §3. *Using statistical evidence comparing establishments*
- §4. *Statistical significance*
- §5. *The Average or Mean Used as a “Benchmark” to Evaluate Establishments*
- §6. *Applying the Law to the Benchmark*
- §7. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 6 INTENTIONAL DISCRIMINATION DEMONSTRATED BY STATISTICS

- §1. *The Consequences of the Two Standard Deviation Rule*
- §2. *Identifying the Numbers of “Affected Workers” Where Discrimination is Found.*
- §3. *Numbers Are Not Quotas.*
- §4. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 7 THE FOUR DEGREES OF INTENTIONAL DISCRIMINATION

- §1. *Hard Core Discriminators.*
- §2. *Clearly Visible Discriminators.*
- §3. *Presumed Discriminators.*
- §4. *At Risk Discriminators.*
- §5. *Summary*
- §6. *Endnote*

CHAPTER 8 ANTICIPATING EXPLANATIONS FOR LIMITED EMPLOYMENT OF MINORITIES OR WOMEN

- §1. *“It happened by chance.”*
 - §2. *Labor markets differ in the participation of minorities/ women.*
 - §3. *An employer may require different types of worker skills than its peers.*
-

Table of Contents

-
- §4. *There are no qualified minority/female workers in the job category.*
 §5. *Residential segregation and transportation difficulties may account for low utilization.*
 §6. *Minority/female employees are not available for work.*
 §7. *Other employers have absorbed all qualified minorities/women in our labor market.*
 §8. *Minorities/females did not apply or do not want to do this kind of work.*
 §9. *The employer was inattentive to the race/sex composition of the workforce.*
 §10. *The MSA data covers a much larger area than that from which an employer may recruit, and thereby gives misleading information.*
 §11. *It is unreasonable to expect employers to stop all other hiring or promotion until they reach the average utilization of minorities and women.*
 §12. *Endnotes*

PART II THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT OF VISIBLE INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION**CHAPTER 9 MINORITIES AND WOMEN**

- §1. *Discriminating Establishments And Affected Workers*
 §2. *Identifying The Gender/Race/Ethnic Interaction In the EEO-1 Labor Force*
 §3. *The Probability That A Minority Or Woman Will Face Discrimination When Seeking An Employment Opportunity In An Occupation Because Of Race, Sex Or Ethnicity*
 §4. *Highlights of the Table*
 §5. *Intentional Job Discrimination Against Minorities And Women By Size Of Establishment*
 A. Minorities
 B. Women
 §6. *Enforcement Implications Of Tables 3 And 4*
 §7. *The Incidence Of Discrimination By Industries*
 §8. *Intentional Discrimination Against Minorities And Women By Degrees – Hard Core, Clearly Visible, Presumed And At Risk*
 A. HARD CORE DISCRIMINATORS
 32,958 MINORITY WORKERS
 240,908 WOMEN WORKERS
 B. CLEARLY VISIBLE DISCRIMINATORS
 359,220 MINORITY WORKERS
 324,924 WOMEN WORKERS
 C. PRESUMED DISCRIMINATORS
 74,087 MINORITY WORKERS
 62,563 WOMEN WORKERS
 D. “AT RISK” DISCRIMINATORS.
 MINORITY WORKERS
 WOMEN WORKERS
 §9. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 10 BLACKS, HISPANICS, ASIANS, NATIVE AMERICANS

- §1. *Discriminating Establishments And Affected Workers*
 §2. *Minorities In The Eeo-1 System.*
 §3. *Highlights of table concerning individual minority groups*
 §4. *The Probability of Discrimination by Occupational Classification*
 A. Blacks
 B. Hispanics
 C. Asian Pacific
 D. Native Americans
 §5. *Endnotes*

CHAPTER 11 DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BLACKS

- §1. *Improvement In Job Opportunities For Black Workers Since 1964.*
 §2. *Intentional Discrimination In 1999*
 §3. *Background Of This Study*
 §4. *The Varieties Of Intentional Discrimination*
 A. AT RISK DISCRIMINATORS.
 B. PRESUMED DISCRIMINATORS.
 C. CLEARLY VISIBLE DISCRIMINATORS.
 D. HARD CORE DISCRIMINATORS.
-

