

Does The Presence of Labor Unions Impact Workers Rights ?

Senior Capstone Project

School of Liberal Studies

Written by, Kimberly Strickland

Purchase College, SUNY

September 6, 2018

Abstract

This paper is about labor unions and how it has an impact on workers rights. No matter what part of the world you live in you should have a labor union and should be entitled to your workers rights. What about the part-time workers? So just because they're part-time their not entitled to a labor union? We will definitely talk about that throughout the paper as well. We as people living in the society that exists today should really know our rights as workers, and be entitled to labor unions no matter if you're part-time, full-time, or per diem. We need people to save our jobs and defend us so we can provide for our families for a long time. Labor Unions are there to help people when they get into some really deep problems or even to fight for their wages to become higher. In all we as a society need labor unions for both part-time and full-time workers. Labor Unions also help to protect workers from mistreatment by their workers.

Introduction

Imagine seeing your children for ten or fifteen minutes a week? Can you withstand that or you can't? Is a twenty hour shift too much? In some worlds that's nothing to them. They'll work from 8:30 AM until 9 PM and do it over and over again until it becomes a habitual manner. My independent variable in this project simply is are labor union laws being good with how they consume culture. My dependent variable is the lifestyle/welfare. Why do we complain for a three hour shift as oppose to a twelve hour shift. We either suck it up or complain the whole shift. Some places have labor unions and some don't. If you're part-time no one represents you. If you're full-time you have a union. According to the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* it states that a labor union is "*an organization of workers formed for the purpose of advancing its members' interests in respect to wages, benefits, and working conditions.*"

Let's be honest we all know someone at the job who constantly complains about any and everything a person, place, or thing does. Nothing will satisfy him or her. What really led me to this concept is, well we as human beings work so much to get things that we need to attain but can't really enjoy them. For instance, we'll buy a house for our family and we're consistently at work putting in so many hours to maintain the house... I know as Americans we work because we have to feed our families, maintain roofs over our heads, and buy things we need and want. It may feel like we're working in sweatshops but it's nothing compared to working in third world countries.

Everyone wants to come to America for privileges but why when we get here the work is extremely excessive and tiring to the body? At least we're not working for 20 hours a day. I'm arguing that there's an increase in poverty. According to *World Affairs* in 2009 the U.S counted

43.6 billion citizens as being officially poor, over 19 million Americans were classified as extremely poor which means they could hardly (or could not at all) find financial resources to sustain their living conditions.

With the designer clothes we wear we don't appreciate the people that burn their fingers and lose their sleep to make us look halfway decent. This topic has been on my mind for some time because we don't appreciate the little things in life. Recent studies show that Americans work more than anyone in the industrialized world. We as Americans take less vacations, work longer during the day, and retire later in life.

Look at the children that are growing up now, they are relying on their parents to make the money and bring home this and that while they don't really appreciate their clothes, parents, nor education. Parents are struggling working three or four jobs to remain a roof, clothes, and food for their families. It's the little things in life that we as human beings take for granted. We should really sit and analyze the simple but big things that are important in our lives. Some parents are going through the struggle being teacher assistants, working in hospitals part-time, or working full-time careers just barely making it with the checks they receive every two weeks. Parents sometimes wish they could get paid every week. I always say this "You need eighteen degrees to live in eighteen degree weather." You better get a career/job in one or more of those degrees to raise a family and or even to survive in the later years to come. Labor unions are hard to come by. Even a good job period. Of course most hospitals have good labor unions but only for the full-time workers. Not part-time. I mean correct me if I'm wrong but if something happens or pops off at my job I gotta run up to my manager and Human Resources to cover myself.

Women don't depend on the male to come home to bring in the money anymore. I mean some women still do but now we are "Go Getters" simply because we have become tired of waiting and sometimes men pull tricks up their sleeves according to whatever lifestyle they live. Children become hungry and no one especially the mother waits around for her husband to bring home the "chicken." Let's be realistic who would anymore. Unless that's something that the husband and wife has discussed. It's different when the wife is pregnant because she has no choice but to stay home. Then again, that puts a lot of pressure on the husband. So he better be a full-time worker with a labor union, excellent benefits, and a car to maneuver around for his family.

