

Employment Law for Business

Third Edition

Dawn D. Bennett-Alexander

Laura P. Hartman



THIRD EDITION

EMPLOYMENT LAW FOR BUSINESS

Dawn D. Bennett-Alexander

University of Georgia

Laura Pincus Hartman

DePaul University



Boston, Massachusetts Burr Ridge, Illinois Dubuque, Iowa Madison, Wisconsin
New York, New York San Francisco, California St. Louis, Missouri

Irwin/McGraw-Hill

A Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies

EMPLOYMENT LAW FOR BUSINESS

Published by Irwin/McGraw-Hill, an imprint of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY, 10020. Copyright © 2001, 1998, 1995, by The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a data base or retrieval system, without the prior written consent of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., including, but not limited to, in any network or other electronic storage or transmission, or broadcast for distance learning. Some ancillaries, including electronic and print components, may not be available to customers outside the United States.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 DOC/DOC 0 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

ISBN 0072314036

Vice president/Editor-in-chief: *Michael W. Junior*

Sponsoring editor: *Andy Winston*

Editorial assistant: *Sara Strand*

Marketing manager: *Brad Schultz*

Project manager: *Paula Krausz*

Production supervisor: *Gina Hangos*

Coordinator freelance design: *Laurie Entringer*

Supplement coordinator: *Susan Lombardi*

New media: *Barb Block*

Designer: *Michael Warrell*

Compositor: *ElectraGraphics, Inc.*

Typeface: *10/12 Times Roman*

Printer: *R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company*

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Bennett-Alexander, Dawn.

Employment law for business / Dawn D. Bennett-Alexander, Laura Pincus Hartman.—

3rd ed.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-07-231403-6

1. Labor laws and legislation—United States. 2. Discrimination in employment—Law and legislation--United States. I. Hartman, Laura Pincus. II. Title.

KF3455 .B46 2001

344.7301—dc21

00-027780

<http://www.mhcollege.com>

To:

Rev. William H Bennett, Sr.

January 9, 1911–August 3, 1998.

“Love” doesn’t even *begin* to describe it . . .

D D B-A

To those among us who will make this world a more peaceful and loving place to work for my children, as well as for all of your sons and daughters—whatever be their race, religion, gender, or ability.

L P H

Dawn D. Bennett-Alexander, Esq., is an award-winning tenured associate professor of Employment Law and Legal Studies at the University of Georgia's Terry College of Business and an attorney admitted to practice in the District of Columbia and six federal jurisdictions. She is a *cum laude* graduate of the Howard University School of Law and a *magna cum laude* graduate of the Federal City College, now the University of the District of Columbia. She was cofounder and cochair, with her coauthor, of the Employment and Labor Law Section of the Academy of Legal Studies in Business; present coeditor of the section's Employment and Labor Law Quarterly; past coeditor of the section's newsletter; and past president of the Southeastern Academy of Legal Studies in Business. Bennett-Alexander taught employment law in the University of North Florida's MBA program from 1982–87 and has been conducting employment law seminars for managers and supervisors since 1985. Prior to teaching, Bennett-Alexander worked at the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the White House Domestic Council, the US Federal Trade Commission, Antioch School of Law, and as law clerk to the Honorable Julia Cooper Mack (retired) at the highest court in the District of Columbia, the D.C. Court of Appeals. Bennett-Alexander publishes widely in the employment law area, is a noted ex-

pert on employment law issues, was asked to write the first ever sexual harassment entry for *Grolier Encyclopedia*, edited the National Employee Rights Institute's definitive book on federal employment, has been widely quoted on TV, radio, and in the print press, including *USA Today*, the *Wall Street Journal*, *Fortune* magazine, and is a founder of Practical Diversity, consultants on diversity and employment law issues. Bennett-Alexander is a 2000–2001 recipient of the Fulbright Scholar Fellowship through which she will teach law in Ghana and conduct research on race and gender in employment in a homogeneous society.