 Table of Contents

§5.	<i>THE RISK OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BLACKS BY OCCUPATION</i>
§6.	<i>THE INCIDENCE OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BLACKS BY INDUSTRIES</i>
§7.	<i>Analysis of Ranking by number of affected Black workers</i>
§8.	<i>CRATERS IN THE PLAYING FIELD — Proportion of Comparisons showing discrimination.</i>
§9.	<i>Conclusion</i>
§10.	<i>Endnotes</i>
CHAPTER 12 DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HISPANICS	
§1.	<i>Improvement in Job Opportunities for Hispanic Workers Since 1964.</i>
§2.	<i>Continued Discrimination Against Hispanic Workers</i>
§3.	<i>BACKGROUND OF THIS STUDY</i>
§4.	<i>INTENTIONAL DISCRIMINATION</i>
	A. AT RISK DISCRIMINATORS.
	B. PRESUMED DISCRIMINATORS.
	C. CLEARLY VISIBLE DISCRIMINATORS.
	D. HARD CORE DISCRIMINATORS.
§5.	<i>The Risk Of Discrimination Against Hispanics By Occupation</i>
§6.	<i>The Incidence Of Discrimination Against Hispanics By Industries</i>
§7.	<i>Analysis Of Industry Ranking By Number Of Affected Hispanic Workers</i>
§8.	<i>Craters In The Playing Field – Proportion Of Comparisons Showing Discrimination Against Hispanics</i>
§9.	<i>Conclusion.</i>
§10.	<i>Endnotes</i>
CHAPTER 13 DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ASIAN-PACIFIC ORIGIN WORKERS	
§1.	<i>Improvement in Job Opportunities for Asian Pacific Workers Since 1964.</i>
§2.	<i>Continued Discrimination Against Asian Pacific Workers</i>
§3.	<i>Background Of This Study</i>
§4.	<i>The Varieties Of Intentional Discrimination</i>
	A. AT RISK DISCRIMINATORS.
	B. PRESUMED DISCRIMINATORS.
	C. CLEARLY VISIBLE DISCRIMINATORS.
	D. HARD CORE DISCRIMINATORS.
§5.	<i>The Risk Of Discrimination Against Asian Pacific Workers By Occupation</i>
§6.	<i>The Incidence Of Intentional Job Discrimination Against Asian-Pacific Workers By Industry</i>
§7.	<i>Analysis of Industry Ranking by Number of Affected Workers.</i>
§8.	<i>Craters In The Playing Field – Proportion Of Comparisons Showing Discrimination Against Asian Pacific Workers</i>
§9.	<i>Conclusion</i>
§10.	<i>Endnotes</i>
CHAPTER 14 DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN - A MORE DETAILED ANALYSIS	
§1.	<i>Improvement in Job Opportunities for Women Since 1964.</i>
§2.	<i>Intentional Discrimination Against Women in 1999.</i>
§3.	<i>Discriminating Establishments and Affected Workers</i>
§4.	<i>The Probability That A Woman Will Face Discrimination When Seeking An Employment Opportunity In An Occupation Because Of Sex – The “Glass Ceiling”</i>
§5.	<i>Continued Concentration Of Women In Office And Clerical Positions.</i>
§6.	<i>Background Of This Study</i>
§7.	<i>Intentional Discrimination</i>
§8.	<i>The Incidence Of Discrimination Against Women By Industries</i>
§9.	<i>Analysis of ranking by number of affected Women workers.</i>
§10.	<i>Craters in the playing field—Proportions of comparisons showing discrimination</i>
§11.	<i>Endnotes</i>
CHAPTER 15 DISCRIMINATION BY INDUSTRIES – FORTY AND TWO HUNDRED SIX	
§1.	<i>The Forty Industries that discriminate extensively against Women, Blacks, Hispanics and Asians.</i>

Table of Contents

§2.	<i>The Two Hundred and Six industries that discriminate extensively against Women, Black and Hispanic workers.</i>
CHAPTER 16 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, REVERSE DISCRIMINATION AND THE STATISTICAL-LEGAL METHODOLOGY OF THIS STUDY	
§1.	<i>Has “The Most Obvious Evil” Faded Away?</i>
§2.	<i>Remembrance Of Things Present</i>
§3.	<i>Who Are the Beneficiaries of Discrimination Against Minorities?</i>
§4.	<i>Can the Methodology of This Study Identify Reverse Discrimination?</i>
§5.	<i>Can Our Methodology Be Modified To Identify “Reverse Discrimination”?</i>
§6.	<i>Supreme Court Precedents Suggest A Role for Statistics in Identifying “Reverse Discrimination.”</i>
CHAPTER 17 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
§1	<i>Conclusions</i>
§2	<i>Recommendations</i>
APPENDIX A – EEO-1 INSTRUCTIONS AND FORM	
APPENDIX B – SIC CODES	
APPENDIX C - TECHNICAL APPENDIX	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Intentional discrimination was “the most obvious evil” that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was designed to prevent. Is intentional discrimination still a potent force restricting job opportunities for women and minorities? Or, is it what University of California Regent Ward Connerly suggested in 1998, “Black Americans are not hobbled by chains any longer. We’re free to compete. We’re capable of competing. It is an absolute insult to suggest that we can’t.”¹ Which is it: a “level playing field,” or an uphill struggle for women and minorities against intentional job discrimination that favors whites/males?

