IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

CHERYL PHIPPS and SHAWN GIBBONS,	)	**CLASS ACTION**
Plaintiffs,	)	**CIVIL ACTION**
v.	)	**CASE NO. 3:12-cv-1009**
WAL-MART STORES, INC.,	)	**JUDGE LAWSON**
Defendant.	)	**MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRENSLEY**

CORRECTED DECLARATION OF MARC BENDICK, JR., PH.D.

ERRATA

This document is identical to the Declaration of Marc Bendick, Jr., Ph.D., dated 30 March 2018 except for the following corrections:

a. Corrected numbers in Table C-18
b. Corrected numbers from Table C-18 cited in Table 9e
c. Corrected numbers from Table C-18 cited in paragraphs 82, 83, and 84
d. Corrected numbers from Table C-18 cited in footnote 28
e. Corrected number and footnotes in Table C-7
f. Corrected citation to Table C-17 in paragraph 80

.

I. Introduction

1. I am an employment economist at Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc., 319 Prince Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. I earned a Ph.D. in

economics from the University of Wisconsin and have engaged in the practice of economics, specializing in employment and related issues, for more than 35 years. Over that period, I have worked as a researcher and policy analyst while also serving as a consultant to major employers and a university lecturer. I have been a consultant to major institutions involved in scholarly or applied research on employment including the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, the EEOC, and multiple agencies of the U.S. Department of Labor, and my work has been supported by major foundations including Ford, MacArthur, and Rockefeller. I am the author of 138 pieces of scholarly research, including articles in peer-reviewed journals, books, book chapters, and Congressional testimony. Attachment A provides my professional resume.

2. My work on employment has included litigation in which I have analyzed: the availability of job-seekers in different demographic groups; processes for recruiting, hiring, training, assigning, evaluating, promoting, compensating, and disciplining employees; policies and practices for managing a demographically-diverse workforce; and economic damages associated with denial or diminution of employment opportunities. This work is described in Attachment B. As that document details, I have been involved in 214 cases, sometimes on behalf of employees, sometimes on behalf of employers, and occasionally as a neutral party.

I have been accepted as an expert in 39 federal district courts as well as 10 state courts or other tribunals.

3. Throughout my work on this case, I have applied modes of analysis, computational procedures, information sources, and standards of care identical to or comparable to those I use in my scholarly research, and I apply theories, models, concepts, reasoning, assumptions, estimates, and analyses that command general acceptance among my professional peers. I hold the opinions I present to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty.

4. The documents and data relied on by me in the present report are identified in the report's text, tables, and footnotes, and Attachment D to this declaration. The analyses presented are based on information and data currently available to me. If additional material becomes available, I would like the opportunity to update or expand my analyses as appropriate.

5. For my work in this case, I am being compensated at the rate of $425 per hour plus out-of-pocket expenses.

II. My Assignment and a Summary of My Opinions

6. With respect to *Phipps et al. v Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*[1] ("*this case*" or "*the present case*"), I have been requested by claimants' counsel to analyze gender

[1] See Class Action Complaint, Filed October 2, 2012 (hereafter, "*Complaint*").

patterns in compensation and promotions for in-store employees[2] at Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.'s retail establishments in the company's Region 43 from December 26, 1998 through February 23, 2009.

7. Based on analyses presented in this report, I have reached eight principal opinions concerning gender disparities in *compensation* for *hourly employees:*

a. Overall Pattern of Gender Disparities. According to a multiple regression analysis controlling for employees' experience, job performance, job description, job level, department, and store, from 1998 through 2008, women hourly employees earned between $.04 per hour and $.54 per hour less than their similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing male counterparts. S*ee Section IV and Table C-2.*

b. Statistical Significance of Gender Disparities. These gender disparities in hourly pay rate are highly "statistically significant" -- that is, too large to have arisen but chance alone. When any results are considered statistically significant if they correspond to 2.0 standard deviations or more, the gender disparities corresponded to between 2.6 and 14.1 standard deviations, corresponding to probabilities that these disparities arose by chance alone as low as less than one in a trillion. *See Section V and Table C-2.*

c. Qualifications of Men and Women. These gender disparities adverse to women cannot be attributed to differences between men and women in the jobs they held, the departments in which they worked, the qualifications they brought to the jobs, or their performance in those jobs because those factors are controlled for in the multiple regression analysis. Furthermore, throughout 1998-2008, women hourly employees had higher performance evaluation scores, greater seniority

[2] I understand that the employees at issue in this case include all hourly in-store employees and all salaried in-store employees, except Store Managers, Co-Managers, and Licensed Pharmacists (*Complaint*, paragraph 15).

with Wal-Mart, and more potential work experience prior to being hired by Wal-Mart than their male counterparts. *See Section IV and Tables C-4, C-5, and C-6.*

d. Gender Disparities in Multiple Years. Women were paid less than similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men in 100% of the years from 1998 through 2008. The pattern prevailed before, during, and after changes in hourly pay policies and practices Wal-Mart reports to have occurred in 2004. *See Section IV and Table C-2.*

e. Alternative Estimate of Gender Disparities. Men and women hourly employees were concentrated in different departments, including multiple departments staffed entirely or nearly entirely by men or women. Plaintiffs allege that this pattern of concentration operates adversely to women through assignment of different "levels" to the same job in different departments and therefore should not be included in regression analyses of hourly pay rates. Multiple regression analysis not controlling for employees' department and job level estimate that women employees earned on average between $.09 per hour and $.78 per hour less than their similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing male counterparts. These gender disparities are present in 100% of the years from 1998 through 2008. They are highly statistically significant, at levels from 6.3 to 19.1 standard deviations. S*ee Section VI and Tables C-8 and C-10.*

f. Gender Disparities in Individual Stores. According to a multiple regression analyses estimated separately for each of the 187 stores operating in Region 43 at some time during 1998 through 2003, female hourly employees had pay rates lower than their similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing male counterparts in 92.3% of all store-years analyzed. Some 57.5% of those store-year disparities were individually statistically significant, and among these, female hourly employees had pay rates lower than their similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing male counterparts in 97.2% of the disparities. *See Section VII and Tables C-9 and C-11.*

g. Gender Disparities in Starting Pay. According to multiple regression analyses of pay rates at the time of hire, newly-hired women hourly employees received pay rates between a fraction of a cent per hour and

$.46 per hour less than similarly situated, equally qualified newly-hired males. *See Section VIII and Table C-12.*

h. Gender Disparities in Raises. During 2004, women hourly employees received large raises compared to counterpart men, in an apparent one-time gender-focused adjustment. However, even those large raises were not sufficient to reduce pre-existing gender pay disparities to zero. In years other than 2004 – both the years before 2004 and the years after -- gender disparities in raises, either adverse to women or favorable to them, were generally small and sometimes not statistically significant. Therefore, they predominantly neither increased or reduced the gender disparities carried forward from gender disparities adverse to women. *See Section IX and Table C-13*.

8. Based on analyses presented in this report, I have reached one principal opinion concerning gender disparities in *compensation* of *Assistant Managers:*

a. Gender Disparities in the Pay of Assistant Managers. According to a multiple regression analysis controlling for employees' experience, job performance, job description, and store, from 1998 through 2008, women Assistant Managers (including Managers in Training) earned between $2,340 and $3,250 per year less than their similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing male counterparts. These gender disparities adverse to women were strongly statistically significant in every year, at between 6.7 and 10.5 standard deviations. S*ee Section X and Table C-14.*

9. Based on analyses presented in this report, I have reached six principal opinions concerning gender disparities in *promotions*:

a. "Glass Ceiling" Patterns within Managers. During 1998-2008, women averaged 27.1% of Managers in Training and 36.5% of Assistant Managers but only 20.7% of Co-Managers and 15.1% of Store Managers. *See Section XI and Table C-15.*

b. Women among Promotion-Relevant Hourly Employees. During 1998-2008, women constituted between 74.5% and 80.3% of hourly employees with performance evaluations, supervisory experience,

seniority, and pay levels making them particularly likely to be qualified for, interested in, and available for promotions to salaried managerial positions. *See Section XI and Tables C-16.*

c. Shortfall of Women among Assistant Manager. Compared to 74.5% -- the *lowest* expected representation of women particularly likely to be qualified for, and interested in, and available for promotion to Managers in Training and Assistant Managers, the 36.6% actual representation of women among Assistant Managers (including Managers in Training) left a shortfall of 287 "missing" women Assistant Managers in the average year from 1998 through 2008. These shortfalls were present in every year from 1998 through 2008. They were highly statistically significant in each of these years, at between 12.9 and 24.4 standard deviations. *See Section XI and Table C-17.*

d. Shortfall of Women among Co-Managers and Store Managers. In parallel, compared to an expected representation of 74.5%, the 16.6% actual representation of women among Co-Managers and Store Managers combined left a shortfall of 88 "missing" women in those two managerial ranks in the average year during 1998-2008. These shortfalls were present in every year from 1998 through 2008. They were highly statistically significant in each of these years, at between 6.8 and 20.7 standard deviations. *See Section XI and Table C-17.*

e. Gender Disparities in Promotion Rates from Hourly Positions. Women hourly employees were promoted to managerial positions at rates that were between 26.1% and 38.6% the rates of similarly situated, equally qualified counterpart male hourly employees. These differences were highly statistically significant, at between 9.3 and 11.7 standard deviations. Relatedly, having promotion-relevant qualifications such as managerial/supervisory experience or seniority increased men's promotion rate by as much as 33% more than the increase they provided in women's promotion rates. *See Section XII and Table C-18.*

f. Gender Disparities in Promotion Rates Among Salaried Positions. During 1998-2008, women Assistant Managers were promoted to Co-Managers and Store Manager positions at 64.2% the rate of their male counterparts, a statistically-significant disparity. *See Section XII and Table C-19.*

10. The remainder of this declaration presents the analyses underlying these findings and conclusions.

III. The Employment Context

11. This section sets forth descriptive information about the workplace and workforce context analyzed throughout the present declaration.

12. The *Complaint* specifies that this litigation concerns only Wal-Mart Region 43. I understand that this region existed prior to the proposed beginning date of this class action -- December 26, 1998 -- and continued until it was discontinued on February 23, 2009. It was centered in Middle and Western Tennessee and included portions of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Missouri, and Mississippi.

13. Table C-1 in Attachment C reports the number of stores in the region on December 31 of each year from 1998 through 2008. This number fluctuated from year to year as stores opened or closed and as the region's boundaries changed. In the average year, the region encompassed 102 stores.[3]

[3] Table C-1 identifies each store with one of three store formats -- discount stores, supercenters, and neighborhood markets. Discount stores are the original "big box" Wal-Mart stores, offering merchandise typical of department stores (e.g., clothing and housewares) but not food items typical of grocery stores or supermarkets. Supercenters are substantially larger than discount stores and offer both department store merchandise and supermarket goods. Neighborhood stores are essentially supermarkets, offering predominantly food and related items. Over multiple years including 1998-2009, Wal-Mart has been phasing out its discount stores in favor of neighborhood markets and, especially, supercenters, including by converting some discount stores into supercenters. See "Our Retail Divisions" (accessed 3/17/2018 at corporate.Wal-

14. Table C-1 reports that in Region 43, on December 31 during 1998-2008, the number of employees per store ranged from an average of 153 total employees in Wal-Mart's smaller format stores to an average of 573 in its largest format."[4] I have been informed by Plaintiffs' Counsel that the policies and practices at issue in this case applied uniformly to all these stores and have been provided documents indicating on their face that they apply to all three store formats.

15. The table also reports that women represent a majority of employees in all store types. This proportion averages 57.5% in its stores offering primarily supermarket goods to 68.0% in stores offering primarily department store goods.[5]

Mart.com/news/archive/2005/ 01/07/our-retail-divisions) and "Wal-Mart Now Has Six Types of Stores" (accessed 2/16/2018 at wallst.com/retail/201403/22).

[4] These figures include both hourly employees and salaried employees, and they encompass all employees assigned to stores excluding Store Managers, registered pharmacists, persons with Sam's Club job descriptions, persons with Bud's/Most job titles, and persons assigned to "Home Office."

[5] These gender patterns parallel those of other large U.S. retailers in the same period. For example, according to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's "EEO-1" data nationwide in 2005 (accessed 2/9/2018 from www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/employment), women averaged 63.9% of all employees of large "general merchandise" retailers and 50.1% of employees of large "food and beverage" retailers.

IV. Overall Gender Disparities in Pay Rates of Hourly Employees

16. Paragraph 15(a) of the *Complaint* alleges that women employed at Wal-Mart retail stores in Region 43 have been subject to a policy or practice of denial of equal pay for hourly retail sales positions.

17. To investigate such an allegation, it is important to compare pay rates for male and female employees who are similarly situated, equally qualified, and equally performing -- that is, to make "apples to apples" comparisons -- to the extent that data are available. To do so, the standard practice among economists and other employment analysts is to apply the well-established statistical analysis technique of multiple regression.[6]

18. In applying multiple regression, I have analyzed 497,907 records for individual Region 43 hourly employees on "snapshot" dates of December 31 of each year from 1998 through 2008 in which each person was an employee. This very large data set allows me to estimate separate regression equations for each year during that period.

[6] The multiple regression technique is described in D. Rubinfeld, "Reference Guide on Multiple Regression" in Federal Judicial Center and National Research Council, *Reference Manual on Statistics* (Washington: National Academies Press, 3rd Edition, 2011), pp. 179-227, as well as essentially any standard textbook in elementary statistics (e.g., T. Wonnacott and R. Wonnacott, *Introductory Statistics for Business and Economics*, Wiley, 1977, chapters 12 and 13).

19. I understand that in prior litigation (*Dukes v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*), Wal-Mart's expert asserted that analyses of compensation should distinguish between grocery and non-grocery positions. In anticipation of this possible position and to further promote "apples to apples" comparisons, I have run separate regression analyses for employees in "grocery jobs" and "non-grocery jobs." Here, I identify a job as a grocery job if it was either in a "grocery" division (e.g., Meat or Produce) or had a "grocery" job description (e.g. Deli Wall or Dairy/Frozen).

20. In each of the resulting 22 regression analyses (one regression for grocery and non-grocery jobs in 11 separate years), available data allowed me to include the following variables to represent each employee's qualifications and job performance:[7]

- seniority as a Wal-Mart employee (years since initial hire);
- potential years of work experience prior to being hired by Wal-Mart; and
- whether the employee has a "high" performance evaluation in the year being analyzed;

21. Available data also allow me to include the following variables to compare employees who are similarly situated:

- which of 282 Wal-Mart-identified hourly jobs the employee held (e.g., Sales Associate, Cashier, Stocker, or Department Manager);

[7] Details concerning how these variables were incorporated in the regression analyses are provided in Table C-2 in Attachment C.

- which "level" (sometimes referred to as "job class") the job was assigned by Wal-Mart in the year being analyzed (on a scale of 1 to 5 prior to 2004 and 1-7 thereafter);

- which of 125 departments the job was located in (e.g., e.g., Housewares, Bakery, Front End, or Night Receiving);

- which of 21 divisions the job was located in (e.g., Wal-Mart Stores in general or specialty divisions such as Jewelry, Optical, or Pharmacy); and

- which of the 187 stores ever included in Region 43 the employee worked in.

22. Table C-2 in Attachment C reports the results of these 22 separate multiple regression analyses. From that table, the following table excerpts the key findings concerning the gender disparity in base pay rate ($ per hour) after controlling for employee's qualifications, job performance, and employment circumstances in the ways just described.[8]

[8] From 1998 through 2008, women's average pay rate ranged from $6.99 per hour (for non-grocery jobs in 1998) to $9.84 per hour (for non-grocery jobs in 2008). Table C-7 in Attachment C re-expresses the gender disparities reported in paragraph 22 as a percentage of its corresponding pay rates. These resulting figures range from 7.6% (for grocery jobs in 1998) to 0.5% (for non-grocery jobs in 2004).

Year	Gender Difference in Hourly Pay Rate ($/Hour) (-means women paid less than men)	
	Non-Grocery Jobs	Grocery Jobs
1998	- $.13	- $.54
1999	- $.16	- $.38
2000	- $.16	- $.42
2001	- $.18	- $.51
2002	- $.19	- $.51
2003	- $.20	- $.49
2004	- $.04	- $.27
2005	- $.08	- $.28
2006	- $.09	- $.24
2007	- $.12	- $.26
2008	- $ .09	- $.24

23. The most fundamental pattern reported in paragraph 22 is that women were consistently paid at lower rates than similarly situated, equally qualified, equally-performing men. Gender disparities adverse to women were present in both grocery and non-grocery jobs in every one of the 11 years. The disparities ranged from $.04 per hours (for non-grocery employees in 2004) to $.54 per hour (for grocery jobs in 1998).[9] Among the 22 regression analyses, the average woman

[9] Paragraph 22 also reports that gender disparities in pay are tend to be larger for grocery jobs than for non-grocery jobs. However, such differences should not distract from the more basic consistency of gender disparities for the two categories, such as would be expected from application to both categories of the same policies and practices.

Moreover, movement of hourly employees between grocery and non-grocery jobs was routine among these hourly employees. Over the 1998-2008 period, an average of 10.4% of

hourly employee was *never* estimated to have been paid at a higher rate than her male counterpart.

24. These gender disparities adverse to women cannot be attributed to differences between men and women in the jobs they held, the departments in which they worked, the qualifications they brought to the jobs, or their performance in those jobs because those factors are controlled for in the multiple regression analysis. Because these regressions compare men and women who are similarly situated, equally qualified, and equally performing, there remains little ready explanation for these differences except gender itself.

25. Even if the regression analyses had not controlled for employees' qualifications or job performance, the gender disparities could not readily be explained by gender differences in those factors because Region 43's female hourly employees on average had better qualifications and higher performance than their male counterparts. From 1998 through 2008:

---

employees in grocery jobs switched to non-grocery jobs each year, while 2.4% of the much larger group of employees in non-grocery jobs made the opposite change. Thus, it was not unusual for the same person to be a grocery worker for one part of her Wal-Mart employment and a non-grocery worker in another part. On both sides of such switches, the average women among those employees would have had the same experience of being paid less than similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing male employees. The only difference would have been the exact dollar-per-hour amount of the pay disparity.

- Women hourly employees' highest performance scores each year averaged 3.79, or 3.5% higher than the 3.66 average for counterpart men (see Table C-4 in Attachment C).

- The proportion of women hourly employees with more than 5 years' Wal-Mart seniority averaged 27.5%, nearly double the 14.3% average for counterpart men (see Table C-5 in Attachment C).

- The proportion of women hourly employees who had been hired with less than five years of potential work experience outside of Wal-Mart averaged 18.0%, only two-thirds the 26.7% average for counterpart men (see Table C-6 in Attachment C).

26. A second pattern revealed in paragraph 22 is a substantial change in gender disparities between 2003 and 2004. Wal-Mart has stated that in 2004, it made important changes in its hourly pay policies and practices, [10] as well as a "neutralization adjustments" in the pay rates of individual women.[11] Consistent with these reported actions, paragraph 22 documents that for hourly employees in grocery jobs, the gender disparity dropped from $.49 per hour in 2003 to $.27 in 2004. In parallel, among non-grocery employees, the disparity dropped from $.20 per hour in 2003 to $.04 in 2004.

27. However, paragraph 22 also makes clear that changes during 2004 *did not eliminate* the gender disparities in hourly pay. Despite these changes, at the end

[10] See, for example, Wal-Mart's Hourly Compensation Guidelines for the 2005 and 2006 Fiscal years (WM-PHIPPS-002702, WM-PHIPPS-050935), and the deposition of Lisa Riley dated February 14, 2018, p. 62 line 14 to p. 64 line 12, p. 67 line 1 to p. 69 line 21, p. 72 line 21 to p.73 line 9, p. 78 line 18 to p. 87 line 15, and p. 94 line 20 to p. 95 line 10.

[11] See WM_PHIPPS-238264 and WM-PHIPPS-177450 to WM-PHIPPS-177454.

of 2004, a disparity of $.04 per hour remained in non-grocery jobs, and disparity of $.27 per hour remained in grocery jobs.

28. Moreover, the changes during 2004 appear to have very limited sustained effect during the years following 2004. Between 2005 and 2008, gender disparities for grocery jobs remained in the range of $.25 per hour in every year. Among non-grocery jobs, starting from the $.04 per hour disparity in 2004, the disparity rose to $.08 in 2005, then $.09 in 2006, and then $.12 in 2007.

V. Statistical Significance of these Gender Disparities

29. What is the probability that the gender disparities in pay rates reported in Section IV would be found in a data set of the size analyzed here if the differences between similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing male and female employees were actually zero? In other words, what is the likelihood that gender disparities this large would have been observed in statistical analyses by chance alone? If that probability is small, then the female penalties are considered "statistically significant."

30. In scholarly and applied research in economics and other social sciences, as well as many litigation situations, a difference is conventionally

considered statistically significant if that chance is less than one in 20 (a 5% chance).[12]

31. The following table displays the number of standard deviations and probabilities corresponding to the gender pay reported in paragraph 22:[13]

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Year	Non-Grocery Jobs		Grocery Jobs	
	Standard Deviations	Probability (less than one chance in …)	Standard Deviations	Probability (less than one chance in ...)
1998	4.9	100,000	7.2	a trillion
1999	13.7	a trillion	10.2	a trillion
2000	12.5	a trillion	12.2	a trillion
2001	12.6	a trillion	14.1	a trillion
2002	12.7	a trillion	13.7	a trillion
2003	12.5	a trillion	13.0	a trillion
2004	2.6	90	8.4	a trillion
2005	6.2	a billion	10.1	a trillion
2006	6.9	a billion	9.6	a trillion
2007	9.6	a trillion	10.8	a trillion
2008	7.1	a billion	10.5	a trillion

[12] See D. Kaye and D. Freedman, "Reference Guide on Statistics," in Federal Judicial Center and National Research Council, *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 3rd edition, 2011), pp. 211-301. A similar exposition can be found in essentially any standard textbook in elementary statistics such as that cited in footnote 6.

[13] This table is based on Table C-2 in Attachment C.

32. According to columns (c) and (e) of this table, the probability that gender disparities as large as those reported in paragraph 22 occurred by chance alone is extremely small. The highest probability among the 22 disparities -- for non-grocery jobs in 2004 -- is less than one in 90. For each of the 21 other disparities, the probability is less than one chance in a billion or less than one chance in a trillion. Thus, individually and collectively, the 22 gender disparities are statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt.

33. In litigation, information about statistical significance is often not stated in terms of probabilities but instead is translated into statisticians' units called "standard deviations." In this translation, a probability is considered statistically significant if, when restated in standard deviations, it achieves a level of 2 or more standard deviations.[14]

34. Columns (b) and (d) of the table in paragraph 30 re-state the probabilities reported there in terms of standard deviations. Reiterating the pattern described in paragraph 31, the number of standard deviations reported there is substantially larger than 2 for all 22 disparities. The smallest number -- for non-

[14] The judicial convention of expressing statistical significance in terms of standard deviations rather than probabilities is discussed in D. Kaye and D. Freedman, "Reference Guide on Statistics," in Federal Judicial Center and National Research Council, *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 3rd edition, 2011), footnote 101. The equivalence between the two ways of expressing statistical significance is discussed there and in essentially any standard textbook in elementary statistics such as that cited in footnote 8.

grocery jobs in 2004 -- is 2.6 standard deviations. For all 21 other disparities, the number of standard deviations ranges from 4.9 to 14.1. Thus, whether statistical significance is expressed in terms of probabilities or standard deviations, individually and collectively, the 22 gender disparities reported in paragraph 22 are statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt.

VI. Alternative Estimate of this Pattern

35. Region 43's hourly employees work in 135 different departments including both sales floor departments (e.g., Jewelry or Sporting Good) and other departments (e.g., Receiving or "Front End"). As Table C-8 in Attachment C reports, the representation of women among employees in these departments varied widely. For example, 33 departments (e.g., Piece Goods) had between 90 and 100% female employees. while nine departments (e.g., Assembling) had between 90% and 100% male employees. Overall, in an hourly workforce that is 64.0% female, 77.1% of women worked in departments where women constitute more than 64.0%, while 76.2% of men worked in departments where women constitute less than 64.0%.[15]

[15]Economists and other social scientists commonly measure the degree of gender concentration in such a situation with a "Gini Coefficient." (P. Vogt, *Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1993, p. 100) Gini coefficients range in value between 0.0 (an absence of gender concentration, with women constituting 64.0% of every department) and 1.0 (complete gender segregation, with all men working in departments with only men and all women in departments with only women). For the data in Table C-8, the Gini Coefficient is .45, further documenting a high degree of gender concentration.

36. Plaintiffs allege that, when women hourly employees were disproportionately concentrated in certain departments, this concentration adversely affected their pay rate through Wal-Mart's policy or practices of assigning the same job in different departments to different levels without a justification in terms of duties or qualifications associated with the positions. I understand that prior to 2002, each job title (e.g., Sales Associate) was assigned to the same level regardless of the department in which an employee with that job title worked. In 2002, and more extensively in 2004, Wal-Mart began to assign different levels to the same job in different departments. Plaintiffs assert that in assigning these levels, Wal-Mart had a policy or practice of assigning higher levels to jobs in predominantly male departments than to the same job in predominantly female departments.

37. To investigate these allegations that the assignment of jobs to new levels in 2004 had an adverse impact on women, Table C-10 in Attachment C examines three of the larger job titles carried by employees assigned to multiple departments -- sales associates, department mages, and stockers. The table examines groups of male and female hourly employees who held the same job title at the same level in the same department on December 31 2003 and hold that same job title in that same department on December 31, 2004. It compares what job levels these men and women held at the end 2004.

38. The results in Table C-10 can be summarized as follows:

- Sales Associates: At the end of 2003, all sales associates examined in the table -- both men and women -- were at level 1. At the end of 2004, the sales associate positions held by 51.1% of women were at level 2. In contrast, only 22.5% of the sales positions held by men were at level 2, with the remaining 77.5% at levels above that.

- Department Managers: At the end of 2003, all department managers examined in the table -- both men and women -- were at level 3. At the end of 2004, the department manager positions held by 82.5% of women were at level 6, with the remaining 17.4% at level 7. In contrast, 29.8% of men held positions at level 7.

- Stockers: At the end of 2003, all stockers examined in the table -- both men and women -- were at level 1. At the end of 2004, the stocker positions held by 67.8% of women were at level 2. In contrast, 4.9% of the stocker positions held by men were at level 2, with 95.1% at level 3.

All three of these patterns of gender disparities adverse to women were highly statistically significant, at between 4.8 and 11.1 standard deviations.

39. The allegations in paragraph 36 carry an important implication for the analyses reported in Table C-2. To the extent that the allegations are correct, they imply that including employees' departments and job levels in regression analyses such those in that table causes gender disparities in pay rates adverse to women to be *under-estimated*. In that circumstance, regression equations that do not include variables for department and job level would more accurately estimate gender disparities in pay rates for similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men and women.

40. Table C-3 in Attachment C presents estimates alternative to those presented in Table C-2. The analyses in the two tables are identical except that

Table C-3 is based on regression analyses that do not include variables for department, division, and job level, whereas Table C-2 does. The following table summarizes the key findings from Table C-3:

Year	Non-Grocery Jobs		Grocery Jobs	
	Gender Disparity in Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	Gender Disparity in Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations
1998	-$0.19	7.5	-$.78	11.3
1999	-$.18	16.7	-$.55	16.0
2000	-$.18	15.9	-$.53	16.6
2001	-$.21	16.2	-$.64	19.1
2002	-$.24	17.2	-$.65	19.0
2003	-$.24	15.7	-$.59	17.5
2004	-$.09	6.3	-$.28	9.7
2005	-$.14	11.1	-$.24	9.6
2006	-$.15	12.2	-$.18	7.5
2007	-$.18	15.4	-$.17	7.7
2008	-.$16	13.5	-$.12	5.2

41. Consistent with the findings from Table C-2, this table reports that Table C-3 found gender disparities adverse to women in every one of the 22 regression results presented. Moreover, all 22 of these disparities are statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt, at levels ranging from 6.3 to 19.1 standard deviations.

VII. Consistency of Gender Disparities Among Stores

42. A total of 187 stores operated in Region 43 for one or more years during 1998-2009. This section examines the extent to which gender disparities in hourly pay rates observed district wide were paralleled in individual stores.

43. Table C-9 in Attachment C reports regression analyses addressing this question. As in Table C-2 above, the analyses reported in Table C-9 include variables for department and job level.[16] Tables C-9 directly parallels Table C-2, except that, to accommodate the smaller number of employee-year observations

[16] Table C-11 presents analyses of individual stores that directly parallel those in Table C-9. However, for reasons discussed in Section VI above, the analyses in Table C-11 do not include variables for department and job level. In their inclusion or exclusion of these variables, Table C-11 pairs with Table C-3, while Table C-9 pairs with Table C-2.

The findings in Table C-11 are very similar to those in Table C-9 discussed in the present section and even more supportive of the predominant consistency between individual stores and region-wide patterns of gender disparity adverse to women. In particular, during 1998-2003:

- Table C-9 reports that women's average hourly pay rate was lower than that of similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men in 92.3% of store years examined. The comparable figure in Table C-11 is 97.2%.

- Table C-9 reports that women's average hourly pay rate was lower than that of similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men in 99.6% of store years in which there was a statistically significant gender disparity. The comparable figure in Table C-11 is 97.3%.

- Table C-9 reports that 81.7% of stores had gender disparities adverse to women in every year they operated in Region 43. The comparable figure in Table C-11 is 100.0%.

- Table C-9 reports that 99.9% of stores with statistically significant disparities had disparities adverse to women in every year they operated in the region. The comparable figure in Table C-11 is 100.0%.

available in individual stores than for the entire region, data for all years[17] and for grocery and non-grocery jobs were examined in a single equation for each store. However, variables were included in this single equation for each store equation to control for both year and the grocery/non-grocery grouping. Table C-9 estimates 1,060 separate gender disparities in hourly pay, one for each store in each year from 1998 through 2008 that the store operated in Region 43 with enough employees to provide a meaningful regression estimate.[18]

44. According to Plaintiffs' Counsel, decisions about pay rates for hourly employees were made at the store level from 1998 through 2003, with changes during 2004-2005 and after which shifted decision-making away from individual stores. Accordingly, they requested that I examine individual store results for the years 1998-2003.

45. During 1998-2003, data permitted analysis of 494 "store years." Table C-9 reports that women's average hourly pay rate was lower than that of similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men in 92.3% of these store years,

[17] In these calculations, the statistical significance of the gender disparity in each year includes a correction for the appearance of the same individual in multiple years.

[18] The table reports findings only for regressions in which the number of data points available for analysis is at least 5 times the number of regression coefficients being estimated. In Table C-9, this criterion led to exclusion from the table of six stores with a total of nine store-years. Under the heading "One in Ten Rule," the statistical reason for this exclusion is discussed in research articles such as P. C. Austin & E. W. Steverberg, "The Number of Subjects Per Variable Required in Linear Regression Analyses," *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 68 (6,2015), pp. 627–636.

with women's hourly pay rate higher than that of comparable men in the remaining 7.7%.

46. Suppose that individual stores in individual years were not predominantly exhibiting the same gender disparities adverse to women documented in Table C-2 and Sections IV and V above. Then the proportion of store years where women were paid more than comparable men would be expected to be 50%, with the other 50% showing the opposite outcome. Table C-9 reports that the probability that 92.3% of store years would have gender pay disparities adverse to women rather than 50% is less than one in trillion, corresponding to 18.8 standard deviations. Thus, the predominant conformity of individual stores in individual years to the region-wide pattern of gender disparities adverse to women is statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt.

47. During the same years from 1998 through 2003, Table C-9 reports gender pay disparities that were individually statistically significant in 284 store years, or 57.5% of the 494 analyses feasible during these years. Among these 284, women's average hourly pay rate was lower than that of similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men in 99.6% of these store years examined, with the converse holding in only one store in a single year.

48. In 494 store years analyses, random chance would be expected to produce 2.5% -- 12 store years -- that were both statistically significant and adverse

to women. Instead, this analysis of 494 store years in Region 43 during 1998 to 2003 found 57.5% -- 284 store years – that met these two conditions. The disparity between these two figures is statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt.

49. Turning from an analysis of "store years" to analyses of individual stores, Table C-9 reports that, during 1998-2003, sufficient data are available to compare average pay rates for similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men and women hourly employees in 126 stores. The table reports that 81.7% of these stores exhibited a gender disparity in pay rates adverse to women *in 100% of the years they operated in Region 43 during 1998-2003*. Moreover, 99.9% of stores with *statistically significant* gender disparities adverse to women exhibited these disparities *in every single year in which they operated in Region 43 and had statistically significant gender disparities*. Both these patterns of predominant conformity of individual stores to the region-wide pattern of gender disparities adverse to women are again statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt.

VIII. Gender Disparities in Starting Pay

50. The hourly base pay rates examined in Sections IV through VII presumably reflect both the starting pay rate assigned to each employee at the time of initial hiring and adjustments in that pay rate received during continuing employment after that.

51. Table C-12 in Attachment C examines gender disparities in starting pay. It does so applying essentially the same regression analyses as in Table C-2.[19]

52. The key findings in Table C-12 are summarized in the following table:

Year	Non-Grocery Jobs		Grocery Jobs	
	Gender Disparities in Starting Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	Gender Disparities in Starting Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations
1999	-$.23	5.7	-$.46	3.2
2000	-$.04	1.1	-$.22	2.2
2001	-$.10	5.2	-$.12	2.7
2002	-$.05	2.9	-$.16	3.6
2003	-$.04	3.0	-$.12	3.6
2004	-$.02	1.4	-$.04	1.2
2005	-$.05	3.6	-$.07	2.4
2006	-$.04	3.4	-$.10	4.0
2007	-$.10	7.7	-$.14	5.5
2008	-$.00	0.2	-$.07	2.8

53. This table reports a consistent pattern of women receiving lower starting pay rates than their similarly situated, equally qualified male counterparts.

[19] The regression equations in Table C-10 differ from those in C-2 only by not including employee evaluation scores (which, of course, could not exist at the time of hire) and not including years of seniority with Wal-Mart (which, of course, would always be zero at the time of hire).

Table C-10 does not include 1998 because few employees were hired during the brief part of 1998 (December 26 through December 31) covered in this litigation.

This pattern is signaled by a minus sign in every one of the 20 regression analyses reported in the table, separately examining grocery and non-grocery jobs in each of 10 years. The pay disparities range from a fraction of a cent per hour (for non-grocery jobs in 2008) to $.46 per hour (for grocery jobs in 1998). Disparities favorable to women over men were never observed among the 20 estimates.

54. What is the probability that 20 out of 20 estimated disparities would be adverse to women when, if there were no consistent pattern of disparities adverse to women we would expect that to be true of only 10 of the 20 and the other 10 favorable to women? This probability is less than 1 chance in 100,000, corresponding to 4.5 standard deviations. Thus, the overall pattern of gender disparities adverse to women is statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt.

55. Additionally, 16 of the 20 disparities adverse to women -- 80% -- were individually statistically significant.

56. I understand that during 2004-2005, Wal-Mart changed its policies and practices for setting starting pay. If so, these changes failed to eliminate gender disparities adverse to women. In the 2005-2008 period -- after these changes had presumably been implemented -- gender disparities in starting pay adverse to women were present for both non-grocery and grocery employees in all four years. Seven of these eight disparities were statistically significant, and they ranged as high as $.14 per hour.

IX. Gender Disparities in Raises

57. During their continuing employment with Wal-Mart, hourly employees typically received raise periodic increases in their pay. I understand that these raises included those based on changes in jobs, those based on continuing employment with satisfactory performance evaluations, and additional increases referred to as "merit increase." Over the 1999-2008 period, one or more raises per years were received by 95.3% of employees who were working in an hourly position on December 31 in two consecutive years.[20]

58. Table C–13 in Attachment C reports multiple regression analyses which, like Table C-2, compare men and women who were similarly situated in terms of job, job level, division, department, grocery/non-grocery, and store. In addition, the regression includes variables for whether or not during each year an employee changed her or his job, job level, division, department, grocery/non-grocery, or store. Furthermore, like Table C-2, Table C-13 compares men and women who are equally qualified (as measured by years of seniority with Wal-Mart and potential years of employment prior to being hired), and equally performing (as measured by each year's performance evaluation score).

59. The key results from Table C-13 are summarized in the following table:

[20] The remaining 4.7% either had no pay increase or a pay decrease. Decreases are not included in the analysis in Table C-12, but instances of zero change are.

Year	Non-Grocery Jobs		Grocery Jobs	
	Gender Disparities in Annual Raises ($/Hour) (- means women received smaller raises than men)	Standard Deviations	Gender Disparities in Annual Raises ($/Hour) (- means women received smaller raises than men)	Standard Deviations
1999	-$.03	1.5	-$.03	0.7
2000	-$.02	2.6	-$.03	1.1
2001	-$.01	0.5	-$.05	2.1
2002	-$.01	1.2	-$.01	07
2003	-$.04	1.2	-$.04	2.7
2004	$.27	24.4	$.31	14.8
2005	-$.01	1.4	$.00	0.1
2006	$.00	0.2	-$.00	0.0
2007	$.02	2.1	$.04	3.7
2008	-.$01	1.9	-$.01	0.1

60. These results clearly divide into three periods.

61. The first period consists of the five years from 1999 through 2003. During these year, 100% -- 10 out of 10 -- of the gender disparities in yearly total raises were adverse to women, by amounts ranging from $.01 to $.05 per hour. However, only three of these disparities were individually statistically significant.

62. These findings provide some evidence that raises during this period tended to increase the gender disparities adverse to women carried forward from gender disparities in starting pay. In particular, the probability that 10 out of 10

disparities would be adverse to women rather than the "no consistent pattern" 5 out of 10 is less than one in 500, corresponding to 3.2 standard deviations. However, in light of the absence of statistically-significant findings in many of the individual years examined, a more conservative conclusion seems appropriate. That conclusion is that the predominant effect of annual raises for hourly employees during 1998-2003 was neither to increase nor to reduce gender disparities inherited from the gender disparities in starting pay documented in Section VIII above.

63. The second period examined in Table C-13 consists of the year 2004, when I understand that Wal-Mart made gender-related adjustments in the pay rates of individual employees. The results in Table C-13 for 2004 are consistent with that understanding. During that year, gender disparities in raises was *favorable* to women compared to similarly situated, equally qualified, equally performing men, by $.27 per hour in non-grocery jobs and $.31 per hour in grocery jobs. This reversal in the direction of the gender disparities clearly sets 2004 apart from the preceding five years.[21]

64. I understand that Wal-Mart has stated that in 2004, it not only made one-time gender-related adjustments in pay rates for individual employees but also

[21] The sharp difference between 2004 and all other years during 1998-2008 is also signaled by the unusual size of raises received by women in that one year. In the average year prior to 2004, raises for women hourly employees averaged $.59 per hour, and in the average year after 2004, they averaged $.58, but during 2004, they averaged $1.00 per hour. (These figures are unweighted averages for these years of Columns (b) and (g) of Table C-13.)

changed raise policies and practices. Consistent with this claim, Table C-11 reports that, among the gender disparities during 2005-2008, four were adverse to women, while four were favorable to women -- a 50/50 split. Moreover, whether favorable to women or adverse to them, the disparities were very small, including four of the eight that were essentially zero.

65. Such raises would predominantly not increase pay disparities adverse to women inherited from gender disparities in starting pay. On the other hand, they would not have diminished those inherited gender disparities inherited but instead predominantly maintained them and extended their adverse impact on women into additional years.

X. Gender Disparities in Salaries of Assistant Managers

66. In Region 43 during 1998-2008, Table C-1 reported that, excluding Store Managers and registered pharmacists, the workforce in Region 43's stores included between 6 and 15 salaried employees per store. During 1998-2008, 68.7% of salaried employee-years were worked by Assistant Managers.[22]

[22] 3.9% of the remaining employee years were worked by Co-Managers and 27.4% by salaried non-managerial employees.

The employees I refer to as Assistant Managers held one of 35 job titles such as "Asst Manager," "Non-Metro Assistant Manager–WM," "OVERNIGHT ASM," or "HARD LINES ASM."