The purpose of this is to open your eyes to your workers' rights and how it makes an impact on you, your family, and the economy that we live in. I find it sad that we have to wait till we're 65 to really enjoy our benefits and our social security. Before my mother passed away that's all she would say is "I can't wait to retire and move down south." That's what we call the life but now we're taking vacations from work and getting paid while we're on vacation. Are we entitled to that? Yes! Of course. We work so hard to not enjoy the simple things that we have. For instance, our beds. We all have them but can't really enjoy them the way we want to. It's either we are feeding our families, braiding our children's hair for school the next day, getting their clothes ready, paying bills, and the list goes on and on. Sometimes married couples can't even enjoy one another because they're stuck at work or they're too tired to entertain one another.

This topic is worthy to be investigated because we are always complaining whether we don't have a career, or we do and we work too much, and we just think money grows

on trees and have to depend on our families to take care of us. Labor unions are extremely important. They're present in our jobs to fight for the needs and rights of the company, manufacturer, and any business that we represent. I came across a book from SUNY Purchase College Library. The title of the book is called *The State of Unions.* A passage in the book struck me that states "These men, women, and children are utterly exhausted after working long hours in the field. Many of the children suffer from chronic diarrhea." I thought this was extremely too much to deal with. No one should be treated in this manner to the point where they'll have problems using the restroom from working. Give them a break. Paul Jacobs's contribution was heterogeneous of articles that appeared within ten years of periodicals and publications of the Center of the Study of Democratic Institutions. Jacobs argues that collective bargaining is demonstrating itself into existence that it's unable to deal with general economic problems such as unemployment and rapid technological change.

People want more money but can you really handle what comes with it? Working full-time and going to school is a bit much. I did it and my grades were failing. I was a Kitchen Supervisor at a restaurant and a full-time student here at SUNY Purchase College. I didn't have a labor union because I was a manager so therefore no one had my back. I mean the other managers that were on my team claimed they had my back but when things really hit the fan they were there but I had to hear the raft.

Labor unions have to struggle to maintain unity for all of the workers. The government depends on the capital accumulation process for their own survival, employers political power is far greater and far more easily hidden from public view, than that of organized labor. The relatively weak position of unions and other workers' associations often forces them into

vulnerable position of making public demands. Unions still have substantial and financial resources that enable them to influence politics and public policy. Organized labor is the single largest organized entity that speaks for and works in the interests of no elites in the United States. The United States labor movement participates in what is colloquially known as the outside game of mobilizing protests.

Unions and the labor movement are different from the others. From the New Deal Era onward, the US labor movement in particular has played both an inside game using its leverage with elected officials and other elites and within the collective bargaining process to secure advances for workers. Human rights are broadly construed as rights and freedoms to which all human beings are entitled such as life, liberty and security of a person.

Another book I stumbled across is *Labor Unions* by Editor-in-chief Gary M Fink which brings it back to National Afflictions, Union Genealogies, executive leadership (Selected Unions), and Membership (Selected Unions). In the beginning of the book he talks about The American Federation of Labor*(AFL) and how it chartered its first actors union- the Actors Nation Protective Union- On January 4, 1896. In 1909 the union changed its title to Actors International Union, and the following year it amalgamated with White Rats of America to form White Rats Actors Union of America. They have been around since 1900 but confined itself as a publishing list of approved, unreliable, dishonest managers and it steadily grew to *(AEA) which is Actors Equity Association organized in 1913.

I found a good database article that talks about the debate over linking workers' rights and trade and its accords. According to the article it says, "The Committee believes that international fair labor standards and procedures to enforce them should be established. . . . It

believes . . . that additional steps are needed which would lead to the elimination of unfair labor conditions which substantially disrupt or distort international trade. The international trading community should seek to develop principles with respect to earnings, hours and conditions of employment of workers, and to adopt public petition and bargaining procedures. Efforts should be made to provide private persons the opportunity to appear before international economic organizations to present grievances.” This is concerning the working conditions and its rights for democracy. I guess I wasn’t the only one that thought it needed to be a change. This article is entitled *Workers' Rights Provisions in Fast Track Authority, 1974-2007: An Historical Perspective and Current Analysis.*