This question is answered in a four year, 1,400 page study of the race color and sex of employees in large and mid sized private business establishments – **THE REALITIES OF INTENTIONAL JOB DISCRIMINATION IN METROPOLITAN AMERICA – 1999**, by Rutgers Law School Professor Alfred W. Blumrosen and adjunct Professor Ruth G. Blumrosen. Supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation to Rutgers University, the study is based on employers’ annual reports to the Federal Government involving 160,000 establishments employing 37 million workers. It involved a computer analysis of these reports combined with Supreme Court and Congressional rules to identify “patterns and practices” of intentional job discrimination of the Supreme Court and Congress.

In 1991, Congress confirmed that intentional discrimination exists when “race, color, religion, sex or national origin was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.”² “Intent to discriminate” is not the equivalent of “evil motive,” where a personal wish or desire to oppress women or minorities is the *only* explanation for the harm done. If an employer has both a legitimate reason for its practices and also a discriminatory reason, it is engaged in intentional discrimination.

The study found that intentional job discrimination continues on a major scale. Blacks, Hispanics, Asian Pacific workers and White Women who have the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience to compete are deprived of that opportunity by intentional discrimination between a quarter and a third of the time they seek such opportunities.

- In 1999, intentional discrimination affected two million minority and female workers. It exists in every region of the country, in each of nine occupational categories from officials and managers to labor and service jobs.
-

-
- Seventy five thousand establishments discriminated intentionally against 1.3 million minorities; while 60,000 establishments discriminated intentionally against 952,000 women. Despite the persistence of intentional discrimination, the majority of establishments did not appear to engage in it. As a result, minorities and women have increased their participation in the labor force and in their proportion in better paying jobs.
 - Forty industries were “equal opportunity discriminators” -- discriminating against 75% of the Blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Pacific workers and White women who were affected. The top ten of these industries were Hospitals, Eating and Drinking Places, Department Stores, Grocery Stores, Nursing and Personal Care Facilities, Computer and Data Processing Services, Hotels and Motels, Telephone Communications, Commercial Banks and Motor Vehicles and Equipment Manufacturing.
 - Medical, Drug and Health related industries alone accounted for 20% of Women, Blacks, Hispanics and Asian Pacific workers affected by discrimination.
 - Ninety percent of the affected workers were subjected to discrimination that was so severe that there was only one chance in 100 that it occurred by accident. That is far more than enough to trigger a legal presumption of intentional job discrimination.
 - Between one third and one half of this discrimination was caused by “hard core” establishments that had been discriminating for at least nine years.

§5. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Private employers of 100 or more employees and government contractors of 50 or more employees have been required to file annual reports, called EEO-1 reports, since 1966 with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Department of Labor. The study obtained computerized versions of these reports from the EEOC with the names and identifying addresses of employers expunged to preserve employer confidentiality. The statistics only identify the state and Metropolitan Statistical Area in which establishments are located.

Intentional job discrimination was identified by examining establishment reports in each metropolitan area by industry. Within each industry, nine occupational categories were examined separately. In this way, the average utilization of men and women, Blacks, Hispanics and Asians in each industry and occupational category within each metropolitan area was obtained. Establishments that were so far below the average utilization of minorities or women that it was

unlikely to have occurred by chance, stood out “like sore thumbs” in this analysis. They are presumed by law to be intentional discriminators under legal rules developed since 1977. In that year, the Supreme Court explained that a statistical imbalance, “is often a telltale sign of purposeful discrimination.... In many cases the only available avenue of proof is the use of racial statistics to uncover clandestine and covert discrimination...” In law suits, employers would have the opportunity to show that the statistics were inaccurate or that they had only good reasons for the abnormally low utilization, a burden that is difficult to satisfy. The study suggests that most establishments facing these statistics would settle rather than litigate.