67. Plaintiffs allege that women Assistant Managers were paid less than comparable male Assistant Managers.[23] Table C-14 in Attachment C applies multiple regression analysis to examine this allegation.

68. In Table C-14, the pay rate examined is the amount earned in a biweekly pay period. To the extent possible,[24] Table C-14 parallels Table C-2 by including variables representing:

- seniority as a Wal-Mart employee (years since initial hire);
- potential years of work experience prior to being hired by Wal-Mart.
- whether the employee has a "high" performance evaluation in the year being analyzed;
- the specific salaried job title the employee held (see footnote 25 above); and
- which of the 187 stores in Region 43 the employee worked in that year.

69. The following table summarizes the key findings from Table C-12:

[23] *Complaint*, paragraph 48.

[24] In contrast to the 497,907 person-years available for analyzing hourly employees in Table C-2, only 7.550 person-years were available for analyzing Assistant Managers. Accordingly, Table C-12 is based on a single regression equation which includes 10 variables for gender disparities, one for each year examined.

Year	Gender Disparity in Biweekly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations
1999	-$113	8.0
2000	-$108	8.2
2001	-$109	8.1
2002	-$ 88	6.4
2003	-$112	8.0
2004	-$134	10.1
2005	-$110	10.8
2006	-$99	10.1
2007	-$ 90	9.3
2008	-$ 91	9.3

70. This table reports gender disparities adverse to women Assistant Managers in every year. Across years, the disparities range from $ 88 to $134 per pay period, which amounts to $2,288 to $3,484 for employees working for a full year.[25] Moreover, all 11 disparities are individually statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt, corresponding to between 6.4 and 10.8 standard deviations. Gender disparities favorable to women were never observed. These results are consistent with plaintiffs' allegations concerning salary disparities adverse to women Assistant Managers.

[25] A complete work year consists of 26 bi-weekly pay periods.

XI. Gender Disparities in the Representation of Women Among Managers

71. With respect to promotions to and within salaried in-store managerial positions within Wal-Mart stores, the *Complaint* alleges that qualified women have been denied equal access to the Management Trainee Program required to become Assistant Managers and to promotions from Assistant Managers to Co-Managers, resulting in an under-representation of women in all salaried managerial positions at issue in this case.[26]

72. Table C-15 in Attachment C documents the proportion of women among management levels in Region 43 during 1998-2008. It reports that women averaged 36.5% of Assistant Managers, 20.7% of Co-Managers, and 15.1% of Store Managers. Thus, the representation of women decreased at each succeeding step "up" the in-store managerial hierarchy. Under the label "glass ceiling," such patterns of decreasing representation of women at increasing levels of management is a familiar, widely discussed pattern throughout the American labor market.[27]

73. Column (e) of Table C-16 in Attachment C reports that women constituted 64.0% of hourly employees during the 1998-2008 period. The contrast

[26] *Complaint*, paragraphs, 51-62.

[27] See, for example, Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, *Good for Business, Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, 1995). These patterns are discussed in essentially any standard textbook in employment economics, for example, R. Ehrenberg & R. Smith, *Modern Labor Economics* (New York: Routledge, 13th Edition 2017), chapter 12.

between 64.0% and all three figures in the previous paragraph -- 36.5% 20.7%, and 15.1% -- suggests the same “glass ceiling” pattern.

74. Table C-15 also reports that women constituted 27.1% of Managers in Training. The contrast between this figure and 64.0% is yet again consistent with the “glass ceiling” pattern.

75. However, economists and other employment analysts seldom consider the proportion of women among all hourly employees – here, 64.0% -- the most accurate measure of the representation of women among “promotion-relevant” hourly employees -- that is, hourly employees likely to be available for, qualified for, and interested in promotions to managerial positions. The overall hourly workforce mixes such “promotion-relevant” individuals with, for example, employees in entry-level jobs (such as Cart Pusher), working part-time, who have been with the company only a few weeks, and who plan to leave soon to pursue other careers. It also includes employees who are performing unsatisfactorily or only minimally in their present job, suggesting limited readiness to handle more responsibility.

76. To create a more precise benchmark to compare to the representation of women among managers, Table C-16 identifies the most "promotion-relevant" hourly employees[28] in three different ways:

- Columns (f) through (i) of the table tabulates hourly employees who were full time, permanent employees; had a high performance evaluation score in the current year;[29] and held hourly jobs with "Manager" or "Supervisor" in the job title.

- Columns (j) through (m) of the table examine hourly employees who were full time, permanent employees; had a high performance evaluation score in the current year; and had worked at Wal-Mart at least five years. And

- Columns (n) through (q) of the table examine hourly employees who were full time, permanent employees; had a high performance evaluation score in the current year; and had hourly pay rates in the top 25% of all hourly employees that year.

77. According to Table C-14, over the 1998-2008 period, women averaged 80.3% of hourly employees in the first group, 79.7% of hourly employees in the second group, and 74.5% of hourly employees in the third group. The *lowest* of

[28] Rows (1) to (3) of Table C-18 in Attachment C verify the promotion-relevance of the three sets of credentials examined in Table C-16. It reports that annual promotion rates were much higher for hourly employees with these credentials than without. For examine, for male hourly employees, row (2) of Table C-18 reports:

- Men in the "managerial/supervisory" group had a promotion rate to a salaried managerial position 7.8 times that of men not in that group.

- Men in the "5+ years' seniority" group had a promotion rate to a salaried managerial position 1.6 times that of men not in that group.

- Men in the "top 25% of pay" group had a promotion rate to a salaried managerial position 2.6 times that of men not in that group.

[29] "High" performance ratings are defined in Table C-16.

these three figures -- 74.5% -- is a reasonable, conservative measure of the proportion of women among the most "promotion-relevant" hourly employees and therefore a benchmark suggesting the expected representation of woman in salaried management positions.[30]

78. Panel (a) of Table C-17 in Attachment C compares the actual representation of women among Assistant Managers (including Managers in Training) to this 74.5% figure. The table reports that in the average year during 1998-2008, if women were expected to be 74.5% of Assistant Managers, they were actually only 36.6% of that group, for a "shortfall" of women of 38.2% of Assistant Managers. This shortfall translates into 287 "missing" women Assistant Managers in the average year during this period.

79. Panel (a) of Table C-17 also reports that this type of shortfall was present in every one of 11 years during this period, and that the shortfall in every year was highly statistically significant, at between 12.9 and 24.4 standard deviations.

[30] The representation of women among managers is affected by a number of employment processes other than promotion from among hourly employees, including hiring of new employees directly into managerial positions, terminations of managerial employees, and movement of managerial employees into non-managerial positions. I understand that Plaintiffs have not alleged discrimination in managerial hiring, terminations, or transfers and accordingly have not analyzed gender disparities there, if any. Section XII below demonstrates that a substantial number of Region 43's salaried managers were promoted from hourly positions.

80. Panel (b) Table C-17 in Attachment C compares the actual representation of women among Co-Managers and Store Managers to the same 74.5% benchmark. If women were expected to be 74.5% of Assistant Managers, they were actually only 16.6% of that group, for a "shortfall" of women of 57.8% of these managers. This shortfall translates into 88 "missing" women Co-Managers or Store Managers in the average year during the 1998-2008 period.[31]

81. The table also reports that such a shortfall was present in every one of 11 years during this period. Moreover, the shortfall in every year was highly statistically significant, at between 6.8 and 18.4 standard deviations.

XII. Gender Disparities in Promotion Rates

82. Table C-18 compares annual promotion rates to salaried managerial positions for male and female hourly employees with the same "promotion-relevant" qualifications.[32] It reports that, in the average year during 1998-2008:

[31] To the extent that Co-Managers tend to be promoted from Assistant Managers, it might be appropriate to compare the representation of women among Assistant Managers. However, this section has documented gender disparities adverse to women in the promotion of hourly employees to Assistant Managers. Therefore, the representation of women among Assistant Managers would have to be increased from the 36.5% figure reported in Table C-15 before that comparison should be made.

[32] I anticipate conducting additional analyses of gender disparities in promotion rates during the liability phase of this litigation. In particular, such analyses might individually examine the thousands of separate promotion decisions made during the 1998-2008 period, in each case comparing the gender of the promoted individual to the gender composition of the "pool" of employees likely to be interested in, available for, and qualified for the promotion. Such a "micro" level of analysis requires substantial time and effort beyond what was feasible given the schedule for class certification. However, when analyses of thousands of separate decisions are combined,

- An average of 3.3% of male hourly employees with "managerial/supervisory job title" qualifications were promoted to a managerial position each year. The rate for women with the same "managerial/supervisory" qualifications was 0.9%, or 26.1% of the males' rate.

- An average of 0.9% of male hourly employees with "5+ years seniority" qualifications were promoted to a managerial position each year. The rate for women with the same "managerial/supervisory" qualifications was 0.3%, or 28.9% of the males' rate.

- An average of 1.2% of male hourly employees with "top 25% of pay" qualifications were promoted to a managerial position each year. The rate for women with the same "managerial/supervisory" qualifications was 0.4%, or 33.9% of the males' rate.

83. Table C-18 also reports that parallel gender disparities in promotion rates held for men and women who were promoted while lacking such qualifications:

- An average of 0.4% of male hourly employees without "managerial/supervisory job title" qualifications were promoted to a managerial position each year. The rate for women without the same "managerial/supervisory" qualifications was 0.1%, or 32.0% of the males' rate.

- An average of 0.6% of male hourly employees without "5+ years seniority" qualifications were promoted to a managerial position each year. The rate for women without the same "managerial/supervisory" qualifications was 0.2%, or 38.6% of the males' rate.

- An average of 0.5% of male hourly employees without "top 25% of pay" qualifications were promoted to a managerial position each year. The rate for women without the same "managerial/supervisory" qualifications was 0.2%, or 35.4% of the males' rate.

---

they are likely to document gender disparities in promotion rates strikingly similar to those reported in this section.

84. All six gender disparities in promotion rates reported in paragraphs 82 and 83 are statistically significant beyond a shadow of a doubt. They correspond to between 9.3 and 12.8 standard deviations, in every case representing less than one chance in a trillion that these disparities arose by chance alone.

85. Table C-19 examines gender disparities in annual promotion rates from Assistant Managers to Co-Managers or Store Managers. It reports a promotion rate for men of 2.8%, compared to a 1.8% rate for women. Thus, women received this type of promotion at 64.2% the rate of counterpart men. This gender disparity is statistically significant at the level of 2.4 standard deviations.

XIII. Economic Damages

86. As an analysis designed to address only questions of class certification, the present report includes no calculations of economic damages. However, such calculations can readily be performed based on statistical analyses such as those discussed in this report and additional analyses likely to be completed during the merits phase. Economists and other employment analysts have well-established, readily available, statistically- and economically-valid methods for calculating damages for individual class members. I personally have applied these methods in dozens of cases involving claims of pay or promotion discrimination.

87. Although the present case involves a large number of potential class members, that size need not pose problems of manageability of the class action. The

bulk of the work of screening each woman's eligibility and quantifying her damages can be completed by computer, leaving at most a small number of disputed claims to be ruled on by the Court.

88. Importantly, this computerized process would not simply "divide the pie evenly" or assign each woman damages based on broad averages. Instead, by applying techniques such as the multiple regression analyses illustrated throughout the present report, the process can accurately tailor each class member's damages to her individual work history, job performance, qualifications, location, and other individual and employment circumstances.

89. Importantly too, these computations would incorporate rulings by the court on issues currently disputed in the present litigation. For example, as noted in Section VI of the present report, Plaintiffs have challenged the use of department in setting pay. Should the liability phase conclude that department is not permissible to include, then the regression analyses such as are reported in Table C-3 would be the starting point for calculating damages. If the conclusion is the opposite, then the starting point would be the regression analyses reported in Table C-2.

* * * * * * *

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Alexandria, VA on April 4, 2018.

Marc Bendick, Jr., Ph.D.

ATTACHMENT A

RESUME

MARC BENDICK, JR.

Dr. Bendick is an employment economist specializing in public and private initiatives to enhance mainstream opportunities for traditionally-excluded individuals, families, businesses, and communities. For additional information, visit http://www.bendickegan.com.

ADDRESS

Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc.
319 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314 USA

marc@bendickegan.com
www.bendickegan.com
(571) 777-8134

CAREER CHRONOLOGY

Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc., Alexandria, VA (1984 - present)

Co-founder and Co-Principal in a firm providing economic, business, and social science analysis to clients in the public, private, international, and non-profit sectors.

The Urban Institute, Washington, DC (1975 - 1984)

Senior Research Associate leading needs assessment, program evaluation, and policy analysis studies under government and foundation sponsorship.

University of Bristol, Great Britain (1980)

Visiting Associate Professor, School for Policy Studies.

Nika Corporation, Chicago (1973 - 1974)

Urban development project planner and financial analyst.

McDonnell Douglas Corporation, Los Angeles (1968 - 1970)

Staff economist and management analyst.

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Economics/Public Policy, University of Wisconsin, 1975 (with distinction)

M.S. Economics/Management Science, University of Wisconsin, 1972

B.A. Economics/Social Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, 1968 (with honors)

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Consultant/contractor to public agencies including City of Atlanta, City of Chicago, U.S. Community Services Administration, California Department of Fair Employment & Housing, Congressional Government Accountability Office, Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, City of Detroit, District of Columbia Commission on Vocational Education, District of Columbia Commission on Social Services, U.S. Economic Development Administration, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, City of Flint (MI), U.S. Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Labor Office of Contract Compliance Programs, U.S. Department of Labor Office of Disability Employment Programs, U. S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, Mayoral Transition Team for the District of Columbia, City of Miami, Michigan Civil Service Commission, U.S. National Commission for Employment Policy, U.S. National Science Foundation, U.S. National Skills Standards Board, New York (City) Commission on Human Rights, New York State Office of the Solicitor General, New York State Office of the Attorney General Civil Rights Bureau, New Jersey Office of the Public Advocate, Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, City of Pontiac, Illinois Prairie State 2000 Authority, City of Seattle Office of Civil Rights, and City of Southfield (MI).

Consultant/grantee for non-profit and research organizations including Abt Associates, Aetna Foundation, American Association of Retired Persons, American Bar Association Commission on Women in the Profession, American Civil Liberties Union, American Public Human Services Association, Annie E. Casey Foundation, Brody & Weiser, Carnegie Corporation, Center for Frontline Retail, Chase Bank Foundation, Cleveland Foundation, Committee for Economic Development, Committee on Strategies against Chronic Poverty, Community Development Research Center, Disability Rights New York, Economic Development Assistance Consortium, Educational Testing Service, Employment Justice Research Center, Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington, Ford Foundation, German Marshall Fund of the United States, Grant makers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees, Greater Washington Research Center, Hewlett Foundation, Housing for All (Denver), The Impact Fund, Institute for Women's Policy Research, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, Job Opportunities Task Force (Baltimore), Jobs for District of Columbia Graduates, JP Morgan Chase Foundation, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, Legal Services Corporation, MacArthur Foundation, Make the Road New York, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, Metlife Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, National Academy of Public Administration, National Commission on Testing and Public Policy, National Center for Occupational Readjustment, National Employment Law Project, National League of Cities, National Planning Association, National Wildlife Federation, OMNI Institute, Organization of Women in International Trade, Organization Resources Counselors, Pelavin Associates, Primerica Foundation, Restaurant Opportunities Center of New York (ROC-NY) and Restaurant Opportunity Center United (ROC-U), Retail Action Project, Rider Pool Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Russell Sage Foundation, Sloan Foundation, Worker Rights Consortium, and Youngstown-Warren Regional Growth Association.

Consultant to employers including American Express Corporation, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Center for Creative Practices, Control Data Corporation, Dupont Corporation, Equitable Life Assurance, Ford Motor Company/Visteon, Georgetown Day School, IBM, International Monetary Fund, Johns Hopkins Hospital and Health Systems, Macy's Department Stores, Orient Express Hotels, Royal Ahold NV/Giant Foods, Southern California Edison, Southern Wines and Spirits, U.S. Foodservice, World Bank Group, and Zenith National Insurance.

Consultant to international and multinational organizations including U.S. Agency for International Development, Australian Bureau of Labour Market Research, Australian Institute for Multicultural Affairs, Center for American Studies-Fudan University (China), Commission of the European Union, International Finance Corporation, International Monetary Fund, International Institute of Management-Berlin, International Labour Organisation, Japanese Institute for Research Advancement, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the World Bank.

Media source quoted or appearing in AARP Bulletin, ABC World News, Advertising Age, Adweek, American Bar Association Perspective, Arkansas Gazette, Associated Press, Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Atlantic, Augusta (GA) Chronicle, Austin Chronicle, Baltimore Sun, Beaumont (TX) Enterprise, BET.com, Black Enterprise, BNet Business Network, Bloomberg Business Week, BBC News, BBC Panorama, Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, BNA Union Labor Report, Boston Globe, Center for Investigative Reporting/Reveal, Chicago Crusader, Christian Science Monitor, Class Action Litigation Report, CNN, CNNMoney.com, Congressional Quarterly, Congressional Digest, Corporate Board Member Magazine, Corporate Social Responsibility Data Network, Crain's New York Business, D Magazine (Dallas), Daily Beast, Daily Labor Report, Dallas Channel 8 (ABC), Deseret News, Detroit Free Press, Diversity Digest, DiversityInc, Diversity Officer Magazine, Employment Discrimination Report, Epoch Times, Fast Company, fireengineering.com, Fortune, Fox News, The Guardian (UK), Health Planning Reports, Houston Chronicle, HUDuser.org, Huffington Post, Inc., Institute for Social Entrepreneurs, Journal of Commerce, Journal of Housing, Lear's, the Linda Chavez Program, Los Angeles Times, McNeil-Lehrer News Hour, Mainstreet.com, Management Review, mediabistro.com, Memphis Commercial Appeal, Milwaukee Journal, Ms. Magazine, MSNBC, The Nation, Nation's Cities, National Civic Review, National Journal, National Public Radio, NBC Nightly News, New York, New York Post, New York Times, NPR Marketplace, NYTimes.com, Newsday, Newsweek, NY1, Occupational Health Safety, Phoenix Focus, Poverty and Race Research Action Council Newsletter, Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin, The Public Interest, racismreview.com, Restaurant News, Reuters, Revista University Sao Paulo (Brazil), San Francisco Chronicle, San Gabriel Valley News, San Jose Mercury News, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Social Care Online, SHRM Online, Time, the Today Show, Tolerance.org, Training and Development Journal, United Press International, Univision, Urban Futures Information Exchange, Urban Outlook, USA Today, U.S. News and World Report, Voice of America, Wall Street Journal, Washington Business Journal, Washington Post, WBZ, WFUV, Which Way L.A, Women's Wear Daily, workforceanswers.com, Workforce Management, Working Papers, and WorkCite.

Guest lecturer at colleges and universities including American, Brandeis, Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Florida State, Franklin and Marshall, George Mason, George Washington, Georgetown, Johns Hopkins, Maryland, Missouri, New School for Social Research, North Texas, Princeton, Southern California, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Non-faculty member of Ph.D. dissertation committees: Devah Pager, University of Wisconsin, 2002; Lauren Brown, Brandeis University, 2008.

International researcher and consultant with experience in Australia, Belgium, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, Ireland, Jamaica, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Senegal, Switzerland, and Sweden.

Member, Academy of Management; Advisory Board, Discrimination Research Center (former); Advisory Board of Directors, Jobs for District of Columbia Graduates (former); Advisory Panel on Cities and Technology, Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (former); Advisory Panel on Dislocated Workers, Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (former); Employment Law Task Force (former); National Community Reinvestment Coalition (former); American Economic Association; Society of Labor Economists (former); Association for Public Policy and Management; Council for Urban Economic Development (former); Industrial Relations Research Association (former); International Association for Diversity Management; International Association of Professionals in Employment Security (former); International Society of Diversity and Inclusion Professionals; National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council Committee on Methods for Collecting Pay Information (2011-2012), National Association for Forensic Economics; National Committee on Pay Equity; Phi Beta Kappa; Social Psychology Network; Society for Human Resource Management (Senior Certified Professional in Human Resources, 1999- ; Special Expertise Panel on Workforce Diversity, 2007-2010; Taskforce on Diversity and Inclusion Standards, 2010-2014); Society of Government Economists (former); Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Member, Boards of Directors/Trustees: Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc.; Workplace Fairness, Inc. (former); U.S. Committee to the International Council on Social Welfare (treasurer; former); World Neighbors, Inc. (former).

Speaker before professional and general audiences including Academy of State and Local Government, AFL-CIO Meany Center for Labor Studies, All-African Conference on Housing and Urban Development (Senegal), American Academy of Arts and Sciences, American Association of Schools of Teacher Education, American Bar Association Section on Labor and Employment Law, ACLU National Leadership Conference, American Economic Association, American Human Services Association, American Psychological Association, Association for Global Business, Association of Providers of Employment and Training, Association for Public Policy and Management, Bar Association of San Francisco, Brookings Institution, Business Coalition for Education Reform, Business Development and Retention Council (Kansas City), Center for Strategic Analysis of the Office of the Prime Minister (France), Chase Manhattan Bank Community Development Group, Commission of the European Union (Brussels), Community Matters Forum (Florida), Congressional Research Service, Corporation for Enterprise Development, Council of State Governments, Council on Foundations, Cultural Contact Working Group, Department of Defense Workshop on Outplacement, DC Agenda, District of Columbia City-Wide Education Conference, District of Columbia Committee on Public Education, District of Columbia Department of Human Services, Diversity Best Practices, Equal Employment Trial Practice Institute, European Centre for Social Welfare Research and Training (Switzerland), Family Impact Seminar, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Florida Bar Association, Forty Plus, Georgia Rural Urban Summit, Grantmakers in Health, Greater London Enterprise (UK), Greater Washington Board of Trade, House of Representatives Republican Conference, Institute on the Urban Economy (France), International Association of Fire Chiefs, International Association of Personnel in Employment Security, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, International Association of Women in Fire and Emergency Services, International Downtown Association, International Youth Employment Conference (New Zealand), Jobs for the Future, Job Opportunities Task Force (Baltimore), Johannesburg (South Africa) Regional Development Initiative, Labor Institute of Public Affairs, League of Women Voters, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Milwaukee Economic Development Summit, Minority Business Legal Defense and Education Fund, National Alliance of Business, NAACP Legal Defense Fund Training Institute, National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics, National Association of Black MBAs, National Association of Protective and Advocacy Systems, National Center for Research on Vocational Education, National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, National Conference on Social Welfare, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Cooperative Bank, National Council for Employment Policy, National Council of La Raza, National Employment Law Institute, National Institute of Education, National League of Cities, National Science Foundation Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate, National Task Force on Tradeswomen Issues, National Urban Coalition, New York Restaurant Industry Summit, Northeast-Midwest Institute, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (Paris), ORIGIN (Organizational and Institutional Gender Information Network), Passaic County (NJ) Economic Development Authority, President's National Equal Pay Enforcement Task Force, Prince Georges County (MD) Planning Department, Program on Community Problem Solving, Public Education Network, Seattle-King County Workforce Development Council, Social Policy Association (UK), Society of Government Economists, Society for Human Resource Management, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Southern Economic Association, Swedish National Labor Market Board, United Way of America, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, U.S. Conference of Mayors, U.S. Information Agency, U.S. State Department International Information Program (Warsaw Embassy), and Vermont Department of Social Welfare.

Expert witness or consulting expert in more than 200 federal and state court cases concerning race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, and other discrimination in employment; patterns of employment and earnings; the employment implications of business development; and interpretation of social science data. These cases have included several dozen class actions involving employers with 10,000 or more employees and five cases reviewed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Research reviewer/journal referee, Academy of Management Learning and Education; Administration in Social Work; Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP); Cornell Industrial and Labor Relations Press, Economic Development Quarterly; European Sociological Review; Government & Policy; The Gerontologist; Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin; International Journal of Diversity in Communities, Organisations and Nations; Journal of Aging and Social Policy**;** Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Journal of Forensic Economics; Journal of Policy Analysis and Management; Journal of Social Issues; Journal of Social Policy; Journal of Regional Science; Land Economics; National Association of Forensic Economics; National Commission on Testing and Public Policy; National Science Foundation; National Tax Journal; Nuffield Foundation; Praeger Publishers; Research on Aging; Sloan Foundation; Sex Roles; Social Science Journal; Social Service Review; Social Sciences; Sociological Perspectives; Springer Publishing; State and Local Government Review, and University of Wisconsin Press.

March 2018

PROFESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

2016 -

142. "Employee Engagement: The Neglected Business Case for Diversity and Inclusion." (in preparation, 2018) (with Mary Lou Egan).

141. "Ethical Standards for Diversity and Inclusion Professionals: When Is it Time to Walk?" (in preparation, 2018) (with Mary Lou Egan).

140. "Reducing Gender Occupational Segregation: A Quantitative Optimization Analysis" (in preparation, 2018) (with John J. Miller).[1]

139. "Race and the Advertising Workforce." In: G. Johnson et al (eds.), ***Race in the Marketplace - Crossing Critical Boundaries*** (in preparation, 2018) (with Mary Lou Egan).

138. "Increasing Minority Employment: Are You Ready to Recruit?" ***Employment Relations Today*** (in press, 2018) (with Mary Lou Egan).[2]

137. "Making it Count: Discrimination Auditing and the Activist Scholar Tradition." In: S. M. Gaddis (ed.). ***Audit Studies: Behind the Scenes with Theory, Method, and Nuance*** (Springer, 2018), pp. 45-62 (with Frances Cherry).

136. "Employment Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities: Evidence from Match Pair Testing," ***International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities, and Nations: Annual Review*** 17 (1, 2017), pp. 11-25**.**[3]

[1] Earlier versions of this paper appeared in *Pathways to Equity, Narrowing the Wage Gap by Improving Women's Access to Good Middle-Skill Jobs* (Washington: Institute for Women's Policy Research, 2016).

[2] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Workshop on Attracting and Retaining U.S. Minorities, World Bank, Washington, DC, November 2010.

135. ***Pathways to Equity, Narrowing the Wage Gap by Improving Women's Access to Good Middle-Skill Jobs*** Washington: Institute for Women's Policy Research, 2016. (with Ariane Hegewisch, Barbara Gault, and Heidi Hartmann).

2011 - 2015

134. "Using Information Regulation to Enhance Workplace Diversity, Inclusion and Fairness." ***Argumenta Oeconomica Cracoviensia*** 10 (2015), pp. 59-77 (with Mary Lou Egan).[4]

133. "What Research Tells us about Women in Firefighting" **Testimony, City Council of the City of New York**, December 13, 2013.

132. "Professionalizing Diversity and Inclusion Practice: Should Voluntary Standards be the Chicken or the Egg?" ***Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*** 6 (2013), pp. 193-205 (with Rosemary Hayes-Thomas).[5]

131. "Availability Estimates for Women and Why They Matter**." Presentation, AFL-CIO Third Annual Conference on Women in the Trade**s, Sacramento, April 2013.

130. "Setting Industry-Level Priorities for EEOC Enforcement." **Testimony, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Hearings on the Strategic Enforcement Plan**, July 2012.

129. "Making Invisible Difference Visible in Measuring Inclusion." **Presentation at the George Mason University Conference on Diversity; Practice and Research,** June 2012.

128. "Developing the Research Base for Controlling Bias in Hiring." ***Journal of Social Issues*** 68 (2012), pp. 238-263 (with Ana Nunes).

127. ***The Availability of Women, Racial Minorities, and Hispanics for On-Site Construction Employment.*** Alexandria, VA: Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Labor, 2011 (with M. Egan, J. Miller & L. Lanier).

126. "Research Evidence on Disparate Treatment in Hiring**." Testimony, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Hearings on Discrimination in Hiring**, June 2011.

2006 - 2010

125. "Employment Discrimination in Upscale Restaurants: Evidence from Paired Comparison Testing." ***Social Science Journal*** 47 (2010), pp. 802-818.(with Rekha Rodriguez and Sarumathi Jayaraman).[6]

---

[3] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Conference on Diversity in Organizations, Communities, and Nations, Toronto, July 2017.

[4] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 13th International Human Resource Management Conference, Krakow, Poland, June 2014.

[5] An earlier version of this paper was presented as the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Annual Conference, San Diego, April 2012.

124. "The Business Case for Diversity and the Perverse Practice of Matching Employees to Customers." ***Personnel Review*** 39 (4, 2010), pp. 468-486 (with Mary Lou Egan and Louis Lanier).[7]

123. "Taking the Heat, Gender Discrimination in Firefighting." **Journal of Gender, Social Policy and the Law** 17 (2010), pp. 705-749. (with Amanda Dupree, Richard Ugelow, et al.).

122. **Transgender Need Not Apply: Gender Identity Job Discrimination in New York City's Retail Sector** New York: Make the Road New York, 2009 (with Chase Madar et al.).

121. "Using Situation Testing to Document Employment Discrimination Against Persons with Psychiatric Disabilities." **Employee Relations Law Journal** 35 (Winter, 2009), pp. 40-60 (with Amir Tal, Galia Moran, and Dan-Olof Rooth).[8]

120. "France's Mandatory 'Triple Bottom Line' Reporting: Promoting Sustainable Development through Informational Regulation," **International Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic, and Social Sustainability** 7 (5, 2009), pp. 27-47 (with Mary Lou Egan, Fabrice Mauleon, and Dominique Wolff).[9]

119. **Research Perspectives on Race and Employment in the Advertising Industry** (Washington: Bendick and Egan Economic Consultants, Inc., 2009) (with Mary Lou Egan).

118. "Manage Employer Inclusion, not Workforce Diversity!" **Presentation to the Society for Human Resource Management Annual Diversity Conference, Atlanta, October 2008** (with Mary Lou Egan).

117. "Combining Multicultural Management and Diversity into One Course on Cultural Competence," **Academy of Management Learning and Education** 7 (September 2008), pp. 387-393 (with Mary Lou Egan).

116. "Enhancing Women's Inclusion in Firefighting in the USA," **International Journal of Diversity in Communities, Organisations, and Nations** 8, 2 (2008), pp. 189-208 (with Denise Hulett, Sheila Thomas, and Francine Moccio).[10]

115. "Measuring Inclusion in the Workplace: A Somewhat Economics Perspective," **Presentation to the National Science Foundation Social Economic and Behavioral Sciences Directorate, June 2008** (with Mary Lou Egan).

---

[6] Portions of this paper also appear in **The Great Service Divide, Occupational Segregation and Inequality in the New York City Restaurant Industry** (New York: Restaurant Opportunity Center of New York and the New York City Restaurant Industry Coalition, 2009).

[7] An earlier version was presented at the 10th International Human Resource Management Conference, Santa Fe, NM, 2009.

[8] An earlier version was presented at the Fourth International Stigma Conference, London, 2009.

[9] Earlier versions were presented at the Second International Conference of the International Center for Corporate Accountability, New York, June 2007, and at the 25th Annual Research Conference, Association for Public Policy and Management, 2003.

[10] Alternative versions appeared as **A National Report Card on Women in Firefighting** (International Association of Women in Fire and Emergency Services, April 2008), and "A Fair Shake," **Fire Chief** (April 2008), pp. 36-40.

114. "Measuring Inclusion in the Workplace," **Presentation to the American Psychological Association National Conference, San Francisco, August 2007** (with Mary Lou Egan).

113. "Situation Testing for Employment Discrimination in the United States of America," **Horizons Strategiques** 5 (July 2007), pp. 17-39.

112. "How Can the EEOC Effectively Promote Employer Efforts to Hire the Best Employees and Avoid Discrimination?" **Testimony, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Hearings on the E-RACE (Eliminate Racism and Colorism in Employment) Initiative**, February 2007.

2000 - 2005

111. "Behavioral Science, Workforce Diversity Management, and Employment Litigation: Implications for Employment Testing," **Presentations to the Monash University Conference on Field Experiments on Discrimination in Markets,** Prato, Italy, July 2005 (with Ana Nunes and Mary Lou Egan).

110. "Using Paired Comparison Testing to Develop a Social Psychology of Civil Rights," **Presentation to the Annual Conference of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, June 2004**.

109. "Workforce Diversity Initiatives of US Multinational Corporations in Europe," **Thunderbird International Business Review** 45 (November-December 2003), pp. 701-727 (with Mary Lou Egan).[11]

108. "The Emerging Job Market on the Internet," **Proceedings of the 7th Conference on International Human Resource Management, Limerick, Ireland, June 2003** (with Lauren E. Brown).

107. "Beyond Simple Counts: A New Approach to Measuring and Monitoring Workforce Diversity," **Proceedings of the 7th Conference on International Human Resource Management, Limerick, Ireland, June 2003** (with Mary Lou Egan and John J. MIller).

106. "US Firms' Evaluation of Employee Qualifications in International Business Careers." **International Journal of Human Resource Management** 13 (February 2002), pp. 76-88 (with Mary Lou Egan and John Miller).

105. "Diversity Training: From Anti-Discrimination Compliance to Organization Development." **Human Resource Planning** 24 (2, 2001), pp. 10-25 (with Mary Lou Egan and Suzanne Lofhjelm.[12]

104. "Using EEO-1 Data to Analyze Allegations of Employment Discrimination," **Presentation to the Section on Labor and Employment Law, American Bar Association**, July 2000.

103. "Changing Workplace Cultures to Reduce Employment Discrimination." **Presentation to the Conference on Low Wage Workers in the New Economy**, Washington, DC May 2000.

102. **Gender Occupational Segregation: An Analysis of Employers' EEO-1 Report**s. Newark, NJ: Employment Discrimination Project, Rutgers Law School (with Alfred W. Blumrosen, John J. Miller, and Ruth Blumrosen), 2000.

1995 - 1999

[11]Reprinted in **Value Creation through Diversity** (Philadelphia: Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, 2002) and **Executive Reference Book** (Hyderabad: Institute of Chartered Financial Analysts of India, 2003).

[12]Awarded Walker Prize for Best Published Research in 2001, Human Resource Planning Society.

101. **Surmounting Five Barriers to Business Participation**. Presentation to the Urban Institute/Department of Labor Conference on Workforce Development, May 1999. Washington: Bendick & Egan Economic Consultants, Inc., 1999.

100. **Welfare Reform and Beyond: Making Work *Work.*** New York: Committee for Economic Development, 2000 (with others).

99. "No Foot in the Door: An Experimental Study of Employment Discrimination Against Older Workers." **Journal of Aging and Social Policy** 10 (4, 1999), pp. 5-23) (with Lauren Brown and Kennington Wall).[13]

98. "Adding Testing to the Nation's Portfolio of Information on Employment Discrimination." In Michael Fix and Margery Turner (eds), **A National Report Card on Discrimination in America: The Role of Testing**. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1999, pp. 47-68.

97. **Employment Discrimination Against Women and Minorities in Georgia**. Newark, NJ: Employment Discrimination Project, Rutgers Law School, 1999 (with Alfred W. Blumrosen, John J. Miller, and Ruth Blumrosen).

96. **The Documentation and Evaluation of Anti-Discrimination Training in the United States.** Geneva: International Labour Office, 1998 (with Mary Lou Egan and Suzanne Lofhjelm).

95. **Employment Discrimination Against Women in Washington State, 1997**. Newark, NJ: Employment Discrimination Project, Rutgers Law School, 1998 (with Alfred W. Blumrosen, John J. Miller, and Ruth Blumrosen).

94. **Access, Diversity and Civil Rights Issues in the Development of Skills Standards.** Washington: National Skills Standards Board, 1997.

93. **Connecting Inner-City Youth to the World of Work.** New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1997 (with others).

92. "Employment Discrimination Against Older Workers: An Experimental Study of Hiring Practices." **Journal of Aging and Social Policy** 8 (4, 1996), pp. 25-46 (with Charles Jackson and J. Horacio Romero).

91. **State of Michigan Equal Employment Opportunity Review**. Lansing: Civil Service Commission of the State of Michigan, 1996 (with Peter Robertson and Alfred W. Blumrosen).

90. **Employment Practices and Employment Discrimination: A Bibliography Combining Economic, Managerial, and Behavioral Science Research.** Washington: Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington, Inc., second edition 1996.

89. "Linking Learning and Earning." **Economic Development Quarterly** 10 (August 1996), pp. 217-223.

88. **Discrimination Against Racial/Ethnic Minorities in Access to Employment in the United States**. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1996.

87. "Employee Ownership and Participation Enhance Economic Development in Low-Opportunity Communities." **Journal of Community Practice** 2 (Winter 1995), pp. 61-85 (with Mary Lou Egan).

86. "Making the Federal Government an Effective Partner in Community Revitalization." **Testimony**, Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, October 19, 1995.

---

[13]Cited in *Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc*., U.S. Supreme Court, 99-536, pp. 10-11.

85. **Rebuilding Inner-City Communities: A New Approach to the Nation's Urban Crisis.** New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1995 (with others).

84. "Research Evidence on Discrimination and Affirmative Action in Employment." **Testimony**, Committee on the Judiciary, California State Assembly, May 4, 1995.[14]

1990 - 1994

83. "The Case against a Misdirected Federal Neighborhood Strategy." **Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy** 12 (1994), pp. 490-493 (with Terra Geiger).

82. "Measuring Employment Discrimination through Controlled Experiments." **Review of Black Political Economy** 23 (Summer 1994), pp. 25-48 (with Charles Jackson and Victor Reinoso).[15]

81. "International Business Careers in the United States: Salaries, Advancement, and Male-Female Differences." **International Journal of Human Resource Management** 5 (February 1994), pp. 33-50 (with Mary Lou Egan).

80. "Use of Testing in Civil Rights Enforcement." in Michael Fix and Raymond Struyk (eds.), **Clear and Convincing Evidence: Measurement of Discrimination in America**. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press, 1993: 345-376 (with Roderic Boggs and Joseph Sellers).

79. "Linking Business Development and Community Development in Inner Cities." **Journal of Planning Literature** 8 (August 1993), pp. 3-19 (with Mary Lou Egan).

78. "Racial and Ethnic Discrimination in Restaurant Franchising." **Testimony**, Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, June 30, 1993 (with Kerry Scanlon).

77. **EEO Testing Manual**. Washington: Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington, 1993 (with others).

76. "Goal Setting." in **Opportunity Denied! A Study of Racial and Sexual Discrimination Related to Government Procurement in New York State**. New York: New York State Department of Economic Development, 1992.

75. "Designing an Effective Re-employment Program for Dislocated Workers." **Testimony**, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, April 30, 1992.

74. **Getting a Job is a Job: A Curriculum for High School**. Washington: Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington, 1992 (with others).

73. **Linking Learning with Earning: The Report of the Commission on Vocational Education**. Washington: District of Columbia Public Schools, 1992 (with others).

---

[14]Reprinted in **Employee Advocate Supplement** 41(Fall 1995): 30-50; Stuart Nagel (ed.), **Research in Public Policy Analysis, Volume 9** (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1998); **International Journal of Public Administration** 22 (8): 1213-1240; **International Journal of Economic Development** 2 (2): 256-274; and Stuart Nagel (ed.), **Diverse Perspectives on Peace, Prosperity, and Democracy** (Nova Publishers, 2002).

[15]Reprinted in **Discrimination and Affirmative Action: Are There Any Facts Out There?** (Sacramento: California State Legislature, 1995); James Stewart (ed.), **African-Americans in Post-Industrial Labor Markets** (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1997); and Fred L. Pincus & Howard J. Ehrlich (eds.), **Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending Views on Prejudice, Discrimination, and Ethnoviolence** (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998).

72. "Discrimination Against Latino Job Applicants: A Controlled Experiment." **Human Resource Management** 30 (Winter 1991), pp. 469-484 (with Charles Jackson, Victor Reinoso, and Laura Hodges).[16]

71. **Managing Greater Washington's Changing Work Force: Keys to Productivity and Profit**. Washington: Greater Washington Research Center, 1991 (with Mary Lou Egan).

70. "Should Labor Market Analyses Recognize that Blacks and Other Minorities are Disproportionately Omitted from Census Counts? in **Papers of the 1990 Training Conference**. New York: NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund, 1990 (with Daniel Edelman).

69. "Upgrade Training in Other Industrial Nations." in Michael Kane and Ann Meltzer, **Upgrade Training for Employed Workers**. Washington: Pelavin Associates for the U.S. Department of Labor, 1990 (with Mary Lou Egan).

68. "Financing Exports: What is the State Role?" in Richard D. Bingham, Edward W. Hill, and Sammis White (eds.), **Financing Economic Development**. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990: 222-240 (with Mary Lou Egan).