Laura Pincus Hartman, J.D., is an associate professor of legal studies and ethics at DePaul University and is DePaul's Assistant Vice-President for Academic Program Development. She recently held the Grainger Chair of Business Ethics at the University of Wisconsin–Madison and was the director of Executive Education for its Human Resource Management and Development programs. Hartman is also past director of DePaul University's Institute for Business and Professional Ethics and held the Wicklander Chair in Professional Ethics at DePaul's Kellstadt Graduate School of Business, where she won the University's Excellence in Teaching award and was chair of the university's Public Service Council. Hartman has also served as an adjunct profes-

sor of business law and ethics at Northwestern's Kellogg Graduate School of Management.

Hartman's teaching responsibilities have included Business Ethics, Employment Law, Human Resource Management, Business Law, Antitrust Law, and Corporate Communication and Crisis Management, among other courses. Hartman graduated *magna cum laude* from Tufts University and the University of Chicago Law School and is a member of the Illinois bar. She is co-founder and past cochair (with Dawn) of the Employment and Labor Law Section of the Academy of Legal Studies in Business, was coeditor of the section's *Employment and Labor Law Newsletter*, and served as president of the Midwest Academy of Legal Studies in Business for the 1994–1995 term.

Hartman has done extensive research on the ethics of the employment relationship, employee rights, and employer responsibilities and has published the first business school textbook in the field, *Employment Law for Business*, as well as *Perspectives in Business Ethics* and other textbooks. She has also published articles in, among other journals, the *Academy of Management Executive*, *Hofstra Law Review*, the *Columbia Business Law Journal*, the *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, the *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, the *American Business Law Journal*, the *Labor Law Journal*, the *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*, and the *Journal of Legal Studies Education*.

Preface to the First Edition

If a disabled employee could perform the job requirements when hired, but the job has progressed and the employee is no longer able to perform, must the employer keep her on?

- Is an employer liable when a supervisor sexually harasses an employee, but the employer knew nothing of it?
- Is an employer liable for racial discrimination because she terminates a black male who refuses to abide by the “no-beard” rule?
- Can an employer be successfully sued for “reverse discrimination” by an employee who feels harmed by the employer’s affirmative action plan?
- How far can an employer go in instituting a dress code?
- If an employer has two equally qualified applicants from which to choose and prefers the white one to the black one, is it illegal discrimination for the employer to hire the white applicant, or must the employer hire the black one?
- Must an employer send to training the employee who is in line to attend, if that employee will retire shortly?
- Must an employer keep an employee

known to be HIV positive when other employees fear for their own health because of their exposure to the HIV-positive employee?

- Is it a violation of wage and hour laws for an employer to hire his 13-year-old daughter to pick strawberries during the summer?
- Is an ex-employer liable for defamation if he gives a negative recommendation about an ex-employee to a potential employer who inquires?
- Must an employer disclose to employees that chemicals with which they work are potentially harmful?
- Can an employer stop employees from forming a union?

These types of questions, which are routinely decided in workplaces everyday, can have devastating financial and productivity consequences if mishandled by the employer. Yet few employers or their managers and supervisors are equipped to handle them well. That is why this textbook was created.

Between fiscal years 1970 when newly enacted job discrimination legislation cases started to rise and 1983, the number of federal discrimination suits grew from fewer than 350 per year to around

9,000 per year. This is an astonishing 2,166 percent growth in the volume of discrimination suits, compared with only 125 percent growth in general federal civil cases for the same period. A major factor in this statistic is that the groups protected by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and similar legislation, including minorities, women, and white males over 40, now constitute over 70 percent of the total workforce. Add to that number those protected by laws addressing disability, wages and hours, unions, workplace environmental right-to-know laws, tort laws, occupational safety and health and tort laws, and the percentage increases even more. There was a 95.7 percent increase from 1969's 45.84 million such employees to 1989's 89.70 million employees.

It is good that employers and employees alike are now getting the benefits derived from having a safer, fairer workplace and one more reflective of the population's diversity. However, this is not without its attendant challenges. One of those challenges is reflected in the statistics given above. With the advent of workplace regulation by the government, particularly the Civil Rights Act of 1964, there is more of an expectation by employees of certain basic rights in the workplace. When these expectations are not met, and the affected population comprises more than 70 percent of the workforce, problems and their attendant litigation will be high.