For many people in the United States and around the world, the need and right to form collective bargain unions is definitely a necessity. It’s important for the workplace, safety, and health also for human rights and to not be discriminated against one another. The topic of human rights has been informed and delivered through anthropology, psychology, international law, literature, philosophy, political science, and even religion. It’s safe to say that human rights come from moral rights and all people possess equally from birth only because the human is embedded inside them. The whole purpose of human rights is to eliminate or minimize people feeling vulnerable at the people that have power to hurt them. Human rights are all about individuality it “prioritizes the rights of all” and “demands that we recognize the rights of others.” To protect people from violations, the rights of others, and to aid them if their rights are violated. This all came from the article entitled *“THE HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT AT U.S. WORKPLACES: CHALLENGES AND CHANGES.”*

In this article “*Flexibility, Gender and Part-Time Work: Evidence from a Survey of the Economically Active*,” talks about how there are many theoretical issues happening between male and females between working full-time and part-time. Whether females are substitutes for males in the workforce. Part-time work is being taken up by women voluntarily and involuntarily and whether the use of women labor is a cost-cutting strategy or a true flexibility. To help overcome these deficiencies this article describes the results of a household survey and of how the economy moves. Part-time workers are known to be of women. Women that work part-time have increased in decades. The lower pay women workers usually are a less investment in human capital can result to lower wages and may also deter women from investing and training.

Institutionalists argue by human capital said that “workers in what termed internal labor markets are able to combine unions and craft groups and use their industrial muscle to bargain with employers for advantageous wages and working conditions.” *Wage discrimination* means the discrimination shown in the payment of wages towards minority groups. The targets of *wage discrimination* are black men and women, and white women. They are faced with decreased wage earning for the same job with the same performance levels and responsibilities as white males.

Basically in the article it talks about how wage discrimination equally qualified people and are given different rewards for the same type of work. Dual labor market theories see the main problem as an attempt to provide a demand-side only explanation and how the workers were forced to make use of supply-side factors as fortuitous elements which help to reinforce tendency towards dualism.

Neo-Marxist labor was so influential Braverman (1974) breathed new life into two concepts of classical Marxism from the nineteenth century. First, the 'deskilling thesis' and how it argues that capitalists will strive to reduce labor costs by simplifying or deskilling work so that it can be taken by easily obtainable, cheap, low skilled workers wresting power away from less obtained, expensive, skilled workers. Second, is to 'reserve army of labor' thesis argues that the booms and slumps that are an endemic to capitalism will result in variations in the demand for labor and lead to a pool of workers who are periodically employed then laid-off. Braverman also argued that the increase in female employment in both services manufacturing is a manifestation of the deskilling process and that women constitute an important part of the reserve army of labor. Of course you know there are criticisms that come along with this that Braverman ignores the substantial competencies that are being undertaken by women.

Back in the day women couldn't work nor vote. Now since we can it's harder for us to get the man jobs or because we're viewed as just the nurturers and have to cook and clean. When in all reality it takes two to tango. The human rights concept that every human being inherit rights and, therefore, dignity is, even at the level of the individual in direct opposition to the market philosophy "that if one has nothing one is nothing." Basically if you stand for nothing you'll fall for anything.

Organized labor is maintaining its strong presence in New York, according to the latest data, but the U.S. Supreme Court could soon make life very difficult for public-sector unions. Overall 24.2% of the workers in the city are union members, a small uptick from last year. More important, the number is more than double the 10.7% average for all 50 states, according to the

recently released annual report from the Murphy Institute at the CUNY Graduate Center.

Something like three-quarters of these workers are government employees.

New York necessitates workers represented by unions to pay union dues even if they don't want to be in the union, under the theory that they receive the contract benefits that the union wins.

These workers can ask to be reimbursed for the fraction of the dues that goes directly to political activity. Conservative legal organizations have challenged this requirement, arguing that union activity is inherently political and governments should not be able to require workers to finance actions with which they do not agree.

The first such case to reach the Supreme Court resulted in a 4–4 deadlock last spring, which left a California law intact. But a second challenge, from Illinois, is on the court's docket for the current term, and the betting is that conservative Trump appointee Neil Gorsuch will provide the conclusive fifth vote to strike down the rule nationally.

The chart on the left, from the Murphy report, shows the percentage of non-members represented by four of the largest unions in the city. These workers presumably will stop paying anything to unions almost immediately.