67. "The Croson Decision Mandates that Setaside Programs be Tools of Business Development." **George Mason University Civil Rights Law Journal** 1 (Spring 1990): 87-104.[17]

1985 - 1989

66. "Welfare to Work: The Research Basis for a Program Emphasizing the Employer Side of the Labor Market." **Proceedings of the National Workshop on Welfare Research and Statistics**. Washington: National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics, 1989.

65. **Building a Job Service for the Year 2000: Innovative State Practices.** Washington: Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, 1989.

64. **Auditing Race Discrimination in Employment: A Research Design**. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1989.

63. "Privatizing the Delivery of Social Welfare Services: An Idea to be Taken Seriously." in Sheila Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn (eds.), **Privatization and the Welfare State**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989, pp. 97-120.

62. "Matching Workers and Job Opportunities: What Role for the Federal-State Employment Service?" in D.L. Bawden and Felicity Skidmore (eds.), **Rethinking Employment Policy**. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 1989: 81-108.

61. **Jobs: Employment Opportunities in the Washington Area for Persons with Limited Employment Qualifications.** Washington: Greater Washington Research Center, 1988 (with Mary Lou Egan).

---

[16]Reprinted in John Kromkowski (ed.), **Race and Ethnic Relations** (Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing, 1993), pp. 86-93, and **Discrimination and Affirmative Action: Are There Any Facts Out There?** (Sacramento: California State Legislature, 1995).

[17]Also presented as **Testimony**, **Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives**, November 30, 1989.

60. "Alternative Uses of Unemployment Compensation: Self-Employment Allowances." **Testimony**, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, December 14, 1987 (with Mary Lou Egan).

59. "Promoting Employer-Provided Worker Reskilling: Lessons from a Tax Credit System in France." **Testimony**, Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress, October 29, 1987 (with Mary Lou Egan).

58. "Transfer Payment Diversion for Small Business Development: British and French Experience." **Industrial and Labor Relations Review** 40 (July 1987): 528-542 (with Mary Lou Egan).[18]

57. "Enhancing Employment Opportunities for Minority and Disadvantaged Youth." in Ray Rist (ed.), **Policy Studies Review Annual, Volume 8**. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1987: 452-466.

56. "Look Who's Becoming an Entrepreneur." **Across the Board** 24 (January 1987): 52-54 (with Mary Lou Egan).

55. **The Human Resources Component of an Economic Revitalization Strategy for the Mahoning Valley.** Youngstown, Ohio: Regional Growth Association, 1987.

54. "Targeting Benefit Payments in the British Welfare State." in Jerome McKinney and Michael Johnston (eds.) **Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Government**. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1986: 49-59.

53. "Enterprise Zones and Inner City Economic Revitalization." in George Peterson (ed.) **Reagan and the Cities.** Washington:Urban Institute Press, 1986: 97-130 (with David W. Rasmussen).

52. "The Role of Small Business Entrepreneurship in Urban Economic Development," in Marc Lipsitz (ed.), **Revitalizing Our Cities**. Washington: National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, 1986: 48-52.

51. "The Rural-Urban Dimension in National Economic Development." **Journal of Developing Areas** 20 (January 1986): 203-222 (with Mary Lou Egan).[19]

50. **A Program to Address the Employment Consequences of Acid Rain Control.** Washington: National Wildlife Federation, 1985.

49. "Housing Assistance Shifts from Construction to Vouchers." **Journal of the American Planning Association** 8 (September 1985): 475- 476.

48. "The Role of Retraining in the Reemployment of Trade-Displaced Workers." **Testimony**, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, September 17, 1985.

47. "Research Evidence on the Cost-Effectiveness of the Job Corps." **Testimony**, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, May 23, 1985.

46. "Improved Program Administration Can Benefit both Recipients and Oregon Taxpayers." **Testimony**, Committee on Human Resources and the Aging, Oregon House of Representatives, March 1985.

45. "Private Sector Initiatives or Public-Private Partnerships?" in Lester A. Salamon and Michael Lund (eds.) **The Reagan Presidency and the Governing of America.** Washington: Urban Institute Press, 1985: 455-479 (with P. Levinson).

---

[18]Reprinted as **The New Entrepreneurs.** London: Centre for Employment Initiatives, 1988.

[19]Reprinted in **Problemes Politiques et Sociaux** 572 (November 27, 1987), pp. 25-27.

44. **The Role of Publicly-Sponsored Export Trading Companies in the Relief of Unemployment and Regional Economic Distress.** Washington: Bendick & Egan Economic Consultants, Inc., 1985 (with Mary Lou Egan).

1980 - 1984

43. "Worker Mobility in Response to a Plant Closure." in Richard Swigart (ed.) **Managing Plant Closures and Occupational Readjustment**. Washington: National Center for Occupational Readjustment, 1984: 47-59.

42. "Privatization of Public Services: Recent Experience." in Harvey Brooks et al. (eds.) **Public-Private Partnership**. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1984: 153-171.[20]

41. "Dislocated Workers and Midcareer Retraining in Other Industrial Nations." in Kevin Hollenbeck et al. (eds.) **Displaced Workers: Implications for Education and Training Institutions**. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1984: 189-208.[21]

40. "A Methodology for Selecting Economic Development Incentives." **Growth and Change** 15 (January 1984): 18-25 (with David W. Rasmussen and Larry C. Ledebur).

39. "Federal Tax Incentives, Federal Expenditures, and Inner City Economic Revitalization." **Testimony**, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, November 1983 (with David W. Rasmussen).

38. **Reinvesting in Employment and Training Programs: A Portfolio of Innovative Federal Initiatives**. The Urban Institute, 1983.

37. **How's Business in the Reagan Era?** Washington: The Urban Institute, 1983 with Phyllis M. Levinson).

36. "Employment and Training Programs to Reduce Structural Unemployment." **Testimony**, Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress, September, 1983.[22]

35. "America's Implicit Industrial Policy." **Testimony**, Committee on Banking, U.S. House of Representatives, June 1983.

34. "Government's Role in the Job Transitions of America's Displaced Workers." **Testimony**, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, June 1983.[23]

33. "Reemploying Displaced Workers: Five Strategies for Pennsylvania." **Testimony**, House of Representatives' Committee on Appropriations, Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, March 1983.

---

[20]Reprinted in J. Steven Ott, Albert C. Hyde, and Jay M. Shafritz (eds.), **Public Management: The Essential Readings** (Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 1991).

[21]Reprinted in Ray Rist (ed.) **Finding Work: Cross-National Perspectives on Employment and Training.** London: Falmer Press, 1986: 159-172.

[22]Reprinted in Ray Rist (ed.), **Policy Studies Review Annual, Volume 7**. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1985: 359-378; and in **The Entrepreneurial Economy** 3 (August 1984): 8-9.

[23]Reprinted in Terry F. Buss et al. (eds.) **Revitalizing the American Economy**. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1986: 158-175.

32. "The Swedish 'Active Labor Market' System for Reemploying Displaced Workers." **Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration** 6 (Fall 1983): 209-224.

31. **Employment and Training Programs for Migrant and Refugee Youth: Lesson from the United Statesd Experience. Washington:** The Urban Institute, 1983 (with Manuel De La Puente).

30. "Lessons for Future Social Experiments." in Joseph Friedman and Daniel Weinberg (eds.) **The Great Housing Experiments**. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Russell Sage, 1983: 258-265 (with Raymond J. Struyk).

29. "The Role of Public Programs and Private Markets in Reemploying Displaced Workers." **Policy Studies Review** 2 (May 1983): 715-733.

28. "Vouchers versus Income versus Services: An American Experiment in Housing Policy." **Journal of Social Policy** 11 (July 1982): 365-377.

27. "Recent Research in the United States on Social Problems Common to Industrial Societies." in **Trends in Policy Research in the United States and Europe.** Tokyo: National Institute for Research Advancement, 1982: 247-511.

26. "Evaluating State Economic Development Incentives from a Firm's Perspective." **Business Economics** 17 (May 1982): 23-29 (with David W. Rasmussen and Larry C. Ledebur).

25. "Employment, Training, and Economic Development." in John R. Palmer and Isabel V. Sawhill (eds.) **The Reagan Experiment**. Washington: Urban Institute Press, 1982: 247-269.

24. "Providing Industrial Jobs in the Inner City." **Business** 32 (January - March 1982): 2-9 (with Mary Lou Egan).[24]

23. "Enterprise Zones: Area Targeting is the Key to the Job Generation Process." **Testimony**, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, April 1982 (with David W. Rasmussen).[25]

22. Plant Closure and Worker Layoff Procedures in the United States. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1981.

21. "Enterprise Zones: A Land Banking Approach." **Testimony**, Senate Minority Task Force on Economic Development, Legislature of the State of New York, September 1981.[26]

20. **A Federal Entrepreneur? Industrial Policy and American Economic Revitalization.** Washington: The Urban Institute, 1981.

19. **Public-Private Partnerships for Urban Development, Preconditions and Payoffs**. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1981 (with Raymond J. Struyk and James Zais).

18. "National Industrial Policy and Economically-Distressed Communities." **Policy Studies Journal** 10 (December 1981): 220-234 (with Larry C. Ledebur). [27]

---

[24]Reprinted in **Economic Development Commentary** 5 (January 1981): 13-16.

[25]Reprinted in **Congressional Quarterly** 64 (May 1982): 145-147.

[26]Reprinted in **Economic Development Commentary** 6 (Summer 1982): 11-13.

17. "Workers Dislocated by Economic Change: Do They Need Federal Employment and Training Assistance?" in **The Federal Interest in Employment and Training**. Washington: National Commission For Employment Policy, 1981: 175-226 (with Judith Radlinski Devine).[28]

16. **Housing Vouchers for the Poor: Lessons from a National Experiment**. Washington: Urban Institute Press, 1981 (editor, with Raymond J. Struyk).

15. "Failure to Enroll in Public Assistance Programs." **Social Work** 25 (July 1980): 268-274.

14. "Quality Control in a Federal-State Public Assistance Program." **Administration in Social Work** 4(Spring 1980): 7-20.

1970 – 1979

13. "A Management Analysis Process for Public Assistance Quality Control." in **Welfare Research and Statistics**. Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1979.

12. **The Anatomy of AFDC Errors.** Washington: Urban Institute Press, 1978 (with Abe Lavine and Toby H. Campbell).

11. "Improving Measures of Economic Well Being [Review]." **Social Service Review** 52 (June 1978): 315-316.

10. "The Literacy of Welfare Clients." **Social Service Review** 52 (March 1978): 56-68 (with Mario Cantu).

9. "WIC and the Paradox of In-Kind Transfers." **Public Finance Quarterly** 6 (July 1978): 359-80.

8. "Management Training for Public Welfare Agencies." **Administration in Social Work** 1 (Winter 1977): 359-67 (with Mary Lou Egan).

7. "Cost-Effective Actions for Reducing AFDC Eligibility and Payment Errors." **Testimony**, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, October 1977.

6. **Income-Conditioned Programs and their Clients.** Washington: Urban Institute Press, 1977 (with D. Lee Bawden).

5. "Education as a Three-Sector Industry." in B. A. Weisbrod. **The Voluntary Non-Profit Sector: An Economic Analysis**. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1977: 101-142.

4. **Toward Efficiency and Effectiveness in the WIC Delivery System**. Washington: Urban Institute Press, 1976 (with Toby H. Campbell, D. Lee Bawden, and Melvin Jones).

3. "Designing Circuit-Breaker Property Tax Relief." **National Tax Journal** 27 (March 1974): 19-28.[29]

2. "Reforming the Homestead Credit for Property Tax Relief." **Testimony**, Joint Finance Committee, Wisconsin State Legislature, February 1974.

---

[27]Reprinted in F. Stevens Redburn and Terry H. Buss (eds.) **Public Policies for Distressed Communities**. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1982: 3-14.

[28]Reprinted in **The Entrepreneurial Economy** 1 (December 1982): 10-11.

[29]Awarded Harold M. Groves Prize for Excellence in Public Finance Research, 1974.

1. **Linear Programming Tools for Aircraft Systems Analysis**. Long Beach, CA: McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 1970.

ATTACHMENT B

MARC BENDICK, JR., Ph.D.

CASES AND PROJECTS IN LITIGATION SUPPORT

March 2017

I. CASES IN WHICH A FEDERAL COURT ACCEPTED BENDICK AS AN EXPERT[1]

[214] Adams et al. v. Brookshire Grocery Company (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, 6:98-CV-00462)

Expert testimony via reports concerning gender patterns in promotion, assignment, and compensation of retail sales employees. Client: Rod Tanner and Associates, Fort Worth, TX, representing plaintiffs

[213] Alcarez v. Block (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, C.A. S-82-298-RAR)

Expert testimony before a judge via declaration concerning the demographic characteristics of low-income persons. Client: California Rural Legal Assistance, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[212] Anderson v. Douglas **&** Lomason Co. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, C.A. DC 85-160-LS-0)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning racial patterns in employment in a manufacturing company. Client: Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[211] Appleton et al. v. Deloite, Touche (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, No, C-95-0483)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning race patterns in the hiring, promotion, assignment, and compensation of professional and administrative employees. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[210] Armstrong et al. v. Ford Motor Company and Visteon Corporation (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division, 3-01-0012)

Design and implementation of a post-settlement monitoring system concerning race patterns in the employment of salaried employees. Client: Visteon Corporation/ Ford Motor Co., Detroit, MI, on behalf of both plaintiffs and defendants.

[209] Baker et al v. City of Detroit (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, 1979)

Expert testimony via a report before a judge concerning racial patterns in promotions in a police department. Client: Law Department, City of Detroit, MI, representing defendants.

[208] Berger et al. v. United Ironworkers Reinforced Rodmen (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 75-1743)

[1] Court stated that he was qualified as an expert, allowed him to present an opinion, explicitly cited his evidence in a decision, or appeared to rely on his evidence in a decision.

Expert testimony before a magistrate concerning the economic loss associated with racial patterns in admission to a construction craft union. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights with Patton Boggs & Blow, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[207] Brionez et al. v. U.S. Department of Agriculture (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 01 3969CW)

Expert testimony before a special master and a judge via a report concerning the employment of Hispanics in the United States Forest Service. Client: Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[206] Bush et al. v. Ruth's Chris Steak House, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C 1:10-cv-01721-RBW)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in promotion, assignment, compensation, discipline, and termination of administrative and managerial employees. Client: Mehri & Skalet, PLLC, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[205] Butler et al. v. Home Depot, Inc. and Frank et al. v. Home Depot, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 94 - 4335 (SI) and C 95 -2182 (SI))

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in the hiring, promotion, assignment, and compensation of retail sales employees. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[204] Clark et al. v. Anna's Linen Company et al. (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C05-02670)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in the employment of retail employees. Client: Goldstein, Demchak, Baller, Borgen & Dardarian, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[203] Coleman v. Best (U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, C.A. H85-1828)

Expert testimony before a jury concerning the economic loss associated with the death of a blue collar worker. Client: Kiersh and Buckman, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[202] Detroit Police Officers' Association v. Young (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, C.A. 74-71838)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning racial and gender patterns in employment in a police department. Client: Law Department, City of Detroit, MI, representing defendants.

[201] Dukes et al. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, No. C-01-2252 MJJ)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in the employment of retail managers. Client: The Impact Fund, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[200] Easterling et al. v. Connecticut Department of Corrections (U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, Civil Action 3:08-cv-0826 (JCH))

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages to female job applicants adversely affected by a physical abilities test. Client: Outten & Golden, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[199] EEOC v. Francis Parker School (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, C 91 4674)

Expert testimony via a report concerning age patterns in the employment of secondary school faculty. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Chicago, District Office, representing plaintiffs.

[198] EEOC v. Walgreen Co. (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois, 07-172).

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning racial patterns in hiring, promoting, and assigning managerial and professional employees in a large retail chain. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, St. Louis office, representing plaintiffs.

[197] Ellis et al. v. Costco (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C.A. 04 3341 MHP)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in employment among retail employees. Client: The Impact Fund, Berkeley, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[196] Foggs v. Block (U. S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, C.A. 81-0365-F)

Expert testimony via deposition concerning the demographic characteristics of low-income persons. Client: Western Massachusetts Legal Services, Springfield, MA, representing plaintiffs.

[195] Guerrero v. California Department of Corrections (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 13-05671 WHA)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning national origin patterns in employment restrictions on persons who previously used a false Social Security number. Client: Employment Law Center-Legal Aid Society, San Francisco, representing plaintiff.

[194] Haynes et. al. v. Shoney's Inc. et al. (U. S. District Cothe Northern District of Florida, Penascola Division, C.A. 89-3093-WEA).

Expert testimony before a judge concerning racial patterns in the employment of restaurant workers. Client: NAACP Legal Defense Fund, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[193] Houser et al. v. Prtizker (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, 10 CIV-3105-FM)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning the race/ethnic patterns in the employment of enumerators for the 2010 Census. Client: Outten & Golden LLP, New York, representing Plaintiffs.

[192] Kraszewski v. State Farm Insurance Co. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 79-1261 TEH)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in the employment of professional sales agents. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[191] Lewis et al. v. City of Chicago (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, 98 C 5596)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning racial patterns in the hiring of fire fighter and economic damages associated with those patterns. Client: Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, representing plaintiffs.

[190] Middleton et al v. City of Flint et al (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division - Flint, C.A. 90-CV40148-FL)

Expert testimony via reports concerning racial patterns in employment in a police department. Client: Keller, Thoma, Schwarze, Schwarze, DuBay & Katz, Detroit, MI, representing defendants.

[189] NAACP v. Detroit (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, C.A. 80-73693)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning racial patterns in employment in a police department. Client: Law Department, City of Detroit, MI, representing defendants.

[188] Nelson and Armstrong et. al. V. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. et al. (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Eastern Division, Case 2:04-cv-00171-WRW)

Expert testimony via reports concerning racial patterns in employment of truck drivers by a large retail firm. Daubert motion to exclude was denied. Client: Cauley, Bowman, Carney & Williams, P.L.L.C., Little Rock, AR, representing plaintiffs.

[187] Pearce v. Griffin Bell (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 86-0008)

Expert testimony before a jury on the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a corporate manager. Client: Milliken, Van Susteren, and Canan, P.C., Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[186] Pegues v. Mississippi State Employment Service (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, C.A. DC 72-4-LS)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning racial and gender patterns in referrals by a state employment service. Client: Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[185] Peterson and Olson et al. v. Seagate Technologies et al. (U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota, C.A. 84 Civil 07-2502 MJD/AJB)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning age patterns in a layoff in a high tech firm. Client: Bertelson Law Offices, Minneapolis, MN, Dorene R. Sarnoski Law Office, Minneapolis, MN, and AARP, Washington, DC representing plaintiffs.

[184] Pines v. State Farm Insurance (U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, C.A. SACU 89-63/AHS)

Expert testimony via reports concerning age patterns in the employment of professional sales agents. Client: American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[183] Satchell et al. v. Fedex Express (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C-03-2659 SI)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning race/ethnic patterns in the employment of manual workers and supervisors in a package delivery service. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs

[182] Shores et al. v. Publix Super Markets, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division, C.A. 95-1162-CIV-T-25E).

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in employment in the retail industry. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[181] Tucker et al. v, Walgreen Company (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois, East St. Louis Division, cv. 05-00440-GPM CJP)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning racial patterns in hiring, promoting, and assigning managerial and professional employees in a large retail chain. Client: Goldstein, Demchak, Baller Borgen & Dardarian, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[180] United States v. City of Miami (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, C. A. 75-3096-CIV-KEHOE)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning race, sex, and national origin patterns in hiring and promotions in a fire department. Client: City Attorney for the City of Miami, FL, representing defendants.

[179] United States v. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (U.S. District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, C.A. 92-0016)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning national origin patterns in the promotion and compensation of public school teachers. Client: Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., representing complainants.

[178] Walker v. Prince Georges County (U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, C.A. Y86-3446)

Expert testimony before a jury concerning the economic loss associated with the death of a blue collar worker/ small business owner. Client: Milliken, Van Susteren & Canan, P.C., Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[177] Williams v. New Orleans (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, C.A. 73-629)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning racial patterns in hiring and promotion in a large police department. Client: NAACP Legal Defense Fund, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[176] Workman v. J.R. Simplot Company, Inc. (U. S. District Court for the District of Idaho, C.A. CIV 91-0105 S EJL)

Expert testimony via deposition and reports concerning gender patterns in employment and wages in a manufacturing firm. Client: Givens, Pursley & Huntley, Boise, ID, representing plaintiffs.

II. CASES IN WHICH A STATE COURT OR OTHER TRIBUNAL ACCEPTED BENDICK AS AN EXPERT[2]

[175] Ball v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, C.A. 04-411518-CD)

Expert testimony before an arbitration tribunal concerning the separation from employment of an executive. Client: Plunkett & Cooney, P.C., Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[2] For a definition, see footnote 1.

[174] Blackwell v. Administrator, General Services Administration (EEOC 033-93-4142X)

Expert testimony before an EEOC hearing examiner concerning racial patterns in promotions in a large federal agency. Client: Yablonski, Both & Edelman, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[173] Dysert v. Westinghouse Electric, Inc. (Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania, Number 2572, July Term 1988)

Expert testimony before a jury concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a professional employee. Client: Bernabei & Katz, Washington, D.C., representing plaintiff.

[172] Lee v. District of Columbia (Superior Court of the District of Columbia, C.A. 13578-83)

Expert testimony before a jury via deposition concerning the economic loss associated with the death of a homemaker/ parent. Client: Milliken, Van Susteren, and Canan, P.C., Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[171] McDowell v. District of Columbia (Superior Court of the District of Columbia, C.A. 8665-84)

Expert testimony before a jury concerning the economic loss associated with the death of a blue collar worker. Client: Milliken, Van Susteren, and Canan, P.C., Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[170] OFCCP v. Packaging Corporation of America (U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Case 92-OFC-15)

Expert testimony via reports concerning gender patterns in hiring in a manufacturing plant. Client: Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Department of Labor, representing plaintiffs.

[169] Pontiac, Michigan Public Safety Departments (1988, 1990, 1995)

Consultation, data analysis, and presentation before a Michigan Act 312 arbitration panel concerning race patterns in employment in police and fire departments. Client: Department of Law, City of Pontiac, MI, representing potential defendants.

[168] Hill v. Administrator, General Services Administration (EEOC 100-98-7063).

Expert testimony before an administrative law judge concerning racial patterns in promotions in a large federal agency. Client: Yablonski, Both & Edelman, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[167] Sondel et al. v. Northwest Airlines (District Court for Dakota County, Minnesota, Case CO-92-8193)

Expert testimony before a judge concerning gender patterns and economic losses associated with limitation of employment opportunities for service personnel. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA., representing plaintiffs.

[166] Stepakoff v. University of Maryland (Circuit Court for Prince George's County, Maryland, CA 92-17117)

Expert testimony before a jury concerning the economic loss associated with interruption of professional education. Client: Bernabei & Katz, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

III. OTHER CASES

[165] [firm name confidential] (no litigation pending)

Consultation and data analysis concerning patterns in compensation of lawyers in a large law firm. Client: Katz, Marshall & Banks, Washington, DC, representing a potential plaintiff.

[164] [firm name confidential] (no litigation pending)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race patterns in employment of sales and marketing professionals in a high technology firm. Client: Mehri & Skalet, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[163] [firm name confidential] (no litigation pending)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race patterns in employment among professional employees in a financial services firm. Client: Asian Pacific American Legal Center, Los Angeles, representing plaintiffs.

[162] Adams and Allard v. Indiana Bell Telephone Co. and Ameritech (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, C.A. IP93-420c and C.A.s IP93-1341C through 1346C)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in employment by a telecommunications company. Client: Rose and Rose, Washington, D.C., representing plaintiffs.

[161] Alberto et al. v. City of Miami (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, C. A. 95-1111-CIV-MARCUS)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race, sex, and national origin patterns in hiring and promotions in a police department. Client: City Attorney for the City of Miami, FL, representing defendants.

[160] Allen v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, C.A. 90-00-3011 CZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a professional employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[159] Alvarado et al. v. Nestle Food Co. (U. S. District Court for the District of Idaho, CIV 94-0248-S-EJL)

Consultation and data analysis concerning ethnic patterns in promotions within a manufacturing plant. Client: Givens, Pursley & Huntley, Boise, Idaho, representing plaintiffs.

[158] Appolon et al. v. University of Miami (U. S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Miami Division, 1:10-cv-24166-CIV-Ungaro/Simonton)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the effect of credit checks on racial and ethnic minority job applicants for administrative jobs. Client: Outten & Golden, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[157] Arnold v. The Kroger Co. (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in the employment of corporate managers. Client: Keller, Thoma, Schwarze, Schwarze, DuBay & Katz, P.C., representing defendant.

[156] Artis v. John Deere (EEOC Charge 550-2008-0016N)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in the employment of customer service representatives. Client: The Impact Fund, Berkeley, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[155] Bell et al v. Lockheed Martin (U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, C.A. 08-6292)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in the promotion, assignment, and compensation of professional and managerial employees. Client: Console Law Offices, Philadelphia, PA, representing plaintiffs.

[154] Barcume v. Flint (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, C.A. 84-8066)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race and gender patterns in employment in a police department. Client: Office of the City Attorney, City of Flint, MI, representing defendant.

[153] Barnes et al. v. Canadian National/Illinois Central Railroad (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, 04-C1249)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in promotions to first-level supervisors among transportation workers. Client: Wiggins, Childs, Quinn & Pantazis, Birmingham, AL, representing plaintiffs.

[152] Barnett et al. v Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (Superior Court for the State of Washington, County of King, No. 03-2-15301-0 SEA)

Consultation and data analysis concerning compensation of hourly retail employees. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[151] Barrow et al. v. Georgia Pacific Corporation (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Alabama, Southern Division, Civil Action 01-0141-BH-M)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the assignment and promotion of manufacturing employees. Client: Taylor, Martino & Hedge, PC, Mobile, AL, representing plaintiffs.

[150] Bergmann et al. v. University of Maryland (U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, C.A. H85-446, H86-445 consolidated)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in the employment of university faculty. Client: Zwerdling, Paul, Leibig, Kahn & Thompson, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[149] Bogle v. Burroughs (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, 86-634866-CZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in the employment of corporate middle managers. Client: Schureman, Frakes, Glass & Wulfmeier, Detroit, MI, representing plaintiff.

[148] Bouman et al. v. Baca (U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, C.V. 80-1341 – RMT)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in the employment of uniformed officers in a large urban police department. Client: Dennis M. Harley, A Law Corporation, Pasadena, CA, presenting plaintiffs.

[147] Bowman v. Blue Care Network and Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, 2:06-cv-14165)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with termination of a supervisory office employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, representing defendants.

[146] Brienza v. United Press International, et al. (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 90-2925)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a journalist. Client: Bernabei & Katz, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[145] Broadnax v. General Electric Company (U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, C.A. 00-11033-WGY)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment at a large manufacturing firm. Client: Rosenfeld & Associates, Boston, representing plaintiff.

[144] Brooks v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, 2:08-CV10621)

Consultation and data analysis concerning promotion of a mid-level manager. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[143] Brown et al. v. Pro Football, Inc. et al. (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 90-1071)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with monopolistic practices in the compensation of professional athletes. Client: Yablonski, Both & Edelman, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[142] Brown et al. v. Sacramento Regional Transit District (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California)

Consultation and preparation of a declaration concerning the job relatedness of job requirements for first-level supervisors. Client: The Impact Fund, Berkeley, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[141] Bryant v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (American Arbitration Association, 54 160 00242 09)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages associated with discharge of an administrative employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, representing defendant.

[140] Byrd et al. v. Sprint (Circuit Court of Jackson County, MO, at Independence, Case No. CV92-018979)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic losses associated with failure to comply with compensation agreements with independent sales agents. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[139] California Department of Fair Employment and Housing v. Equity Residential Properties

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns among residents of apartment complexes. Client: California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Sacramento, representing plaintiffs.

[138] California Department of Fair Employment and Housing v. Airbandb. California Department of Fair Employment and Housing Cases 574743-231889 and 574743-231624.

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in provision of short-term housing. Client: California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Sacramento, representing plaintiffs.

[137] California Department of Fair Employment and Housing v. Lawrence Livermore Laboratory (no litigation)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the hiring, assignment, and promotion of technical and professional employees. Client: California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Sacramento, representing plaintiffs.

[136] Campbell et al v. Amtrak (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action 1:99CV02979 (EGS))

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the hiring, assignment, promotion, and compensation of transportation employees. Client: Wiggins, Childs, Quinn & Pantazes, P.C., Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[135] Carstarphen v. Georgia Pacific Corporation (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, Civil Action 1:01-CV-1654, WBH)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the assignment, promotion, and compensation of manufacturing employees. Client: McCleave & Denson, LLC, Mobile, AL, representing plaintiffs.

[134] Carter et al. v. United Parcel Service of America, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C-97-01590)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the assignment, promotion, and compensation of hourly employees. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstien, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[133] Carter and Phillips et al. v. Wells Fargo Advisors et al. [Wachovia Bank] (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 1:09-cv-01752-CKK0

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment among professional employees in a financial services firm. Client: Mehri & Skalet, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[132] City of Burlington v. Dague et al. (U.S. Supreme Court, 91-810)

Consultation and analysis concerning the role of risk in the earnings of professional workers. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA, representing respondent (plaintiff).

[131] City of Chicago Minority Purchasing Ordinance (1990).

Consultation and data analysis concerning public programs to promote minority and women-owned business enterprises. Client: Mayor's Panel of Minority and Women-Owned Business, City of Chicago, IL, representing potential defendants.

[130] City of Detroit Executive Order 22 (1988).

Consultation and data analysis concerning public programs to promote minority employment in the construction industry. Client: Law Department, City of Detroit, MI representing potential defendants.

[129] Clark v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, CV-13609-JCO-RSW)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a technical employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[128] Coalition for Economic Equity et al. v. Pete Wilson et al (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C-96-4024-TEH).

Consultation and data analysis concerning the role of affirmative action in employment of women and minorities. Client: ACLU Foundation of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[127] Cook et. al. v. Billington et al. (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 82-0400 (NHJ/PJA)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in promotions in a large federal government agency. Client: Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs and Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn, representing plaintiffs.

[126] Cote et al. v. Wal-Mart (U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, C.A. 1:15-CV-12945 (WGY)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages associated with denial of health insurance coverage for same-sex partners. Client: Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs, representing plaintiffs

[125] Danies v. MCI Worldcom Network Services, Inc (U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, Northern Division, C.A. WMN - 00 –CV-3046)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages experienced by a technical worker as a consequence of termination of his employment. Client: Thomas Gagliardo, Esq., Silver Spring, MD, representing plaintiff.

[124] Davis et al v. Shaw Industries, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Albany Division, C.A. 03-CV-139)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in promotions and other employment outrcomes in a manufacturing firm. Client: Wiggins, Childs, Quinn & Pantazis, P.C., Washington DC, representing plaintiffs.

[123] Dixon v. Recruit U.S.A., Inc. et al. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 91-0347-JPV)

Consultation, data analysis, and deposition testimony concerning the economic loss associated with racial patterns in referrals by an employment referral agency. Client: Employment Law Center, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[122] Donaldson et al. v. Microsoft Corp. (U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington, C00-1684P)

Consultation and data analysis concerning patterns of compensation for male and female employees. Client: Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld & Toll, PLLC, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[121] Duling et al. V. Gristede's Operating Corp (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, 06 Civ. 10197 (LTS)/(BHP))

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in hiring, promotions, and compensation. Client: Outten & Golden, LLP, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[120] Dunn v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (American Arbitration Association, 54-160-01677-08-02 LAVA-R)

Consultation and data analysis concerning separation from employment of a mid-level manager. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, representing defendant.

[119] EEOC v. Allstate Insurance Company (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri Eastern Division, C.A. 4:04CV01359 ERW)

Consultation and data analysis concerning rehiring policies and damages associated with separation from employment of older insurance sales agents. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, St. Louis Office, representing plaintiffs.

[118] EEOC v. Hamtramck (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, C.A. 81-71353)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of fire fighters. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Detroit Office, representing plaintiffs.

[117] EEOC and Davis et al. v. J & R Baker Farms (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Valdosta Division, C.A. 7:11-cv-136-HL)

Consultation and data analysis concerning employment patterns of U.S. and foreign agricultural workers. Client: Georgia Legal Services Program, Atlanta, GA, representing plaintiff-intervenors.

[116] EEOC v. McCormick & Schmick (EEOC Commissioner's Charge 550-2006002139)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment in a restaurant chain. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, San Francisco Office, representing plaintiffs.

[115] EEOC v. Mach Mining, LLC (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois, 11-879-JPG/PMF)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment in a coal mine. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Chicago Office, representing plaintiffs.

[114] EEOC v. Mavis Discount Tire, Inc. et al. (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, 12-CV-0741 (JGK) (GWG)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment in an auto services chain. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, New York Office, representing plaintiffs.

[113] EEOC v. United Air Lines, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C.A. 84-0560).

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment among skilled technicians. Client: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, San Francisco Office, representing plaintiffs.

[112] Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington et al. v. BMC Marketing Trading as Snelling & Snelling Personnel Consultants (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 91 - 0989)

Analysis through employment "testers" of racial patterns in the placement activities of an employment referral agency. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law with Arnold & Porter, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[111] Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington et al. v. Gale S. Molovinski Trading as Executive Suite (Superior Court for the District of Columbia. C.A. 91-CA07202)

Analysis through employment "testers" concerning gender patterns in the placement activities of an employment referral agency. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law with Reed Smith Shaw & McClay, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[110] Field v. Philadelphia Electric Co. (Court of Common Pleas of York County, Pennsylvania, 87-SU-0254-01)

Consultation and analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a skilled technician. Client: Bernabei & Katz, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[109] Fogle v. U.S. General Accounting Office (EEOC 091-80X0055)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with racial patterns in the employment of professional employees in a public agency. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[108] Fowler v. McCrory Stores (Circuit Court for Montgomery County, Maryland, C.A. 23-098)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a mid-level corporate manager. Client: NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[107] Freed v. Georgetown University (Superior Court of the District of Columbia, C.A. 89-CA12859)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a medical research scientist. Client: Bernabei & Katz, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[106] Fulcher et al. v. 24 Hour Fitness USA, Inc. (Superior Court of the State of California for Alameda County, 10524911)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race, ethnic, and gender patterns in promotions and compensation in health and fitness clubs. Client: Lewis, Feinberg, Lee, Renaker & Jackson, P.C., Oakland, CA., representing plaintiffs.

[105] Giant Food. Inc. (no litigation filed)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race and gender patterns in the employment of retail sales employees. Client: Venable, Baetjer, Howard & Civiletti, LLP, representing potential defendants.

[104] Gonzalez et al. v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc. (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco/Oakland Division, 03-2817 SI0)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial and ethnicity patterns in the retail employees. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[103] Gonzalez et al. v. Local 52, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees et al. (U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, 2:14-cv-03407)

Consultation and data analysis concerning ethnicity patterns in admission to a craft union. Client: Levy Ratner P.C., representing plaintiff.

[102] Goshton v. Arva Overton and Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, 08-105466-CZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of an administrative employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[101] Gutierrez and Morgan, et al. v. Johnson & Johnson (U. S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, C.A. 01-5302)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial and ethnicity patterns in the employment of professional workers. Client: Mehri & Skalet, PLLC, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[100] Hardie v. National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) et al. (U. S. District Court for the Southern District of California, 13CV0346 W – DHB)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in criminal records. Client: Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, Washington, DC, and Morrison & Foerster LLP, representing plaintiff.

[99] Heatherly v. University of Alabama (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, Western Division, C.A. 7:16-cv-00275-RDP)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender discrimination in the compensation of a senior administrative employee. Client: Haynes & Haynes, P.C. Birmingham, AL, representing plaintiff.

[98] Hensel et al. v. Noll Printing Co., Inc. (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division, C.A. F91-00292)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in the termination from employment of skilled manufacturing workers. Client: Rose and Rose, Washington, D.C., representing plaintiffs.

[97] Hinson v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, 09-006726-CD)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages associated with discharge of a customer service employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, representing defendant.

[96] Hioutakos v. Simplex Grinnell (Third District Court, State of New Jersey, 2:10-cv-04505-DMC-JAD)

Consultation and data analysis concerning payment of prevailing wages to employees working on public contracts. Client: Mehri & Skalet, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[95] Hogle v. Accident Fund Insurance Company of America. (District Court for the County of Ingram, Michigan, Case 06-131-CL)

Consultation and data analysis concerning damages associated from employment of a corporate manager. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, representing defendant.

[94] Holloway et al. v. Best Buy Co., Inc. (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco/Oakland Division, 05-5056 MEJ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender and race patterns in the employment of retail employees. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[93] Hubbard v. Wal-Mart et al. (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Western Division, 07-CV-3169)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender and race patterns in the employment of retail managers. Client: Law Office of J. Baron, Toledo, Ohio, representing plaintiff.

[92] Hudson et al. v. First Transit (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C10-03158-WHA)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race and national origin patterns in the effect of criminal convictions on the hiring of transportation employees. Client: Goldstein, Demchak, Baller, Borgen & Dardarian, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[91] Jock et al. v. Sterling Jewelers, Inc. (American Arbitration Association Case 11 160 00655 08)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in assignment, promotion and compensation of retail sales and sales management employees. Client: Cohen Milstein Hausfeld & Toll, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[90] Johnson v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (arbitration)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic consequences of termination for a professional employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, representing defendant.

[89] Jones et al. v. Ford Motor Co. (U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota, C. F. 3-93-370)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race patterns in the hiring, promotion, assignment, and compensation of professional employees. Client: Sprenger & Lang, Washington, D.C., representing plaintiffs.

[88] Joyner et al. v. Archers Daniel Midland (U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Urbana Division, Civil Action 03-2177 (MPM))

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment in the promotion and pay of manufacturing workers. Client: Wiggins, Childs, Quinn & Pantazis, PC, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[87] Kaden v. Macalaster College (U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota, case not filed)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of an athletic coach. Client: Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi, L.L.P., Minneapolis, MN, representing plaintiff.

[86] [Keo] Ratha et al v. Phatthana Seafood Co, Ltd. et al. (U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, Western Division, Case 2:16-cv-04271)

Consultation and data analysis concerning financial benefits to the employer and economic damages to the plaintiffs from human trafficking practices in food processing. Client: Cohen, Milstein, Sellers & Toll, Washington DC, representing plaintiffs.

[85] Kujan v. The Kroger Co. (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, C.A. 92-210725CZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in the employment of corporate managers. Client: Keller, Thoma, Schwarze, Schwarze, DuBay & Katz, P.C., representing defendant.

[84] Labor Committee for NAACP, Front Royal, VA v. Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 69 (EEOC 033 810402)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in job assignments allocated by a construction craft union. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights with Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[83] Lewis and Powell et al. v. Pitney Bowes, Inc. (EEOC)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the assignment of industrial sales workers. Client: Mehri & Skalet PLLC, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[82] Little et al. v. Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority et al. (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C. A. 1:14-cv-01289-RMC)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages accruing to un-hired and terminated transportation workers. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs, Washington, DC, and NAACP Legal Defense Fund, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[81] City of Los Angeles v. County of Los Angeles (Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, C.A. 655-274)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the demographic characteristics of homeless persons. Client: Western Center on Law and Poverty, Los Angeles, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[80] Lucas et al. v. Ferrara Candy Company et al. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, C.A. 13 C 1525)
Consultation and data analysis concerning employment referrals and employment of unskilled manufacturing workers. Client: Cohen, Milstein, Sellers & Toll, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[79] Lucas [Green] et al. v. Gold Standard Baking, Inc. and Personnel Staffing Group (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, C.A. 13 C 1524)

Consultation and data analysis concerning employment referrals and employment of unskilled manufacturing workers. Client: Cohen, Milstein, Sellers & Toll, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[78] Lucas et al. v. Vee Pak, Inc. et al. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, C.A. 12 C 9672)

Consultation and data analysis concerning employment referrals and employment of unskilled manufacturing workers. Client: Cohen, Milstein, Sellers & Toll, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[77] Lucas et al. v. Kmart Corp (U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, C.A. 99-K-1923)

Consultation and data analysis concerning access to retail services by persons in wheelchairs. Client: Fox and Robertson, P.C., Denver, CO, representing plaintiffs.