Plaintiffs won 57% of lawsuits brought for wrongful termination based on race, gender, and disability discrimination in the seven-year period between 1988 and 1995. The median compensatory damage award was more than \$100,000. Much of the litigation and liability arising in the area covered by these statistics is avoidable. Many times the only difference between an employer being sued or not is a manager or supervisor who recognizes that the decision being made may lead to unnecessary litigation and thus avoids it.

We have seen what types of employment law problems are most prevalent in the workplace from our extensive experience in the classroom, in

our research and writing, as well as in conducting over the years many employment seminars for managers, supervisors, business owners, equal employment opportunity officers, human resources personnel, general counsels, and others. We have seen how management most often strays from appropriate considerations and treads on thin legal ice, exposing them to potential increased liability. We came to realize that many of the mistakes were based on ignorance rather than malice. Often it was simply not knowing that a decision was being handled incorrectly.

Becoming more aware of potential liability does not mean the employer is not free to make legitimate workplace decisions. It simply means that those decisions are handled appropriately in ways that lessen or avoid liability. The problem does not lie in not being able to terminate the female who is chronically late for work, because the employer thinks she will sue for gender discrimination. Rather, the challenge lies in doing it in a way that precludes her from being able to file a successful claim. It does not mean the employer must retain her, despite her failure to adequately meet workplace expectations and requirements. It means simply that the employer must make certain the termination is beyond reproach. If the employee has performed in a way that results in termination, this should be documentable and, therefore, defensible.

Termination of the employee under such circumstances should present no problem, assuming similarly situated employees have been treated consistently in the same manner. The employer is free to make the management decisions necessary to run the business, but she or he simply does so correctly.

Knowing how to do so correctly doesn't just happen. It must be learned. We set out to create a textbook aimed at anyone who would, or presently does, manage people. Knowing what is in this book is a necessity. For those already in the workplace, your day is filled with one awkward situation after another—for which you wish you had the answers. For those in school, you will soon be

in the workplace, and in the not-too-distant future you will likely be in a position managing others. We cannot promise answers to every one of your questions, but we can promise that we will provide the information and basic considerations in most areas that will help you arrive at an informed, reasonable, and defensible answer about which you can feel more comfortable. You will not walk away feeling as if you rolled the dice when you made a workplace decision, then wait with anxiety to see if the decision will backfire in some way.

In an effort to best inform employers of the reasoning behind legal requirements and to provide a basis for making decisions in “gray areas,” we often provide background in relevant social or political movements, or both, as well as in legislative history and other relevant considerations. Law is not created in a vacuum, and this information gives the law context so the purpose is more easily understood. Often understanding why a law exists can help an employer make the correct choices in interpreting the law when making workplace decisions with no clear-cut answers.

Legal cases are used to illustrate important concepts; however, we realize that it is the managerial aspects of the concepts with which you must deal. Therefore, we took great pains to try to rid the cases of unnecessary “legalese” and procedural matters that would be more relevant to a lawyer or law student. We also follow each case with questions designed to aid in thinking critically about the issues involved from an employer’s standpoint, rather than from a purely legal standpoint. We understand that *how* employers make their decisions has a great impact on the decisions made. Therefore, our case-end questions are designed as critical-thinking questions to get the student to go beyond the legal concepts and think critically about management issues. This process of learning to analyze and think critically about issues from different points of view will greatly enhance student decision-making abilities as future managers or business owners. Addressing the issues in the way they are likely to arise in life greatly enhances that ability.

It is one thing to know that the law prohibits gender discrimination in employment. It is quite another to recognize such discrimination when it occurs and govern oneself accordingly. For instance, a female employee says she cannot use a “filthy” toilet, which is the only one at the work site. The employer can dismiss the complaint and tell the employee she must use the toilet, and perhaps later be held liable for gender discrimination. Or the employer can think of what implications this may have, given that this is a female employee essentially being denied a right that male employees have in access to a usable toilet. The employer then realizes there may be a problem and is more likely to make the better decision.

