

Activity #1**An Age Discrimination Case?**

The table¹ in the next page presents data provided by the Envelope Division of the Westvaco Corporation (a pulp and paper company originally based in West Virginia and which was purchased by the Meade Corporation in January of 2002) to the lawyers of Robert Martin. Martin was laid off by Westvaco in 1991 when the company decided to downsize. The company went through 5 rounds of layoffs. Martin was laid off in the second round and he was 55 years old then. He claimed that he had been laid off because of his age. He sued the company later that year alleging age discrimination. Your goal for this activity is to determine whether the data provided show that the suit had any merit.

The rows in the table represent the 50 employees in the envelope division of Westvaco before the layoffs (Robert Martin is in row 44). The Pay-column shows an “H” if the worker is paid hourly, and an “S” if the worker had a salary. The last column gives the age of each worker as of the first of January 1991 (shortly before the layoffs). The “RIF” column shows a “0” if the worker was not laid off during downsizing, a “1” if the worker was laid off in the first round of downsizing, a “2” if laid off in the second round, and so on.

For this activity, you will work in groups. Each team will study the data provided in search for patterns, if any, that might reflect age discrimination on the part of Westvaco management. Based on the analysis that your team makes of the data, your team will take a position on whether there was age discrimination, or whether the data do not present enough evidence to support Martin’s claim.

¹The table is Display 1.1 in *Statistics in Action* by Watkins, Scheaffer and Cobb, p. 5. This activity is based on Chapter 1 of that book.

Row	Job Title	Pay	Birth		Hire		RIF	Age 1/1/91
			Mo	Yr	Mo	Yr		
1	Engineering Clerk	H	9	66	7	89	0	25
2	Engineering Tech II	H	4	53	8	78	0	38
3	Engineering Tech II	H	10	35	7	65	0	56
4	Secretary to Engin Manag	H	2	43	9	66	0	48
5	Engineering Tech II	H	8	38	9	74	1	53
6	Engineering Tech II	H	8	36	3	60	1	55
7	Engineering Tech II	H	1	32	2	63	1	59
8	Parts Crib Attendant	H	11	69	10	89	1	22
9	Engineering Tech II	H	5	36	4	77	2	55
10	Engineering Tech II	H	8	27	12	51	2	64
11	Technical Secretary	H	5	36	11	73	2	55
12	Engineering Tech II	H	2	36	4	62	3	55
13	Engineering Tech II	H	9	58	11	76	4	33
14	Engineering Tech II	H	7	56	5	77	4	35
15	Customer Serv Engineer	S	4	30	9	66	0	61
16	Customer Serv Engr Assoc	S	2	62	5	88	0	29
17	Design Engineer	S	12	43	9	67	0	48
18	Design Engineer	S	3	37	6	74	0	54
19	Design Engineer	S	3	36	2	78	0	55
20	Design Engineer	S	1	31	3	67	0	60
21	Engineering Assistant	S	6	60	7	86	0	31
22	Engineering Associate	S	2	57	4	85	0	34
23	Engineering Manager	S	2	32	11	63	0	59
24	Machine Designer	S	9	59	3	90	0	32
25	Packaging Engineer	S	3	38	11	83	0	53
26	Prod Spec—Printing	S	12	44	11	74	0	47
27	Proj Eng—Elec	S	9	43	4	71	0	48
28	Project Engineer	S	7	49	9	73	0	42
29	Project Engineer	S	8	43	4	64	0	48
30	Project Engineer	S	6	34	8	81	0	57
31	Supv Engineering Serv	S	4	54	6	72	0	37
32	Supv Machine Shop	S	11	37	3	64	0	54
33	Chemist	S	8	22	4	54	1	69
34	Design Engineer	S	9	38	12	87	1	53
35	Engineering Associate	S	2	61	9	85	1	30
36	Machine Designer	S	2	39	4	85	1	52
37	Machine Parts Cont—Supv	S	10	28	8	53	1	63
38	Prod Specialist	S	9	27	10	43	1	64
39	Project Engineer	S	7	25	9	59	1	66
40	Chemist	S	12	30	10	52	2	61
41	Design Engineer	S	4	60	5	89	2	31
42	Electrical Engineer	S	11	49	3	86	2	42
43	Machine Designer	S	3	35	12	68	2	56
44	Machine Parts Cont Coord	S	9	37	10	67	2	54
45	VH Prod Specialist	S	5	35	9	55	2	56
46	Printing Coordinator	S	2	41	1	62	3	50
47	Prod Dev Engineer	S	6	59	11	85	3	32
48	Prod Specialist	S	7	32	1	55	4	59
49	VH Prod Specialist	S	3	42	4	62	4	49
50	Engineering Associate	S	8	68	5	89	5	23

Display 1.1 The data in *Martin v. Westvaco*.

Source: *Martin v. Envelope Division of Westvaco Corp.*, CA No. 92-03121-MAP, 850 Fed. Supp. 83 (1994).