[76] Maliniak v. City of Tucson (U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona, Tucson Division, CV 07-125 TUC JMR)

Consultation and data analysis concerning on-the-job harassment of a female firefighter. Client: Jenne S. Forbes, Esq., Tucson, AZ, representing plaintiff.

[75] McCrossan v. Sutton (Federal District Court for New Mexico, CV 95-6556-HB)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the utilization of minority and disadvantaged owned businesses on federally-funded construction projects. Client: Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., representing defendant.

[74] McReynolds et al. v. Merrill Lynch (Federal District Court for Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, 1:2008cv06105).

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the employment of financial services professional employees. Client: Stowell and Friedman, Ltd., Chicago, IL, representing plaintiffs.

[73] Marcus v. Stevens (Illinois Human Rights Commission, Charge 1989CF3102)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial and obesity patterns in referrals by an employment placement agency. Client: Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago, Chicago, representing plaintiff.

[72] Martinez v. Pomona College (Superior Court of Los Angeles County, BC518863)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a college professor. Client: Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Funds, Inc., representing plaintiff.

[71] Mates Food System, Inc. v. Hardee's Food System, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, C.A. 93-451-CIV-5-F)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the award and management of fast food franchises. Client: Smallwood and Associates, Windsor, N.C., representing plaintiff.

[70] Matthews v. Johnson and Johnson (EEOC, 2004)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial adverse impact in the use of credit histories as an employment criterion. Client: Outten and Golden, New York, NY, representing plaintiff.

[69] Mayfield v. Thornburgh (EEOC 033-085-x5214, Baltimore District Office)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment among clerical employees in a public agency. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law with Sidley and Austin, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[68] Michigan Civil Service Affirmative Action Plan (1994, 2006)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the design of an affirmative action plan covering administrative and public safety employees. Client: Civil Service Commission of the State of Michigan, representing potential defendants.

[67] Milwaukee Brotherhood of Firefighters v. City of Milwaukee (EEOC Charge 260970100)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with racial patterns in the employment of employees in a public agency. Client: Hall, Charne Burce and Olsen, PC, Milwaukee, representing plaintiffs.

[66] Mitchell et al. v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, 01 CIV 2112 (WHP)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment in a large life insurance company. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[65] Moeller et al. v. Taco Bell Corporation (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 02-5849 MJJ)
Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages arising from inaccessibility of restaurant services to persons in wheelchairs. Client: Fox & Robertson, P.C., Denver, CO, representing plaintiffs.

[64] Moody v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, 09-007926-NZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages associated with discharge of a clerical employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, representing defendant.

[63] Morgan v. Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 1: 98CV01397 (ESH))

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment among professional employees in a financial services firm. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[62] Morgan Stanley (no litigation pending)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment among professional employees in a financial services firm. Client: Asian Pacific Americans Legal Center of Southern Caliufornia, Los Angeles, representing plaintiffs.

[61] Morris v. Communications Satellite Corp. (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 88-3480)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a skilled technician. Client: Yablonski, Both & Edelman, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[60] Munchus v. Friedman Billings Ramsey & Co., Inc. (Financial Industry Regulatory Authority 08163, 2009)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a highly-paid financial services sales employee. Client: Bernabei & Wachtel, PLLC, Washington, DC, representing defendant.

[59] Murphy-Clay v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, No. 97-701244- CZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of an administrative employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[58] Murphy-Taylor and United States v. Queen Ann's County, MD et al. (U.S. District Court for the District of Mayland , 1:12-cv-02521-ELH)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages associated with separation from employment of a police officer. Client: Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff-intervenor.

[57] NAACP, et al. v. Imperial Irrigation District, et al. (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Civ. 70-0302GT)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment at a public utility company. Client: Employment Law Center, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[56] New Era Cap Co., Inc (2008)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race and gender patterns in compensation and promotions in a manufacturing distribution center. Client: Workers Rights Consortium, Washington DC, a third-party investigator.

[55] New York State Procurement Setasides (1991)

Consultation and data analysis concerning public programs to promote the development of minority and women-owned business enterprises. Client: Office of the Solicitor General, State of New York, representing potential defendants.

[54] O'Bannon et al. v. Friedman's Jewelers, Inc. (United States District Court for the District of Maryland, Southern Division)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment in a retail chain. Client: Goldstein, Demchak, Baller, Borgen & Dardarian, Oakland CA, representing plaintiffs.

[53] Ochoa et al. v. Mcdonald's Corporation et al. (United States District Court for the Northern District of California, No. 3:14-cv-02098-JD)

Consultation and data analysis concerning uncompensated work by low-wage restaurant employees. Client: Altschuler Berzon, LLP, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[52] Oldham v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, No. 94-407474 ND)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a clerical employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[51] O'Neal v. City of New Albany (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, C.A. NA 90-90C)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in employment in a police department. Client: Lynch, Cox, Gilman & Mahan, Louisville, KY, representing plaintiff.

[50] OFCCP v. Elim Care Center

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in hiring health care employees. Client: Regional Solicitor's Office, U.S. Department of Labor, representing plaintiff.

[49] Osborne v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, 08-11195)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of an administrative worker. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[48] Phipps et al. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, No. 3:12-cv-1009)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in the employment and compensation of retail employees. Client: Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[47] Perry v. New York Health and Racquet Club (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, C.A. 84 Civ. 3610 and 85 Civ. 4606)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the employment of service workers. Client: Hill, Betts, and Nash, New York, NY, representing plaintiffs.

[46] Piasecki .v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, No. 97-728747-NZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a professional employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[45] Pierre et al. v. Debby's Staffing Services, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, Central Division, Case 3:15-CV-00089

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in referrals by an employment staffing agency. Client: Newkirk Zwagerman, Des Moines, IA, representing plaintiffs.

[44] Pike and Thomas v. Lucent Technologies, Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, C.A. 1:00-CV-1406-RWS)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic damages associated with layoffs of older, professional employees. Client: Greene, Buckley, Jones & McQueen, Atlanta, Georgia, representing plaintiffs.

[43] Quintero v. Temporaries, Inc. et al. (Superior Court of the State of California, San Francisco County, C.A. 895-675)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in referrals by a private employment placement agency. Client: Employment Law Center, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[42] Rabin et al. v. Price Waterhouse Coopers LLP (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case 3:16-cv-02276)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in hiring by a professional services firm. Client: Outten & Golden, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[41] Raskin v. Wyatt (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, C.A. 94-CIVIL-2314)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in employment by a professional services firm. Client: Rose and Rose, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[40] Ricci v. DeStefano (U.S. Supreme Court, Docket 07-1428)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns among employees of fire departments. Client: NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, New York, representing defendants.

[39] Rice et al. v. Southern California Edison Company (U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, Case 94-6353-JMI (JRx))

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns among employees of a large public utility company and diversity management programs affecting these patterns. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[38] Ridgeway et al. v. Denny's Inc. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C.A. C-93-20202).

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns among restaurant customers. Client: Saperstein, Goldstein, Demchak & Baller, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[37] Rodriguez et al. v. Merrill Lynch et al. (Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division: Hudson County, Docket l-5905-98)

Consultation and data analysis concerning employment patterns of low-skill immigrant workers alleging sexual harassment and employment discrimination. Client: Arenson, Dittmar & Karban, New York, representing plaintiffs.

[36] City of San Francisco Minority Purchasing Ordinance (1989)

Consultation and data analysis concerning public programs to promote minority and women-owned business enterprises. Client: Lawyers' Committee for Urban Affairs, San Francisco, CA, representing potential defendants.

[35] Saephan v. Oakland Unified School District (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C-06-4428 JCS)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the effect of English language requirements on race/ethnic patterns of employment among service workers. Client: Employment Law Center of the Legal Aid Society, San Francisco, representing plaintiff.

[34] Salazar et al. v. McDonalds et al. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, 3:14-CV-02096-RS)

Consultation and data analysis concerning uncompensated work by low-wage restaurant employees. Client: Altschuler Berzon, LLP, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[33] Scott v. Eastman Chemical Company (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee at Greenville, No. 2:03-cv-311)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment in a manufacturing firm. Client: Jennifer B. Morton, Esq., Knoxville, TN, representing plaintiff.

[32] Second Chance, Inc. v. Bell South Telecommunications, Inc. (Circuit Court of Calhoun Co., AL, C.V. 92-417)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss suffered by an non-profit organization experiencing a business interruption. Client: Floyd, Keener, Cusimano & Roberts, Gadsden, AL, representing plaintiffs.

[31] Segar et al. v. Meese et al. (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, C.A. 77-0081)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with racial patterns in employment in a large federal government agency. Client: Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law with Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, Washington, D.C., representing plaintiffs.

[30] Serrano et al. v. Cintas Corporation. (U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, File 04-cv-40132)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in the employment of sales service representatives. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs..

[29] Siri v. City of Dallas, et al. (District Court for Dallas County, Texas. Cause 09-04875)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment and workforce diversity management issues in a large fire department. Client: Herman Sargent, Bates, LLP, Dallas, TX, representing plaintiff.

[28] Slonim v. The Kroger Co. (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, C.A. 94-423190)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns in the employment of corporate managers. Client: Keller, Thoma, Schwarze, Schwarze, DuBay & Katz, P.C., representing defendant.

[27] Smikle et al. v. Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. (U. S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, C.A. 03W431(MLC))

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in the employment of route sales employees. Client: Joseph, Greenwald & Laake, Greenbelt, MD, representing plaintiffs.

[26] Sneed v. District of Columbia Department of Corrections (Superior Court of the District of Columbia).

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a public employee. Client: Dolkhart and Zavos, Washington, DC, representing plaintiff.

[25] Sova v. Northrup Grumman v. Information Technology Inc. (American Arbitration Association 74 160 00535 08 (LMT))

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with separation from employment of a professional employee. Client: Gary M. Gilbert & Associates, Silver Spring, MD, representing claimant.

[24] City of Southfield Affirmative Action Plan (1991)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the design of an affirmative action plan covering administrative and public safety employees. Client: City of Southfield, MI, representing potential defendants.

[23] Stoner v. George Washington University Hospital (Superior Court of the District of Columbia, C.A. 88-CA 05433).

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with the death of a clerical worker. Client: Debevoise and Plimpton, New York, representing plaintiff.

[22] Terrell v. U.S. Pipe and Foundry (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, C.A. 72-P-0887-S)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with racial patterns in employment in a manufacturing firm. Client: NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[21] Thomas et al. v. City of St. Paul (U. S. District Court for the District of Minnesota, Third Division, C.A. 04-5101 JMR/FLN)

Consultation and data analyses concerning racial patterns in public contracting. Client: Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[20] Thomas v. Plusquellic (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, C.A. CV73-478)

Consultation and data analyses concerning racial patterns in employment in police and fire departments. Client: Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[19] Tolbert v. Bessemer (U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, C.A. 83P-3050S).

Consultation and data analysis concerning the impact on the demographic characteristics of residents of annexations to a city. Client: NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[18] Torres et al. v, Gristede's et al. (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, 4 CIV 3316 (RMB) (AJP))

Consultation and data analysis concerning compensation practices violating the Fair Labor Standards Act. Client: Outten & Golden LLP, New York, NY, representing plaintiffs.

[17] Tykocki and Tycocki v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, C.A. 91-107456)

Consultation and data analysis concerning age patterns associated with separation from employment of a professional employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendants.

[16] United Building and Construction Trades Council v. Camden(Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, Docket A-79, September term 1981)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the employment and economic development impacts of requirements to employ city residents as a condition of receiving construction contracts. Client: New Jersey Office of the Public Advocate, Trenton, NJ, representing defendants.

[15] United States v. Becker C.P.A. Review (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, CV-92-2879 (TFH))

Consultation and data analysis concerning the economic loss associated with delays in obtaining professional licensing. Client: Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., representing plaintiff.

[14] Vandell et al. v. Chevron (Superior Court of the State of California, City and County of San Francisco, No. 945302)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment and compensation in an industrial firm. Client: Ryu, Dickey & Larkin, Oakland, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[13] Vasquez et al. v. USM & Dollar Stores, et al. (Superior Court for Alameda County, CA RG136 3:2006:cv00963)

Consultation and data analysis concerning financial adequacy of payments for minimum wage janitorial workers. Client: Chavez & Gertler LLP, Mill Valley, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[12] Vedachalam et al. v. Tata American International Corp. (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, 3:2006:cv00963)

Consultation and data analysis concerning prevailing wage determinations for information technology professionals. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, representing plaintiffs.

[11] Villarreal v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Inc. (Petition for Writ of Certiorari, U.S. Supreme Court)

Party to *amicus* brief by labor economists and social scientists discussing age discrimination in hiring. Client: Altschuler Berzon, LLP, representing plaintiff-petitioner.

[10] Helen Watts v. City of Dallas et al. (District Court for Dallas County, Texas, Cause 08-13000).

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in employment and workforce diversity management issues in a large fire department. Client: Law Offices of Aaron Ramirez, Dallas, TX, representing plaintiff.

[9] Wachovia Financial Services (no litigation filed)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race patterns in employment among professional employees in a financial services firm. Client: Mehri & Skalet, Washington, DC, representing plaintiffs.

[8] Marcus Washington v. William Morris Endeavor Entertainment (American Arbitration Association Case 13 160 01426 12)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages associated with race-based employment practices and the separation from employment of a professional employee. Client: Marcus Washington, *pro se* plaintiff, New York, NY, representing plaintiff.

[7] Wegher v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, 06-613799-CZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a temporary worker. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[6] Wiggins v. PSSC (American Arbitration Association Arbitration)

Consultation and data analysis concerning economic damages experienced by a terminated administrative employees. Client: Law Offices of Frank Jackson, Esq., Detroit, MI, representing plaintiff.

[5] Williams et al. v. Well Fargo Bank (Iowa District Court for Polk County, LACL 131387)

Consultation and data analysis concerning racial patterns in criminal records background check for financial services employees. Client: Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarian & Ho, San Francisco, representing plaintiffs.

[4] Wren et al. v. RGIS Inventory Specialists (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 06-05778 JCS and C 07-0032 JCS)

Consultation and data analysis concerning employee compensation for travel time to a work sites. Client: Schneider and Wallace, San Francisco, CA, representing plaintiffs.

[3] Wynne et al. v. McCormick & Schmick's (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C 06 3153 CW)

Consultation and data analysis concerning race/ethnic patterns in employment of service workers. Client: Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, representing plaintiffs.

[2] Yang v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (Circuit Court for Wayne County, Michigan, C.A. 95-514482 CZ)

Consultation and data analysis concerning the separation from employment of a professional employee. Client: Office of the General Counsel, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan, Detroit, MI, representing defendant.

[1] Zuniga et al. v. Bernalillo County et al (U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico, Civil No. 1:11-cv-00877, RHS/LAM)

Consultation and data analysis concerning gender patterns in hiring, promotion, and compensation of salaried civil servants. Client: Moody & Warner, PC, Albuquerque, NM, representing plaintiffs.

ATTACHMENT C

Table C - 1
Stores and Employees in Region 43, 1998-2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)
	Year	Stores			Hourly Employees Per Store			Salaried Employees Per Store			Total Employees Per Store			Women % of Employees		
		Neighbor-hood Markets	Discount Stores	Super Centers	Neighbor-hood Markets	Discount Stores	Super Centers	Neighbor-hood Markets	Discount Stores	Super Centers	Neighbor-hood Markets	Discount Stores	Super Centers	Neighbor-hood Markets	Discount Stores	Super Centers
(1)	1998			23			395			14			409			67.0%
(2)	1999		47	45		301	688		7	17		308	705		68.8%	64.5%
(3)	2000		47	45		310	742		7	17		317	759		67.8%	63.9%
(4)	2001		47	55		242	638		6	16		248	654		67.2%	62.1%
(5)	2002	3	36	62	140	233	603	5	6	15	145	239	618	56.2%	67.2%	61.9%
(6)	2003	5	22	60	164	224	610	6	6	15	170	230	626	53.4%	67.5%	61.3%
(7)	2004	5	19	68	170	224	569	7	7	15	177	231	584	53.1%	68.8%	61.9%
(8)	2005	7	19	106	158	189	506	6	6	14	164	195	520	58.0%	69.8%	64.0%
(9)	2006	7	10	106	141	247	505	5	9	16	146	256	521	60.3%	67.1%	63.6%
(10)	2007	6	6	99	133	238	527	5	8	14	138	246	541	58.7%	66.8%	62.1%
(11)	2008	6	5	103	129	218	484	5	8	14	135	226	497	59.9%	69.1%	61.8%
(12)	Average Store-Year	6	26	70	148	257	558	6	7	15	153	263	573	57.5%	68.0%	62.8%

Sources and Notes

Tabulated from 502,387 hourly employee-years and 13,531 salaried employee-years in 1,069 store-years. Figures are as of December 31 of each year.

Includes all jobs with a store designation except Store Managers, registered pharmacists, jobs with "Sam's Club" or "SC" in the job description, jobs in Divison 14 (Bud's/Most), and jobs in Division 5 ("Home Office").

The three store formats are described in footnote 3 of this report.

Table C - 2
Multiple Regression Analyses of Gender Disparities in Hourly Employee Pay Rates, 1998-2008, By Year and Grocery/Non-Grocery Jobs

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
	Year	Non-Grocery Jobs				Grocery Jobs			
		Gender Disparity in Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Employees Analyzed	Gender Disparity in Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Employees Analyzed
(1)	1998	-$0.13	4.9	0.79	7,507	-$0.54	7.2	0.65	1,330
(2)	1999	-$0.16	13.7	0.82	39,099	-$0.38	10.2	0.70	4,844
(3)	2000	-$0.16	12.5	0.80	41,362	-$0.42	12.2	0.70	5,631
(4)	2001	-$0.18	12.6	0.80	39,975	-$0.51	14.1	0.70	6,102
(5)	2002	-$0.19	12.7	0.80	39,274	-$0.51	13.7	0.72	6,530
(6)	2003	-$0.20	12.5	0.82	35,620	-$0.49	13.0	0.75	6,517
(7)	2004	-$0.04	2.6	0.85	36,314	-$0.27	8.4	0.79	7,255
(8)	2005	-$0.08	6.2	0.86	47,953	-$0.28	10.1	0.79	10,167
(9)	2006	-$0.09	6.9	0.87	46,258	-$0.24	9.6	0.80	10,560
(10)	2007	-$0.12	9.6	0.87	43,858	-$0.26	10.8	0.81	10,295
(11)	2008	-$0.09	7.1	0.89	41,749	-$0.24	10.5	0.83	9,707

Sources and Notes

Based on 497,907 employee records as of the last record for each employee in each calendar year.

Each regression controls for:

- (age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart)
- (age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart) squared
- seniority with Wal-mart
- seniority with Wal-Mart squared
- Does employee have a "high" performance evaluation score (defined by Wal-Mart in file WM-Phipps- 040748, sheet eval_rating-nbr).
- Employee has no evaluation score in this year
- Employee has performance score of "7"
- Job description (282 job descriptions appear in at least one regression)
- Job level (levels 1 - 5 in some years, 1-7 in other years)
- Department (125 departments appear in at least one regression)
- Division (21 divisions appear in at least one regression)
- Store number (187 stores appear in at least one regression)

Dependent variable is hourly base pay rate ($/hour).

Table C - 3
Multiple Regression Analyses of Gender Disparities in Hourly Employee Pay Rates, 1998-2008, By Year and Grocery/Non-Grocery Jobs, Excluding Control Variables for Department and Job Level

	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
	Year	Non-Grocery Jobs				Grocery Jobs		
		Gender Disparities in Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Employees Analyzed	Gender Disparities in Hourly Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Employees Analyzed
(1)	1998	-$0.19	7.5	0.79	7,507	-$0.78	11.3	0.61	1,330
(2)	1999	-$0.18	16.7	0.81	39,099	-$0.55	16.0	0.66	4,844
(3)	2000	-$0.18	15.9	0.80	41,362	-$0.53	16.6	0.67	5,631
(4)	2001	-$0.21	16.2	0.79	39,975	-$0.64	19.1	0.67	6,102
(5)	2002	-$0.24	17.2	0.79	39,274	-$0.65	19.0	0.70	6,530
(6)	2003	-$0.24	15.7	0.81	35,620	-$0.59	17.5	0.74	6,517
(7)	2004	-$0.09	6.3	0.85	36,314	-$0.28	9.7	0.78	7,255
(8)	2005	-$0.14	11.1	0.85	47,953	-$0.24	9.6	0.78	10,167
(9)	2006	-$0.15	12.2	0.86	46,258	-$0.18	7.5	0.80	10,560
(10)	2007	-$0.18	15.4	0.87	43,858	-$0.17	7.7	0.80	10,295
(11)	2008	-$0.16	13.5	0.88	41,749	-$0.12	5.2	0.82	9,707

Sources and Notes

Based on 497,907 employee records as of the last record for each employee in each calendar year.

Each regression controls for:

- (age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart)
- (age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart) squared
- seniority with Wal-Mart
- seniority with Wal-Mart squared
- Does employee have a "high" performance evaluationscore (defined in Table C-2).
- Employee has no evaluation score in this year
- Employee has performance score of "7"
- Job description (282 job descriptions appear in at least one regression)
- Store number (187 stores appear in at least one regression)

Depdendent variable is base pay rate per hour.

Table C - 4
Performance Ratings for Hourly Employees, by Gender, 1998 -2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
	Year	Scale	Average Highest Performance Score		Difference (- if Males Score Higher than Females)		Number of Observations		Standard Deviations
			Females	Males	Points	% of Male Average	Females	Males	
(1)	1998	H	4.18	4.19	-0.01	-0.2%	2,525	833	--
(2)	1999	H	4.13	4.06	0.08	1.9%	10,687	3,480	--
(3)	2000	H	4.11	4.00	0.11	2.7%	13,810	5,096	--
(4)	2001	H	3.93	3.80	0.12	3.2%	20,426	9,380	--
(5)	2002	H	3.87	3.74	0.14	3.6%	21,997	11,206	--
(6)	2003	H	3.76	3.62	0.14	3.9%	18,691	10,122	--
(7)	2004	H	3.71	3.61	0.11	3.0%	9,101	4,961	--
(8)	2004	3	3.72	3.61	0.11	3.0%	10,620	5,335	--
(9)	2005	3	3.71	3.63	0.08	2.2%	28,758	13,908	--
(10)	2006	3	3.70	3.61	0.09	2.6%	26,414	13,108	--
(11)	2007	3	3.66	3.55	0.11	3.2%	24,772	13,289	--
(12)	2008	5	3.62	3.33	0.29	8.7%	22	17	--
(13)	2008	3	3.65	3.53	0.12	3.4%	24,202	13,383	--
(14)	Weighted Average, 1998-2008		3.79	3.66	0.13	3.5%	--	--	33.8

Sources and Notes

Based on 316,143 employee-year observations for employees with an evaluation each year.

Table tabulates highest performance evaluation score for each employee dated within each year, potentially including Annual Reviews, 90 Day Reviews, 6 Month Reviews, Re-Evaluations, and "Unknown." Scores of 7 are included in the averages.

Table C - 5
Seniority with WalMart for Hourly Employees, by Gender, 1998 -2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
	Year	% Employed < 1 Year		% Employed 1 - 5 Years		% Employed > 5 Years		Number of Observations		Standard Deviations
		Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	
(1)	1998	42.1%	55.3%	33.7%	32.1%	24.1%	12.6%	6,043	2,794	--
(2)	1999	52.2%	65.1%	28.3%	26.7%	19.5%	8.3%	29,389	14,554	--
(3)	2000	51.2%	64.2%	29.2%	27.2%	19.6%	8.6%	31,067	15,926	--
(4)	2001	42.6%	59.1%	33.4%	30.7%	24.1%	10.2%	29,596	16,481	--
(5)	2002	40.1%	54.2%	33.6%	33.7%	26.3%	12.2%	29,197	16,607	--
(6)	2003	42.4%	55.9%	31.0%	31.4%	26.6%	12.7%	26,397	15,740	--
(7)	2004	42.1%	54.1%	29.6%	31.4%	28.3%	14.5%	27,543	16,026	--
(8)	2005	37.6%	49.4%	30.0%	32.5%	32.4%	18.2%	37,771	20,349	--
(9)	2006	39.9%	51.6%	28.8%	30.0%	31.3%	18.3%	36,679	20,139	--
(10)	2007	42.1%	55.6%	27.0%	27.0%	30.9%	17.4%	34,037	20,116	--
(11)	2008	36.6%	50.3%	30.0%	30.9%	33.4%	18.8%	32,180	19,276	--
(12)	Weighted Average	42.5%	55.5%	30.1%	30.2%	27.5%	14.3%	--	--	106.2

Sources and Notes

Based on 497,907 employee-year records.

Table tabulates on years between each employee's date of hire and December 31 of each year.

Standard deviations are based on gender differences in proportion employed > 5 years.

Table C - 6
Years of Potential Work Experience Prior to Hire at WalMart,
by Gender, 1998 - 2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
	Year	% < 5 Years		% 5 - 15 Years		% > 15 Years		Number of Observations		Standard Deviations
		Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	
(1)	1998	19.9%	32.2%	28.3%	31.3%	51.8%	36.6%	6,043	2,794	--
(2)	1999	23.3%	35.5%	28.7%	31.1%	48.1%	33.5%	29,389	14,554	--
(3)	2000	22.9%	33.8%	28.3%	30.9%	48.8%	35.3%	31,067	15,926	--
(4)	2001	19.5%	28.1%	27.7%	33.2%	52.8%	38.8%	29,596	16,481	--
(5)	2002	17.6%	25.4%	27.1%	33.8%	55.3%	40.8%	29,197	16,607	--
(6)	2003	16.8%	23.7%	27.9%	35.0%	55.3%	41.3%	26,397	15,740	--
(7)	2004	17.0%	24.3%	28.9%	35.6%	54.2%	40.1%	27,543	16,026	--
(8)	2005	16.0%	25.2%	27.9%	33.7%	56.1%	41.0%	37,771	20,349	--
(9)	2006	16.2%	24.9%	28.4%	34.1%	55.4%	41.1%	36,679	20,139	--
(10)	2007	16.2%	24.8%	28.6%	34.5%	55.2%	40.7%	34,037	20,116	--
(11)	2008	14.8%	22.8%	27.7%	33.7%	57.5%	43.5%	32,180	19,276	--
(12)	Weighted Average	18.0%	26.7%	28.1%	33.6%	53.9%	39.8%	--	--	72.1

Sources and Notes

Based on 497,907 employee-year records.

Table tabulates each employee's age - 15-WalMart seniority as of December 31 of each year.

Standard deviations are based on gender differences in proportion with < 5 years.

Table C-7 - CORRECTED 4/4/2018
Gender Disparities as % of Women's Average Pay Rates, 1998 - 2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
	Year	Women's Average Pay Rate ($/Hour)		Gender Disparity ($/Hour) (- means women had lower pay rates than men)		Gender Disparity as % of Women's Average Pay Rate (- means women had lower pay rates than men)	
		Not Grocery Jobs	Grocery Jobs	Not Grocery Jobs	Grocery Jobs	Not Grocery Jobs	Grocery Jobs
(1)	1998	$6.99	$7.10	-$0.13	-$0.54	-1.9%	-7.6%
(2)	1999	$7.10	$7.29	-$0.16	-$0.38	-2.3%	-5.2%
(3)	2000	$7.37	$7.62	-$0.16	-$0.42	-2.2%	-5.5%
(4)	2001	$7.83	$8.02	-$0.18	-$0.51	-2.3%	-6.4%
(5)	2002	$8.11	$8.27	-$0.19	-$0.51	-2.3%	-6.2%
(6)	2003	$8.24	$8.36	-$0.20	-$0.49	-2.4%	-5.9%
(7)	2004	$8.72	$8.82	-$0.04	-$0.27	-0.5%	-3.1%
(8)	2005	$9.09	$9.11	-$0.08	-$0.28	-0.9%	-3.1%
(9)	2006	$9.19	$9.10	-$0.09	-$0.24	-1.0%	-2.6%
(10)	2007	$9.47	$9.43	-$0.12	-$0.26	-1.3%	-2.8%
(11)	2008	$9.84	$9.82	-$0.09	-$0.24	-0.9%	-2.4%

Notes and Sources

Columns (d) and (e) repeat Columns (b) and (f) in Table C-2.

Columns (b) and (c) are computed from the same employee-year records as Table C-2.

Column (f) = Column (d) / Column (b).

Column (g) = Column (e) / Column (c).

Table C - 8
The Representation of Women Among Hourly Employees, by Department, 1998 - 2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
	Department				Employees			
	Division Number	Division Description	Department Number	Department Description	Women	Men	Total	% Female
(1)	1	WAL-MART STORES	25	SHOES	3	0	3	100.0%
(2)	1	WAL-MART STORES	32	JEWELRY	5	0	5	100.0%
(3)	1	WAL-MART STORES	44	PIECE GOODS	176	0	176	100.0%
(4)	10	PHARMACY	54		2	0	2	100.0%
(5)	11	JEWELRY	67	CELEBRATION	5	0	5	100.0%
(6)	26	DAIRY / CMRCL BREAD	80	SERVICE DELI	15	0	15	100.0%
(7)	26	DAIRY / CMRCL BREAD	81	COMMERCIAL BREAD	3	0	3	100.0%
(8)	28	GROCERY	90	DAIRY PRODUCTS	1	0	1	100.0%
(9)	28	GROCERY	282	DIV 28 SALES SUPPORT	9	0	9	100.0%
(10)	1	WAL-MART STORES	820	MERCH AREA 820	48	0	48	100.0%
(11)	1	WAL-MART STORES	923	MERCHANDISE ZONE 3	1	0	1	100.0%
(12)	1	WAL-MART STORES	925	MERCHANDISE ZONE 5	2	0	2	100.0%
(13)	1	WAL-MART STORES	928	MERCHANDISE ZONE 8	4	0	4	100.0%
(14)	1	WAL-MART STORES	985	FRONT END	9	0	9	100.0%
(15)	1	WAL-MART STORES	988	DEMO	1	0	1	100.0%
(16)	1	WAL-MART STORES	997	CHECKOUT MDSE	23	0	23	100.0%
(17)	1	WAL-MART STORES	19	PIECE GOODS	4,715	17	4,732	99.6%
(18)	1	WAL-MART STORES	34	LADIES SPORTSWEAR	4,650	31	4,681	99.3%
(19)	1	WAL-MART STORES	27	HOSIERY	5,234	44	5,278	99.2%
(20)	1	WAL-MART STORES	26	INFANTS/TODDLERS	3,904	34	3,938	99.1%
(21)	1	WAL-MART STORES	824	MERCH AREA 824	172	2	174	98.9%
(22)	1	WAL-MART STORES	46	HEALTH AND BEAUTY AIDS	3,638	43	3,681	98.8%
(23)	1	WAL-MART STORES	932	DV 1 JEWLERY EVENT ASSOC	281	4	285	98.6%
(24)	1	WAL-MART STORES	24	BOYS WEAR	635	11	646	98.3%
(25)	1	WAL-MART STORES	2	HEALTH AND BEAUTY AIDS	3,038	54	3,092	98.3%
(26)	1	WAL-MART STORES	84	FLORAL	46	1	47	97.9%
(27)	11	JEWELRY	32	JEWELRY	9,273	216	9,489	97.7%
(28)	1	WAL-MART STORES	809	MERCH AREA 809	135	4	139	97.1%
(29)	1	WAL-MART STORES	825	MERCH AREA 825	226	7	233	97.0%
(30)	25	PRODUCE	84	FLORAL	534	18	552	96.7%
(31)	1	WAL-MART STORES	912	OFFICES	819	35	854	95.9%
(32)	1	WAL-MART STORES	23	MENS WEAR	3,983	205	4,188	95.1%
(33)	1	WAL-MART STORES	991	BACK OFFICE	1,085	56	1,141	95.1%
(34)	1	WAL-MART STORES	20	DOMESTIC GOODS	2,917	166	3,083	94.6%
(35)	28	GROCERY	281	DIV 28 BACK OFFICE	33	2	35	94.3%
(36)	1	WAL-MART STORES	826	MERCH AREA 826	194	12	206	94.2%
(37)	8	SNACK BAR	39	SNACK BAR	2,163	135	2,298	94.1%
(38)	1	WAL-MART STORES	910	BACK OFFICE	8,783	567	9,350	93.9%
(39)	1	WAL-MART STORES	82	IMPULSE MERCHANDISE	879	59	938	93.7%
(40)	15	SHOES	25	SHOES	6,554	490	7,044	93.0%
(41)	1	WAL-MART STORES	904	OVERNIGHT ASSOCIATES	520	41	561	92.7%
(42)	10	PHARMACY	940	DIV 10, D38 & D40	2,938	247	3,185	92.2%

(43)	27	DELI / BAKERY	98	BAKERY	8,536	870	9,406	90.8%
(44)	10	PHARMACY	40	PHARMACY	3,388	347	3,735	90.7%
(45)	1	WAL-MART STORES	821	MERCH AREA 821	151	16	167	90.4%
(46)	10	PHARMACY	38	PHARMACY-RX	6,141	674	6,815	90.1%
(47)	1	WAL-MART STORES	3	STATIONARY AND BOOKS	2,411	273	2,684	89.8%
(48)	27	DELI / BAKERY	77	LARGE APPLIANCES	24	3	27	88.9%
(49)	1	WAL-MART STORES	819	MERCH AREA 819	116	16	132	87.9%
(50)	1	WAL-MART STORES	344	CELEBRATION AREA	57	8	65	87.7%
(51)	10	PHARMACY	27	HOSIERY	13	2	15	86.7%
(52)	1	WAL-MART STORES	822	MERCH AREA 822	24	4	28	85.7%
(53)	1	WAL-MART STORES	916	MERCH DEPTS: 16,18,56	3,577	620	4,197	85.2%
(54)	27	DELI / BAKERY	80	SERVICE DELI	415	73	488	85.0%
(55)	8	SNACK BAR	79	SAMS CAFE	14	3	17	82.4%
(56)	24	MEAT	80	SERVICE DELI	10,235	2,197	12,432	82.3%
(57)	30	OPTICAL	49	OPTICAL PROFESSIONAL	3,680	818	4,498	81.8%
(58)	1	WAL-MART STORES	14	HOUSEWARES	2,772	625	3,397	81.6%
(59)	1	WAL-MART STORES	903	OVERNIGHT ASSOCIATES	12,507	2,865	15,372	81.4%
(60)	1	WAL-MART STORES	990	FRONT END	110,882	25,933	136,815	81.0%
(61)	1	WAL-MART STORES	823	MERCH AREA 823	25	6	31	80.6%
(62)	31	PHOTO / 1-HR PHOTO	85	PHOTO LAB	6,354	1,730	8,084	78.6%
(63)	31	PHOTO / 1-HR PHOTO	806	DIV 31 DEPT 6	107	32	139	77.0%
(64)	28	GROCERY	288	DIV 28 SETUP	13	4	17	76.5%
(65)	28	GROCERY	980	FRONT END	3	1	4	75.0%
(66)	45	WIRELESS SERVICE CEN	87	WIRELESS	1,974	710	2,684	73.5%
(67)	1	WAL-MART STORES	7	TOYS	3,838	1,387	5,225	73.5%
(68)	30	OPTICAL	88		25	10	35	71.4%
(69)	28	GROCERY	990	FRONT END	10	4	14	71.4%
(70)	28	GROCERY	1	CANDY, TOBACCO, COOKIES	1,132	497	1,629	69.5%
(71)	1	WAL-MART STORES	987	SLS FLR SUPPORT	546	241	787	69.4%
(72)	1	WAL-MART STORES	921	DIV 01	82	47	129	63.6%
(73)	1	WAL-MART STORES	21	CURTAINS AND DRAPES	327	188	515	63.5%
(74)	24	MEAT	83	SEAFOOD	672	420	1,092	61.5%
(75)	1	WAL-MART STORES	816	MERCH AREA 816	80	50	130	61.5%
(76)	1	WAL-MART STORES	934	EXPANDED FOOD	11	7	18	61.1%
(77)	24	MEAT	97	PREPACK DELI	1,313	893	2,206	59.5%
(78)	1	WAL-MART STORES	994	RECEIVING	62	44	106	58.5%
(79)	1	WAL-MART STORES	1	CANDY, TOBACCO, COOKIES	293	214	507	57.8%
(80)	1	WAL-MART STORES	931	NIGHT RECEIVING	15,624	12,289	27,913	56.0%
(81)	1	WAL-MART STORES	993	MANAGEMENT	460	376	836	55.0%
(82)	1	WAL-MART STORES	5	PLAYERS AND ELECTRONICS	5,748	4,798	10,546	54.5%
(83)	1	WAL-MART STORES	998	SETUP	1,827	1,651	3,478	52.5%
(84)	1	WAL-MART STORES	992	SALES SUPPORT	47	47	94	50.0%
(85)	1	WAL-MART STORES	18	SEASONAL	71	76	147	48.3%
(86)	28	GROCERY	810	MERCH AREA 810	23	27	50	46.0%
(87)	6	TBA	10	AUTOMOTIVE	3,039	3,575	6,614	45.9%
(88)	28	GROCERY	903	OVERNIGHT ASSOCIATES	3	4	7	42.9%
(89)	1	WAL-MART STORES	922	MERCHANDISE ZONE 2	3	4	7	42.9%
(90)	1	WAL-MART STORES	929	MERCHANDISE ZONE 9	3	4	7	42.9%
(91)	1	WAL-MART STORES	4	HOUSEHOLD PAPER GOODS	903	1,298	2,201	41.0%
(92)	1	WAL-MART STORES	980	FRONT END	2,016	3,059	5,075	39.7%
(93)	1	WAL-MART STORES	963	MERCHANDISE AREA 8,82	26	42	68	38.2%
(94)	32	LARGE APPLIANCES	77	LARGE APPLIANCES	9	15	24	37.5%

(95)	28	GROCERY	92	GROCERY DRY GOODS	1,597	2,707	4,304	37.1%
(96)	1	WAL-MART STORES	815	MERCH AREA 815	141	243	384	36.7%
(97)	24	MEAT	240	MEAT/DELI	105	186	291	36.1%
(98)	28	GROCERY	284	DIV 28 RECEIVING	7,282	13,358	20,640	35.3%
(99)	1	WAL-MART STORES	11	HARDWARE	1,636	3,095	4,731	34.6%
(100)	1	WAL-MART STORES	9	SPORTING GOODS	2,575	5,017	7,592	33.9%
(101)	1	WAL-MART STORES	930	DAY RECEIVING	11,155	22,369	33,524	33.3%
(102)	26	DAIRY / CMRCL BREAD	812	MERCH AREA 812	16	34	50	32.0%
(103)	1	WAL-MART STORES	16	HORTICULTURE AND ACCESS	3,795	8,340	12,135	31.3%
(104)	26	DAIRY / CMRCL BREAD	90	DAIRY PRODUCTS	1,911	4,615	6,526	29.3%
(105)	1	WAL-MART STORES	935	RECEIVING 2ND SHIFT	231	596	827	27.9%
(106)	1	WAL-MART STORES	811	MERCH AREA 811	34	90	124	27.4%
(107)	1	WAL-MART STORES	10	AUTOMOTIVE	46	125	171	26.9%
(108)	1	WAL-MART STORES	17	HOME FURNISHINGS	198	540	738	26.8%
(109)	1	WAL-MART STORES	8	PETS AND SUPPLIES	804	2,215	3,019	26.6%
(110)	26	DAIRY / CMRCL BREAD	91	FROZEN FOODS	1,191	3,303	4,494	26.5%
(111)	28	GROCERY	91	FROZEN FOODS	63	191	254	24.8%
(112)	1	WAL-MART STORES	818	MERCH AREA 818	64	210	274	23.4%
(113)	28	GROCERY	280	DRY GROCERY	219	730	949	23.1%
(114)	1	WAL-MART STORES	814	MERCH AREA 814	30	100	130	23.1%
(115)	25	PRODUCE	94	PRODUCE	1,678	5,864	7,542	22.2%
(116)	6	TBA	50	OPTICAL MERCHANDISE	5	19	24	20.8%
(117)	24	MEAT	93	MEAT	1,041	3,961	5,002	20.8%
(118)	1	WAL-MART STORES	995	MAINTENANCE	2,744	10,550	13,294	20.6%
(119)	1	WAL-MART STORES	829	MERCH AREA 829	2	8	10	20.0%
(120)	1	WAL-MART STORES	813	MERCH AREA 813	6	25	31	19.4%
(121)	25	PRODUCE	250	PRODUCE	50	222	272	18.4%
(122)	1	WAL-MART STORES	817	MERCH AREA 817	33	164	197	16.8%
(123)	24	MEAT	76	FRESH MEAT	5	25	30	16.7%
(124)	26	DAIRY / CMRCL BREAD	260	DAIRY/FROZEN	65	391	456	14.3%
(125)	1	WAL-MART STORES	996	SECURITY	453	3,632	4,085	11.1%
(126)	25	PRODUCE	56	HORTICULTURE AND ACCESS	2	17	19	10.5%
(127)	6	TBA	37	TBO SERVICE	1,454	13,439	14,893	9.8%
(128)	59	FUEL/CARWASH	35	MATERNITY	0	4	4	0.0%
(129)	1	WAL-MART STORES	90	DAIRY PRODUCTS	0	5	5	0.0%
(130)	26	DAIRY / CMRCL BREAD	97	PREPACK DELI	0	1	1	0.0%
(131)	27	DELI / BAKERY	800	BAKERY / DELI	0	1	1	0.0%
(132)	1	WAL-MART STORES	976	O/N LOSS PREVENTION	0	3	3	0.0%
(133)	1	WAL-MART STORES	982	AREA B	0	1	1	0.0%
(134)	1	WAL-MART STORES	989	ASSEMBLING	0	10	10	0.0%
(135)	28	GROCERY	995	MAINTENANCE	0	4	4	0.0%
(136)	Employee-Years in all 135 Departments				319,899	178,008	497,907	64.2%
(137)	Employee-Years in 71 Departments with % Female > 64.2%				246,626	42,470	289,096	85.3%
(138)	Employee-Years in 64 Departments with % Female < 64.2%				73,273	135,538	208,811	35.1%
(139)	% of Women's Employee-Years in Departments with % Female > 64.2%				77.1%	--	--	--
(140)	% of Men's Employee-Years in Departments with % Female < 64.2				--	76.1%	--	--

Sources and Notes

Department indentifications are as reported in Wal-Mart data without correction of apparent errors (e.g., "Maternity" in "Fuel/Car Wash").