Workers affected by this discrimination were measured by the difference between the number actually employed and the number that the apparent discriminator would have employed if it had employed minorities/women at the average. This is the standard the Supreme Court has applied in cases of intentional discrimination. There is no single average in the study. For each occupation in each establishment, the average utilization varies depending on the number of qualified available workers in the labor market, industry and occupation. The average is not a quota—it is a fact, showing how similar employers have employed minorities and women in the same occupation under the same labor market and industrial circumstances.

The study addresses some of the most common employer explanations for such low levels of minority and female employment, such as women aren’t interested in the work, [they are doing the same work for other similar employers]; no qualified workers were available. [qualified workers were available because they were doing the same type of work for other employers.]

§6. THE BURDEN OF DISCRIMINATION

What is the risk that a minority or woman will face discrimination because of their race, sex or national origin when seeking an employment opportunity? The study found that the probability of discrimination varied with the kind of job being sought. The table below describes the probability of discrimination by occupational category. The percentages apply each time a person sought an employment opportunity, be it employment, promotion, assignment, layoff, discharge or other employment related activities.

Risk of Discrimination because of race, sex, national origin each time a job opportunity is sought in the occupation.

	Blacks	Hispanics	Asian	Women
Officials and Managers	26.6%	21.8%	24.6%	18%
Professionals	27.6%	20.7%	30.8%	23%
Technical workers	29.1%	21.9%	30.2%	23%
Sales	39.5%	28.1%	27.3%	20%
Office and Clerical	31.8%	21.8%	26.4%	19%
Craft workers (skilled)	28.7%	27.1%	35.0%	37%
Operatives (semi skilled)	33.2%	33.4%	42.8%	38%
Laborers	34.9%	34.4%	43.6%	30%
Service workers	40.3%	34.0%	38.1%	19%
All comparisons	34.1%	35.0%	39.0%	23%

§7. BLACK WORKERS MOST SERIOUSLY AFFECTED

Despite the initial focus of the Civil Rights Act on Black workers, and the improvement that has taken place since, Black workers still bear the severest brunt of this discrimination. They constitute less than half of all minority workers reported, but they were 57% of all workers affected by discrimination. Fifteen percent of all Black workers were so affected in 1999, while 11 % of both Hispanics and Asian Pacific workers were affected.

- Thirty five thousand business establishments discriminated against 586,000 Blacks. Ninety percent of these Black workers were affected by establishments that were so far below the average utilization that there was only a 1 in 100 chance that this happened by accident and half by "hard core" employers who had been discriminating for at least nine years.
 - Hispanic workers were 33% of minority workers reported, and they constituted 28% of those affected by discrimination or 283,000 workers.
 - Asian Pacific workers were 17% of the minorities, and 15% -- or nearly 150,000 -- of those affected by discrimination.
 - The data about Native American workers was too sparse to draw conclusions.
-

§8. IMPROVEMENT IN PROPORTION OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN EMPLOYED BETWEEN 1975 AND 1999

The bright spot in this study of intentional discrimination, is that between 1975 and 1999, minorities increased their participation in the labor force by 4.6 million workers beyond the increase resulting from economic growth; and women similarly increased their participation by 3.8 million workers. In absolute numbers, minorities went from 4 million workers in 1975 to more than 11 million in 1999; women went from 8 million workers in '75 to 17.5 million in 1999. More important, all groups increased their share of “better jobs” as officials, managers, professionals, technical and sales workers.

§9. FORTY INDUSTRIES THAT WERE ‘EQUAL OPPORTUNITY DISCRIMINATORS’

The study identified 40 industries that were “equal opportunity discriminators,” discriminating against more than 75% of the Black, Hispanic, Asian, and White Women workers affected by discrimination.

[Continued on next page.]

