



Job Promotion Discrimination

Francisco Arrieta, Lucia Camenisch, Manuela Giansante, Oumaima Al Qoh, Emily Schmidt, Camille Beatrice Valera

March 31st, 2023

Executive Summary

This report suggests the possibility of employment discrimination against the plaintiff, John Doe, regarding job promotion at ABC Organization after the last chairman election. Financial campaign contributions are not a requirement for career advancement, yet there seems to be a correlation between monetary contributions and job promotion. Among employees in John Doe's promotion cycle, there was a higher percentage of individuals promoted than those who did not. Based on ABC Organization's promotion strategy, it is possible that the plaintiff may have had a higher chance of being promoted if he had contributed to the campaign. Despite the given data, Diché Consulting cannot confirm or deny if discrimination occurred in the workplace.

The phrases and circumstances of this Agreement are completely confidential between the parties and shall not be disclosed to anybody else. Any disclosure in violation shall be deemed a breach of this Agreement.

Contents

Introduction2

Results2

 Table 1: Contribution by Promotion.....3

 Table 2: Candidate Ranking3

 Table 3: Promoted vs. Financial Contribution.....4

Conclusion.....4

Appendix6

Introduction

John Doe, represented by XYZ Law Firm, believes that he may have been discriminated against by his employer, ABC Organization. The plaintiff is acknowledged as a high-ranking employee who was not promoted after the last election of the chairman of a governing commission. Out of 10 employees eligible for promotion, seven advanced in their careers. Of the seven promoted, six individuals made financial contributions to the campaign of the winning candidate. These monetary gifts were not required by any party.

ABC Organization's promotion strategy is based on a standard test score that every eligible candidate must take. Scores are ranked and the procedure follows that for each promotion slot, the successful candidate must be selected from those who are currently among the top three ranked candidates (including ties). This method is applied sequentially until all the available promotion slots have been filled. As an exceptional employee who received a ranking of four (4), John Doe speculates that his position should have been more than sufficient to obtain a promotion. Since the plaintiff did not make any contributions to the election, he claims that discrimination has occurred.

Diché Consulting's objective is to support XYZ Law Firm and their client, John Doe, to reasonably prove that the plaintiff was discriminated due to his organization's action of non-promotion. Based on data submitted by the plaintiff, Diché Consulting will provide arguments for and against this inequality case through several statistical components.

Beforehand, critical details from the data may be reviewed below:

- Number of employees who contributed to the election campaign (Table 1)
 - Number of employees who did not contribute to the election campaign (Table 1)
 - Number of employees who were promoted (Table 1)
 - Number of employees who were not promoted (Table 1)
 - Rankings for each candidate (Table 2)
 - Number of employees who were not candidates for promotion who were asked two questions:
 1. Did they feel a positive or negative change in their conditions after the election was held?
Options to answer: Positive, Negative, Unknown* (Table 3)
 2. Did they make financial contributions to the campaign of the winning candidate?
Options to answer: Contributed to Winner, Did Not Contributed to Winner, Unknown* (Table 3)
- *Unknown: No response to that question was provided.

Diché Consulting focuses on three main elements. Table 1 directs its focus towards the employees' contributions and the percentage of those who were promoted. Table 2 provides data to understand how the promotion procedure operates through probabilities. Lastly, Table 3 gives information about the non-promotable employees, their opinions, and actions. Ensuring that XYZ Law Firm and John Doe are well equipped, Diché Consulting has prepared a data-driven report to assist the clients' decision to proceed with this discriminatory case.

Results

XYZ Law Firm obtained relevant data from John Doe while working at ABC Organization. Each section represents information that could potentially be used to support Doe's claim as well as provide limitations where the counsel should increase their knowledge or introduce additional data for further analysis.

Table 1: Contribution by Promotion

Contribution by Promotion		
	Promoted	Not Promoted
Contributed to Winner	6	0
Did Not Contribute to Winner	1	3

To help determine if discrimination in the workplace occurred, Diché has utilized Table 1. This provides data on the individuals who were promoted versus those who were not based on their possible financial donations. Out of the 10 candidates qualifying for promotion, only seven were promoted. Among those seven, 85.7% had contributed to the winner. The other 14.3% did not give monetary contributions and were still promoted. There was no one who gave funds to the chairman of a governing commission and was not upgraded to a higher position.

In addition, the relationship between promotion and contribution has a high correlation at 80.2% (*see Appendix Figs.1 and 2*). This means that an employee is more likely to be promoted if they have participated in a donation. There appears to be a high correlation between contributions and promotion which could insinuate that Doe would not be promotable.

Table 2: Candidate Ranking

Candidate Ranking (1 = highest)										
Candidate	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	8	8

The table above displays the candidate ranking for the first round of promotions. Assuming that the procedure is sequential, this ranking is maintained after each of the seven rounds, not including the individual who was promoted. All others will gain one position every time the chance for advancement is offered.

During those seven rounds of promotions, employee D (John Doe) continuously placed amongst the top three starting from round two, making him eligible for a promotion for the remaining six cycles. Diché Consulting computed the probability of employee D being promoted under the assumption that candidates are randomly selected following a uniform distribution wherein each draw is independent from the other.

$$1 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^6 = 91.2\%$$

Only considering employee ranking, John Doe has a 91.2% chance of being selected during six rounds of promotion. Consequently, the possibility of not being selected for those higher spots within the company is 8.8%. Moreover, Doe was in the top one position starting from round four. Though it is unlikely that he would not be promoted, there is still a small chance that this scenario could happen. Additionally, this does not consider any other underlying factors that could affect his chances that were not communicated to Diché by XYZ Law Firm.