Table C-9

Regression Analyses of the Effect of Gender on Base Pay Rate for Hourly Employees, 1998-2008, by Store

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
	Store			**Person-Years, 1998-2008**		**1998**		**1999**		**2000**		**2001**	
	Number	**Location**	**Store Type**	**Number**	**%**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**
(1)	950	BARTLETT , TN	Super C	9,841	2.0%	**-$0.67**	**6.1**	**-$0.53**	**7.8**	**-$0.47**	**6.7**	**-$0.46**	**6.3**
(2)	848	SOUTHAVEN , MS	Super C	8,756	1.8%	**-$0.60**	**5.7**	**-$0.49**	**6.4**	**-$0.50**	**5.9**	**-$0.60**	**6.7**
(3)	1248	MEMPHIS , TN	Disc/Sup	8,457	1.7%			**-$0.30**	**3.9**	**-$0.27**	**3.4**	**-$0.42**	**6.0**
(4)	682	MURFREESBORO , TN	Super C	8,353	1.7%			**-$0.33**	**4.7**	**-$0.40**	**6.3**	**-$0.36**	**4.7**
(5)	406	SMYRNA , TN	Super C	8,115	1.6%			**-$0.23**	**4.3**	**-$0.21**	**3.9**	**-$0.10**	**2.0**
(6)	659	NASHVILLE , TN	Super C	7,961	1.6%			**-$0.31**	**3.7**	**-$0.38**	**4.6**	-$0.16	1.7
(7)	94	MILLINGTON , TN	Super C	7,909	1.6%			**-$0.33**	**4.8**	**-$0.33**	**4.4**	**-$0.30**	**3.7**
(8)	175	COLLIERVILLE , TN	Super C	7,792	1.6%	**-$0.40**	**3.7**	**-$0.31**	**4.1**	**-$0.24**	**3.6**	**-$0.21**	**2.8**
(9)	335	JACKSON , TN	Super C	7,583	1.5%			**-$0.23**	**3.3**	**-$0.35**	**4.9**	**-$0.54**	**6.4**
(10)	272	FRANKLIN , TN	Disc/Sup	7,219	1.5%			**-$0.65**	**5.1**	**-$0.58**	**5.4**	**-$0.41**	**5.2**
(11)	192	COLUMBIA , TN	Disc/Sup	6,912	1.4%			**-$0.44**	**5.7**	**-$0.56**	**7.0**	**-$0.37**	**4.3**
(12)	710	HERMITAGE , TN	Disc/Sup	6,690	1.3%			**-$0.38**	**4.2**	**-$0.39**	**4.8**	**-$0.34**	**3.3**
(13)	674	GALLATIN , TN	Super C	6,647	1.3%			**-$0.33**	**4.5**	**-$0.28**	**3.3**	**-$0.24**	**3.1**
(14)	264	DICKSON , TN	Super C	6,597	1.3%			**-$0.36**	**3.9**	**-$0.31**	**4.0**	**-$0.39**	**4.7**
(15)	671	LEBANON , TN	Super C	6,456	1.3%			**-$0.47**	**5.0**	**-$0.35**	**3.7**	**-$0.39**	**4.2**
(16)	70	WEST MEMPHIS , AR	Super C	6,237	1.3%	**-$0.56**	**4.5**	**-$0.41**	**4.7**	**-$0.37**	**3.7**	**-$0.36**	**3.5**
(17)	2322	CORDOVA , TN	Disc/Sup	5,961	1.2%			**-$0.27**	**2.8**	**-$0.24**	**2.7**	**-$0.31**	**3.0**
(18)	45	JONESBORO , AR	Super C	5,874	1.2%	-$0.13	1.8	-$0.08	1.8	**-$0.19**	**3.7**	**-$0.22**	**4.0**
(19)	2846	OLIVE BRANCH , MS	Super C	5,612	1.1%					**-$0.35**	**4.2**	**-$0.27**	**3.3**
(20)	1561	MEMPHIS , TN	Disc	5,165	1.0%			**-$0.22**	**2.7**	**-$0.17**	**2.2**	**-$0.23**	**2.5**
(21)	698	CLEVELAND , TN	Super C	5,048	1.0%								
(22)	688	NASHVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	5,023	1.0%			**-$0.35**	**3.7**	**-$0.36**	**4.0**	**-$0.26**	**2.8**
(23)	1606	HIXSON , TN	Super C	4,894	1.0%								
(24)	657	COOKEVILLE , TN	Super C	4,823	1.0%								
(25)	695	MADISON , TN	Disc	4,788	1.0%			**-$0.41**	**3.8**	**-$0.48**	**3.9**	**-$0.27**	**2.3**
(26)	258	TUPELO , MS	Super C	4,713	1.0%			**-$0.19**	**2.1**	$0.01	0.1	-$0.13	1.4

Table C-9 (Continued)

	(n)	(o)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)	(r)	(s)	(t)	(u)	(v)	(w)	(x)	(y)
	2002		**2003**		**2004**		**2005**		**2006**		**2007**		**2008**	
	Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**
(1)	**-$0.48**	**6.0**	**-$0.47**	**4.7**	-$0.02	0.2	-$0.05	0.5	$0.03	0.3	$0.04	0.4	$0.08	0.8
(2)	**-$0.55**	**5.4**	**-$0.58**	**5.3**	-$0.01	0.1	$0.23	1.8	$0.25	1.7				
(3)	**-$0.32**	**4.2**	**-$0.36**	**3.8**	-$0.13	1.3	-$0.04	0.4	$0.04	0.4	$0.08	0.9	$0.11	1.3
(4)	**-$0.37**	**4.5**	**-$0.41**	**4.2**	-$0.06	0.7	$0.05	0.6	-$0.05	0.6	-$0.02	0.3	$0.01	0.2
(5)	-$0.12	1.8	$0.00	0.0	-$0.07	1.1	$0.02	0.3	$0.06	1.1	$0.08	1.4	**$0.21**	**2.8**
(6)	**-$0.30**	**2.9**	**-$0.31**	**2.9**	-$0.05	0.5	$0.09	0.9	$0.15	1.5	$0.14	1.5	**$0.22**	**2.3**
(7)	**-$0.28**	**2.9**	**-$0.26**	**2.6**	-$0.05	0.6	$0.00	0.0	$0.04	0.4	-$0.04	0.4	-$0.08	0.7
(8)	**-$0.19**	**2.4**	-$0.11	1.3	$0.05	0.5	-$0.03	0.3	$0.08	0.7	-$0.01	0.1	$0.01	0.1
(9)	**-$0.52**	**6.0**	**-$0.37**	**4.1**	$0.10	1.1	$0.10	1.2	$0.12	1.2	$0.17	1.8	$0.08	1.0
(10)	**-$0.31**	**3.5**	-$0.10	1.2	$0.14	1.9	$0.11	1.4	$0.07	0.9	$0.01	0.1	**$0.18**	**2.3**
(11)	**-$0.23**	**3.4**	**-$0.18**	**2.7**	$0.01	0.1	$0.03	0.5	$0.02	0.3	$0.10	1.2	$0.02	0.2
(12)	**-$0.30**	**2.7**	**-$0.28**	**2.9**	-$0.02	0.3	$0.16	1.9	$0.08	0.9	$0.13	1.7	$0.12	1.4
(13)	**-$0.26**	**3.5**	**-$0.30**	**3.2**	-$0.06	0.7	-$0.04	0.4	-$0.02	0.2	$0.08	0.9	**$0.18**	**2.0**
(14)	**-$0.49**	**5.1**	**-$0.29**	**3.1**	**-$0.21**	**2.4**	-$0.04	0.4	$0.02	0.2	$0.01	0.1	-$0.05	0.5
(15)	**-$0.25**	**2.2**	**-$0.22**	**2.0**	$0.02	0.2	$0.11	1.0	$0.07	0.6	-$0.08	0.8	$0.13	1.2
(16)	**-$0.34**	**3.1**	**-$0.36**	**3.1**	$0.19	1.9	**$0.28**	**2.8**	$0.19	1.5				
(17)	-$0.19	1.7	**-$0.20**	**2.4**	-$0.05	0.6	-$0.02	0.2	$0.07	0.7	$0.10	1.1	-$0.07	0.7
(18)	**-$0.20**	**3.9**	-$0.07	1.3	**$0.22**	**3.2**								
(19)	**-$0.20**	**2.3**	-$0.12	1.2	$0.00	0.0	$0.00	0.0	-$0.07	0.5				
(20)	**-$0.25**	**2.6**	-$0.16	1.6	$0.03	0.3	$0.01	0.0	$0.08	0.7	-$0.11	0.9	$0.04	0.3
(21)	**-$0.24**	**2.5**	**-$0.19**	**2.1**	-$0.17	1.6	-$0.08	0.8	-$0.12	1.2	-$0.04	0.4	-$0.07	0.8
(22)	**-$0.26**	**2.4**	-$0.16	1.4	-$0.22	1.5	$0.08	0.5	$0.17	1.0	$0.03	0.3	$0.10	1.0
(23)	**-$0.24**	**2.7**	**-$0.25**	**2.8**	$0.14	1.6	**$0.23**	**2.3**	$0.07	0.7	$0.08	0.8	$0.07	0.8
(24)	**-$0.21**	**2.7**	**-$0.34**	**4.3**	**-$0.16**	**2.2**	-$0.08	0.9	-$0.03	0.4	-$0.08	0.9	**-$0.19**	**2.2**
(25)	**-$0.27**	**2.3**	$0.00	0.0	$0.18	1.3	**$0.36**	**2.5**	**$0.38**	**2.6**	**$0.48**	**3.3**	**$0.50**	**2.9**
(26)	-$0.04	0.3	-$0.06	0.6	$0.10	1.0	**$0.25**	**2.4**						

Table C-9 (Continued)

	(z)	(aa)	(ab)	(ac)	(ad)
	R-Squared	**F**	**Degrees of Freedom Numerator**	**Degree of Freedom Denominator**	**Ratio of Obser-vations to Estimated Variables**
(1)	0.803	195.9	201	4408	48.7
(2)	0.800	182.6	188	3584	46.3
(3)	0.822	202.5	188	4061	44.7
(4)	0.860	264.7	190	3575	43.7
(5)	0.908	416.1	187	4166	43.2
(6)	0.818	179.5	194	3674	40.8
(7)	0.868	277.9	182	3312	43.2
(8)	0.857	261.2	175	3240	44.3
(9)	0.893	326.3	190	3167	39.7
(10)	0.810	156.2	192	3293	37.4
(11)	0.874	254.9	183	2964	37.6
(12)	0.886	279.7	180	3010	37.0
(13)	0.868	238.9	178	2769	37.1
(14)	0.880	275.8	171	2763	38.4
(15)	0.851	195.2	184	2632	34.9
(16)	0.807	142.3	178	2621	34.8
(17)	0.829	158.1	177	2594	33.5
(18)	0.858	197.1	175	2872	33.4
(19)	0.847	201.9	150	2754	37.2
(20)	0.874	224.8	154	2236	33.3
(21)	0.868	211.7	152	2539	33.0
(22)	0.909	273.2	177	2329	28.2
(23)	0.847	159.9	164	2283	29.7
(24)	0.907	300.5	152	2180	31.5
(25)	0.886	240.2	150	2047	31.7
(26)	0.851	167.9	155	2162	30.2

(27)	1469	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	4,681	0.9%								
(28)	656	SHELBYVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	4,646	0.9%			**-$0.42**	**4.5**	**-$0.23**	**2.8**	-$0.06	0.9
(29)	687	CROSSVILLE , TN	Super C	4,607	0.9%								
(30)	683	LAWRENCEBURG , TN	Super C	4,570	0.9%			-$0.16	1.8	**-$0.22**	**2.7**	**-$0.31**	**3.6**
(31)	105	CORINTH , MS	Super C	4,545	0.9%			**-$0.46**	**5.3**	**-$0.38**	**4.4**	**-$0.45**	**4.2**
(32)	5057	MURFREESBORO , TN	Super C	4,531	0.9%								
(33)	1376	HENDERSONVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	4,526	0.9%			**-$0.29**	**2.5**	**-$0.20**	**2.0**	**-$0.22**	**2.2**
(34)	5058	ANTIOCH , TN	Super C	4,472	0.9%								
(35)	155	SENATOBIA , MS	Super C	4,333	0.9%	-$0.15	1.2	-$0.09	1.0	**-$0.22**	**2.5**	-$0.18	1.8
(36)	677	DYERSBURG , TN	Super C	4,324	0.9%			**-$0.33**	**4.3**	**-$0.25**	**3.7**	**-$0.32**	**2.9**
(37)	314	FAYETTEVILLE , TN	Super C	4,219	0.9%							**-$0.40**	**3.9**
(38)	238	PULASKI , TN	Super C	4,201	0.8%			**-$0.32**	**3.9**	**-$0.23**	**2.9**	**-$0.38**	**3.6**
(39)	308	MANCHESTER , TN	Super C	4,065	0.8%							**-$0.24**	**2.8**
(40)	119	BATESVILLE , AR	Super C	4,024	0.8%	**-$0.31**	**3.8**	**-$0.20**	**2.7**	**-$0.35**	**4.8**	-$0.31	4.0
(41)	676	ROCKWOOD , TN	Super C	3,948	0.8%								
(42)	1089	KIMBALL , TN	Super C	3,946	0.8%							-$0.43	4.2
(43)	668	MCMINNVILLE , TN	Super C	3,930	0.8%								
(44)	735	WINCHESTER , TN	Super C	3,888	0.8%							-$0.39	4.1
(45)	391	TUPELO , MS	Super C	3,788	0.8%			**-$0.21**	**2.0**	-$0.14	1.2	**-$0.27**	**2.2**
(46)	124	LITTLE ROCK , AR	Super C	3,752	0.8%	$0.18	1.0	$0.12	1.1	-$0.03	0.3	-$0.08	0.7
(47)	5	CONWAY , AR	Super C	3,714	0.7%	**-$0.23**	**2.8**	**-$0.11**	**2.0**	-$0.09	1.4	-$0.11	1.5
(48)	684	LEXINGTON , TN	Disc/Sup	3,706	0.7%			**-$0.63**	**4.4**	**-$0.55**	**3.7**	-$0.28	1.7
(49)	85	BENTON , AR	Super C	3,669	0.7%	**-$0.21**	**2.3**	**-$0.32**	**5.8**	**-$0.23**	**3.5**	**-$0.28**	**3.6**
(50)	157	SEARCY , AR	Super C	3,623	0.7%	**-$0.38**	**4.0**	**-$0.15**	**2.2**	**-$0.19**	**2.8**	**-$0.21**	**2.8**
(51)	128	JONESBORO , AR	Super C	3,602	0.7%	-$0.06	0.6	**-$0.17**	**2.3**	**-$0.29**	**4.0**	**-$0.37**	**4.4**
(52)	667	TULLAHOMA , TN	Super C	3,596	0.7%							**-$0.37**	**3.1**
(53)	177	PARIS , TN	Super C	3,555	0.7%			**-$0.27**	**2.6**	-$0.16	1.8	-$0.23	1.9
(54)	24	JACKSONVILLE , AR	Super C	3,493	0.7%			**-$0.26**	**4.1**	**-$0.22**	**3.9**	-$0.10	1.8
(55)	663	ATHENS , TN	Disc/Sup	3,476	0.7%								
(56)	1031	MEMPHIS , TN	Disc	3,287	0.7%			**-$0.41**	**3.7**	**-$0.50**	**4.3**	**-$0.59**	**4.5**
(57)	766	FLORENCE , AL	Super C	3,276	0.7%							**-$0.59**	**5.7**
(58)	153	NEW ALBANY , MS	Super C	3,269	0.7%			**-$0.54**	**4.2**	**-$0.52**	**4.2**	**-$0.27**	**2.3**
(59)	1458	FORT OGLETHORPE , GA	Super C	3,232	0.7%								
(60)	5251	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	3,230	0.7%								
(61)	5263	CLEVELAND , TN	Super C	3,201	0.6%								
(62)	268	SAVANNAH , TN	Disc/Sup	3,131	0.6%			**-$0.49**	**2.3**	**-$0.44**	**2.2**	**-$0.42**	**2.0**

(27)	**-$0.31**	**3.1**	**-$0.29**	**3.0**	-$0.12	1.4	-$0.05	0.6	$0.04	0.5	$0.02	0.2	$0.12	1.5
(28)	**-$0.18**	**2.3**	-$0.15	1.8	-$0.07	1.3	$0.00	0.1	-$0.09	1.3	-$0.07	1.0	**-$0.13**	**2.1**
(29)	**-$0.21**	**3.0**	**-$0.17**	**2.2**	-$0.06	0.8	-$0.02	0.2	$0.01	0.1	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.05	0.6
(30)	**-$0.46**	**4.3**	**-$0.43**	**3.8**	-$0.17	1.6	-$0.12	1.1	-$0.06	0.5	-$0.11	0.9	-$0.12	1.0
(31)	**-$0.48**	**4.1**	**-$0.31**	**2.5**	$0.03	0.3	**$0.22**	**2.2**	$0.20	1.4				
(32)			**-$0.16**	**2.8**	**-$0.17**	**3.4**	-$0.09	1.8	**-$0.12**	**2.1**	-$0.07	1.2	-$0.12	1.8
(33)	**-$0.31**	**2.6**	-$0.09	0.8	**-$0.19**	**2.1**	-$0.06	0.8	$0.03	0.4	$0.05	0.6	$0.04	0.5
(34)			**-$0.29**	**3.9**	**-$0.16**	**2.8**	**-$0.14**	**2.0**	**-$0.14**	**2.0**	-$0.06	0.8	$0.02	0.3
(35)	-$0.10	0.8	**-$0.27**	**2.3**	**$0.30**	**2.2**	**$0.35**	**2.0**						
(36)							$0.00	0.0	-$0.03	0.3	-$0.03	0.4	-$0.01	0.1
(37)	**-$0.37**	**4.1**	**-$0.29**	**2.8**	-$0.04	0.5	-$0.02	0.2	-$0.03	0.4	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.04	0.5
(38)	**-$0.36**	**3.4**	**-$0.25**	**2.3**	-$0.16	1.5	-$0.14	1.2	-$0.17	1.5	-$0.10	0.9	$0.00	0.0
(39)	**-$0.31**	**3.5**	**-$0.29**	**3.2**	-$0.09	1.0	-$0.05	0.5	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.03	0.4
(40)	**-$0.21**	**2.3**	-$0.17	1.8	-$0.23	1.7								
(41)	**-$0.45**	**5.3**	**-$0.39**	**5.0**	-$0.15	1.7	-$0.09	0.9	-$0.05	0.6	$0.02	0.3	$0.06	0.7
(42)	**-$0.33**	**3.2**	**-$0.26**	**2.7**	-$0.09	0.7	-$0.09	0.7	-$0.02	0.2	-$0.02	0.1	-$0.10	1.0
(43)	**-$0.33**	**3.3**	**-$0.27**	**2.5**	$0.00	0.0	$0.00	0.0	$0.05	0.5	$0.07	0.7	$0.08	0.9
(44)	**-$0.23**	**2.5**	**-$0.21**	**2.4**	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.12	1.2	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.12	1.5	**-$0.18**	**2.1**
(45)	**-$0.27**	**2.4**	-$0.11	1.0	$0.06	0.5	$0.04	0.3						
(46)	-$0.10	0.7												
(47)	**-$0.28**	**2.9**												
(48)	-$0.24	1.8	**-$0.27**	**2.1**	-$0.05	0.4	$0.06	0.5	$0.06	0.5	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.05	0.3
(49)	**-$0.37**	**3.1**												
(50)	-$0.39	3.4												
(51)	**-$0.24**	**2.7**	-$0.14	1.5	$0.02	0.2								
(52)	**-$0.25**	**2.4**	-$0.11	1.1	$0.00	0.0	$0.11	1.0	$0.13	1.0	$0.09	1.0	**$0.23**	**2.3**
(53)							$0.24	1.7	**$0.23**	**2.1**	$0.14	1.3	$0.11	1.1
(54)	-$0.15	1.7												
(55)	**-$0.30**	**2.9**	**-$0.25**	**2.3**	**-$0.25**	**2.1**	-$0.02	0.3	-$0.03	0.4	-$0.02	0.4	$0.00	0.0
(56)	**-$0.44**	**2.8**	-$0.30	1.7	-$0.26	1.4	-$0.24	1.3	$0.05	0.3	$0.05	0.3	$0.24	0.5
(57)	-$0.47	4.5	**-$0.35**	**3.1**	$0.02	0.2	$0.11	1.0						
(58)	-$0.11	1.0	-$0.13	1.0	-$0.01	0.1	$0.10	0.7						
(59)	**-$0.70**	**4.8**	**-$0.68**	**4.8**	**-$0.31**	**2.3**	-$0.07	0.5	-$0.18	1.0				
(60)					**-$0.18**	**2.0**	-$0.08	1.0	$0.00	0.0	-$0.10	1.2	$0.02	0.3
(61)			$0.09	0.4	-$0.04	0.7	$0.01	0.2	$0.00	0.0	-$0.09	1.2	$0.03	0.4
(62)	**-$0.45**	**2.5**	**-$0.42**	**2.4**	-$0.02	0.1	-$0.03	0.2	$0.10	0.5	$0.11	0.6	$0.14	0.8

(27)	0.823	126.8	166	2190	28.0
(28)	0.908	287.6	154	2300	30.0
(29)	0.893	243.3	152	1838	30.1
(30)	0.898	221.7	174	1590	26.1
(31)	0.840	139.8	165	1688	27.4
(32)	0.895	244.4	152	2518	29.6
(33)	0.850	141.5	174	2225	25.9
(34)	0.868	174.5	163	2371	27.3
(35)	0.825	128.6	153	1686	28.1
(36)	0.918	276.8	169	2036	25.4
(37)	0.888	218.1	148	1701	28.3
(38)	0.888	182.2	175	1686	23.9
(39)	0.889	217.0	145	1709	27.8
(40)	0.835	122.3	160	1526	25.0
(41)	0.879	198.2	140	1838	28.0
(42)	0.890	199.6	154	1690	25.5
(43)	0.910	263.1	146	1574	26.7
(44)	0.910	259.5	146	1574	26.4
(45)	0.832	113.0	159	1461	23.7
(46)	0.832	113.1	157	1846	23.7
(47)	0.861	150.1	147	1782	25.1
(48)	0.894	197.3	152	1347	24.2
(49)	0.854	141.0	146	1633	25.0
(50)	0.851	133.0	149	1634	24.2
(51)	0.823	106.1	151	1609	23.7
(52)	0.889	184.8	149	1505	24.0
(53)	0.925	272.7	154	1543	22.9
(54)	0.855	138.9	142	1957	24.4
(55)	0.902	203.3	150	1696	23.0
(56)	0.850	129.4	138	1389	23.6
(57)	0.852	133.3	136	1415	23.9
(58)	0.858	128.1	147	1322	22.1
(59)	0.848	114.5	150	1362	21.4
(60)	0.846	108.8	155	1864	20.7
(61)	0.893	173.2	147	1689	21.6
(62)	0.874	127.0	162	929	19.2

(63)	93	COVINGTON , TN	Disc/Sup	3,108	0.6%			**-$0.66**	**4.3**	**-$0.77**	**4.4**	**-$0.68**	**2.8**
(64)	393	JACKSON , TN	Disc/Sup	2,958	0.6%			**-$0.26**	**2.7**	-$0.19	1.9	-$0.15	1.5
(65)	218	SELMER , TN	Super C	2,955	0.6%			**-$0.45**	**3.2**	**-$0.29**	**2.4**	**-$0.30**	**2.3**
(66)	619	DAYTON , TN	Disc/Sup	2,912	0.6%								
(67)	5175	COOKEVILLE , TN	Super C	2,885	0.6%								
(68)	660	MUSCLE SHOALS , AL	Super C	2,837	0.6%							**-$0.29**	**2.7**
(69)	126	LITTLE ROCK , AR	Disc	2,784	0.6%			-$0.13	1.5	**-$0.23**	**2.4**	-$0.16	1.5
(70)	737	LEWISBURG , TN	Disc/Sup	2,757	0.6%			**-$0.53**	**3.9**	**-$0.38**	**3.3**	**-$0.28**	**2.0**
(71)	1318	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,715	0.5%								
(72)	3495	CLARKSVILLE , TN	Super C	2,665	0.5%								
(73)	5196	MEMPHIS , TN	Super C	2,636	0.5%								
(74)	714	WEST HELENA , AR	Super C	2,563	0.5%	-$0.23	1.2	-$0.17	1.0	-$0.26	1.2	-$0.16	0.7
(75)	685	MORRISTOWN , TN	Super C	2,549	0.5%								
(76)	672	ALCOA , TN	Super C	2,539	0.5%								
(77)	466	BOLIVAR , TN	Disc/Sup	2,534	0.5%			-$0.24	1.6	$0.03	0.1	$0.12	0.6
(78)	304	SPRINGFIELD , TN	Super C	2,475	0.5%								
(79)	1320	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,467	0.5%								
(80)	578	SEVIERVILLE , TN	Super C	2,445	0.5%								
(81)	587	SPARTA , TN	Disc/Sup	2,362	0.5%								
(82)	91	FORREST CITY , AR	Super C	2,345	0.5%	**-$0.45**	**4.3**	**-$0.36**	**3.9**	**-$0.40**	**4.3**	**-$0.35**	**3.1**
(83)	2065	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,307	0.5%								
(84)	120	HUMBOLDT , TN	Disc/Sup	2,289	0.5%			-$0.20	1.4	**-$0.37**	**2.7**	-$0.31	1.7
(85)	104	MILAN , TN	Disc/Sup	2,283	0.5%			-$0.14	0.7	-$0.15	0.8	-$0.39	1.2
(86)	1080	JOHNSON CITY , TN	Super C	2,261	0.5%								
(87)	62	BLYTHEVILLE , AR	Super C	2,248	0.5%			**-$0.42**	**4.9**	**-$0.40**	**4.2**	**-$0.59**	**4.1**
(88)	673	CLARKSVILLE , TN	Super C	2,239	0.5%								
(89)	161	HUNTINGDON , TN	Disc/Sup	2,223	0.4%			-$0.35	1.8	-$0.33	1.9	-$0.38	1.9
(90)	2932	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,204	0.4%								
(91)	1075	CLARKSVILLE , TN	Super C	2,197	0.4%								
(92)	477	SODDY DAISY , TN	Disc/Sup	2,193	0.4%								
(93)	36	PARAGOULD , AR	Super C	2,179	0.4%	-$0.10	1.3	**-$0.15**	**2.5**	**-$0.29**	**3.6**	**-$0.26**	**2.7**
(94)	2988	LA FAYETTE , GA	Super C	2,137	0.4%								
(95)	2587	CABOT , AR	Super C	2,103	0.4%	**-$0.15**	**2.0**	**-$0.15**	**2.3**	-$0.12	1.6	-$0.04	0.6
(96)	160	ASH FLAT , AR	Super C	2,099	0.4%	**-$0.25**	**2.5**	-$0.06	0.7	-$0.02	0.3	-$0.05	0.7
(97)	64	BROWNSVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	2,080	0.4%			**-$0.24**	**2.3**	-$0.17	1.4	$0.01	0.1
(98)	680	GREENEVILLE , TN	Super C	2,073	0.4%								

(63)	**-$0.64**	**2.8**	**-$0.54**	**2.4**	**-$0.68**	**2.4**	**-$0.73**	**2.2**	-$0.29	1.9	-$0.22	2.0	-$0.11	1.0
(64)	-$0.03	0.3	$0.08	0.6	$0.09	1.1	$0.07	0.7	**$0.23**	**2.2**	$0.07	0.7	-$0.02	0.2
(65)	-$0.06	0.5	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.01	0.0	$0.21	1.6	$0.13	0.8	$0.17	1.5	$0.10	0.7
(66)	**-$0.36**	**2.8**	**-$0.73**	**5.2**	**-$0.34**	**3.6**	**-$0.28**	**2.9**	-$0.14	1.5	-$0.08	0.8	-$0.12	1.3
(67)			**-$0.28**	**2.1**	**-$0.19**	**3.3**	-$0.11	1.9	$0.03	0.5	$0.01	0.2	-$0.07	1.0
(68)	-$0.31	2.8	**-$0.29**	**2.5**	$0.16	1.3	$0.16	1.2						
(69)	-$0.27	1.7												
(70)	-$0.09	0.6	-$0.14	0.9	-$0.30	2.0	-$0.16	1.8	**-$0.20**	**2.0**	$0.02	0.2	-$0.17	1.6
(71)							-$0.17	1.8	**-$0.17**	**2.2**	-$0.11	1.5	-$0.01	0.1
(72)							**-$0.20**	**2.3**	-$0.09	1.2	-$0.12	1.7	-$0.11	1.6
(73)					$0.03	0.3	**-$0.18**	**2.4**	-$0.06	0.9	**-$0.31**	**3.0**	**-$0.19**	**2.0**
(74)	-$0.16	0.7	-$0.01	0.0	$0.15	0.6	$0.34	1.0						
(75)							-$0.15	1.8	-$0.07	1.2	-$0.06	1.1	-$0.10	1.7
(76)							-$0.18	1.7	-$0.16	1.8	-$0.17	1.8	-$0.04	0.4
(77)	-$0.03	0.3	$0.02	0.2	**$0.17**	**2.0**	$0.15	1.8	$0.13	1.2	$0.03	0.3	$0.05	0.5
(78)							$0.10	1.0	$0.17	1.9	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.09	1.0
(79)							$0.00	0.0	$0.09	1.2	-$0.11	1.4	-$0.03	0.5
(80)							$0.00	0.0	$0.01	0.2	-$0.05	0.7	-$0.06	0.8
(81)	**-$0.27**	**2.5**	-$0.25	3.3	-$0.10	1.4	-$0.13	1.8	$0.09	1.3	$0.09	1.2	$0.07	0.9
(82)	**-$0.47**	**3.9**			-$0.01	0.1								
(83)							-$0.30	1.9	-$0.21	1.9	**-$0.20**	**2.2**	-$0.07	0.8
(84)							$0.01	0.1	$0.15	1.7	**$0.19**	**2.0**	$0.13	1.3
(85)							-$0.04	0.3	$0.07	0.6	$0.13	1.2	$0.08	0.7
(86)							**-$0.30**	**2.4**	-$0.13	1.6	-$0.08	0.9	$0.01	0.1
(87)							-$0.15	1.1	-$0.13	0.8				
(88)							**-$0.31**	**2.8**	**-$0.29**	**2.9**	-$0.17	1.8	**-$0.19**	**2.3**
(89)	-$0.19	1.2	-$0.12	0.8	-$0.13	0.9	$0.06	0.5	$0.18	1.2	$0.22	1.4	$0.04	0.3
(90)							-$0.05	0.4	-$0.09	0.8	-$0.02	0.2	$0.01	0.1
(91)							**-$0.44**	**3.3**	-$0.15	1.5	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.14	1.6
(92)	**-$0.54**	**3.4**	**-$0.46**	**2.9**	-$0.30	2.3	**-$0.21**	**2.6**	-$0.16	1.7	**-$0.20**	**2.0**	**-$0.19**	**2.1**
(93)														
(94)	**-$0.26**	**2.3**	-$0.20	1.7	$0.06	0.6	**$0.26**	**2.6**	$0.13	1.0				
(95)	$0.05	0.4												
(96)	$0.01	0.1	-$0.03	0.3	-$0.03	0.3								
(97)	-$0.25	1.5	-$0.04	0.3	$0.12	0.7	$0.05	0.4	**$0.22**	**2.4**	$0.12	1.1	$0.10	0.9
(98)							-$0.17	1.6	$0.00	0.1	$0.05	0.6	-$0.04	0.4

(63)	0.869	132.5	148	1342	20.9
(64)	0.916	191.8	159	1234	18.5
(65)	0.904	177.5	149	1159	19.7
(66)	0.850	120.9	130	1463	22.2
(67)	0.917	217.5	140	1534	20.5
(68)	0.867	131.7	134	1128	21.0
(69)	0.814	105.4	111	1433	24.9
(70)	0.906	171.0	147	1158	18.6
(71)	0.891	157.0	134	1299	20.1
(72)	0.908	185.9	134	1390	19.7
(73)	0.902	165.5	139	1252	18.8
(74)	0.782	64.6	135	867	18.8
(75)	0.905	165.2	139	1200	18.2
(76)	0.891	144.9	135	1105	18.7
(77)	0.913	193.4	130	960	19.3
(78)	0.908	164.0	140	1194	17.6
(79)	0.895	153.9	130	1296	18.8
(80)	0.917	193.7	132	1083	18.4
(81)	0.934	223.7	141	951	16.6
(82)	0.863	91.6	151	929	15.4
(83)	0.844	89.5	131	1235	17.5
(84)	0.889	117.2	146	1109	15.6
(85)	0.916	146.2	159	1032	14.3
(86)	0.898	129.0	145	1141	15.5
(87)	0.883	98.0	160	1135	14.0
(88)	0.906	141.2	143	1103	15.5
(89)	0.880	128.9	120	905	18.4
(90)	0.835	75.0	139	1104	15.7
(91)	0.917	156.7	145	1022	15.0
(92)	0.885	119.4	133	1084	16.4
(93)	0.840	80.3	134	1062	16.1
(94)	0.893	137.9	122	964	17.4
(95)	0.917	205.9	107	1050	19.5
(96)	0.912	157.5	129	736	16.1
(97)	0.906	128.4	145	803	14.2
(98)	0.902	131.1	136	987	15.1

(99)	390	WAVERLY , TN	Disc/Sup	2,059	0.4%			**-$0.38**	**2.8**	**-$0.31**	**2.2**	-$0.09	0.6
(100)	690	ELIZABETHTON , TN	Super C	2,029	0.4%								
(101)	738	CAMDEN , TN	Disc/Sup	2,021	0.4%			-$0.32	1.8	**-$0.65**	**3.6**	**-$0.52**	**2.6**
(102)	273	FULTON , MS	Super C	2,018	0.4%			**-$0.54**	**4.3**	**-$0.60**	**4.1**	**-$0.78**	**3.6**
(103)	107	MARTIN , TN	Disc/Sup	1,963	0.4%			-$0.12	1.0	-$0.09	0.8	-$0.14	1.1
(104)	724	JEFFERSON CITY , TN	Super C	1,958	0.4%								
(105)	97	RIPLEY , TN	Super C	1,954	0.4%			-$0.12	1.6	-$0.09	1.2	-$0.33	1.9
(106)	2310	KNOXVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	1,950	0.4%								
(107)	675	UNION CITY , TN	Super C	1,932	0.4%								
(108)	741	LENOIR CITY , TN	Super C	1,923	0.4%								
(109)	1194	OAK RIDGE , TN	Super C	1,908	0.4%								
(110)	2575	CONWAY , AR	Super C	1,894	0.4%			-$0.09	0.7	-$0.16	2.8	-$0.01	0.3
(111)	678	NEWPORT , TN	Super C	1,779	0.4%								
(112)	742	KINGSPORT , TN	Super C	1,732	0.3%								
(113)	1105	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, AR	Disc	1,701	0.3%			-$0.02	0.2	$0.00	0.0	$0.05	0.5
(114)	599	KINGSPORT , TN	Super C	1,697	0.3%								
(115)	8	MORRILTON , AR	Super C	1,692	0.3%	-$0.16	1.5	-$0.10	1.2	-$0.05	0.7	-$0.10	1.1
(116)	281	HEBER SPRINGS , AR	Super C	1,678	0.3%	**-$0.22**	**2.2**	**-$0.14**	**2.0**	-$0.10	1.3	-$0.09	1.0
(117)	1226	ASHLAND CITY , TN	Super C	1,610	0.3%								
(118)	3660	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	1,573	0.3%								
(119)	3234	ROGERSVILLE , TN	Super C	1,549	0.3%								
(120)	1466	JACKSBORO , TN	Super C	1,542	0.3%								
(121)	102	STUTTGART , AR	Super C	1,530	0.3%	-$0.19	1.1	-$0.01	0.1	$0.04	0.5	$0.03	0.3
(122)	366	MADISONVILLE , TN	Super C	1,523	0.3%								
(123)	1115	HOHENWALD , TN	Disc/Sup	1,506	0.3%			**-$0.32**	**2.4**	**-$0.25**	**2.8**	$0.01	0.1
(124)	176	RIPLEY , MS	Disc	1,427	0.3%			-$0.10	0.8	-$0.02	0.2	$0.03	0.4
(125)	3659	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	1,346	0.3%								
(126)	620	BRISTOL , TN	Super C	1,336	0.3%								
(127)	1319	KNOXVILLE , TN	Disc	1,294	0.3%								
(128)	3717	NASHVILLE , TN	Super C	1,274	0.3%								
(129)	3230	BRYANT , AR	Super C	1,265	0.3%							**-$0.20**	**2.9**
(130)	7	SHERWOOD , AR	Disc	1,210	0.2%			**-$0.23**	**3.0**	-$0.11	1.5	-$0.06	0.7
(131)	303	HOLLY SPRINGS , MS	Disc/Sup	1,202	0.2%			-$0.18	1.1	-$0.23	1.5	-$0.04	0.2
(132)	403	RUSSELLVILLE , AL	Disc/Sup	1,169	0.2%							-$0.23	1.6
(133)	71	POCAHONTAS , AR	Super C	1,166	0.2%	**-$0.23**	**2.7**	**-$0.17**	**2.2**	-$0.12	1.4	-$0.18	1.6
(134)	3599	BARTLETT , TN	N Mkt	1,145	0.2%								