This seemingly unlikely scenario is based on an actual case, which you will later read. It is a great example of how simple but unexpected decisions can create liability in surprising ways. Knowing the background and intent of a law often can help in situations where the answer to the problem may not be readily apparent. Including the law in your thinking can help the thought process for making well-founded decisions.

We also have included boxed items from easily accessible media sources that you come across every day, such as *People* magazine and the *USA Today* newspaper. The intent is to demonstrate how the matters discussed are interesting and integrated into everyday life, yet they can have serious repercussions for employers.

Much of today’s litigation results from workplace decisions arising from unfortunate ideas about various groups, and from lack of awareness about what may result in litigation. We do not want to take away anyone’s right to think whatever they wish about whomever they wish, but we do want to teach that those thoughts may result in legal trouble when they are acted on.

Something new and innovative must be done if we are to break the cycle of insensitivity, and myopia that results in spiraling numbers of unnecessary lawsuits. Part of breaking this cycle is language and using terminology that more accurately reflects those considerations. We have,

therefore, in a rather unorthodox move, taken the offensive and created a path, rather than followed one.

For instance, the term *sex* is used in this text to mean sex only in a purely sexual sense. The term *gender* is used to distinguish males from females. With the increasing use of sexual harassment as a cause of action, it became confusing to continue to speak of “sex” as meaning gender, particularly when it adds to the confusion to understand that sex need *not* be present in a sexual harassment claim, but gender differences *are* required. For instance, to say that a claim must be based on “a difference in treatment based on sex” leaves it unclear as to whether it means gender or sexual activity. Since it actually means gender, we have made such clarifications. Also, use of the term *sex* in connection with gender discrimination cases, the majority of which are brought by women, continues to inject sexuality into the equation of women and work. This, in turn, contributes to keeping women and sexuality connected in an inappropriate setting (employment). Further, it does so at a time when there is an attempt to decrease such connections and, instead, concentrate on the applicant’s qualifications for the job.

So, too, with the term *homosexuality*. In this text, the term *affinity orientation* is used, instead. The traditional term emphasizes, for one group and not others, the highly personal yet generally irrelevant issue of the employee’s sexuality. The use of the term sets up those within that group for consideration as different (usually interpreted to be “less than”), when they may well be qualified for the job and otherwise acceptable. With sexuality being highlighted in referring to them, it becomes difficult to think of them in any other light. The term also continues to pander to the historically more sensational or titillating aspects of the applicant’s personal life choices and uses it to color their entire life when all that should be of interest is ability to do the job. Using more appropriate terminology will hopefully keep the focus on that ability.

The term “*disabled*” is used, rather than

“*handicapped*,” to conform to the more enlightened view taken by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. It gets away from the old notion that those who were differently abled went “cap in hand” looking for handouts. Rather, it recognizes the importance of including in employment these 43 million Americans who can contribute to the workplace.

There is also a diligent effort to use gender-inclusive or neutral terminology—for example, police officers, rather than policemen; firefighters, rather than firemen; servers, rather than waiters or waitresses; flight attendants, rather than stewards or stewardesses. We urge you to add to the list and use such language in your conversations. To use different terminology for males and females performing the same job reflects a gender difference when there is no need to do so. If, as the law requires, it is irrelevant because it is the job itself on which we wish to focus, then our language should reflect this.

It is not simply a matter of terminology. Terminology is powerful. It conveys ideas to us about the matter spoken of. To the extent we change our language to be more neutral when referring to employees, it will be easier to change our ingrained notions of the “appropriateness” of traditional employment roles based on gender, sexuality, or other largely irrelevant criteria and make employment discrimination laws more effective.

This conscious choice of language also is not a reflection of temporal “political correctness” considerations. It goes far beyond what terming something “politically correct” tends to do. These changes in terminology are substantive and non-trivial changes that attempt to have language reflect reality, rather than have our reality shaped and limited by the language we use. Being sensitive to the matter of language can help make us more sensitive to what stands behind the words. That is an important aid in avoiding liability and obeying the law.