Table 3: Promoted vs. Financial Contribution

Promoted vs. Financial Contribution			
	Positive	Negative	Unknown
Contributed to Winner	4	0	2
Did Not Contribute to Winner	0	7	0
Unknown	1	9	2

*Unknown: No response to that question was provided.

Doe gave his representative, XYZ Law Firm, additional details that could potentially benefit their case against ABC Organization. Although this is the weakest argument for discrimination, Diché Consulting has made some recommendations to increase its validity.

Table 3 provides information on two questions. One, employees who were not candidates for promotion were asked a question regarding whether they felt a positive or negative change in their job conditions after the election was held. Second, those same individuals were asked whether they made financial contributions to the campaign of the winning candidate.

Two approaches were taken to analyze how this data could impact Doe's claim. In examining Table 3, there is a 66.7% probability that if individuals not eligible for promotion contributed to the campaign, they had a feeling of positivity towards their job conditions. On the other hand, if an employee did not contribute to the campaign, they had a 100% chance of feeling negative about their work conditions.

Then, the data was manipulated to exclude any 'unknown' values to compute the correlation between contribution to the campaign and positive or negative feelings. In doing so, a correlation coefficient of 100% is obtained. The discrimination in question surrounds financial favoritism due to the likelihood of employees who provide monetary support to campaign winners benefitting more often compared to those who do not. Overall, Table 3 lacks data to support the affirmation or rejection of discrimination.

Conclusion

There is suggestive evidence that discrimination against the plaintiff occurred based on the data shared with Diché Consulting. On the grounds of John Doe's employee ranking and the provisional information on the promotional process, the plaintiff has at least a 91.2% chance of being selected for a higher position. However, these chances may be impacted when other factors, such as financial contributions, are considered.

Our analyses showed that among eligible employees in the plaintiff's promotion cycle, 85.7% of individuals awarded higher positions were those who gave monetary contributions. Only 14.3% of promoted employees did not donate to the campaign by comparison. The claim of discrimination is further implied by the fact that a correlation of 80.2% was discovered between contributions and job promotion.

While financial support is allegedly not mandatory for promotion, the data currently available indicate that employees who participated in a donation are more likely to advance in their careers. Once again, the plaintiff had a higher chance of being promoted based on his ranking. Therefore, it is highly likely that other factors, such as campaigns contributions play a role in ABC Organization's promotion system.

Conversely, multiple limitations must be considered if the legal counsel decides to proceed with the discrimination complaint:

[1] Limited data (10 entries) was used for the main analyses. Results obtained may be biased.

[2] While chances of the plaintiff not being promoted based on employee ranking is low, this does not mean that the occurrence is impossible. Even with a high rank of 4, there is still an 8.8% chance that John Doe was not selected based on the promotion strategy, and/or any other circumstances.

[3] Although financial favoritism may be shown through reports of positive and negative work experience in association with campaign contributions, this should not be used in the formal argument. First, the data collection and processing strategy is unclear. Second, the data may not be representative of all employees not categorized as promotion candidates. Third, the definition of “Unknown” is unspecific. For instance, it could be a refusal to respond or an inability to do so, as a result of being absent at the moment of data gathering. Fourth, the method of measuring how employees feel is unclear. There is no definition of positive and negative feelings, in addition to no range or scale to quantify these responses. Overall, this evidence is weak and could introduce more bias to the case.

Diché Consulting suggests that the legal counsel acquire more information regarding ABC Organization’s promotion system. Other than the standardized test and employee rank, it is necessary to determine the specific factors that are utilized during candidate selection. Additional data on career advancement and campaign contributions of promotion cycles throughout multiple years is also essential. If the results of subsequent analyses correspond to this initial study, a strong pattern of financial favoritism may be established. Moreover, precise details of how information was collected for questions regarding promotion and financial contribution among employees not eligible for promotion is needed. A professional survey conducted by a third party may be useful to better understand the implications of financial contribution regarding employees’ job conditions. These additional resources would collectively decrease bias and provide substantial knowledge in pursuing the discrimination complaint.

Appendix

Figure (1): Represents the 10 candidates by two variables, ‘Promoted’ and ‘Contributed.’ If a 1 is present, this means that the individual has either been promoted or has contributed. Otherwise, the value would be 0.

	Promoted	Contributed
1	1	1
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	0
8	0	0
9	0	0
10	0	0

Figure (2): From Figure 1, the correlation matrix was computed to get the following results:

	Promoted	Contributed
Promoted	1	0.8017837
Contributed	0.8017837	1

The above provides an indication that there is high correlation between having contributed to the campaign with regards to obtaining a promotion.

Figure (3): Represents the fact that non-candidates responded or not to how they felt about work-environment. If a 1 is present it means that the individual has answered the question about contribution (contributed or not) as well as responded about the work environment (positive or negative). Otherwise, the value would be 0.

	Answered Contribution	Answered Feeling
1	1	0
2	1	0
3	1	0
4	1	0
5	1	0
6	1	0
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	0	0
15	0	0
16	0	0
17	0	1
18	0	1
19	0	1
20	0	1
21	0	1
22	0	1
23	0	1
24	0	1
25	0	1

Figure (4): From Figure 3, the correlation matrix was computed to get the following results:

	Answered Contribution	Answered Feeling
Answered Contribution	1	-0.02201762
Answered Feeling	-0.02201762	1

The above provides indication that there is no correlation with the fact that non-candidates who did not respond about their contributions possibly feel a particular way, positively or negatively, about the working environment post-new chairman selection.