(99)	-$0.16	1.0	$0.02	0.2	$0.08	0.8	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.06	0.5	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.03	0.3
(100)							-$0.21	2.2	-$0.15	1.9	-$0.10	1.2	-$0.08	1.1
(101)	**-$0.46**	**2.5**	-$0.11	0.6	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.14	0.7	$0.02	0.2	$0.05	0.4	-$0.11	0.9
(102)	**-$0.62**	**3.3**	**-$0.47**	**3.0**	-$0.04	0.3	$0.06	0.4						
(103)							-$0.25	1.3	-$0.09	1.0	$0.04	0.4	$0.03	0.3
(104)							-$0.28	2.2	-$0.14	1.6	-$0.18	2.0	-$0.12	1.3
(105)							$0.05	0.4	$0.11	1.0	$0.02	0.3	-$0.05	0.5
(106)							$0.03	0.2	$0.08	0.7	$0.00	0.0	-$0.06	0.7
(107)							-$0.23	1.8	**-$0.26**	**3.0**	-$0.28	3.2	-$0.30	3.9
(108)							-$0.22	1.6	-$0.07	0.6	-$0.17	1.6	-$0.16	1.4
(109)							**-$0.37**	**2.0**	-$0.13	0.9	$0.03	0.2	$0.09	0.7
(110)	-$0.02	0.2												
(111)							**-$0.27**	**2.2**	-$0.18	1.7	-$0.17	1.6	**-$0.23**	**2.1**
(112)									$0.12	1.0	$0.09	0.9	**$0.22**	**2.1**
(113)	-$0.04	0.3												
(114)									**-$0.47**	**4.5**	**-$0.49**	**4.8**	**-$0.39**	**4.0**
(115)	-$0.19	1.3												
(116)	-$0.20	1.4												
(117)							-$0.09	0.9	-$0.02	0.2	-$0.07	0.9	$0.05	0.7
(118)									-$0.07	1.1	-$0.12	1.7	-$0.12	1.5
(119)							-$0.11	0.9	$0.00	0.0	-$0.08	0.9	-$0.04	0.5
(120)							**-$0.54**	**2.5**	-$0.23	1.6	-$0.14	1.0	-$0.12	0.9
(121)	-$0.03	0.2												
(122)							**-$0.37**	**2.7**	**-$0.28**	**2.6**	**-$0.29**	**2.4**	**-$0.32**	**3.0**
(123)	$0.04	0.3	$0.16	1.0	$0.13	0.9	$0.22	1.5	$0.20	1.5	$0.09	0.8	$0.13	1.1
(124)	$0.15	1.8	$0.00	0.0	$0.13	1.3	$0.19	1.8	$0.23	1.7				
(125)									-$0.09	1.0	-$0.10	1.2	-$0.14	1.6
(126)									-$0.15	1.6	-$0.17	1.8	-$0.15	1.6
(127)							-$0.14	1.2	$0.01	0.1	-$0.08	0.8	$0.03	0.3
(128)											-$0.08	1.4	-$0.05	0.9
(129)	**-$0.23**	**2.3**												
(130)	$0.01	0.1												
(131)	-$0.29	1.3	-$0.07	0.3	-$0.08	0.7	$0.20	1.7						
(132)	-$0.17	1.7	-$0.21	1.7	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.01	0.1						
(133)														
(134)	-$0.02	0.3	-$0.06	0.8	$0.07	0.7	**$0.34**	**2.9**	$0.09	0.7	-$0.05	0.3	$0.22	1.4

(99)	0.924	185.0	127	764	16.1
(100)	0.907	148.3	125	939	16.1
(101)	0.908	128.9	144	762	13.9
(102)	0.808	64.9	123	823	16.3
(103)	0.921	146.3	145	935	13.4
(104)	0.914	146.8	132	891	14.7
(105)	0.915	155.4	127	939	15.3
(106)	0.882	100.1	136	989	14.2
(107)	0.940	217.9	129	945	14.9
(108)	0.871	93.2	130	928	14.7
(109)	0.894	117.5	128	938	14.8
(110)	0.828	69.1	123	1095	15.3
(111)	0.937	196.3	125	732	14.1
(112)	0.922	162.5	117	914	14.7
(113)	0.874	98.3	112	926	15.1
(114)	0.916	134.2	127	934	13.3
(115)	0.856	82.1	114	766	14.7
(116)	0.848	80.8	108	712	15.4
(117)	0.899	103.5	128	831	12.5
(118)	0.836	68.3	109	973	14.3
(119)	0.893	101.1	118	721	13.0
(120)	0.884	85.7	126	694	12.1
(121)	0.904	132.8	101	656	15.0
(122)	0.921	132.9	123	679	12.3
(123)	0.919	138.3	114	556	13.1
(124)	0.939	208.3	98	485	14.4
(125)	0.858	62.2	119	816	11.2
(126)	0.933	139.0	121	727	11.0
(127)	0.917	136.8	97	557	13.2
(128)	0.864	65.9	112	940	11.3
(129)	0.875	73.9	109	836	11.5
(130)	0.874	83.6	93	655	12.9
(131)	0.895	82.9	112	492	10.6
(132)	0.870	61.6	114	574	10.2
(133)	0.891	87.0	100	508	11.5
(134)	0.865	97.0	71	590	15.9

(135)	583	ONEIDA , TN	Super C	1,135	0.2%								
(136)	3835	OOLTEWAH , TN	Super C	1,108	0.2%								
(137)	68	WYNNE , AR	Disc/Sup	1,095	0.2%			**-$0.29**	**2.2**	**-$0.29**	**2.9**	**-$0.28**	**2.2**
(138)	879	LAFAYETTE , TN	Super C	1,094	0.2%								
(139)	4223	MARYVILLE , TN	Super C	1,084	0.2%								
(140)	409	HALEYVILLE , AL	Disc	1,043	0.2%			$0.03	0.2	-$0.23	1.5	-$0.08	0.6
(141)	5043	MEMPHIS , TN	N Mkt	1,022	0.2%								
(142)	699	OXFORD , MS	Disc	996	0.2%			-$0.15	1.4	-$0.13	1.1	**-$0.41**	**3.1**
(143)	568	CARTHAGE , TN	Disc/Sup	990	0.2%							-$0.06	0.3
(144)	190	KENNETT , MO	Super C	943	0.2%					**-$0.20**	**2.5**	**-$0.39**	**3.1**
(145)	3829	JOHNSON CITY , TN	Super C	915	0.2%								
(146)	5419	HERNANDO , MS	Super C	900	0.2%								
(147)	5122	MEMPHIS , TN	N Mkt	899	0.2%								
(148)	3593	HORN LAKE , MS	N Mkt	881	0.2%								
(149)	410	MURRAY , KY	Super C	872	0.2%								
(150)	274	IUKA , MS	Disc	851	0.2%			-$0.14	1.1	-$0.14	0.9	-$0.10	0.6
(151)	229	TRUMANN , AR	Disc/Sup	836	0.2%			**-$0.20**	**2.2**	-$0.09	0.9	-$0.06	0.6
(152)	1467	JAMESTOWN , TN	Disc/Sup	790	0.2%								
(153)	1074	GRENADA , MS	Super C	766	0.2%	-$0.13	1.0	-$0.18	1.4				
(154)	736	RUSSELLVILLE , KY	Super C	755	0.2%								
(155)	74	OSCEOLA , AR	Disc	740	0.1%			-$0.30	1.2	-$0.32	1.1	-$0.04	0.2
(156)	4414	SMITHVILLE , TN	Super C	725	0.1%								
(157)	18	NEWPORT , AR	Disc	724	0.1%			-$0.33	1.9	**-$0.38**	**2.0**	-$0.20	1.0
(158)	3362	OAK GROVE , KY	Super C	720	0.1%								
(159)	670	CULLMAN , AL	Super C	719	0.1%								
(160)	707	CLARKSDALE , MS	Disc	710	0.1%			-$0.15	1.2	**-$0.25**	**2.0**	-$0.29	1.9
(161)	114	BOONEVILLE , MS	Disc	696	0.1%			-$0.10	0.7	-$0.14	1.0	-$0.28	1.7
(162)	430	MAYFIELD , KY	Super C	693	0.1%								
(163)	5119	NASHVILLE , TN	N Mkt	693	0.1%								
(164)	661	ATHENS , AL	Super C	672	0.1%								
(165)	1468	BATESVILLE , MS	Disc	661	0.1%			**-$0.31**	**2.6**	-$0.19	1.9	-$0.04	0.2
(166)	3852	UNICOI , TN	Super C	641	0.1%								
(167)	2690	MADISON , AL	Super C	637	0.1%								
(168)	662	DECATUR , AL	Super C	636	0.1%								
(169)	4226	DUNLAP , TN	Super C	630	0.1%								
(170)	348	MONTICELLO , AR	Super C	629	0.1%	-$0.14	1.6	**-$0.25**	**2.6**				

(135)									-$0.09	1.0	**-$0.26**	**2.5**	**-$0.31**	**3.3**
(136)											$0.01	0.1	$0.09	1.1
(137)	**-$0.39**	**2.6**			-$0.05	0.4								
(138)									$0.05	0.4	$0.00	0.0	$0.09	1.1
(139)											**-$0.25**	**3.3**	**-$0.25**	**3.4**
(140)	$0.07	0.5	$0.18	1.3	$0.11	0.9	$0.19	1.4						
(141)	**-$0.37**	**2.1**	-$0.31	1.9	-$0.07	0.4	-$0.15	1.0	$0.14	1.2	-$0.04	0.3	**-$0.32**	**2.3**
(142)														
(143)	-$0.32	1.3	-$0.31	1.4	-$0.10	0.4	-$0.09	0.3	-$0.02	0.1	$0.03	0.1	$0.17	1.2
(144)														
(145)											-$0.01	0.1	-$0.06	0.9
(146)					$0.06	0.5	-$0.04	0.4	$0.05	0.4				
(147)			-$0.09	0.7	$0.13	0.9	$0.23	1.4	$0.04	0.2	-$0.02	0.2	-$0.17	1.1
(148)	-$0.11	0.9	-$0.18	1.7	-$0.10	0.8	-$0.16	1.2	-$0.19	1.0				
(149)							$0.04	0.5	$0.09	1.0				
(150)	$0.12	0.9	$0.19	1.3	$0.25	1.1	**$0.45**	**2.1**						
(151)	-$0.12	0.7	$0.08	0.6	-$0.03	0.3								
(152)							**-$0.39**	**2.3**	-$0.12	0.9	-$0.17	1.5	$0.11	0.8
(153)														
(154)							**-$0.27**	**2.1**	**-$0.26**	**2.0**				
(155)	-$0.22	1.3	$0.05	0.4	-$0.01	0.1								
(156)									-$0.06	0.5	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.03	0.3
(157)	-$0.41	1.9												
(158)							-$0.05	0.5	-$0.01	0.1				
(159)							-$0.11	0.8						
(160)														
(161)	-$0.13	0.8												
(162)							-$0.19	1.3	-$0.13	0.9				
(163)			$0.21	1.3	$0.15	1.2	$0.11	0.9	$0.09	0.8	$0.25	1.7	$0.27	1.7
(164)							**-$0.26**	**2.3**						
(165)														
(166)									-$0.07	0.6	-$0.12	1.0	-$0.14	0.9
(167)							**-$0.21**	**2.2**						
(168)							-$0.21	1.6						
(169)									-$0.23	1.4	-$0.13	0.9	-$0.17	1.2
(170)														

(135)	0.942	154.5	108	606	10.4
(136)	0.842	49.9	107	788	10.3
(137)	0.858	47.9	122	557	8.9
(138)	0.929	112.4	114	553	9.5
(139)	0.929	126.1	102	762	10.5
(140)	0.928	137.0	89	378	11.6
(141)	0.822	59.9	73	572	13.8
(142)	0.859	59.6	92	492	10.7
(143)	0.895	74.9	101	430	9.7
(144)	0.827	34.8	114	601	8.2
(145)	0.890	62.8	104	632	8.7
(146)	0.900	62.9	113	476	7.9
(147)	0.858	68.3	73	501	12.1
(148)	0.851	63.9	72	490	12.1
(149)	0.927	84.0	114	464	7.6
(150)	0.947	177.5	78	282	10.8
(151)	0.940	111.9	103	428	8.0
(152)	0.921	77.3	103	385	7.6
(153)	0.822	27.2	111	398	6.8
(154)	0.922	63.0	119	405	6.3
(155)	0.905	76.8	82	311	8.9
(156)	0.891	57.6	90	416	8.0
(157)	0.891	65.0	81	299	8.8
(158)	0.927	77.0	102	402	7.0
(159)	0.885	39.4	117	718	6.1
(160)	0.863	45.7	86	345	8.2
(161)	0.905	73.7	80	298	8.6
(162)	0.945	92.4	108	362	6.4
(163)	0.860	53.0	72	322	9.5
(164)	0.873	35.9	108	671	6.2
(165)	0.835	37.7	78	381	8.4
(166)	0.919	74.7	84	336	7.5
(167)	0.874	34.3	107	636	5.9
(168)	0.905	45.9	109	635	5.8
(169)	0.917	71.0	85	322	7.3
(170)	0.852	29.0	104	331	6.0

(171)	5107	MADISON , TN	N Mkt	614	0.1%							
(172)	1100	HAMILTON , AL	Disc	537	0.1%							
(173)	57	WALNUT RIDGE , AR	Disc	494	0.1%		-$0.23	1.8	-$0.14	1.1	**-$0.31**	**1.7**
(174)	156	CARUTHERSVILLE , MO	Disc	488	0.1%		-$0.02	0.1	$0.10	0.8	$0.20	0.9
(175)	30	DEXTER , MO	Disc	477	0.1%		-$0.01	0.1	-$0.01	0.0	-$0.03	0.1
(176)	3306	NASHVILLE , TN	N Mkt	477	0.1%							
(177)	4635	CLINTON , TN	Super C	470	0.1%							
(178)	169	LONOKE , AR	Disc	466	0.1%		-$0.20	1.1	-$0.28	1.8	**-$0.70**	**2.2**
(179)	1159	NEW TAZEWELL , TN	Disc	459	0.1%							
(180)	84	BRINKLEY , AR	Disc	348	0.1%		-$0.31	1.8	-$0.14	0.7	-$0.15	0.7
(181)	453	MALDEN , MO	Disc	330	0.1%		**$0.36**	**2.7**	$0.26	1.4	$0.12	0.9
(182)	**Total Person-Years**			***495,704***	***100.0%***							

	1998	***1999***	***2000***	***2001***
	All Store-Years Analyzed			
Men Favored	***22***	***88***	***85***	***93***
Women Favored	***1***	***3***	***6***	***8***
Total	***23***	***91***	***91***	***101***
%	***95.7%***	***96.7%***	***93.4%***	***92.1%***
	Store-Years with Statistically-Significant Gender Disparity			
Men Favored	***13***	***57***	***55***	***54***
Women Favored	***0***	***1***	***0***	***0***
Total	***13***	***58***	***55***	***54***
%	***100.0%***	***98.3%***	***100.0%***	***100.0%***

(171)							$0.02	0.2	-$0.07	0.5	-$0.06	0.4	$0.05	0.3
(172)	$0.30	1.5	$0.25	1.4	$0.28	1.7	**$0.40**	**2.3**						
(173)														
(174)							$0.29	1.4	$0.28	1.4				
(175)														
(176)							-$0.25	1.6	-$0.15	0.8	-$0.25	1.7	-$0.03	0.2
(177)													$0.10	0.9
(178)	**-$0.98**	**2.6**												
(179)							**-$0.42**	**2.4**	-$0.22	1.1	**-$0.51**	**2.5**	-$0.05	0.4
(180)	-$0.15	0.7												
(181)														

2002	*2003*	*2004*	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*
			All Store-Years Analyzed			
93	*75*	*57*	*76*	*64*	*68*	*61*
8	*12*	*35*	*53*	*58*	*43*	*51*
101	*87*	*92*	*129*	*122*	*111*	*112*
92.1%	*86.2%*	*62.0%*	*58.9%*	*52.5%*	*61.3%*	*54.5%*
			Store-Years with Statistically-Significant Gender Disparity			
61	*43*	*13*	*20*	*9*	*10*	*13*
0	*0*	*3*	*10*	*4*	*2*	*7*
61	*43*	*16*	*30*	*13*	*12*	*20*
100.0%	*100.0%*	*81.3%*	*66.7%*	*69.2%*	*83.3%*	*65.0%*

(171)	0.813	39.4	61	373	9.9
(172)	0.924	87.8	65	246	8.1
(173)	0.895	46.0	77	256	6.3
(174)	0.899	47.6	77	231	6.3
(175)	0.892	52.3	65	214	7.2
(176)	0.889	56.6	59	263	8.0
(177)	0.907	39.5	93	469	5.0
(178)	0.822	29.4	63	235	7.3
(179)	0.957	131.5	66	188	6.9
(180)	0.920	54.8	60	138	5.7
(181)	0.938	65.3	62	151	5.2

Based on 497,907 employee records analyzed in 187 regressions (one per store).

Column (ad) states the ratio of number of employee-year observations to number of estimated regression coefficients. The table reports regression results only when this ratio is 5 or more. Therefore, results are not reported for six stores with a total of 9 store-year observations. For 79.0% of the reported regressions (143 of the out of 181), the ratio is 10 or greater.

Each regression controls for:

year

(age-15-seniority with WalMart)

(age-15-seniority with WalMart) squared
seniority with WalMart
seniority with WalMart squared
Does employee have a "high" score on current year performance evaluation

Employee has no evaluation score in this year

Employee has evaluations score of "7"
Employee is in a grocery division or has a grocery job description (see Table C-2)
Division where empoyee works.
Department where employee works.
Job description (282 job descriptions appear in at least one regression).
Job level (1-7)

Dependent variable is hourly base pay rate ($/hour).
Standard deviations is adjusted for the extent to which individual employees appear in more than one year in the same regression.

Sign Test for Statistical Significance of Overall Gender Difference for 1998 - 2003

All Regressions		***All Regressions with Statistically-Significant Gender Coefficients (bolded)***	
Females Higher (shaded)	38	Females Higher (shaded)	1
Males Higher	456	Males Higher	283
Total Analyses	494	Total Analyses	284
% Males Higher	92.3%	% Males Higher	99.6%
Standard Deviations	18.8	Standard Deviations	16.7
probability	< 1 in a trillion	probability	< 1 in a trillion

Sign Test for Statistical Significance of Overall Gender Difference for1998 - 2008

All Regressions		***All Regressions with Statistically-Significant Gender Coefficients (bolded)***	
Females Higher (shaded)	278	Females Higher (shaded)	27
Males Higher	782	Males Higher	348
Total Analyses	1,060	Total Analyses	375
% Males Higher	73.8%	% Males Higher	92.8%
Standard Deviations	15.5	Standard Deviations	16.6
probability	< 1 in a trillion	probability	< 1 in a trillion

Commonality Analysis for1998 - 2003

	Store Number	*Commonality Analysis for Stores - All Regressions*				*Commonality Analysis for Stores - Regressions with Statsticially-Significant Gender Coefficients*			
		Females Higher (Shaded)	*Males Higher*	*Total Analyses*	*% Males Higher*	*Females Higher (Shaded)*	*Males Higher*	*Total Analyses*	*% Males Higher*
(182)	950	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(183)	848	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(184)	1248	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(185)	682	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(186)	406	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(187)	659	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(188)	94	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(189)	175	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(190)	335	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(191)	272	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(192)	192	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(193)	710	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(194)	674	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(195)	264	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(196)	671	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(197)	70	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(198)	2322	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(199)	45	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(200)	2846	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(201)	1561	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(202)	698	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(203)	688	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(204)	1606	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(205)	657	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(206)	695	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(207)	258	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(208)	1469	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

Commonality Analysis for All Years 1998 -2008

	Store Number	*Commonality Analysis for Stores - All Regressions*				*Commonality Analysis for Stores - Regressions with Statsticially-Significant Gender Coefficients*			
		Females Higher (Shaded)	***Males Higher***	***Total Analyses***	***% Males Higher***	***Females Higher (Shaded)***	***Males Higher***	***Total Analyses***	***% Males Higher***
(182)	950	3	8	11	*72.7%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(183)	848	2	7	9	*77.8%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(184)	1248	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(185)	682	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(186)	406	4	6	10	*60.0%*	1	3	4	*75.0%*
(187)	659	4	6	10	*60.0%*	1	4	5	*80.0%*
(188)	94	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(189)	175	3	8	11	*72.7%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(190)	335	5	5	10	*50.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(191)	272	5	5	10	*50.0%*	1	4	5	*80.0%*
(192)	192	5	5	10	*50.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(193)	710	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(194)	674	2	8	10	*80.0%*	1	5	6	*83.3%*
(195)	264	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(196)	671	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(197)	70	3	6	9	*66.7%*	1	6	7	*85.7%*
(198)	2322	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(199)	45	1	6	7	*85.7%*	1	3	4	*75.0%*
(200)	2846	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(201)	1561	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(202)	698	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(203)	688	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(204)	1606	5	2	7	*28.6%*	1	2	3	*66.7%*
(205)	657	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(206)	695	6	4	10	*40.0%*	4	4	8	*50.0%*
(207)	258	3	4	7	*57.1%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(208)	1469	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(209)	656	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(210)	687	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(211)	683	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(212)	105	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(213)	5057	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(214)	1376	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(215)	5058	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(216)	155	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(217)	677	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(218)	314	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(219)	238	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(220)	308	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(221)	119	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(222)	676	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(223)	1089	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(224)	668	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(225)	735	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(226)	391	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(227)	124	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	0	0	
(228)	5	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(229)	684	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(230)	85	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(231)	157	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(232)	128	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(233)	667	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(234)	177	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(235)	24	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(236)	663	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(237)	1031	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(238)	766	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(239)	153	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(240)	1458	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(241)	5251								
(242)	5263	1	0	1	*0.0%*	0	0	0	

(209)	656	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(210)	687	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(211)	683	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(212)	105	3	5	8	*62.5%*	1	5	6	*83.3%*
(213)	5057	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(214)	1376	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(215)	5058	1	5	6	*83.3%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(216)	155	2	6	8	*75.0%*	2	2	4	*50.0%*
(217)	677	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(218)	314	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(219)	238	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(220)	308	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(221)	119	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(222)	676	2	5	7	*71.4%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(223)	1089	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(224)	668	5	2	7	*28.6%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(225)	735	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(226)	391	2	5	7	*71.4%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(227)	124	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	0	0	
(228)	5	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(229)	684	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(230)	85	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(231)	157	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(232)	128	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(233)	667	5	3	8	*37.5%*	1	2	3	*66.7%*
(234)	177	4	3	7	*42.9%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(235)	24	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(236)	663	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(237)	1031	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(238)	766	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(239)	153	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(240)	1458	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(241)	5251	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(242)	5263	3	3	6	*50.0%*	0	0	0	

(243)	268	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(244)	93	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(245)	393	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(246)	218	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(247)	619	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(248)	5175	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(249)	660	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(250)	126	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(251)	737	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(252)	1318								
(253)	3495								
(254)	5196								
(255)	714	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(256)	685								
(257)	672								
(258)	466	3	2	5	*40.0%*	0	0	0	
(259)	304								
(260)	1320								
(261)	578								
(262)	587	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	
(263)	91	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(264)	2065								
(265)	120	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(266)	104	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(267)	1080								
(268)	62	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(269)	673								
(270)	161	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(271)	2932								
(272)	1075								
(273)	477	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(274)	36	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(275)	2988	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(276)	2587	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(243)	268	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(244)	93	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	7	7	*100.0%*
(245)	393	5	5	10	*50.0%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(246)	218	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(247)	619	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(248)	5175	2	4	6	*66.7%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(249)	660	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(250)	126	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(251)	737	1	9	10	*90.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(252)	1318	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(253)	3495	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(254)	5196	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(255)	714	2	6	8	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(256)	685	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(257)	672	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(258)	466	8	2	10	*20.0%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(259)	304	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(260)	1320	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(261)	578	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(262)	587	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	2	2	
(263)	91	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(264)	2065	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(265)	120	4	3	7	*42.9%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(266)	104	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	0	0	
(267)	1080	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(268)	62	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(269)	673	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(270)	161	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	0	0	
(271)	2932	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(272)	1075	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(273)	477	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(274)	36	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(275)	2988	3	2	5	*40.0%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(276)	2587	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(277)	160	1	5	6	*83.3%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(278)	64	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(279)	680								
(280)	390	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(281)	690								
(282)	738	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(283)	273	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(284)	107	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(285)	724								
(286)	97	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(287)	2310								
(288)	675								
(289)	741								
(290)	1194								
(291)	2575	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(292)	678								
(293)	742								
(294)	1105	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(295)	599								
(296)	8	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(297)	281	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(298)	1226								
(299)	3660								
(300)	3234								
(301)	1466								
(302)	102	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	0	0	
(303)	366								
(304)	1115	3	2	5	*40.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(305)	176	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	0	0	
(306)	3659								
(307)	620								
(308)	1319								
(309)	3717								
(310)	3230	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(277)	160	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(278)	64	6	4	10	*40.0%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(279)	680	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(280)	390	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(281)	690	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(282)	738	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(283)	273	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(284)	107	2	5	7	*71.4%*	0	0	0	
(285)	724	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(286)	97	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	0	0	
(287)	2310	3	1	4	*25.0%*	0	0	0	
(288)	675	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(289)	741	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(290)	1194	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(291)	2575	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(292)	678	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(293)	742	3	0	3	*0.0%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(294)	1105	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(295)	599	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(296)	8	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(297)	281	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(298)	1226	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(299)	3660	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(300)	3234	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(301)	1466	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(302)	102	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	0	0	
(303)	366	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(304)	1115	8	2	10	*20.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(305)	176	5	3	8	*37.5%*	0	0	0	
(306)	3659	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(307)	620	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(308)	1319	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(309)	3717	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(310)	3230	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(311)	7	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(312)	303	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(313)	403	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(314)	71	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(315)	3599	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(316)	583								
(317)	3835								
(318)	68	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(319)	879								
(320)	4223								
(321)	409	3	2	5	*40.0%*	0	0	0	
(322)	5043	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(323)	699	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(324)	568	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(325)	190	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(326)	3829								
(327)	5419								
(328)	5122	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(329)	3593	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(330)	410								
(331)	274	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	0	0	
(332)	229	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(333)	1467								
(334)	1074	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(335)	736								
(336)	74	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	0	0	
(337)	4414								
(338)	18	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(339)	3362								
(340)	670								
(341)	707	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(342)	114	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(343)	430								
(344)	5119	1	0	1	*0.0%*	0	0	0	

(311)	7	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(312)	303	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	0	0	
(313)	403	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(314)	71	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(315)	3599	4	3	7	*42.9%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(316)	583	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(317)	3835	2	0	2	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(318)	68	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(319)	879	2	1	3	*33.3%*	0	0	0	
(320)	4223	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(321)	409	5	2	7	*28.6%*	0	0	0	
(322)	5043	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(323)	699	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(324)	568	2	6	8	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(325)	190	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(326)	3829	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(327)	5419	2	1	3	*33.3%*	0	0	0	
(328)	5122	3	3	6	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(329)	3593	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(330)	410	2	0	2	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(331)	274	4	3	7	*42.9%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(332)	229	1	5	6	*83.3%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(333)	1467	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(334)	1074	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(335)	736	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(336)	74	1	5	6	*83.3%*	0	0	0	
(337)	4414	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(338)	18	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(339)	3362	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(340)	670	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(341)	707	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(342)	114	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(343)	430	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(344)	5119	6	0	6	*0.0%*	0	0	0	

(345)	661								
(346)	1468	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(347)	3852								
(348)	2690								
(349)	662								
(350)	4226								
(351)	348	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(352)	5107								
(353)	1100	2	0	2	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(354)	57	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(355)	156	2	1	3	*33.3%*	0	0	0	
(356)	30	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(357)	3306								
(358)	4635								
(359)	169	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(360)	1159								
(361)	84	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(362)	453	3	0	3	*0.0%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(363)	*Total*	38	456	494	*92.3%*	1	283	284	*99.6%*

1998-2003

Stores with Any Gender Disaprity Adverse to Women in Every year the Store was in region 43	**103 out of 126**	***81.7%***
Stores with any Gender Disaparity Adverse to Women in More than Half their Years in Region 43	**117 out of 126**	***92.9%***
Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result in Every Year the Store was in Region 43	**96 out of 97**	***99.0%***
Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result for at Least Half the Years the Store was in Region 43	**96 out of 97**	***99.0%***

(345)	661	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(346)	1468	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(347)	3852	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(348)	2690	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(349)	662	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(350)	4226	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(351)	348	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(352)	5107	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(353)	1100	4	0	4	*0.0%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(354)	57	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(355)	156	4	1	5	*20.0%*	0	0	0	
(356)	30	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(357)	3306	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(358)	4635	1	0	1	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(359)	169	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(360)	1159	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(361)	84	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(362)	453	3	0	3	*0.0%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(363)	*Total*	278	782	1,060	*73.8%*	27	348	375	*92.8%*

1998-2008

Stores with any Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in Every Year the Store was in Region 43	**78 out of 181**	***43.1%***
Stores with any Gender Disaparity Adverse to Women in More than Half their Years in Region 43	**144 out of 181**	***79.6%***
Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result in Every Year the Store was in Region 43	**102 out of 125**	***81.6%***
Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result for at Least Half the Years the Store was in Region 43	**111 out of 125**	***88.8%***

Table C-10
Gender Disparities in the Effect of 2004 Changes
in Job Levels for Selected Hourly Job Titles

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)
	Employees Analyzed					Job Level in 2004 for Persons who are in Same Department and Same Job Title as in 2003								Mantel Haentzel Chi Square	
	Job Title	Gender	Level in 2003	% at this Level in 2003	Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	All Levels	Probability (less than 1 chance in a…)	Standard Deviations
(1)	Sales Associate	Men	1	100.0%	1,220	0.1%	22.5%	43.6%	28.8%	5.1%			100.0%	100 million	5.9
(2)		Women		100.0%	2,732	0.0%	51.1%	18.0%	15.6%	15.3%			100.0%		
(3)	Department Manager	Men	3	100.0%	292			0.0%			70.2%	29.8%	100.0%	100,000	4.8
(4)		Women		100.0%	1,244			0.1%			82.5%	17.4%	100.0%		
(5)	Stocker	Men	1	100.0%	142	0.0%	4.9%	95.1%					100.0%	trillion	11.1
(6)		Women		100.0%	146	0.7%	67.8%	31.5%					100.0%		

Table C-11

Regression Analyses of the Effect of Gender on Base Pay Rate for Hourly Employees, 1998-2008, by Store , based on Regression Equations Not Inlcuding Department and Job Level

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
	Store			**Person-Years, 1998-2008**		**1998**		**1999**		**2000**		**2001**	
	Number	**Location**	**Store Type**	**Number**	**%**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**
(1)	950	BARTLETT , TN	Super C	9,841	2.0%	**-$0.76**	**7.1**	**-$0.63**	**9.8**	**-$0.53**	**7.6**	**-$0.52**	**7.0**
(2)	848	SOUTHAVEN , MS	Super C	8,756	1.8%	**-$0.72**	**6.6**	**-$0.61**	**8.0**	**-$0.60**	**7.1**	**-$0.68**	**7.6**
(3)	1248	MEMPHIS , TN	Disc/Sup	8,457	1.7%			**-$0.38**	**5.1**	**-$0.39**	**4.8**	**-$0.54**	**7.7**
(4)	682	MURFREESBORO , TN	Super C	8,353	1.7%			**-$0.43**	**6.5**	**-$0.43**	**6.9**	**-$0.47**	**6.0**
(5)	406	SMYRNA , TN	Super C	8,115	1.6%			**-$0.35**	**6.7**	**-$0.30**	**5.4**	**-$0.20**	**3.9**
(6)	659	NASHVILLE , TN	Super C	7,961	1.6%			**-$0.44**	**5.4**	**-$0.52**	**6.4**	**-$0.33**	**3.7**
(7)	94	MILLINGTON , TN	Super C	7,909	1.6%			**-$0.40**	**5.9**	**-$0.39**	**5.2**	**-$0.39**	**4.5**
(8)	175	COLLIERVILLE , TN	Super C	7,792	1.6%	**-$0.52**	**4.6**	**-$0.38**	**5.0**	**-$0.37**	**5.2**	**-$0.34**	**4.2**
(9)	335	JACKSON , TN	Super C	7,583	1.5%			**-$0.23**	**3.5**	**-$0.37**	**5.4**	**-$0.56**	**6.7**
(10)	272	FRANKLIN , TN	Disc/Sup	7,219	1.4%			**-$0.78**	**5.8**	**-$0.75**	**6.5**	**-$0.56**	**6.7**
(11)	192	COLUMBIA , TN	Disc/Sup	6,912	1.4%			**-$0.39**	**5.2**	**-$0.51**	**6.7**	**-$0.36**	**4.1**
(12)	710	HERMITAGE , TN	Disc/Sup	6,690	1.3%			**-$0.46**	**5.0**	**-$0.40**	**4.6**	**-$0.43**	**3.9**
(13)	674	GALLATIN , TN	Super C	6,647	1.3%			**-$0.35**	**4.5**	**-$0.34**	**3.8**	**-$0.29**	**3.4**
(14)	264	DICKSON , TN	Super C	6,597	1.3%			**-$0.55**	**6.5**	**-$0.47**	**5.9**	**-$0.52**	**5.8**
(15)	671	LEBANON , TN	Super C	6,456	1.3%			**-$0.46**	**5.3**	**-$0.34**	**4.0**	**-$0.41**	**4.0**
(16)	70	WEST MEMPHIS , AR	Super C	6,237	1.3%	**-$0.62**	**4.6**	**-$0.50**	**5.7**	**-$0.41**	**3.9**	**-$0.39**	**3.8**
(17)	2322	CORDOVA , TN	Disc/Sup	5,961	1.2%			**-$0.35**	**4.0**	**-$0.36**	**4.2**	**-$0.43**	**4.2**
(18)	45	JONESBORO , AR	Super C	5,874	1.2%	**-$0.23**	**3.3**	**-$0.18**	**3.9**	**-$0.27**	**5.5**	**-$0.28**	**5.6**
(19)	2846	OLIVE BRANCH , MS	Super C	5,612	1.1%					**-$0.45**	**5.3**	**-$0.40**	**4.7**
(20)	1561	MEMPHIS , TN	Disc	5,165	1.0%			**-$0.19**	**2.8**	**-$0.18**	**2.7**	**-$0.24**	**2.8**
(21)	698	CLEVELAND , TN	Super C	5,048	1.0%								
(22)	688	NASHVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	5,023	1.0%			**-$0.34**	**3.9**	**-$0.35**	**4.0**	**-$0.30**	**3.4**
(23)	1606	HIXSON , TN	Super C	4,894	1.0%								
(24)	657	COOKEVILLE , TN	Super C	4,823	1.0%								
(25)	695	MADISON , TN	Disc	4,788	1.0%			**-$0.57**	**5.5**	**-$0.56**	**4.6**	**-$0.49**	**4.2**
(26)	258	TUPELO , MS	Super C	4,713	0.9%			**-$0.26**	**3.0**	-$0.10	1.3	**-$0.26**	**2.9**

Table C-11 (Continued)

	(n)	(o)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)	(r)	(s)	(t)	(u)	(v)	(w)	(x)	(y)
	2002		**2003**		**2004**		**2005**		**2006**		**2007**		**2008**	
	Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**	**Effect of Being Female ($/Hour)**	**Std. Devs.**
(1)	**-$0.54**	**6.8**	**-$0.53**	**5.2**	-$0.11	1.2	-$0.15	1.5	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.03	0.3	-$0.02	0.2
(2)	**-$0.57**	**5.7**	**-$0.66**	**6.1**	-$0.09	0.9	$0.13	1.0	$0.16	1.1				
(3)	**-$0.41**	**5.2**	**-$0.44**	**4.6**	-$0.16	1.7	-$0.06	0.7	$0.04	0.4	$0.11	1.4	$0.12	1.4
(4)	**-$0.50**	**5.8**	**-$0.55**	**5.3**	-$0.14	1.4	-$0.04	0.4	-$0.15	1.6	-$0.12	1.4	-$0.12	1.5
(5)	**-$0.26**	**3.6**	**-$0.13**	**2.1**	**-$0.16**	**2.3**	-$0.06	1.0	-$0.02	0.3	-$0.04	0.6	$0.11	1.4
(6)	**-$0.44**	**4.5**	**-$0.45**	**4.4**	-$0.14	1.4	-$0.01	0.2	$0.01	0.1	$0.03	0.3	$0.10	1.0
(7)	**-$0.36**	**3.7**	**-$0.37**	**3.6**	-$0.14	1.5	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.12	1.1
(8)	**-$0.34**	**3.8**	**-$0.24**	**2.7**	-$0.02	0.2	-$0.12	1.0	-$0.01	0.1	-$0.09	0.8	-$0.05	0.4
(9)	**-$0.54**	**6.0**	**-$0.41**	**4.5**	$0.05	0.5	$0.05	0.6	$0.05	0.5	$0.11	1.1	$0.01	0.1
(10)	**-$0.43**	**4.4**	**-$0.21**	**2.0**	$0.02	0.2	-$0.03	0.4	-$0.05	0.6	-$0.12	1.3	$0.03	0.4
(11)	**-$0.24**	**3.7**	**-$0.16**	**2.5**	$0.06	0.9	$0.08	1.1	$0.05	0.7	$0.12	1.6	$0.02	0.2
(12)	**-$0.42**	**3.7**	**-$0.36**	**3.7**	-$0.01	0.2	**$0.17**	**2.0**	$0.08	0.8	$0.14	1.6	$0.11	1.2
(13)	**-$0.32**	**3.9**	**-$0.38**	**3.8**	-$0.13	1.3	-$0.12	1.1	-$0.09	0.8	$0.02	0.2	$0.08	0.8
(14)	**-$0.62**	**5.9**	**-$0.40**	**3.9**	**-$0.22**	**2.2**	-$0.05	0.5	$0.00	0.0	-$0.02	0.1	-$0.10	0.9
(15)	**-$0.28**	**2.2**	**-$0.27**	**2.3**	-$0.02	0.2	$0.05	0.4	$0.05	0.4	-$0.07	0.6	$0.13	1.2
(16)	**-$0.37**	**3.3**	**-$0.42**	**3.4**	$0.07	0.6	$0.16	1.4	$0.04	0.2				
(17)	**-$0.33**	**2.8**	**-$0.30**	**3.5**	-$0.11	1.3	-$0.04	0.4	$0.01	0.1	$0.05	0.6	-$0.13	1.3
(18)	**-$0.27**	**5.2**	**-$0.13**	**2.4**	**$0.15**	**2.3**								
(19)	**-$0.32**	**3.6**	**-$0.25**	**2.7**	-$0.04	0.4	-$0.03	0.3	-$0.16	1.1				
(20)	**-$0.28**	**3.2**	**-$0.19**	**2.0**	-$0.02	0.1	-$0.04	0.3	$0.10	1.0	-$0.10	0.8	$0.06	0.4
(21)	**-$0.30**	**3.3**	**-$0.23**	**2.7**	-$0.18	1.6	-$0.08	0.8	-$0.13	1.3	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.09	1.0
(22)	**-$0.32**	**3.0**	-$0.21	1.8	-$0.10	0.7	$0.18	1.2	$0.29	1.8	$0.08	0.8	$0.10	0.9
(23)	**-$0.41**	**4.9**	**-$0.40**	**4.7**	-$0.03	0.4	$0.06	0.6	-$0.08	0.7	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.07	0.8
(24)	**-$0.30**	**3.7**	**-$0.41**	**5.0**	**-$0.16**	**2.0**	-$0.06	0.7	-$0.04	0.4	-$0.09	0.9	**-$0.20**	**2.0**
(25)	**-$0.50**	**4.4**	-$0.21	1.6	$0.04	0.3	$0.11	0.8	$0.22	1.3	**$0.31**	**2.0**	$0.19	1.2
(26)	-$0.21	1.9	**-$0.23**	**2.5**	-$0.01	0.1	$0.13	1.1						

Table C-11 (Continued)