That's only the beginning of the problem. When Wisconsin made paying dues voluntary, union membership dropped precipitously, to 23%, last year, from 50% in 2013.

Unions are already intensifying their efforts to persuade non-members to join. It isn't clear if they are having any success.

But the political fallout in local elections, where public-sector unions play a large role, could be very significant. As their ranks shrink, unions will have a much harder time finding the

money to spend on election politics. And it will become clear that they represent fewer voters than ever before.

In June, the U.S. Supreme Court found that states cannot require public employees who opt out of union membership to nonetheless help pay for collective bargaining undertaken on their behalf. The court had deadlocked over a similar case in 2016. The decision is expected to reduce the funds unions use to support their members and expand recruitment efforts. And it is likely to cut into their political power, since they'll have less to spend supporting (mostly Democratic) candidates.

The court's decision was another blow to a system that's been in decline for years. In 2017, just 10.7 percent of wage and salary workers in the U.S. belonged to a union; almost half the rate in 1983. So-called right-to-work laws, which ban any requirement for employees to pay union dues or fees, are already in place in more than half the states, including the traditional union strongholds of Michigan, Indiana and Wisconsin. In the public sector, where the membership rate has hovered at about 35 percent, unions were already feeling pressure to agree to pay, pension and health-care cuts. There have been a few bright spots: a string of recent successful unionization campaigns by journalists at the Los Angeles Times, Vox Media and MTV News, and a series of teacher strikes in states including West Virginia, Oklahoma, and Colorado that led to salary increases.

EVEN before the Supreme Court piled in, American unions were in a bad way. In their heyday in the mid-1950s, more than 30% of workers were members. Today just 11% are. With

only a toehold in the private sector—where they cover a mere 7% of workers—unions have become increasingly reliant on faithful public-sector employees, 34% of whom are members, to stay financially afloat and politically relevant. The Supreme Court’s ruling in the case of *Janus v AFSCME* at the end of June will shrink the rump of union members even further. What will the consequences of even lower union membership be?

Unions engage in both collective bargaining for their workers and political lobbying, typically for progressive causes and Democratic candidates. Among white Americans, blue-collar workers have had their heads turned by President Donald Trump even as union bosses remain steadfast Democrats, so that many members disagree with their union’s politics. Opting out of union membership—and its mandatory dues—would allow them to benefit from negotiated pay rises and holidays without incurring any of the cost. For decades, the compromise had been to make non-members who would otherwise free-ride on collective-bargaining agreements pay “agency fees”—the share of union dues that go to non-political operations and overheads. In its *Janus* decision, conservative jurists on the Supreme Court cited the First Amendment, to hold that such schemes violated the constitution on free-speech grounds.

All public-sector workers covered by a union will now have to opt in and consent before paying anything. It is not a question of whether unions will lose members as a result of this, but how many. Here’s an example of how a union works. Suppose you’re a factory worker who’s unhappy with your job. You’re on your feet for hours at a time in a building that’s too hot in summer and too cold in winter, and you’re barely earning a living wage. But when you complain to your boss about the working conditions, he simply says that if you don’t like it, you can quit.

If you can't afford to do that, you're pretty much out of options. Because you're only one person, you don't have much leverage to bargain with the boss. After all, he has plenty of other workers, so the threat of losing you isn't a big deal to him.

But suppose you get all the workers at the factory to go to the boss as a group and demand better wages and working conditions. You announce that if you don't get what you want, you'll go on strike — that is, you'll all stop working at once, grinding production to a halt. Now the tables are turned; it's the workers who have the upper hand in the negotiation.

This is a very simple example of collective bargaining, which is the main function of a union. In collective bargaining, union leaders, speaking on behalf of workers, sit down with the owners of a business to work out a contract for all of the workers in the business. They can negotiate over matters such as wages, working hours, vacation time, or even the nature of the job itself.

This kind of bargaining isn't the same as haggling over prices at a store or a car dealership. In labor negotiations, both parties are aiming for the same result: a deal that will keep the workers happy while allowing the business to survive and prosper. Usually, collective bargaining is an ongoing process, with union and management leaders sitting down together on a regular basis to fine-tune the deal and make sure it still works for everyone.