The best way to determine what an employer must do to avoid liability for employment decisions is to look at cases to see what courts have

used to determine previous liability. This is why we have provided many and varied cases for you to consider. Much care has been taken to make the cases not only relevant, informative, and illustrative but also interesting, up-to-date, and easy to read. There is a good mix of new cases, along with the old “standards” that still define an area. We have assiduously tried to avoid legalese and intricate legal consideration. Instead, we emphasize the legal managerial aspects of cases—that is, what does the case mean that management should or should not do to be best protected from violating the law?

We wanted the textbook to be informative, readable, and a resource, to encourage critical and creative thinking about workplace problems, and to sensitize you to the need for effective workplace management. We think we have accomplished our goal. We hope the text is as interesting and informative for you to read and use as it was exciting and challenging for us to write.

We *sincerely* would like to know what you think. We urge you to write and let us know—good or bad—your thoughts.

Dawn D. Bennett-Alexander

Terry College of Business
University of Georgia
202 Brooks Hall
Athens, GA 30602-6255
(706) 542-4290
E-mail: dawndba@terry.uga.edu

Laura P. Hartman


Executive Offices
DePaul University
55 E. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604-2787
(312) 362-6569
E-mail: lhartman@wppost.depaul.edu

Preface to the Third Edition

My, how time flies and things just keep getting better! When we first published this book in 1995, there were virtually no courses in employment law in the country. Our publisher believed so much in our mantra, “If we write it, they will come,” that they promised to allow the book to go into second edition even if the first edition did not meet their modest projections. They took the long view and agreed to try to hang in there with us until the market caught on. Well, the first edition outstripped all projections, and the second edition did even better. It caught on. Then it zoomed. Once there was a text to use, the classes came and people understood how incredibly important this subject matter is to anyone managing people today. As we enter the new millennium, our population becoming ever more diverse, we must do more than pay lip service to the issue of diversity. Rather, we must understand that it will be increasingly vital to the very continued existence of business as we know it. We are pleased to be able to aid students, managers, and others in their quest for understanding these issues and avoiding unnecessary liability.

Thank you for helping to make our dream—a textbook that would give students, managers, human resources professionals and others the answers they needed in language they could understand and relate to—a successful reality. We feel like many of you were there with us from the first edition and have made this incredible journey into a new discipline with us. We very much appreciate your support in every way.

With this third edition, we have listened to your suggestions, which we encourage, and have incorporated a great many of them. In addition to updating the material, in this edition we have added pedagogical tools that we think will be even more helpful in using the textbook:

- There are many new cases.
- We have added case cites to many chapter-end questions.
- We have added more website notations.
- We have added nonlegal writings in selected areas to help you focus on some of the less obvious issues which greatly underscore the subject matter.
- We have put our website notations on a webpage dedicated to the text which can be easily updated.
-  Look for this icon near topics that have additional Internet resources on the book’s website (www.mhhe.com/emplaw).

We hope you have as much enjoyment reading the text as we had writing it. Either way, let us know.

Dawn D. Bennett-Alexander, Esq.
Athens, GA
April 20, 2000

The authors would like to honor and thank the following individuals, without whose assistance and support this text would never have been written: McGraw-Hill Higher Education editorial support, including Craig Beytien, executive editor, for having the insight and courage to sign the first employment law text of its kind before many others were able to see the vast but undeniable merit of doing so; and Sara Strand, editorial assistant. For their contributions to making the third edition better than ever, special thanks to Mark O. Flaherty, Old Dominion University; Denise Leigh, Phoenix Community College (Gainesville, FL); Lewis Tanner, University of Georgia; Anne Levy, Michigan State University; and a *very* special thank you to Diane Bradley, trial attorney extraordinaire for the District of Columbia office of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and adjunct professor of Employment Law at the University of Maryland. Diane's contributions to this edition, particularly chapter 3, were insightful, cogent, timely and selfless. Thank you *very much* Diane. Finally, we would like to thank the scholars who have class tested and reviewed this manuscript, including the following:

Curt Behrens	<i>Northern Illinois University</i>
George Biles	<i>American University</i>