	(z)	(aa)	(ab)	(ac)	(ad)
	R-Squared	**F**	**Degrees of Freedom Numerator**	**Degree of Freedom Denominator**	**Ratio of Obser-vations to Estimated Variables**
(1)	0.791	267.8	137	4408	71.3
(2)	0.782	251.9	123	3584	70.6
(3)	0.799	269.8	123	4061	68.2
(4)	0.846	353.6	128	3575	64.8
(5)	0.896	542.0	127	4166	63.4
(6)	0.802	243.6	130	3674	60.8
(7)	0.854	374.4	122	3312	64.3
(8)	0.841	340.1	119	3240	64.9
(9)	0.881	427.9	129	3167	58.3
(10)	0.788	207.2	127	3293	56.4
(11)	0.854	327.1	121	2964	56.7
(12)	0.871	368.3	120	3010	55.3
(13)	0.857	332.1	118	2769	55.9
(14)	0.863	363.3	112	2763	58.4
(15)	0.834	256.7	124	2632	51.6
(16)	0.787	191.1	118	2621	52.4
(17)	0.816	219.7	118	2594	50.1
(18)	0.847	282.4	113	2872	51.5
(19)	0.824	277.5	93	2754	59.7
(20)	0.863	305.6	104	2236	49.2
(21)	0.854	294.5	98	2539	51.0
(22)	0.899	370.3	118	2329	42.2
(23)	0.829	214.8	108	2283	44.9
(24)	0.900	419.3	101	2180	47.3
(25)	0.875	332.9	99	2047	47.9
(26)	0.826	214.4	102	2162	45.8

(27)	1469	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	4,681	0.9%								
(28)	656	SHELBYVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	4,646	0.9%			**-$0.50**	**5.6**	**-$0.33**	**4.4**	**-$0.14**	**2.2**
(29)	687	CROSSVILLE , TN	Super C	4,607	0.9%								
(30)	683	LAWRENCEBURG , TN	Super C	4,570	0.9%			**-$0.26**	**3.5**	**-$0.34**	**3.9**	**-$0.41**	**4.1**
(31)	105	CORINTH , MS	Super C	4,545	0.9%			**-$0.63**	**7.4**	**-$0.54**	**6.7**	**-$0.58**	**5.3**
(32)	5057	MURFREESBORO , TN	Super C	4,531	0.9%								
(33)	1376	HENDERSONVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	4,526	0.9%			**-$0.39**	**3.7**	**-$0.30**	**3.1**	**-$0.36**	**3.5**
(34)	5058	ANTIOCH , TN	Super C	4,472	0.9%								
(35)	155	SENATOBIA , MS	Super C	4,333	0.9%	**-$0.29**	**2.4**	**-$0.16**	**2.0**	**-$0.33**	**3.8**	**-$0.33**	**2.9**
(36)	677	DYERSBURG , TN	Super C	4,324	0.9%			**-$0.44**	**5.6**	**-$0.33**	**4.9**	**-$0.50**	**4.2**
(37)	314	FAYETTEVILLE , TN	Super C	4,219	0.8%							**-$0.46**	**4.2**
(38)	238	PULASKI , TN	Super C	4,201	0.8%			**-$0.38**	**4.7**	**-$0.29**	**3.6**	**-$0.41**	**3.6**
(39)	308	MANCHESTER , TN	Super C	4,065	0.8%							**-$0.31**	**3.7**
(40)	119	BATESVILLE , AR	Super C	4,024	0.8%	**-$0.40**	**5.1**	**-$0.29**	**4.2**	**-$0.43**	**6.0**	-$0.38	4.7
(41)	676	ROCKWOOD , TN	Super C	3,948	0.8%								
(42)	1089	KIMBALL , TN	Super C	3,946	0.8%							**-$0.52**	**4.8**
(43)	668	MCMINNVILLE , TN	Super C	3,930	0.8%								
(44)	735	WINCHESTER , TN	Super C	3,888	0.8%							**-$0.49**	**4.7**
(45)	391	TUPELO , MS	Super C	3,788	0.8%			**-$0.28**	**2.8**	**-$0.27**	**2.5**	**-$0.47**	**3.7**
(46)	124	LITTLE ROCK , AR	Disc/Sup	3,752	0.8%	$0.01	0.1	-$0.05	0.6	-$0.18	1.9	**-$0.22**	**2.2**
(47)	5	CONWAY , AR	Super C	3,714	0.7%	**-$0.30**	**3.6**	**-$0.17**	**3.2**	**-$0.16**	**2.6**	**-$0.19**	**2.6**
(48)	684	LEXINGTON , TN	Disc/Sup	3,706	0.7%			**-$0.65**	**4.9**	**-$0.64**	**4.9**	**-$0.42**	**2.8**
(49)	85	BENTON , AR	Super C	3,669	0.7%	**-$0.33**	**3.4**	**-$0.39**	**7.0**	**-$0.30**	**4.5**	**-$0.37**	**4.6**
(50)	157	SEARCY , AR	Super C	3,623	0.7%	**-$0.48**	**5.1**	**-$0.25**	**4.0**	**-$0.27**	**4.0**	**-$0.29**	**3.8**
(51)	128	JONESBORO , AR	Super C	3,602	0.7%	-$0.16	1.6	**-$0.26**	**3.8**	**-$0.37**	**5.0**	**-$0.42**	**4.8**
(52)	667	TULLAHOMA , TN	Super C	3,596	0.7%							**-$0.52**	**4.2**
(53)	177	PARIS , TN	Super C	3,555	0.7%			**-$0.29**	**3.3**	-$0.13	1.7	**-$0.35**	**2.8**
(54)	24	JACKSONVILLE , AR	Super C	3,493	0.7%			**-$0.26**	**4.3**	**-$0.21**	**3.9**	-$0.10	1.7
(55)	663	ATHENS , TN	Disc/Sup	3,476	0.7%								
(56)	1031	MEMPHIS , TN	Disc	3,287	0.7%			**-$0.30**	**3.0**	**-$0.42**	**4.1**	**-$0.50**	**3.9**
(57)	766	FLORENCE , AL	Super C	3,276	0.7%							**-$0.68**	**6.3**
(58)	153	NEW ALBANY , MS	Super C	3,269	0.7%			**-$0.55**	**4.6**	**-$0.54**	**4.3**	**-$0.36**	**2.8**
(59)	1458	FORT OGLETHORPE , GA	Super C	3,232	0.6%								
(60)	5251	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	3,230	0.6%								
(61)	5263	CLEVELAND , TN	Super C	3,201	0.6%								
(62)	268	SAVANNAH , TN	Disc/Sup	3,131	0.6%			**-$0.54**	**3.1**	**-$0.51**	**2.6**	**-$0.43**	**2.4**

(27)	**-$0.41**	**4.2**	**-$0.38**	**4.1**	**-$0.19**	**2.1**	-$0.10	1.2	-$0.03	0.4	-$0.05	0.6	$0.03	0.4
(28)	**-$0.23**	**2.8**	**-$0.17**	**2.4**	$0.00	0.0	$0.07	1.1	-$0.03	0.5	-$0.03	0.4	-$0.07	1.1
(29)	**-$0.31**	**4.0**	**-$0.28**	**3.4**	$0.00	0.1	$0.04	0.5	$0.06	0.7	$0.06	0.7	-$0.01	0.1
(30)	**-$0.56**	**4.7**	**-$0.51**	**4.0**	-$0.23	1.9	-$0.19	1.5	-$0.17	1.2	-$0.22	1.5	-$0.22	1.6
(31)	**-$0.60**	**4.9**	**-$0.41**	**3.2**	-$0.03	0.2	$0.19	1.9	$0.19	1.3				
(32)			**-$0.14**	**2.6**	**-$0.14**	**2.8**	-$0.08	1.6	**-$0.11**	**2.0**	-$0.06	1.1	-$0.11	1.7
(33)	**-$0.41**	**3.5**	**-$0.24**	**2.2**	**-$0.21**	**2.4**	-$0.05	0.7	$0.06	0.8	$0.10	1.4	$0.06	0.7
(34)			**-$0.36**	**5.1**	**-$0.22**	**4.0**	**-$0.17**	**2.4**	**-$0.17**	**2.5**	-$0.08	1.2	-$0.01	0.2
(35)	**-$0.28**	**2.2**	**-$0.41**	**3.3**	$0.11	0.8	$0.11	0.6						
(36)							-$0.07	0.7	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.07	0.8	-$0.08	1.1
(37)	**-$0.43**	**4.2**	**-$0.36**	**3.1**	-$0.09	0.9	-$0.03	0.2	-$0.04	0.5	-$0.05	0.6	-$0.05	0.6
(38)	**-$0.41**	**3.7**	**-$0.32**	**2.8**	-$0.13	1.3	-$0.07	0.6	-$0.09	0.7	-$0.01	0.1	$0.02	0.2
(39)	**-$0.36**	**4.3**	**-$0.33**	**3.6**	-$0.14	1.5	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.10	0.9	-$0.12	1.2	-$0.08	0.9
(40)	**-$0.31**	**3.6**	**-$0.27**	**2.7**	**-$0.36**	**2.7**								
(41)	**-$0.56**	**6.5**	**-$0.47**	**5.9**	**-$0.25**	**2.9**	**-$0.21**	**2.1**	-$0.17	1.9	-$0.10	1.2	-$0.07	0.8
(42)	**-$0.44**	**4.0**	**-$0.35**	**3.5**	-$0.15	1.2	-$0.16	1.1	-$0.09	0.7	-$0.08	0.8	-$0.18	1.7
(43)	**-$0.51**	**4.9**	**-$0.46**	**4.3**	-$0.15	1.4	-$0.14	1.3	-$0.08	0.8	-$0.08	0.8	-$0.06	0.6
(44)	**-$0.37**	**3.8**	**-$0.34**	**3.6**	-$0.09	0.9	-$0.10	0.9	-$0.06	0.6	-$0.12	1.3	**-$0.21**	**2.1**
(45)	**-$0.46**	**3.8**	**-$0.34**	**2.9**	-$0.19	1.6	-$0.17	1.5						
(46)	-$0.25	1.9												
(47)	**-$0.35**	**3.7**												
(48)	**-$0.32**	**2.7**	**-$0.32**	**2.9**	-$0.03	0.2	$0.01	0.1	$0.04	0.3	-$0.02	0.2	-$0.11	0.9
(49)	**-$0.48**	**3.8**												
(50)	**-$0.52**	**4.5**												
(51)	**-$0.30**	**3.4**	**-$0.24**	**2.6**	-$0.02	0.2								
(52)	**-$0.40**	**3.9**	**-$0.30**	**3.0**	-$0.11	0.9	$0.03	0.2	$0.03	0.3	-$0.02	0.2	$0.08	0.7
(53)							$0.22	1.5	$0.23	1.9	$0.15	1.2	$0.05	0.5
(54)	-$0.15	1.7												
(55)	**-$0.38**	**3.8**	**-$0.35**	**3.3**	**-$0.32**	**2.7**	-$0.02	0.3	-$0.04	0.5	-$0.03	0.5	$0.03	0.5
(56)	**-$0.37**	**2.5**	-$0.25	1.5	-$0.32	1.8	-$0.28	1.6	$0.00	0.0	-$0.03	0.2	$0.26	0.6
(57)	**-$0.56**	**5.2**	**-$0.45**	**3.9**	-$0.02	0.2	$0.05	0.4						
(58)	-$0.24	1.9	-$0.21	1.5	-$0.04	0.3	$0.06	0.5						
(59)	**-$0.86**	**6.4**	**-$0.82**	**6.5**	**-$0.42**	**3.4**	-$0.20	1.5	**-$0.36**	**2.1**				
(60)					**-$0.21**	**2.3**	-$0.13	1.4	-$0.05	0.6	-$0.12	1.4	-$0.06	0.8
(61)			-$0.14	0.7	-$0.10	1.5	-$0.05	0.7	-$0.07	1.0	**-$0.18**	**2.4**	-$0.06	0.7
(62)	**-$0.37**	**2.5**	**-$0.35**	**2.5**	-$0.04	0.3	-$0.07	0.4	$0.08	0.5	$0.09	0.5	$0.10	0.6

(27)	0.808	175.1	110	2190	42.2
(28)	0.896	393.6	100	2300	46.0
(29)	0.879	330.4	99	1838	46.1
(30)	0.881	275.6	119	1590	38.1
(31)	0.825	191.4	109	1688	41.3
(32)	0.878	326.7	98	2518	45.8
(33)	0.831	185.7	117	2225	38.4
(34)	0.858	243.4	108	2371	41.0
(35)	0.797	165.8	100	1686	42.9
(36)	0.902	347.9	112	2036	38.3
(37)	0.874	287.9	99	1701	42.2
(38)	0.871	233.3	118	1686	35.3
(39)	0.875	294.6	94	1709	42.8
(40)	0.819	170.2	104	1526	38.3
(41)	0.858	255.4	91	1838	42.9
(42)	0.880	272.9	103	1690	37.9
(43)	0.898	350.0	96	1574	40.5
(44)	0.902	355.2	98	1574	39.3
(45)	0.798	146.0	100	1461	37.5
(46)	0.821	167.8	100	1846	37.1
(47)	0.850	208.5	98	1782	37.5
(48)	0.878	264.1	98	1347	37.4
(49)	0.845	207.7	94	1633	38.6
(50)	0.834	179.2	99	1634	36.2
(51)	0.803	144.1	99	1609	36.0
(52)	0.878	250.8	100	1505	35.6
(53)	0.912	361.0	99	1543	35.6
(54)	0.844	199.5	92	1957	37.6
(55)	0.886	270.8	97	1696	35.5
(56)	0.842	180.4	94	1389	34.6
(57)	0.834	184.3	87	1415	37.2
(58)	0.827	159.4	95	1322	34.1
(59)	0.837	168.0	96	1362	33.3
(60)	0.823	145.7	100	1864	32.0
(61)	0.878	232.3	96	1689	33.0
(62)	0.861	178.5	105	929	29.5

(63)	93	COVINGTON , TN	Disc/Sup	3,108	0.6%			**-$0.63**	**5.5**	**-$0.81**	**5.5**	**-$0.83**	**4.3**
(64)	393	JACKSON , TN	Disc/Sup	2,958	0.6%			**-$0.35**	**3.5**	**-$0.37**	**3.5**	**-$0.38**	**3.5**
(65)	218	SELMER , TN	Super C	2,955	0.6%			**-$0.61**	**4.8**	**-$0.43**	**4.0**	**-$0.43**	**3.8**
(66)	619	DAYTON , TN	Disc/Sup	2,912	0.6%								
(67)	5175	COOKEVILLE , TN	Super C	2,885	0.6%								
(68)	660	MUSCLE SHOALS , AL	Super C	2,837	0.6%							**-$0.49**	**4.6**
(69)	126	LITTLE ROCK , AR	Disc	2,784	0.6%			**-$0.22**	**2.7**	**-$0.31**	**3.5**	**-$0.22**	**2.2**
(70)	737	LEWISBURG , TN	Disc/Sup	2,757	0.6%			**-$0.56**	**4.2**	**-$0.43**	**3.7**	**-$0.36**	**2.5**
(71)	1318	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,715	0.5%								
(72)	3495	CLARKSVILLE , TN	Super C	2,665	0.5%								
(73)	5196	MEMPHIS , TN	Super C	2,636	0.5%								
(74)	714	WEST HELENA , AR	Super C	2,563	0.5%	**-$0.45**	**2.4**	**-$0.39**	**2.3**	-$0.47	2.3	**-$0.43**	**2.1**
(75)	685	MORRISTOWN , TN	Super C	2,549	0.5%								
(76)	672	ALCOA , TN	Super C	2,539	0.5%								
(77)	466	BOLIVAR , TN	Disc/Sup	2,534	0.5%			-$0.29	1.7	-$0.10	0.5	-$0.08	0.4
(78)	304	SPRINGFIELD , TN	Super C	2,475	0.5%								
(79)	1320	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,467	0.5%								
(80)	578	SEVIERVILLE , TN	Super C	2,445	0.5%								
(81)	587	SPARTA , TN	Disc/Sup	2,362	0.5%								
(82)	91	FORREST CITY , AR	Super C	2,345	0.5%	**-$0.57**	**5.1**	**-$0.49**	**5.3**	**-$0.55**	**5.5**	**-$0.52**	**4.5**
(83)	2065	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,307	0.5%								
(84)	120	HUMBOLDT , TN	Disc/Sup	2,289	0.5%			**-$0.47**	**3.3**	**-$0.66**	**5.3**	**-$0.60**	**3.2**
(85)	104	MILAN , TN	Disc/Sup	2,283	0.5%			**-$0.42**	**2.2**	**-$0.40**	**2.1**	-$0.58	1.7
(86)	1080	JOHNSON CITY , TN	Super C	2,261	0.5%								
(87)	62	BLYTHEVILLE , AR	Super C	2,248	0.5%			**-$0.44**	**5.3**	**-$0.48**	**4.9**	**-$0.66**	**4.3**
(88)	673	CLARKSVILLE , TN	Super C	2,239	0.4%								
(89)	161	HUNTINGDON , TN	Disc/Sup	2,223	0.4%			**-$0.48**	**2.3**	**-$0.44**	**2.3**	**-$0.44**	**2.1**
(90)	2932	KNOXVILLE , TN	Super C	2,204	0.4%								
(91)	1075	CLARKSVILLE , TN	Super C	2,197	0.4%								
(92)	477	SODDY DAISY , TN	Disc/Sup	2,193	0.4%								
(93)	36	PARAGOULD , AR	Super C	2,179	0.4%	-$0.13	1.9	**-$0.17**	**3.1**	**-$0.31**	**4.0**	**-$0.31**	**3.1**
(94)	2988	LA FAYETTE , GA	Super C	2,137	0.4%								
(95)	2587	CABOT , AR	Super C	2,103	0.4%	-$0.13	1.6	**-$0.14**	**2.1**	**-$0.17**	**2.3**	-$0.11	1.6
(96)	160	ASH FLAT , AR	Super C	2,099	0.4%	**-$0.40**	**3.7**	**-$0.24**	**2.8**	-$0.13	1.8	**-$0.15**	**2.0**
(97)	64	BROWNSVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	2,080	0.4%			**-$0.25**	**3.1**	-$0.13	1.5	-$0.03	0.4
(98)	680	GREENEVILLE , TN	Super C	2,073	0.4%								

(63)	**-$0.67**	**3.5**	**-$0.60**	**3.3**	**-$0.60**	**2.4**	**-$0.66**	**2.2**	-$0.20	1.5	-$0.16	1.5	-$0.07	0.7
(64)	**-$0.25**	**2.3**	-$0.15	1.1	$0.06	0.7	$0.01	0.1	$0.16	1.4	$0.03	0.2	-$0.07	0.8
(65)	-$0.20	1.6	-$0.19	1.5	-$0.05	0.4	$0.20	1.4	$0.09	0.6	$0.20	1.7	$0.12	0.8
(66)	**-$0.41**	**3.3**	**-$0.73**	**6.0**	**-$0.32**	**3.5**	**-$0.30**	**3.2**	-$0.16	1.9	-$0.12	1.3	-$0.15	1.7
(67)			**-$0.32**	**3.3**	**-$0.16**	**2.3**	-$0.08	1.1	$0.05	0.6	$0.00	0.1	-$0.08	1.0
(68)	-$0.52	4.4	**-$0.52**	**4.4**	-$0.07	0.6	-$0.06	0.5						
(69)	**-$0.31**	**2.1**												
(70)	-$0.19	1.3	-$0.21	1.5	-$0.10	0.7	-$0.04	0.5	-$0.08	0.8	$0.14	1.4	-$0.06	0.6
(71)							**-$0.24**	**2.4**	**-$0.22**	**2.6**	**-$0.16**	**2.1**	-$0.10	1.1
(72)							**-$0.26**	**2.8**	-$0.14	1.8	**-$0.17**	**2.2**	**-$0.18**	**2.5**
(73)					-$0.05	0.5	**-$0.21**	**2.6**	-$0.12	1.7	**-$0.38**	**3.1**	**-$0.26**	**2.5**
(74)	-$0.38	1.6	-$0.17	0.8	-$0.11	0.4	$0.11	0.4						
(75)							**-$0.20**	**2.4**	-$0.11	1.8	-$0.09	1.5	-$0.12	2.0
(76)							**-$0.37**	**3.4**	**-$0.34**	**3.7**	**-$0.40**	**4.0**	**-$0.30**	**3.0**
(77)	-$0.10	1.1	-$0.10	1.1	$0.13	1.6	**$0.17**	**2.0**	$0.13	1.1	$0.00	0.0	$0.03	0.3
(78)							-$0.04	0.3	$0.04	0.5	-$0.15	1.7	**-$0.19**	**2.2**
(79)							-$0.05	0.5	$0.04	0.6	**-$0.16**	**2.1**	-$0.08	1.0
(80)							-$0.07	0.8	-$0.05	0.6	-$0.11	1.3	-$0.11	1.4
(81)	**-$0.45**	**3.9**	**-$0.30**	**3.8**	-$0.12	1.6	**-$0.16**	**2.1**	$0.04	0.5	$0.05	0.7	$0.03	0.3
(82)	**-$0.65**	**5.1**			-$0.14	0.9								
(83)							**-$0.47**	**2.8**	**-$0.37**	**2.9**	**-$0.37**	**3.6**	**-$0.19**	**2.2**
(84)							$0.05	0.5	**$0.21**	**2.3**	**$0.22**	**2.4**	$0.16	1.8
(85)							-$0.04	0.3	$0.06	0.4	$0.15	1.1	$0.09	0.7
(86)							**-$0.37**	**2.7**	**-$0.23**	**2.4**	-$0.13	1.3	-$0.05	0.6
(87)							-$0.29	1.9	-$0.21	1.3				
(88)							**-$0.47**	**3.7**	**-$0.39**	**3.5**	-$0.27	2.5	**-$0.32**	**3.7**
(89)	**-$0.32**	**2.2**	-$0.21	1.4	-$0.17	1.1	-$0.02	0.2	$0.06	0.4	$0.10	0.6	-$0.05	0.3
(90)							-$0.12	0.8	-$0.16	1.4	-$0.09	0.8	-$0.03	0.4
(91)							**-$0.53**	**3.8**	**-$0.21**	**2.0**	-$0.13	1.3	-$0.17	1.9
(92)	**-$0.51**	**3.4**	**-$0.46**	**3.0**	-$0.29	1.9	**-$0.16**	**2.0**	-$0.12	1.3	-$0.18	1.8	-$0.17	1.9
(93)														
(94)	**-$0.41**	**3.6**	**-$0.35**	**3.1**	-$0.07	0.6	$0.08	0.7	$0.01	0.1				
(95)	-$0.04	0.4												
(96)	-$0.08	0.8	-$0.12	1.3	-$0.10	0.9								
(97)	-$0.26	1.7	-$0.02	0.2	$0.20	1.3	$0.07	0.5	**$0.25**	**2.8**	$0.17	1.6	$0.16	1.4
(98)							-$0.18	1.7	-$0.01	0.2	$0.01	0.1	-$0.06	0.7

(63)	0.850	184.3	93	1342	33.1
(64)	0.900	252.2	102	1234	28.7
(65)	0.892	236.2	100	1159	29.3
(66)	0.840	179.1	83	1463	34.7
(67)	0.908	303.9	91	1534	31.4
(68)	0.847	173.4	88	1128	31.9
(69)	0.806	158.5	71	1433	38.7
(70)	0.888	219.1	96	1158	28.4
(71)	0.875	218.6	84	1299	31.9
(72)	0.895	242.9	90	1390	29.3
(73)	0.890	218.1	94	1252	27.7
(74)	0.740	82.0	86	867	29.5
(75)	0.896	235.1	90	1200	28.0
(76)	0.876	198.2	87	1105	28.9
(77)	0.900	284.5	78	960	32.1
(78)	0.892	213.8	92	1194	26.6
(79)	0.878	210.9	81	1296	30.1
(80)	0.903	264.1	83	1083	29.1
(81)	0.922	289.8	93	951	25.1
(82)	0.839	120.5	97	929	23.9
(83)	0.829	127.1	85	1235	26.8
(84)	0.870	153.4	96	1109	23.6
(85)	0.893	177.6	102	1032	22.2
(86)	0.879	173.9	91	1141	24.6
(87)	0.864	135.1	101	1135	22.0
(88)	0.891	184.2	95	1103	23.3
(89)	0.861	174.2	76	905	28.9
(90)	0.818	109.3	87	1104	25.0
(91)	0.905	207.5	96	1022	22.6
(92)	0.871	161.5	88	1084	24.6
(93)	0.806	99.6	87	1062	24.8
(94)	0.880	195.9	77	964	27.4
(95)	0.906	298.1	66	1050	31.4
(96)	0.887	193.5	82	736	25.3
(97)	0.893	175.6	94	803	21.9
(98)	0.887	174.6	89	987	23.0

(99)	390	WAVERLY , TN	Disc/Sup	2,059	0.4%			**-$0.51**	**3.2**	**-$0.41**	**2.6**	-$0.27	1.4
(100)	690	ELIZABETHTON , TN	Super C	2,029	0.4%								
(101)	738	CAMDEN , TN	Disc/Sup	2,021	0.4%			**-$0.68**	**4.5**	**-$0.88**	**4.9**	**-$0.81**	**3.8**
(102)	273	FULTON , MS	Super C	2,018	0.4%			**-$0.65**	**5.5**	**-$0.70**	**5.1**	**-$0.92**	**4.1**
(103)	107	MARTIN , TN	Disc/Sup	1,963	0.4%			**-$0.24**	**2.5**	**-$0.23**	**2.4**	**-$0.38**	**3.0**
(104)	724	JEFFERSON CITY , TN	Super C	1,958	0.4%								
(105)	97	RIPLEY , TN	Super C	1,954	0.4%			**-$0.22**	**3.1**	**-$0.24**	**3.0**	**-$0.51**	**2.6**
(106)	2310	KNOXVILLE , TN	Disc/Sup	1,950	0.4%								
(107)	675	UNION CITY , TN	Super C	1,932	0.4%								
(108)	741	LENOIR CITY , TN	Super C	1,923	0.4%								
(109)	1194	OAK RIDGE , TN	Super C	1,908	0.4%								
(110)	2575	CONWAY , AR	Super C	1,894	0.4%			-$0.18	1.4	**-$0.22**	**3.9**	-$0.09	1.8
(111)	678	NEWPORT , TN	Super C	1,779	0.4%								
(112)	742	KINGSPORT , TN	Super C	1,732	0.3%								
(113)	1105	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, AR	Disc	1,701	0.3%			-$0.13	1.5	-$0.13	1.5	-$0.05	0.6
(114)	599	KINGSPORT , TN	Super C	1,697	0.3%								
(115)	8	MORRILTON , AR	Super C	1,692	0.3%	-$0.13	1.3	-$0.07	0.9	-$0.04	0.5	-$0.10	1.1
(116)	281	HEBER SPRINGS , AR	Super C	1,678	0.3%	**-$0.27**	**2.7**	**-$0.19**	**2.8**	**-$0.17**	**2.2**	-$0.18	1.9
(117)	1226	ASHLAND CITY , TN	Super C	1,610	0.3%								
(118)	3660	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	1,573	0.3%								
(119)	3234	ROGERSVILLE , TN	Super C	1,549	0.3%								
(120)	1466	JACKSBORO , TN	Super C	1,542	0.3%								
(121)	102	STUTTGART , AR	Super C	1,530	0.3%	-$0.22	1.3	-$0.04	0.5	$0.03	0.4	-$0.01	0.1
(122)	366	MADISONVILLE , TN	Super C	1,523	0.3%								
(123)	1115	HOHENWALD , TN	Disc/Sup	1,506	0.3%			**-$0.45**	**3.0**	**-$0.44**	**4.4**	**-$0.33**	**2.1**
(124)	176	RIPLEY , MS	Disc	1,427	0.3%			**-$0.23**	**2.6**	-$0.14	2.0	-$0.08	1.2
(125)	3659	CHATTANOOGA , TN	Super C	1,346	0.3%								
(126)	620	BRISTOL , TN	Super C	1,336	0.3%								
(127)	1319	KNOXVILLE , TN	Disc	1,294	0.3%								
(128)	3717	NASHVILLE , TN	Super C	1,274	0.3%								
(129)	3230	BRYANT , AR	Super C	1,265	0.3%							**-$0.25**	**3.7**
(130)	7	SHERWOOD , AR	Disc	1,210	0.2%			**-$0.15**	**2.1**	-$0.07	1.1	-$0.03	0.4
(131)	303	HOLLY SPRINGS , MS	Disc/Sup	1,202	0.2%			**-$0.47**	**3.1**	**-$0.37**	**2.2**	-$0.18	0.9
(132)	403	RUSSELLVILLE , AL	Disc/Sup	1,169	0.2%							-$0.21	1.5
(133)	71	POCAHONTAS , AR	Super C	1,166	0.2%	**-$0.24**	**3.0**	**-$0.17**	**2.5**	-$0.14	1.6	-$0.21	1.9
(134)	3599	BARTLETT , TN	N Mkt	1,145	0.2%								

(99)	-$0.32	1.6	-$0.05	0.5	$0.02	0.1	-$0.07	0.6	-$0.07	0.6	-$0.03	0.2	-$0.06	0.4
(100)							-$0.19	1.9	-$0.17	1.9	-$0.10	1.2	-$0.12	1.5
(101)	**-$0.70**	**3.1**	-$0.32	1.7	-$0.03	0.1	-$0.21	0.9	$0.01	0.0	$0.01	0.1	-$0.12	0.8
(102)	**-$0.69**	**3.9**	**-$0.55**	**3.6**	-$0.06	0.5	$0.03	0.2						
(103)							-$0.35	1.3	-$0.16	1.4	$0.05	0.4	-$0.03	0.2
(104)							**-$0.45**	**3.1**	**-$0.28**	**2.4**	**-$0.34**	**3.1**	**-$0.27**	**2.5**
(105)							$0.06	0.4	$0.16	1.5	$0.03	0.4	-$0.01	0.1
(106)							$0.01	0.1	$0.00	0.0	-$0.10	1.2	-$0.13	1.6
(107)							**-$0.39**	**2.2**	**-$0.38**	**3.0**	**-$0.44**	**3.4**	**-$0.45**	**3.7**
(108)							**-$0.34**	**2.3**	-$0.19	1.7	**-$0.29**	**2.7**	**-$0.25**	**2.3**
(109)							**-$0.43**	**2.4**	-$0.16	1.2	-$0.06	0.5	$0.01	0.1
(110)	-$0.10	1.2												
(111)							**-$0.29**	**2.4**	-$0.16	1.5	-$0.16	1.6	-$0.22	1.9
(112)									-$0.02	0.1	-$0.07	0.7	$0.06	0.6
(113)	-$0.17	1.4												
(114)									**-$0.50**	**5.1**	**-$0.54**	**5.5**	**-$0.42**	**4.5**
(115)	-$0.18	1.2												
(116)	**-$0.32**	**2.3**												
(117)							-$0.15	1.4	-$0.04	0.6	-$0.09	1.3	$0.02	0.2
(118)									**-$0.23**	**3.0**	**-$0.25**	**3.0**	**-$0.24**	**2.6**
(119)							-$0.01	0.1	$0.04	0.5	-$0.04	0.5	$0.00	0.0
(120)							**-$0.67**	**2.8**	**-$0.33**	**2.0**	-$0.24	1.5	-$0.19	1.3
(121)	-$0.09	0.7												
(122)							**-$0.42**	**2.3**	**-$0.31**	**2.1**	**-$0.32**	**2.0**	**-$0.38**	**2.7**
(123)	-$0.21	1.4	-$0.06	0.3	$0.15	0.9	$0.24	1.5	$0.18	1.2	$0.07	0.6	$0.06	0.5
(124)	$0.06	0.8	-$0.08	0.9	$0.14	1.7	**$0.22**	**2.5**	$0.22	1.8				
(125)									-$0.13	1.3	**-$0.17**	**2.1**	**-$0.18**	**2.3**
(126)									-$0.16	1.4	-$0.14	1.4	-$0.12	1.1
(127)							**-$0.42**	**2.4**	-$0.26	1.8	**-$0.37**	**2.4**	-$0.22	1.5
(128)											**-$0.19**	**3.2**	**-$0.15**	**2.5**
(129)	**-$0.28**	**2.9**												
(130)	$0.03	0.3												
(131)	-$0.43	1.5	-$0.21	0.8	$0.04	0.3	$0.22	1.5						
(132)	-$0.17	1.4	-$0.21	1.6	-$0.06	0.5	$0.00	0.0						
(133)														
(134)	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.07	0.8	$0.02	0.3	**$0.24**	**2.1**	-$0.03	0.2	-$0.16	1.1	$0.15	1.0

(99)	0.915	269.8	79	764	25.7
(100)	0.893	206.9	79	939	25.4
(101)	0.889	161.1	96	762	20.8
(102)	0.779	96.4	71	823	28.0
(103)	0.901	183.8	93	935	20.9
(104)	0.901	192.3	88	891	22.0
(105)	0.901	214.9	79	939	24.4
(106)	0.863	134.3	87	989	22.2
(107)	0.922	250.7	87	945	22.0
(108)	0.855	130.6	83	928	22.9
(109)	0.880	160.9	83	938	22.7
(110)	0.805	98.5	76	1095	24.6
(111)	0.923	255.0	80	732	22.0
(112)	0.907	228.8	71	914	24.1
(113)	0.860	145.8	69	926	24.3
(114)	0.906	186.8	83	934	20.2
(115)	0.833	113.9	71	766	23.5
(116)	0.823	112.1	67	712	24.7
(117)	0.882	134.1	85	831	18.7
(118)	0.798	84.9	70	973	22.2
(119)	0.861	122.1	75	721	20.4
(120)	0.869	121.3	80	694	19.0
(121)	0.888	191.1	61	656	24.7
(122)	0.900	164.7	79	679	19.0
(123)	0.906	196.5	70	556	21.2
(124)	0.923	251.1	65	485	21.6
(125)	0.832	79.1	79	816	16.8
(126)	0.921	188.7	78	727	16.9
(127)	0.886	154.0	62	557	20.5
(128)	0.831	83.5	71	940	17.7
(129)	0.857	103.5	69	836	18.1
(130)	0.865	127.5	58	655	20.5
(131)	0.863	104.5	68	492	17.4
(132)	0.852	90.0	70	574	16.5
(133)	0.878	118.1	67	508	17.1
(134)	0.848	114.6	53	590	21.2

(135)	583	ONEIDA , TN	Super C	1,135	0.2%								
(136)	3835	OOLTEWAH , TN	Super C	1,108	0.2%								
(137)	68	WYNNE , AR	Disc/Sup	1,095	0.2%			**-$0.29**	**2.7**	**-$0.31**	**3.7**	**-$0.28**	**2.4**
(138)	879	LAFAYETTE , TN	Super C	1,094	0.2%								
(139)	4223	MARYVILLE , TN	Super C	1,084	0.2%								
(140)	409	HALEYVILLE , AL	Disc	1,043	0.2%			-$0.15	1.2	**-$0.41**	**2.9**	**-$0.29**	**2.1**
(141)	5043	MEMPHIS , TN	N Mkt	1,022	0.2%								
(142)	699	OXFORD , MS	Disc	996	0.2%			-$0.23	3.0	**-$0.20**	**2.1**	**-$0.45**	**3.8**
(143)	568	CARTHAGE , TN	Disc/Sup	990	0.2%							-$0.31	1.5
(144)	190	KENNETT , MO	Super C	943	0.2%					**-$0.21**	**3.0**	**-$0.41**	**3.7**
(145)	3829	JOHNSON CITY , TN	Super C	915	0.2%								
(146)	5419	HERNANDO , MS	Super C	900	0.2%								
(147)	5122	MEMPHIS , TN	N Mkt	899	0.2%								
(148)	3593	HORN LAKE , MS	N Mkt	881	0.2%								
(149)	410	MURRAY , KY	Super C	872	0.2%								
(150)	274	IUKA , MS	Disc	851	0.2%			**-$0.38**	**2.8**	**-$0.33**	**2.2**	-$0.17	1.2
(151)	229	TRUMANN , AR	Disc/Sup	836	0.2%			**-$0.32**	**3.9**	**-$0.23**	**2.6**	-$0.17	1.9
(152)	1467	JAMESTOWN , TN	Disc/Sup	790	0.2%								
(153)	1074	GRENADA , MS	Super C	766	0.2%	**-$0.33**	**2.6**	**-$0.31**	**2.4**				
(154)	736	RUSSELLVILLE , KY	Super C	755	0.2%								
(155)	74	OSCEOLA , AR	Disc	740	0.1%			**-$0.48**	**2.2**	-$0.53	1.9	-$0.28	1.5
(156)	4414	SMITHVILLE , TN	Super C	725	0.1%								
(157)	18	NEWPORT , AR	Disc	724	0.1%			**-$0.37**	**2.1**	**-$0.50**	**2.7**	-$0.25	1.3
(158)	3362	OAK GROVE , KY	Super C	720	0.1%								
(159)	670	CULLMAN , AL	Super C	719	0.1%								
(160)	707	CLARKSDALE , MS	Disc	710	0.1%			**-$0.27**	**3.1**	**-$0.40**	**3.9**	**-$0.45**	**3.7**
(161)	114	BOONEVILLE , MS	Disc	696	0.1%			-$0.12	1.0	-$0.17	1.2	**-$0.35**	**2.4**
(162)	430	MAYFIELD , KY	Super C	693	0.1%								
(163)	5119	NASHVILLE , TN	N Mkt	693	0.1%								
(164)	661	ATHENS , AL	Super C	672	0.1%								
(165)	1468	BATESVILLE , MS	Disc	661	0.1%			**-$0.39**	**3.0**	**-$0.27**	**2.4**	-$0.14	0.7
(166)	3852	UNICOI , TN	Super C	641	0.1%								
(167)	2690	MADISON , AL	Super C	637	0.1%								
(168)	662	DECATUR , AL	Super C	636	0.1%								
(169)	4226	DUNLAP , TN	Super C	630	0.1%								
(170)	348	MONTICELLO , AR	Super C	629	0.1%	-$0.16	1.9	**-$0.26**	**2.8**				

(135)									-$0.13	1.3	**-$0.29**	**2.7**	**-$0.36**	**3.8**
(136)											$0.00	0.0	$0.07	0.9
(137)	**-$0.40**	**2.8**			-$0.03	0.2								
(138)									-$0.19	1.2	-$0.23	1.5	-$0.12	0.9
(139)											**-$0.34**	**3.8**	**-$0.32**	**3.5**
(140)	-$0.10	0.7	$0.04	0.3	$0.17	1.4	$0.29	1.9						
(141)	-$0.29	2.0	-$0.24	1.6	-$0.04	0.2	-$0.17	1.2	$0.15	1.4	-$0.03	0.2	**-$0.38**	**2.7**
(142)														
(143)	**-$0.50**	**2.0**	**-$0.51**	**2.2**	-$0.19	0.8	-$0.18	0.6	-$0.13	0.5	-$0.08	0.4	$0.10	0.7
(144)														
(145)											-$0.11	1.4	-$0.16	2.1
(146)					$0.04	0.3	-$0.04	0.4	$0.07	0.5				
(147)			-$0.10	0.7	$0.01	0.1	$0.00	0.0	-$0.08	0.5	-$0.16	1.0	-$0.32	1.8
(148)	-$0.18	1.4	-$0.19	1.8	-$0.08	0.7	-$0.18	1.1	-$0.27	1.1				
(149)							-$0.01	0.1	$0.02	0.3				
(150)	$0.01	0.1	$0.13	0.9	$0.32	1.9	**$0.45**	**2.6**						
(151)	-$0.22	1.4	$0.01	0.1	-$0.05	0.5								
(152)							**-$0.61**	**3.6**	**-$0.28**	**2.1**	**-$0.39**	**2.9**	-$0.23	1.5
(153)														
(154)							**-$0.47**	**3.1**	**-$0.41**	**2.7**				
(155)	**-$0.42**	**2.2**	-$0.14	0.9	$0.05	0.3								
(156)									-$0.15	1.1	-$0.12	1.2	-$0.06	0.7
(157)	-$0.42	1.7												
(158)							-$0.12	1.1	-$0.03	0.2				
(159)							**-$0.28**	**2.0**						
(160)														
(161)	-$0.25	1.3												
(162)							-$0.21	1.6	-$0.18	1.3				
(163)			$0.11	0.7	$0.14	1.1	$0.08	0.6	$0.09	0.8	**$0.35**	**2.5**	$0.32	1.9
(164)							-$0.23	1.9						
(165)														
(166)									-$0.06	0.5	-$0.13	1.0	-$0.15	1.0
(167)							**-$0.20**	**2.1**						
(168)							**-$0.33**	**2.6**						
(169)									-$0.22	1.3	-$0.09	0.6	-$0.06	0.4
(170)														