FORTY INDUSTRIES' INTENTIONAL DISCRIMINATION* AGAINST WOMEN, BLACKS, HISPANICS, AND ASIANS, SHOWING AFFECTED WORKERS** AND DISCRIMINATION RISK BY INDUSTRY***										
SIC	Industry	WOMEN		BLACKS		HISPANICS		ASIANS		AFFECTED WORKERS
		#	%Rsk	#	%Rsk	#	%Rsk	#	%Rsk*	
806	Hospitals	63,908	21%	89,314	41%	19,562	22%	23,719	36%	196,503
581	Eating and Drinking Places	35,370	19%	55,591	43%	43,702	40%	3,530	40%	138,193
531	Department Stores	42,271	22%	50,959	37%	20,615	29%	5,414	31%	119,259
541	Grocery Stores	28,253	14%	53,333	41%	20,681	33%	1,559	24%	103,827
805	Nursing and Personal Care Facilities	13,865	14%	39,429	35%	7,247	34%	5,508	34%	66,049
737	Computer and Data Processing Services	31,114	26%	8,206	28%	1,986	27%	16,637	36%	57,943
701	Hotels and Motels	13,127	17%	17,960	29%	18,651	25%	6,471	32%	56,208
481	Telephone Communication	29,394	30%	19,857	32%	3,654	25%	2,886	33%	55,791
602	Commercial Banks	18,673	18%	20,131	37%	4,006	23%	4,821	30%	47,632
371	Motor Vehicles and Equipment	18,084	32%	14,470	36%	3,206	32%	1,732	37%	37,492
367	Electronic Components and Accessories	11,965	26%	3,001	33%	5,808	23%	11,748	35%	32,522
421	Trucking & Courier Services, Ex. Air	10,119	42%	15,842	35%	5,304	26%	501	32%	31,766
451	Air Transportation, Scheduled	15,651	32%	8,597	30%	4,057	22%	2,768	33%	31,073
308	Miscellaneous Plastics Products	11,109	33%	4,662	33%	7,216	35%	2,559	49%	25,547
514	Groceries and Related Products	11,184	32%	4,783	34%	6,077	32%	534	36%	22,577
809	Health and Allied Services	10,329	21%	6,767	35%	2,063	29%	1,478	32%	20,638
633	Fire, Marine, and Casualty Insurance	7,858	18%	4,012	22%	772	20%	754	32%	13,395
632	Medical Service and Health Insurance	5,733	19%	5,751	28%	914	21%	944	26%	13,341
372	Aircraft and Parts	5,901	29%	1,443	34%	2,611	17%	2,497	35%	12,453
357	Computer and Office Equipment	5,814	27%	1,310	28%	1,066	21%	4,170	32%	12,360
594	Miscellaneous Shopping Goods Stores	6,186	30%	3,216	36%	1,888	33%	619	28%	11,909
621	Security Brokers and Dealers	7,506	21%	2,277	29%	817	23%	1,122	21%	11,723
384	Medical Instruments and Supplies	5,474	25%	1,012	27%	1,821	27%	2,995	31%	11,301
871	Engineering & Architectural Services	6,487	23%	1,792	25%	715	18%	2,235	25%	11,229
504	Professional & Commercial Equipment	6,440	26%	1,984	26%	977	25%	1,632	29%	11,033
366	Communications Equipment	4,500	25%	1,269	20%	978	20%	3,839	36%	10,585
283	Drugs	5,301	23%	1,718	25%	1,185	24%	2,301	31%	10,504
801	Offices & Clinics Of Medical Doctors	4,936	19%	2,987	33%	1,028	22%	1,419	27%	10,370
275	Commercial Printing	4,869	29%	1,984	31%	1,486	31%	878	43%	9,216
201	Meat Products	2,286	32%	1,720	33%	3,517	28%	916	58%	8,439
641	Insurance Agents, Brokers, & Service	3,943	19%	2,768	30%	756	25%	756	25%	8,222
349	Misc. Fabricated Metal Products	3,440	35%	1,511	30%	1,683	29%	835	39%	7,469
836	Residential Care	2,481	21%	3,449	33%	854	28%	378	35%	7,163
267	Misc. Converted Paper Products	3,505	33%	1,511	30%	1,516	33%	456	44%	6,988
344	Fabricated Structural Metal Products	2,242	37%	1,660	33%	2,476	32%	511	48%	6,888
489	Communication Services	2,530	30%	1,322	27%	1,474	29%	1,474	29%	6,800
271	Newspapers	2,924	19%	2,094	37%	1,016	26%	337	31%	6,372
501	Motor Vehicles, Parts, and Supplies	2,579	29%	1,354	30%	1,010	31%	1,010	31%	5,953
209	Misc. Food and Kindred Products	2,024	32%	1,119	35%	2,091	25%	695	43%	5,930
225	Knitting Mills	1,396	34%	1,043	34%	700	46%	414	59%	3,553
Total affected workers		470,773		463,206		207,186		125,052		1,266,217
31% reduction for minority women included in Women totals		(145,940)								1,120,277
Percent of all affected Workers		75%		79%		73%		84%		77%
* Discrimination 1.65 or more standard deviations.										
**Affected Workers are the difference between employment in same labor market and occupation at 2 or more standard deviations below average, and number who would have been employed if establishment had employed at the average.										
***Risk based on proportion of comparisons of establishments in same labor market and occupation.										