Michael Garrison	<i>North Dakota State University</i>
Andrea Giampetro-Meyer	<i>Loyola College of Maryland</i>
John Gray	<i>Loyola College of Maryland</i>
Marsha Hass	<i>College of Charleston</i>
Roger Johns	<i>Eastern New Mexico State University</i>
Eileen Kelly	<i>Louisiana State University</i>
Nancy Kubasek	<i>Bowling Green State University</i>
Tony McAdams	<i>University of Northern Iowa</i>
James Morgan	<i>California State University—Chico</i>
Gregory Mosier	<i>Oklahoma State University</i>
Patricia Pattison	<i>University of Wyoming</i>
Kenneth Schneyer	<i>Johnson & Wales University</i>
Benjamin Weeks	<i>St. Xavier College</i>

Bennett-Alexander: I would like to thank (1) my co-author, Laura Pincus Hartman, one of my very favorite people in the whole world, for her wonderful enthusiasm, intellect, energy, support, and hard work; (2) my daughters Jenniffer Dawn Bennett Alexander, Anne Alexis Bennett Alexander and Tess Alexandra Bennett Harrison for being my special gifts from above and for knowing that my favorite thing in the whole world is

being their Mama—even though they drive me crazy; (3) Linda F. Harrison, without whose laughter the world would be a much different, less fun, place and for whom I have only five words: “Oh! What *kind* of eggs?”; (4) my siblings, Brenda Bennett Watkins, Gale C. Bennett Harris, Barbara Jean Bennett Bethea and Rev. Dr. William H. Bennett II, for their unwavering confidence, love, support and laughs; (5) my department chair, Dr. Sandra G. Gustavson, who continues to be so supportive in so many ways; (6) the thousands of managers, supervisors, employers and employees who have shared their experiences and insights over the years; (7) my colleagues from across the country who have been so supportive of this text; and last but not least, (8) my students, who are a never-ending source of utter wonder, insight, and fun for me. Do we have a good time, or what?

This text is immeasurably richer for having the contributions of each of you.

DDB-A

I, Laura, am grateful for the assistance of a multitude of individuals who have helped to bring the third edition of this text to fruition. First, I would like to commend the efforts of my assistant Kimberly Tenerelli who methodically, precisely, and never begrudgingly cite-checked and helped to update this new edition. Without her attention to detail, her careful consideration of the context, and her patience with my requests, this book would be significantly different and inferior. I am also beholden to Robyn Berkley for her input and materials in connection with the segment on probationary employees and to Richard Henquinet for his assistance with the ADA accommodations material. On a more personal note, I couldn't imagine going through this life without the nurturing friendship, support, and coaxing of my co-author, Dawn. I am also continually astonished at the graces that have allowed me to share my life with my husband, David, and my daughters, Rachel and Emma. Everyone should be so blessed.

LPH

PART I

**THE REGULATION OF THE
EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP 1**

1 The Regulation of Employment 2

Introduction to the Regulatory Environment	3
Is Regulation Necessary?	4
Background—The Employment-at-Will Doctrine	9
Exceptions to the At-Will Doctrine	12
The Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act	12
Violation of Public Policy	13
Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing	20
Breach of Implied Contract	22
Introduction to Wrongful Discharge	28
Constructive Discharge	28
Wrongful Discharge Based on Other Tort Liability	29
The Model Uniform Employment Termination Act	29
Management Considerations	31
Summary	32
Chapter-End Questions	33

2 The Employer–Employee Relationship: Definitions and Distinctions 38

Introduction to the Issue	39
Origins in Agency Law	40
Why Is It Important to Determine Whether a Worker Is an Employee?	41
Employer Payroll Deductions	41
Benefits	42
Discrimination and Affirmative Action	42
Cost Reductions	43
Failure to Appropriately Categorize Worker	44
How Do You Determine Whether a Worker Is an Employee?	45
Contingent or Temporary Workers	59
Employment Probation	60
Who Constitutes an Employer?	61
The Civil Rights Act of 1866	62
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964	62
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964	62
Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967	63
Rehabilitation Act of 1973	63