(135)	0.936	218.0	71	606	15.8
(136)	0.818	67.5	69	788	15.8
(137)	0.832	68.1	74	557	14.6
(138)	0.906	127.4	77	553	14.0
(139)	0.902	139.3	67	762	15.9
(140)	0.916	195.0	55	378	18.6
(141)	0.801	72.2	54	572	18.6
(142)	0.848	87.0	60	492	16.3
(143)	0.882	111.8	62	430	15.7
(144)	0.808	50.8	72	601	12.9
(145)	0.868	82.8	67	632	13.5
(146)	0.868	73.5	74	476	12.0
(147)	0.833	82.8	51	501	17.3
(148)	0.818	76.0	49	490	17.6
(149)	0.910	115.0	70	464	12.3
(150)	0.915	176.0	49	282	17.0
(151)	0.926	154.3	63	428	13.1
(152)	0.898	97.8	65	385	12.0
(153)	0.761	29.7	74	398	10.2
(154)	0.895	76.8	75	405	9.9
(155)	0.893	112.6	51	311	14.2
(156)	0.862	70.2	59	416	12.1
(157)	0.878	92.7	52	299	13.7
(158)	0.903	88.8	68	402	10.4
(159)	0.870	60.8	71	718	10.0
(160)	0.844	65.8	54	345	12.9
(161)	0.888	104.1	49	298	13.9
(162)	0.935	131.6	68	362	10.0
(163)	0.836	60.4	54	322	12.6
(164)	0.849	52.5	65	671	10.2
(165)	0.814	52.1	51	381	12.7
(166)	0.887	88.7	52	336	12.1
(167)	0.851	50.3	65	636	9.7
(168)	0.887	68.9	65	635	9.6
(169)	0.888	84.3	54	322	11.5
(170)	0.836	40.7	70	331	8.9

(171)	5107	MADISON	, TN	N Mkt	614	0.1%						
(172)	1100	HAMILTON	, AL	Disc	537	0.1%						
(173)	57	WALNUT RIDGE	, AR	Disc	494	0.1%		**-$0.30**	**2.8**	-$0.20	1.9	**-$0.38**	**2.3**
(174)	156	CARUTHERSVILLE	, MO	Disc	488	0.1%		-$0.12	1.0	-$0.07	0.7	-$0.08	0.4
(175)	30	DEXTER	, MO	Disc	477	0.1%		-$0.15	1.5	-$0.11	0.9	-$0.15	0.9
(176)	3306	NASHVILLE	, TN	N Mkt	477	0.1%							
(177)	4635	CLINTON	, TN	Super C	470	0.1%							
(178)	169	LONOKE	, AR	Disc	466	0.1%		**-$0.33**	**2.4**	**-$0.32**	**2.6**	-$0.54	1.8
(179)	1159	NEW TAZEWELL	, TN	Disc	459	0.1%							
(180)	4483	WHITE HOUSE	, TN	Super C	414	0.1%							
(181)	106	FULTON	, KY	Super C	391	0.1%							
(182)	1124	HARTSELLE	, AL	Super C	388	0.1%							
(183)	394	MOULTON	, AL	Super C	381	0.1%							
(184)	4533	OAKLAND	, TN	Super C	375	0.1%							
(185)	84	BRINKLEY	, AR	Disc	348	0.1%		**-$0.44**	**2.4**	-$0.26	1.3	-$0.22	1.1
(186)	453	MALDEN	, MO	Disc	330	0.1%		$0.22	1.6	$0.13	0.8	$0.04	0.3
(187)	235	CORNING	, AR	Disc	254	0.1%		**-$0.12**	**1.4**	-$0.11	1.4	-$0.08	0.9
(188)	**Total Person-Years**				***497,907***	***100.0%***							

All Store-Years Analyzed

	1998	***1999***	***2000***	***2001***
Men Favored	***22***	***91***	***90***	***101***
Women Favored	***1***	***1***	***2***	***1***
Total	***23***	***92***	***92***	***102***
%	***95.7%***	***98.9%***	***97.8%***	***99.0%***

Store-Years with Statistically-Significant Gender Disparity

Men Favored	***16***	***80***	***72***	***74***
Women Favored	***0***	***0***	***0***	***0***
Total	***16***	***80***	***72***	***74***
%	***100.0%***	***100.0%***	***100.0%***	***100.0%***

(171)							-$0.12	0.8	-$0.11	0.7	-$0.19	1.2	-$0.08	0.4
(172)	$0.01	0.1	$0.02	0.1	$0.11	0.7	$0.19	1.1						
(173)														
(174)							**$0.53**	**2.7**	**$0.43**	**2.3**				
(175)														
(176)							-$0.19	1.1	-$0.05	0.3	-$0.19	1.3	$0.01	0.1
(177)													$0.04	0.4
	-$0.87	**2.1**												
							-$0.43	**2.1**	-$0.23	1.1	**-$0.50**	**2.5**	-$0.02	0.1
													-$0.35	2.8
							-$0.08	0.6	-$0.04	0.3				
							$0.06	0.4						
							-$0.35	1.3						
(178)													-$0.20	1.8
(179)	-$0.37	1.2												
(180)														
(181)														

2002	*2003*	*2004*	*2005*	*2006*	*2007*	*2008*
			All Store-Years Analyzed			
97	*82*	*69*	*92*	*80*	*82*	*77*
4	*5*	*23*	*40*	*43*	*29*	*37*
101	*87*	*92*	*132*	*123*	*111*	*114*
96.0%	*94.3%*	*75.0%*	*69.7%*	*65.0%*	*73.9%*	*67.5%*
			Store-Years with Statistically-Significant Gender Disparity			
70	*82*	*15*	*29*	*17*	*21*	*21*
0	*0*	*1*	*6*	*3*	*3*	*0*
70	*82*	*16*	*35*	*20*	*24*	*21*
100.0%	*100.0%*	*93.8%*	*82.9%*	*85.0%*	*87.5%*	*100.0%*

(171)	0.779	40.5	49	373	12.3
(172)	0.900	108.8	41	246	12.8
(173)	0.884	65.9	51	256	9.5
(174)	0.863	60.4	46	231	10.4
(175)	0.883	78.4	42	214	11.1
(176)	0.873	62.9	47	263	9.9
(177)	0.873	48.6	58	469	8.0
	0.792	39.4	41	235	11.1
	0.944	161.7	43	188	10.4
	0.878	40.2	63	413	6.5
	0.879	44.1	55	209	7.0
	0.874	37.9	60	387	6.4
	0.848	30.3	59	380	6.4
(178)	0.896	49.1	56	374	6.6
(179)	0.907	77.0	39	138	8.7
(180)	0.928	101.4	37	151	8.7
(181)	0.965	175.4	34	119	7.3

Based on 497,907 employee records analyzed in 187 regressions (one per store).

Column (ad) states the ratio of number of employee-year observations to number of estimated regression coefficients. The table reports regression results only when this ratio is 5 or more. All the equations achieve this standard, so results are given for all lines. For 91.4% of the reported regressions (171 out of 187), the ratio is 10 or greater.

Each regression controls for:

year

(age-15-seniority with WalMart)

(age-15-seniority with WalMart) squared
seniority with WalMart
seniority with WalMart squared
Does employee have a "high" score on current year performance evaluation

Employee has no evaluation score in this year

Employee has evaluations score of "7"
Employee is in a grocery division or has a grocery job description (see Table C-2)
Job description (282 job descriptions appear in at least one regression).

Dependent variable is hourly base pay rate ($/hour).
Standard deviations is adjusted for the extent to which individual employees appear in more than one year in the same regression.

Sign Test for Statistical Significance of Overall Gender Difference for 1998 - 2003

All Regressions		***All Regressions with Statistically-Significant Gender Coefficients (bolded)***	
Females Higher (shaded)	14	Females Higher (shaded)	0
Males Higher	483	Males Higher	370
Total Analyses	497	Total Analyses	370
% Males Higher	97.2%	% Males Higher	100.0%
Standard Deviations	21.0	Standard Deviations	19.2
probability	< 1 in a trillion	probability	< 1 in a trillion

Sign Test for Statistical Significance of Overall Gender Difference for1998 - 2008

All Regressions		***All Regressions with Statistically-Significant Gender Coefficients (bolded)***	
Females Higher (shaded)	186	Females Higher (shaded)	13
Males Higher	883	Males Higher	473
Total Analyses	1,069	Total Analyses	486
% Males Higher	82.6%	% Males Higher	97.3%
Standard Deviations	21.3	Standard Deviations	20.9
probability	< 1 in a trillion	probability	< 1 in a trillion

Commonality Analysis for1998 - 2003

	Store Number	*Commonality Analysis for Stores - All Regressions*				*Commonality Analysis for Stores - Regressions with Statsticially-Significant Gender Coefficients*			
		Females Higher (Shaded)	*Males Higher*	*Total Analyses*	*% Males Higher*	*Females Higher (Shaded)*	*Males Higher*	*Total Analyses*	*% Males Higher*
(182)	950	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(183)	848	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(184)	1248	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(185)	682	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(186)	406	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(187)	659	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(188)	94	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(189)	175	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(190)	335	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(191)	272	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(192)	192	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(193)	710	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(194)	674	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(195)	264	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(196)	671	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(197)	70	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(198)	2322	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(199)	45	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(200)	2846	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(201)	1561	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(202)	698	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(203)	688	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(204)	1606	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(205)	657	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(206)	695	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(207)	258	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(208)	1469	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

Commonality Analysis for All Years 1998 -2008

	Store Number	*Commonality Analysis for Stores - All Regressions*				*Commonality Analysis for Stores - Regressions with Statsticially-Significant Gender Coefficients*			
		Females Higher (Shaded)	*Males Higher*	*Total Analyses*	*% Males Higher*	*Females Higher (Shaded)*	*Males Higher*	*Total Analyses*	*% Males Higher*
(182)	950	0	11	11	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(183)	848	2	7	9	*77.8%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(184)	1248	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(185)	682	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(186)	406	1	9	10	*90.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(187)	659	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(188)	94	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(189)	175	0	11	11	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(190)	335	5	5	10	*50.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(191)	272	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(192)	192	5	5	10	*50.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(193)	710	4	6	10	*60.0%*	1	5	6	*83.3%*
(194)	674	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(195)	264	1	9	10	*90.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(196)	671	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(197)	70	3	6	9	*66.7%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(198)	2322	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(199)	45	1	6	7	*85.7%*	1	6	7	*85.7%*
(200)	2846	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(201)	1561	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(202)	698	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(203)	688	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(204)	1606	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(205)	657	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(206)	695	5	5	10	*50.0%*	1	4	5	*80.0%*
(207)	258	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(208)	1469	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*

(209)	656	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(210)	687	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(211)	683	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(212)	105	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(213)	5057	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(214)	1376	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(215)	5058	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(216)	155	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(217)	677	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(218)	314	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(219)	238	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(220)	308	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(221)	119	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(222)	676	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(223)	1089	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(224)	668	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(225)	735	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(226)	391	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(227)	124	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(228)	5	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(229)	684	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(230)	85	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(231)	157	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(232)	128	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(233)	667	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(234)	177	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(235)	24	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(236)	663	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(237)	1031	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(238)	766	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(239)	153	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(240)	1458	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(241)	5251								
(242)	5263	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0	0	

(209)	656	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(210)	687	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(211)	683	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(212)	105	2	6	8	*75.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(213)	5057	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(214)	1376	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(215)	5058	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(216)	155	2	6	8	*75.0%*	0	6	6	*100.0%*
(217)	677	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(218)	314	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(219)	238	1	9	10	*90.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(220)	308	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(221)	119	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	7	7	*100.0%*
(222)	676	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(223)	1089	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(224)	668	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(225)	735	0	8	8	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(226)	391	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(227)	124	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(228)	5	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(229)	684	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(230)	85	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(231)	157	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(232)	128	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(233)	667	3	5	8	*62.5%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(234)	177	4	3	7	*42.9%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(235)	24	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(236)	663	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(237)	1031	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(238)	766	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(239)	153	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(240)	1458	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(241)	5251	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(242)	5263	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*

(243)	268	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(244)	93	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(245)	393	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(246)	218	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(247)	619	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(248)	5175	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(249)	660	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(250)	126	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(251)	737	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(252)	1318								
(253)	3495								
(254)	5196								
(255)	714	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(256)	685								
(257)	672								
(258)	466	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(259)	304								
(260)	1320								
(261)	578								
(262)	587	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	
(263)	91	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(264)	2065								
(265)	120	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(266)	104	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(267)	1080								
(268)	62	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(269)	673								
(270)	161	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(271)	2932								
(272)	1075								
(273)	477	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(274)	36	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(275)	2988	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(276)	2587	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(243)	268	3	7	10	*70.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(244)	93	0	10	10	*100.0%*	0	7	7	*100.0%*
(245)	393	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(246)	218	4	6	10	*60.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(247)	619	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(248)	5175	2	4	6	*66.7%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(249)	660	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(250)	126	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(251)	737	1	9	10	*90.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(252)	1318	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(253)	3495	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(254)	5196	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(255)	714	1	7	8	*87.5%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(256)	685	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(257)	672	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(258)	466	5	5	10	*50.0%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(259)	304	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(260)	1320	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(261)	578	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(262)	587	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(263)	91	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(264)	2065	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(265)	120	4	3	7	*42.9%*	2	3	5	*60.0%*
(266)	104	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(267)	1080	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(268)	62	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(269)	673	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(270)	161	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(271)	2932	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(272)	1075	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(273)	477	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(274)	36	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(275)	2988	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(276)	2587	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(277)	160	0	6	6	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(278)	64	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(279)	680								
(280)	390	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(281)	690								
(282)	738	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(283)	273	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(284)	107	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(285)	724								
(286)	97	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(287)	2310								
(288)	675								
(289)	741								
(290)	1194								
(291)	2575	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(292)	678								
(293)	742								
(294)	1105	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(295)	599								
(296)	8	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(297)	281	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(298)	1226								
(299)	3660								
(300)	3234								
(301)	1466								
(302)	102	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	0	0	
(303)	366								
(304)	1115	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(305)	176	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(306)	3659								
(307)	620								
(308)	1319								
(309)	3717								
(310)	3230	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(277)	160	0	7	7	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(278)	64	5	5	10	*50.0%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(279)	680	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(280)	390	1	9	10	*90.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(281)	690	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(282)	738	2	8	10	*80.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(283)	273	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	5	5	*100.0%*
(284)	107	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(285)	724	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(286)	97	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(287)	2310	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(288)	675	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(289)	741	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(290)	1194	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(291)	2575	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(292)	678	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(293)	742	1	2	3	*66.7%*	0	0	0	
(294)	1105	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(295)	599	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(296)	8	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(297)	281	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(298)	1226	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(299)	3660	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(300)	3234	2	2	4	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(301)	1466	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(302)	102	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	0	0	
(303)	366	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(304)	1115	5	5	10	*50.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(305)	176	4	4	8	*50.0%*	1	1	2	*50.0%*
(306)	3659	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(307)	620	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(308)	1319	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(309)	3717	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(310)	3230	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*

(311)	7	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(312)	303	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(313)	403	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(314)	71	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(315)	3599	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(316)	583								
(317)	3835								
(318)	68	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(319)	879								
(320)	4223								
(321)	409	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(322)	5043	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(323)	699	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(324)	568	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(325)	190	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(326)	3829								
(327)	5419								
(328)	5122	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(329)	3593	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(330)	410								
(331)	274	2	3	5	*60.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(332)	229	1	4	5	*80.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(333)	1467								
(334)	1074	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(335)	736								
(336)	74	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(337)	4414								
(338)	18	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(339)	3362								
(340)	670								
(341)	707	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(342)	114	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(343)	430								
(344)	5119	1	0	1	*0.0%*	0	0	0	

(311)	7	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(312)	303	2	5	7	*71.4%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(313)	403	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(314)	71	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(315)	3599	3	4	7	*57.1%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*
(316)	583	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(317)	3835	1	1	2	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(318)	68	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	4	4	*100.0%*
(319)	879	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(320)	4223	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(321)	409	3	4	7	*57.1%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(322)	5043	1	6	7	*85.7%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(323)	699	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(324)	568	1	7	8	*87.5%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(325)	190	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(326)	3829	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(327)	5419	2	1	3	*33.3%*	0	0	0	
(328)	5122	2	4	6	*66.7%*	0	0	0	
(329)	3593	0	5	5	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(330)	410	1	1	2	*50.0%*	0	0	0	
(331)	274	4	3	7	*42.9%*	1	2	3	*66.7%*
(332)	229	1	5	6	*83.3%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(333)	1467	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(334)	1074	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(335)	736	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(336)	74	1	5	6	*83.3%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(337)	4414	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(338)	18	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(339)	3362	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(340)	670	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(341)	707	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(342)	114	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(343)	430	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(344)	5119	6	0	6	*0.0%*	1	0	1	*0.0%*

(345)	661								
(346)	1468	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(347)	3852								
(348)	2690								
(349)	662								
(350)	4226								
(351)	348	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(352)	5107								
(353)	1100	2	0	2	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(354)	57	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(355)	156	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(356)	30	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(357)	3306								
(358)	4635								
(359)	169	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(360)	1159								
(361)	4483								
(362)	106								
(363)	1124								
(364)	394								
(365)	4533								
(366)	84	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(367)	453	3	0	3	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(368)	235	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(369)	*Total*	14	483	497	*97.2%*	0	370	370	*100.0%*

1998-2003

Stores with Any Gender Disaprity Adverse to Women in Every year the Store was in region 43	**117 out of 127**	***92.1%***
Stores with any Gender Disaparity Adverse to Women in More than Half their Years in Region 43	**124 out of 127**	***97.6%***

(345)	661	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(346)	1468	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(347)	3852	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(348)	2690	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(349)	662	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(350)	4226	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(351)	348	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(352)	5107	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(353)	1100	4	0	4	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(354)	57	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(355)	156	2	3	5	*60.0%*	2	0	2	*0.0%*
(356)	30	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(357)	3306	1	3	4	*75.0%*	0	0	0	
(358)	4635	1	0	1	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(359)	169	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	3	3	*100.0%*
(360)	1159	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	2	2	*100.0%*
(361)	4483	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(362)	106	0	2	2	*100.0%*	0	0		
(363)	1124	1	0	1	*0.0%*	0	0		
(364)	394	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0		
(365)	4533	0	1	1	*100.0%*	0	0		
(366)	84	0	4	4	*100.0%*	0	1	1	*100.0%*
(367)	453	3	0	3	*0.0%*	0	0	0	
(368)	235	0	3	3	*100.0%*	0	0	0	
(369)	*Total*	186	883	1,069	*82.6%*	13	473	486	*97.3%*

1998-2008

Stores with Any Gender Disaprity Adverse to Women in Every year the Store was in region 43	**104 out of 187**	***55.6%***
Stores with any Gender Disaparity Adverse to Women in More than Half their Years in Region 43	**168 out of 187**	***89.8%***

Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result in Every Year the Store was in Region 43	**111 out of 111**	***100.0%***
Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result for at Least Half the Years the Store was in Region 43	**111 out of 111**	***100.0%***

Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result in Every Year the Store was in Region 43	**140 out of 151**	***92.7%***
Among Stores with a Statistically Significant Gender Disparity Adverse to Women in at least One year, the Number which Had that Result for at Least Half the Years the Store was in Region 43	**145 out of 151**	***96.0%***

Table C-12
Multiple Regression Analyses of Gender Disparities in Hourly Employee Starting Pay Rates, 1999 - 2008, by Year

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
	Year	Non-Grocery Jobs				Grocery Jobs			
		Gender Disparities in Starting Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Hiring Decisions Analyzed	Gender Disparities in Starting Pay Rate (- means women paid less than men)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Hiring Decisions Analyzed
(1)	1999	-$0.23	5.7	0.84	2,577	-$0.46	3.2	0.73	424
(2)	2000	-$0.04	1.1	0.77	4,353	-$0.22	2.2	0.62	661
(3)	2001	-$0.10	5.2	0.77	10,889	-$0.12	2.7	0.68	1,769
(4)	2002	-$0.05	2.9	0.72	12,488	-$0.16	3.6	0.59	2,122
(5)	2003	-$0.04	3.0	0.79	13,424	-$0.12	3.6	0.65	2,437
(6)	2004	-$0.02	1.4	0.76	13,372	-$0.04	1.2	0.61	2,644
(7)	2005	-$0.05	3.6	0.74	14,490	-$0.07	2.4	0.62	2,955
(8)	2006	-$0.04	3.4	0.73	15,494	-$0.10	4.0	0.62	3,332
(9)	2007	-$0.10	7.7	0.74	16,404	-$0.14	5.5	0.63	3,802
(10)	2008	-$0.00	0.2	0.71	13,645	-$0.07	2.8	0.58	2,885

Notes and Sources

In the part of 1998 included in this littgation, there were too few hiring decisions to permit estimation of regression equations.

Each regression controls for:

(age-15) as of hire date.

(age-15) squared as of hire date.

Job into which employee was hired.

Job level into which employee was hired.

Division into which employee was hired.

Department in to which the employee was hired.

Store into which individual was hired.

Dependent variable is hourly pay rate in first paycheck after the hire date.

Multiple hirings of the same employee are excluded from the analysis if they occur less than 15 days apart within the same year.

Table C-13
Multiple Regression Analyses of Gender Disparities in Annual Raises for Hourly Employees,1999 - 2008, By Year

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(i)	(i)
	Year	Non-Grocery Jobs					Grocery Jobs				
		Average Raise for Women ($/Hour)	Gender Disparities in Raises ($/Hour) (- means women's raises were smaller than men's)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Employees Analyzed	Average Raise for Women ($/Hour)	Gender Disparities in Raises ($/Hour) (- means women's raises were smaller than men's)	Standard Deviations	R-Squared for Regression Equation	Number of Employees Analyzed
(1)	1999	$0.63	-$0.03	1.5	0.27	4,071	$0.64	-$0.03	0.7	0.31	748
(2)	2000	$0.59	-$0.02	2.6	0.30	14,396	$0.67	-$0.03	1.1	0.28	1,765
(3)	2001	$0.62	-$0.01	0.5	0.27	12,968	$0.62	-$0.05	2.1	0.27	1,800
(4)	2002	$0.54	-$0.01	1.2	0.30	11,765	$0.58	-$0.01	0.7	0.29	1,857
(5)	2003	$0.51	-$0.01	1.2	0.29	14,738	$0.54	-$0.04	2.7	0.36	2,589
(6)	2004	$0.96	$0.27	24.4	0.29	14,293	$1.02	$0.31	14.8	0.30	2,746
(7)	2005	$0.57	-$0.01	1.4	0.43	11,800	$0.57	$0.00	0.1	0.36	2,428
(8)	2006	$0.58	$0.00	0.2	0.27	15,926	$0.60	-$0.00	0.0	0.35	3,521
(9)	2007	$0.55	$0.02	2.1	0.42	17,168	$0.57	$0.04	3.7	0.38	4,061
(10)	2008	$0.62	-$0.01	1.9	0.43	18,964	$0.60	-$.00	0.1	0.50	4,642

Notes and Sources

Regression equations can not be estimated for 1998 due to absence of pay rate data for 1997.

Dependent variable is change in hourly pay rate from previous year to the year being analyzed.

3,442 person-year decreases in pay rates are not inlcuded in this analysis.

Each regression controls for:

- (age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart)
- (age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart) squared
- seniority with Wal-Mart
- seniority with Wal-Mart squared
- Does employee have a "high" performance evaluation (defined in Table C-2).
- Employee has no evaluation score in this year
- Employee has performance score of "7"
- Job description (282 job descriptions appear in at least one regression)
- Job level (levels 1 - 7)
- Department (125 departments appear in at least one regression)
- Division (21 divisions appear in at least one regression)
- Store number (187 stores appear in at least one regression)
- Did the employee change jobs between this year and the previous year?
- Did the employee change job level between this year and the previous year?
- Did the employee change division between this year and the previous year?
- Did the employee change department between this year and the previous year.
- Did the employee change non-grocery job/grocery job between this year and the previous year?
- Did the employee change store between this year and the previous year?

Table C-14
Multiple Regression Analyses of Gender Disparities in Assistant Manager Pay Rates, 1999-2008

	(a) Year	(b) Gender Difference in Pay Rate ($ Per Pay Period) (- means women paid less than men)	(c) Standard Deviations	(d) Probability
(1)	1999	$113.31	8.0	< 1 in a trillion
(2)	2000	-$107.53	8.2	< 1 in a trillion
(3)	2001	-$109.36	8.1	< 1 in a trillion
(4)	2002	-$88.38	6.4	< 1 in a billion
(5)	2003	-$111.64	8.0	< 1 in a trillion
(6)	2004	-$134.40	10.1	< 1 in a trillion
(7)	2005	-$109.51	10.8	< 1 in a trillion
(8)	2006	-$99.00	10.1	< 1 in a trillion
(9)	2007	-$90.38	9.3	< 1 in a trillion
(10)	2008	-$90.00	9.3	< 1 in a trillion

R-squared: 0.64 n: 7,550

Notes and Sources

Assistant Managers are employees who, on December 31, held one of 35 Assistant Manager job titles.

The dependent variable is bi-weekly base pay rate.

Regression controls for:

(age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart)

(age-15-seniority with Wal-Mart) squared

seniority with Wal-Mart

seniority with Wal-Mart squared

Does employee have a "high" performance evaluation score this year?

Employee does not have an evaluation score this year

Store where employee worked on December 31

Employee's job title on December 31

year

Standard deviations are adjusted for inlcusion of the same employee in data for more than one year.

Table C - 15
Representation of Women in Managerial Positions, 1998-2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)
	Year	Managers in Training				Assistant Managers				Co-Managers				Store Managers			
		Women	Men	Total	% Female	Women	Men	Total	% Female	Women	Men	Total	% Female	Women	Men	Total	% Female
(1)	1998	0	0	0	--	44	135	179	24.6%	0	3	3	0.0%	5	22	27	18.5%
(2)	1999	3	6	9	33.3%	151	377	528	28.6%	10	80	90	11.1%	18	120	138	13.0%
(3)	2000	1	6	7	14.3%	173	389	562	30.7%	7	64	71	9.9%	19	101	120	15.8%
(4)	2001	1	11	12	8.3%	183	404	587	31.1%	8	23	31	25.8%	15	107	122	12.3%
(5)	2002	5	21	26	19.2%	198	429	627	31.6%	11	46	57	19.3%	15	103	118	12.7%
(6)	2003	3	18	21	14.3%	206	391	597	34.5%	12	44	56	21.4%	16	105	121	13.2%
(7)	2004	6	30	36	16.7%	220	395	615	35.8%	23	57	80	28.8%	14	109	123	11.4%
(8)	2005	16	36	52	30.8%	363	558	921	39.4%	26	45	71	36.6%	21	66	87	24.1%
(9)	2006	22	66	88	25.0%	444	654	1,098	40.4%	0	11	11	0.0%	20	96	116	17.2%
(10)	2007	32	68	100	32.0%	407	584	991	41.1%	1	7	8	12.5%	18	86	104	17.3%
(11)	2008	21	34	55	38.2%	435	589	1,024	42.5%	2	2	4	50.0%	17	85	102	16.7%
(12)	Average Year	10	27	37	--	257	446	703	--	9	35	44	--	16	91	107	--
(13)	Weighted Average				27.1%				36.5%				20.7%				15.1%

Notes and Sources:

Based on 9,795 employees holding one of the indicated job title on December 31 of the indicated year.

Table C - 16
Representation of Women in Selected Groups of Hourly Employees, 1998-2008

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)
	Year	All Hourly Employees				Full-Time, Permanent Hourly Employees with High Performance Rating and "Manager" or "Supervisor" in Hourly Job Title				Full-Time, Permanent Hourly Employees with High Performance Rating and at Least Five Years' Seniority				Full-Time, Permanent Hourly Employees with High Performance Rating and Hourly Pay Rate in Top 25% of Hourly Pay Rates			
		Women	Men	Total	% Female	Women	Men	Total	% Female	Women	Men	Total	% Female	Women	Men	Total	% Female
(1)	1998	4,560	2,034	6,594	69.2%	400	68	468	85.5%	874	190	1,064	82.1%	704	241	945	74.5%
(2)	1999	19,518	9,671	29,189	66.9%	1,530	275	1,805	84.8%	3,230	598	3,828	84.4%	3,079	997	4,076	75.5%
(3)	2000	21,604	10,589	32,193	67.1%	1,781	329	2,110	84.4%	3,715	707	4,422	84.0%	3,656	1,244	4,900	74.6%
(4)	2001	21,646	11,907	33,553	64.5%	1,954	405	2,359	82.8%	4,256	857	5,113	83.2%	3,871	1,442	5,313	72.9%
(5)	2002	19,499	11,222	30,721	63.5%	1,964	453	2,417	81.3%	4,440	1,012	5,452	81.4%	3,594	1,375	4,969	72.3%
(6)	2003	14,635	9,062	23,697	61.8%	1,475	359	1,834	80.4%	3,552	904	4,456	79.7%	2,620	989	3,609	72.6%
(7)	2004	14,638	9,061	23,699	61.8%	1,528	384	1,912	79.9%	3,747	993	4,740	79.1%	2,687	912	3,599	74.7%
(8)	2005	21,810	11,993	33,803	64.5%	2,302	623	2,925	78.7%	5,788	1,576	7,364	78.6%	3,960	1,329	5,289	74.9%
(9)	2006	20,774	11,850	32,624	63.7%	2,081	612	2,693	77.3%	5,372	1,559	6,931	77.5%	3,871	1,235	5,106	75.8%
(10)	2007	18,241	11,115	29,356	62.1%	1,936	549	2,485	77.9%	4,819	1,459	6,278	76.8%	3,474	1,103	4,577	75.9%
(11)	2008	16,371	10,014	26,385	62.0%	1,859	550	2,409	77.2%	4,850	1,520	6,370	76.1%	3,217	999	4,216	76.3%
(12)	Total	193,296	108,518	301,814	--	18,810	4,607	23,417	--	44,643	11,375	56,018	--	34,733	11,866	46,599	--
(13)	Weighted Average				64.0%				80.3%				79.7%				74.5%

Notes and Sources:

Based on 301,814 person years for full-time, permanent hourly employees on December 31 of each year, data as of the last record for that employee in each calendar year.

High performance rating is defined as High performance rating as defined by Wal-Mart in each year or rating of 7.

Table C - 17
Shortfalls, Compared to the Lowest Hourly Employee Benchmark, of Women in Salaried Managerial Jobs, 1998-2008

(a) For Assistant Managers and Managers in Training

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
	Year	Women Among Actual Employees			Compared to the LOWEST of the 3 Hourly Employee Benchmarks					
		Women Employees	Total Employees	% Female	Expected Representation of Women		Shortfall (- means fewer women than expected)		Statistical Significance	
					Number	% Female	Number	%	Standard Deviations	Probability (less than 1 in a ...)
(1)	1998	44	179	24.6%	133	74.5%	-89	-49.9%	12.9	trillion
(2)	1999	154	537	28.6%	406	75.5%	-252	-46.9%	22.2	trillion
(3)	2000	174	569	30.7%	425	74.6%	-251	-43.9%	21.7	trillion
(4)	2001	184	599	31.1%	436	72.9%	-252	-41.8%	21.0	trillion
(5)	2002	203	653	31.6%	472	72.3%	-269	-40.7%	21.1	trillion
(6)	2003	209	618	34.5%	449	72.6%	-240	-38.1%	18.9	trillion
(7)	2004	226	651	35.8%	486	74.7%	-260	-38.9%	20.2	trillion
(8)	2005	379	973	39.4%	729	74.9%	-350	-35.5%	22.3	trillion
(9)	2006	466	1,186	40.4%	899	75.8%	-433	-35.4%	24.4	trillion
(10)	2007	439	1,091	41.1%	828	75.9%	-389	-34.8%	22.8	trillion
(11)	2008	456	1,079	42.5%	823	76.3%	-367	-33.8%	21.6	trillion
(12)	Average Year	267	8,135	--	553	--	-287	--	--	--
(13)	Weighted Average			36.6%		74.8%		-38.2%	--	--

(b) For Co-Managers and Store Managers Combined

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
	Year	Women Among Actual Employees			Compared to the LOWEST of the 3 Hourly Employee Benchmarks					
		Women Employees	Total Employees	% Female	Expected Representation of Women		Shortfall (- means fewer women than expected)		Statistical Significance	
					Number	% Female	Number	%	Standard Deviations	Probability (less than 1 in a ...)
(14)	1998	5	30	16.7%	22	74.5%	-17	-57.8%	6.8	billion
(15)	1999	28	228	12.3%	172	75.5%	-144	-63.3%	20.7	trillion
(16)	2000	26	191	13.6%	143	74.6%	-117	-61.0%	18.4	trillion
(17)	2001	23	153	15.0%	111	72.9%	-88	-57.8%	15.5	trillion
(18)	2002	26	175	14.9%	127	72.3%	-101	-57.5%	14.7	trillion
(19)	2003	28	177	15.8%	128	72.6%	-100	-56.8%	16.0	trillion
(20)	2004	37	203	18.2%	152	74.7%	-115	-56.4%	17.3	trillion
(21)	2005	47	158	29.7%	118	74.9%	-71	-45.1%	12.6	trillion
(22)	2006	20	127	15.7%	96	75.8%	-76	-60.1%	15.2	trillion
(23)	2007	19	122	15.6%	93	75.9%	-74	-60.3%	15.0	trillion
(24)	2008	19	106	17.9%	81	76.3%	-62	-58.4%	13.6	trillion
(25)	Average Year	25	1,670	--	113	--	-88	--	--	--
(26)	Weighted Average			16.6%		74.4%		-57.8%	--	--

Notes and Sources:

Column (a): --

Columns (b) to (d): Columns (b) to (e) of Table C-13.

Columns (e) and (f): Columns (n) to (q) of Table C-14.

Column (g): Column (b) - Column (e).

Column (h): Column (d) - Column (f).

Columns (i) and (j): Continuity-corrected chi-square test for the difference of proportions.

Table C - 18 (CORRECTED April 2, 2018)
Annual Promotion Rates for Hourly Employees to Manager in Training, Assistant Manager, Co-Manager, or Store Manager Combined, 1998-2008, by Gender

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
Gender	Full-Time, Permanent Hourly Employees with High Performance Rating and "Manager" or "Supervisor" in Hourly Job Title			Full-Time, Permanent Hourly Employees with High Performance Rating and at Least Five Years' Seniority			Full-Time, Permanent Hourly Employees with High Performance Rating and Hourly Pay Rate in Top 25% of Hourly Pay Rates		
	% of Employees with these Qualifications Promoted in One Year	% of Employees without these Qualifications Promoted in One Year	Ratio of Promotion Rate with the Credential to Promotion Rate without the Credential	% of Employees with these Qualifications Promoted in One Year	% of Employees without these Qualifications Promoted in One Year	Ratio of Promotion Rate with the Credential to Promotion Rate without the Credential	% of Employees with these Qualifications Promoted in One Year	% of Employees without these Qualifications Promoted in One Year	Ratio of Promotion Rate with the Credential to Promotion Rate without the Credential
(1) All Employees	1.3%	0.2%	5.7	0.4%	0.3%	1.2	0.6%	0.3%	2.3
(2) Men	3.3%	0.4%	7.8	0.9%	0.6%	1.6	1.2%	0.5%	2.6
(3) Women	0.9%	0.1%	6.4	0.3%	0.2%	1.2	0.4%	0.2%	2.5
(4) Ratio of Women's Promotion Rate to Men's Promotion Rate	26.1%	32.0%	--	28.9%	38.6%	--	33.9%	35.4%	--
(5) Difference between Men's Rate and Women's Rate (- means women are promoted at a lower rate than men)	-2.5%	-0.3%	--	-0.6%	-0.3%	--	-0.8%	-0.3%	--
(6) Standard Deviations	11.7	12.8	--	9.3	11.5	--	9.4	11.8	--
(7) Probability is less than 1 chance in a	trillion	trillion	--	trillion	trillion	--	trillion	trillion	--

Notes and Sources:

Based on 189,222 person years for full-time, permanent hourly employees on December 31 of each year and the previous year, data as of the last record for that employee in each calendar year.

Table C - 19
Annual Promotion Rates from Assistant Manager, 1998-2008, by Gender

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Promotion Type	Women	Men	Ratio of Promotion Rate for Women to Promotion Rate for Men	Diifference (- means women promoted at a lower rate than men)	Standard Deviations	Probability (less than 1 chance in a…)
From Assistant Manager to Co-Manager or Store Manager	1.8%	2.8%	64.2%	-1.0%	2.4	50

Notes and Sources:

Based on 6,525 person years for employess with an Assistant Manager job title on December 31 of one year and still a Wal-Mart employee in the next year.

ATTACHMENT D

Class Action Complaint, Phipps v. Wal-Mart, No. 3:12-01009, Dkt. 1 (M.D. Tenn. Oct. 2, 2012)

Deposition of Charles Rinehart, Feb. 27, 2018, and Exhibits 1-27
Deposition of Christopher Vaden, Feb. 21, 2018, and Exhibits 1-28
Deposition of Russell Steiner, Feb. 28, 2018, and Exhibits 1-26
Deposition of Craig Arnold, 30(b)(6) deponent, *Dukes v. Wal-Mart*, June 4, 2002
Deposition of Lisa Riley, 30(b)(6), Feb. 14, 2018, and Exhibits 1-11, 19, 20, 22-42
Deposition of Sonya Hostetler, Feb. 9, 2018, and Exhibits 1-41

Hard drive produced by defendants on July 27, 2017

CONFIDENTIAL - Advance - Division Numbers.xlsx
CONFIDENTIAL - LT0269 DataDictionary_LT691167Data 2012-023517-D1
CONFIDENTIAL - LT0269 DataDictionary_LT691168Data 2012-023517-D2
LT69167 DataStructures 2012-023517-D41.xlsx
LT69168 TableListing 2012-023517-D1.xlsx
WMDukes-500508-15217-00000001
WMDukes-500508-15217-00000001.txt
WMHO1031998
WMHO204269-277
WMHO215699
WMHO220459
WMHOe-000031-024-00018107-08
WMHOe-002004-001-00016391
WMHOe-5000525-004-00000810
WMHOP-000017-003-00000244
WM-PHIPPS-000185
WM-PHIPPS-000210
WM-PHIPPS-000555
WM-PHIPPS-000833
WM-PHIPPS-001147
WM-PHIPPS-001206
WM-PHIPPS-001214
WM-PHIPPS-001280
WM-PHIPPS-001328
WM-PHIPPS-001467
WM-PHIPPS-001892
WM-PHIPPS-002314
WM-PHIPPS-002457
WM-PHIPPS-002658
WM-PHIPPS-002702
WM-PHIPPS-002938
WM-PHIPPS-022964
WM-PHIPPS-023959
WM-PHIPPS-023967
WM-PHIPPS-024245

WM-PHIPPS-024799
WM-PHIPPS-025663
WM-PHIPPS-027507
WM-PHIPPS-027569
WM-PHIPPS-027583
WM-PHIPPS-027909
WM-PHIPPS-028543
WM-PHIPPS-029869
WM-PHIPPS-029961
WM-PHIPPS-032040
WM-PHIPPS-032536
WM-PHIPPS-032611
WM-PHIPPS-033493
WM-PHIPPS-033640
WM-PHIPPS-033678
WM-PHIPPS-033692
WM-PHIPPS-034391
WM-PHIPPS-035194
WM-PHIPPS-035194.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035195
WM-PHIPPS-035195.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035196
WM-PHIPPS-035196.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035872.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035873.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035874.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035875.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035876.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035877.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035878.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035879.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035880.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035881.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035882.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035883.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035884.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035885.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035886.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-035929
WM-PHIPPS-040748
WM-PHIPPS-040748
WM-PHIPPS-040749
WM-PHIPPS-040750.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-046533
WM-PHIPPS-047779
WM-PHIPPS-050935

WM-PHIPPS-177399
WM-PHIPPS-177427
WM-PHIPPS-238264
WM-PHIPPS-272513.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-278482.txt
WM-PHIPPS-278482_Native
WM-PHIPPS-278483.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-278483_Native
WM-PHIPPS-278484.txt
WM-PHIPPS-278490.txt
WM-PHIPPS-278490_Native
WM-PHIPPS-278491.txt
WM-PHIPPS-278492.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-278492_Native
WM-PHIPPS-278493
WM-PHIPPS-278895.xlsx
WM-PHIPPS-278896.xlsx