Additional highlights of the Study include:

- The largest number of establishments discriminating against both minorities and women employed between 100 and 500 workers. 22,000 establishments of that size discriminated against minorities, 20,000 against women. These establishments contributed about half the intentional job discrimination against both minorities and women.
- Separate studies for each state and each metropolitan area where there is data are included in the nationwide study. “Discrimination, like politics, is essentially local,” the study states. “We hope this material will be studied by

those interested in civil rights to try to address this discrimination in each state and metro area.”

§10. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STILL NECESSARY

The study concludes that intentional discrimination is still so pervasive that affirmative action programs continue to be necessary. “ It is impossible to address the 75,000 establishments through formal law enforcement efforts. Congress was right in 1964 to make voluntary action the preferred means of improving opportunity for minorities and women, and it was right when it reaffirmed that principle in 1991.” Affirmative action programs are intended to allow employers who have reason to be concerned that they might be discriminating to take steps to correct their practices.

The statistics from this study will be helpful to all groups concerned with employment discrimination, the Study concludes. Employers would like to know where they stand compared to others; enforcement agencies and courts may use the information and those interested in civil rights can measure progress using the data. However, the Blumrosens doubt that the Federal Government, under either a Republican or Democratic administration is likely to use the study in ways they have suggested.

To address the needs of employers and workers, the Blumrosens have incorporated as EEO1.Inc., to make information available without identifying the names and addresses of any employer. The Study will be published on the web site, EEO1.com. This site will also include a program, the Discrimination Calculator, to enable workers and their representatives to find the likelihood of discrimination in labor markets, industries and occupations of interest to them without cost. Employers who are interested in comparative data and others who are entitled to it, may consult EE01.com to find out how to obtain such data.

§11. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Employers** should demand access to information that will tell them where they stand compared to similar employers so that they can decide whether to take affirmative action; they should insist that they be free to take such action whenever the statistics warrant it. Industries that exhibit serious discrimination should establish programs to assist their members whose employment practices tarnish the industry reputation.
 2. **The Federal Government** should provide statistical information to employers so that they will know where they stand; adopt a five year enforcement program
-

based on the statistical analysis and incorporate state and local government efforts, focusing on the 40 and 206 industries identified in the Study, and seeking increased employment, leaving litigation over damages to the private bar. They should also extend the reporting requirement to all establishments with 50 or more employees.

3. **Congress** should mandate these federal programs, and provide additional funding to proceed against the 206 industries, and extend the reporting requirements to identify the age of employees, to facilitate enforcement of the age discrimination act.
 4. **The Federal Courts** should recognize the prevalence of intentional job discrimination in constitutional and statutory decisions on affirmative action; reconsider the assumption that employers are likely to adopt rigid programs without individualized proof that such was the case and recognize that intentional discrimination appears to reflect the unwillingness of roughly one third of establishments to work with people who are not “White.”
 5. **State and Local Civil Rights Agencies** should secure EEO-1 data, urge interested groups to examine this study and initiate actions in their state based on the information. In addition, they should cooperate with the federal and other state agencies in enforcement programs; support affirmative action where statistics justify it, and encourage state and federal legislative leaders to address the prevalence of intentional discrimination as identified in this study.
 6. **Civil Rights and Women’s organizations** should use this study in public discussions of discrimination; cooperate with each other in legislative and other public affairs because they have a mutual interest in eliminating job discrimination, particularly in the 40 industries that discriminate against all the groups they represent; evaluate government programs more by how many jobs are obtained and less by how many cases are processed, or how many dollars individual workers obtain; demand a focused set of governmental programs to address the 40/206 industries, and support expansion of the EEO-1 reports to the age act and all establishments of 50 or more workers.
 7. **Lawyers for both workers and employers** should develop a fair arbitration system for dealing with individual discrimination cases, so that resources can be focused on patterns or practices of discrimination.
 8. **Universities, colleges, high schools and research oriented institutions** should make use of this study in research activities, and should integrate this study into the work of other disciplines concerned with labor relations and human behavior.
-

§12. ENDNOTES

-
1. Interview on “60 Minutes” by Mike Wallace, Aug.2, 1998, transcript, p. 22.
 2. Sec. 703 (m) of Title VII.
-