Management Considerations	63
Summary	67
Chapter-End Questions	67

PART II

REGULATION OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT 71

3 Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 73

Statutory Basis	74
A Historic Rights Act	74
The Structure of Title VII	80
What Is Prohibited under Title VII	80
Who Must Comply	80
Who Is Covered	80
Who Is Not Covered	81
Filing Claims under Title VII	82
Judicial Review	85
Remedies	85
Jury Trials	87
Theoretical Bases for Title VII	
Lawsuits	87
Disparate Treatment	87
Disparate Impact	90
An Important Note	101
Summary	103
Chapter-End Questions	104

4 Title VII: The Beginning of the Employment Relationship 105

Management Concerns in Recruitment	106
Recruitment	106
Federal Statutory Regulation of Recruitment	108
State Employment Law Regulation	108
Common Law	111
Application of Regulation to Recruitment Practices	113
Preferential Treatment	122
Information Gathering and Selection	124

The Application Process	124
The Interview	125
Background or Reference Check, Negligent Hiring	126
Reference Checks: Potential for Defamation	132
Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures	133
Documentation of Failure to Hire	133
Administration	134
Summary	135
Chapter-End Questions	136

5 Affirmative Action 139

Statutory Basis	140
The Design and Unstable History	141
Introduction	142
Executive Order 11246	149
Penalties for Noncompliance	151
Judicial Affirmative Action Plan Requirements	152
Who Can Receive Benefits under Affirmative Action Plans?	159
Reverse Discrimination	164
Valuing Diversity/Multiculturalism	171
Summary	176
Chapter-End Questions	177

6 Race Discrimination 178

Statutory Basis	179
Below the "Glass Ceiling"	179
General Considerations	184
Recognizing Race Discrimination	185
Racial Harassment	192
A Word about Color	194
The Reconstruction Civil Rights Acts	196
42 U.S.C. Section 1981	197
Other Reconstruction Civil Rights Acts	199
Summary	201
Chapter-End Questions	202

7 Gender Discrimination 204

- Statutory Basis 205
- Does It Really Exist? 206
- Gender Discrimination in General 209
- Recognizing Gender Discrimination 214
- “Gender-Plus” Discrimination 219
- Gender Issues 220
 - Gender Stereotyping 221
 - Grooming Codes 224
 - Customer or Employee Preferences 226
 - Logistical Considerations 227
 - Equal Pay and Comparable Worth 229
- Gender as a BFOQ 236
- Pregnancy Discrimination 237
- Parental Leave Policies 242
- Fetal Protection Policies 246
- Summary 249
- Chapter-End Questions 249

8 Sexual Harassment 251

- Statutory Basis 252
- Since Eden . . . and Counting 252
 - Where Do Sexual Harassment Considerations Leave the Employer? 257
- Sexual Harassment in General 257
- Quid Pro Quo Sexual Harassment 266
- Hostile Environment Sexual Harassment 274
 - Unwelcome Activity 277
 - Severe and Pervasive Requirement 279
 - Perspective Used to Determine Severity 284
 - “Sexual” Requirement Explained 288
- Employer Liability for Sexual Harassment 290
- Other Important Considerations 297
 - Determining the Truth of Allegations 297
 - Retaliation and Employee Privacy 298

- Corrective Action 298
- Damages and Jury Trials 298
- Tort and Criminal Liability 303
- Summary 305
- Chapter-End Questions 305

9 Affinity Orientation Discrimination 307

- Statutory Basis 308
- Out of the Closet 308
- Affinity Orientation as a Basis for Adverse Employment Decisions 319
- Same Gender Sexual Harassment 326
- Transsexual Discrimination 327
- Employment Benefits 332
- Management Considerations 334
- Summary 338
- Chapter-End Questions 339

10 Religious Discrimination 340

- Statutory Basis 341
- Posings and Imposings 341
- What Is Religion? 348
- Religious Conflicts 349
- Employer’s Duty to Reasonably Accommodate 357
- Employee’s Duty to Cooperate in Accommodation 369
- What Constitutes Undue Hardship? 372
- Religion as a BFOQ 375
- Religious Harassment 379
- Union Activity and Religious Discrimination 380
- Summary 382
- Chapter-End Questions 383

11 National Origin Discrimination 385

- Statutory Basis 386
- Chez/Casa/Fala/Wunderbar Uncle Sam 387
- Background 388