American workers formed unions as early as the late 1700s. For instance, printers in New York City unionized in 1778, and carpenters in Philadelphia fought together for a 10-hour workday in

1791. However, most of these early unions were short-lived, breaking up once they'd achieved their goals.

Labor unions pushed for bigger things after the Civil War, with mixed results. Their first successful involvement in politics came in 1868 when a coalition of skilled and unskilled workers and farmers called the National Labor Union succeeded in convincing Congress to establish an eight-hour workday for federal employees. In the 1890s, both the Pullman Railroad workers and the United Mine workers went on strike for higher pay and better working conditions, but the government broke up both strikes. In 1881, workers from several national and local unions banded together to form the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, which later became the American Federation of Labor (AFL).

The power of labor unions grew during the 20th century when Congress established the Department of Labor (DOL) and passed several worker-friendly laws. The Clayton Antitrust Act protected workers' right to go on strike, while the Fair Labor Standards Act established the federal minimum wage, rules for overtime pay, and restrictions on child labor. During the Great Depression, unions became a key part of the New Deal Coalition, which supported President Roosevelt's policies.

The union movement hit its peak after World War II. Unions in several different industries held successful strikes, and organized labor became a major force in the economy. By 1954, nearly 35% of all American workers were union members. In 1955, the AFL merged with the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) to form the AFL-CIO, the longest-lived and most

powerful trade union in U.S. history. However, at the height of their power, some unions — notably, the Teamsters Union, which represents truck drivers — were plagued by corruption and ties to organized crime.

Unions remained a strong force in the economy during the 1960s and 1970s, but their power was gradually declining. Cheap imports weakened U.S. manufacturing, and many factories either moved to Southern states where unions were weaker or moved overseas.

At the same time, businesses jumped into the political arena, spending vast sums to fight against laws that would strengthen unions. Unions lost much of their influence with the Democratic party, and Republicans turned against them entirely. In 1981, President Ronald Reagan, who had once been a union president himself, broke a strike by PATCO the air traffic controllers' union, undermining the power of the union movement as a whole.

Today, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), less than 11% of all American workers and less than 7% of private-sector workers are members of unions. Many of the largest U.S. companies are actively hostile to unions and go to extreme lengths to stop their workers from joining one. For instance, The Atlantic reported in 2015 that Walmart, the nation's biggest private employer, had fired and disciplined workers who attempted to organize and even closed down stores where workers had joined or formed unions.

The second half of the 20th century brought giant, bold changes to the economic status quo in countries all over the world. Globalization and the invention of new experiences meant that

companies in developed nations could produce goods for much fewer money in far-away factories or at home with the help of classy machinery.

These forces certainly explain part of the decline in union density and impact in the United States; fewer workers active in the union-dominated manufacturing sector meant fewer union workers. But this decline has not been simulated to the same degree in many European countries. In Iceland, for example, 92 percent of workers are still members of a union, according to the most recent edition of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Economic Outlook, an annual magazine reviewing financial situations and trends in developed countries. In the Scandinavian countries—Sweden, Denmark, and Finland—union thickness sores around 65 percent.

Even in those European countries where union membership is lower, a much higher percentage of workers are covered by collective bargaining agreements. While union membership is only around 10 percent in France (much lower than the OECD average), almost 100 percent of workers are covered by collective bargaining agreements. In most of Europe, collective bargaining agreements are sector or industry-wide, covering vast groups of workers who aren't union members.

The diverging experiences of European and American unions raises a puzzling question: Why has the decline of American unions been so much more dramatic and pressurized than that of

their European counterparts, given that both sets of countries have faced a similar set of economic challenges?

Conclusion

Human rights and labor unions are definitely important to the society that we live in. We need labor unions to help us fight for our rights and to get the wages and everything we need. Any problems anyone has they can go right to the union worker to help resolve everything that comes in their favor. I feel as though if no one knows their human rights they will fall for anything. Especially in this day and age. You have to be aware of what your rights and what your labor union entitles for you. Although international human rights law provides an important framework for promising the rights of all people in all countries, human rights standards generally do not become enforceable in the United States unless and until they are executed through local, state, and/or federal law. International treaties define rights very generally, and international courts and monitoring bodies typically lack the ability to directly enforce their decisions in the United States. Because the greatest capacity for protection lies in domestic law, one of the best ways to improve human rights in the United States is to strengthen domestic legal protections for human rights by passing laws recognizing those rights and ensuring the execution of those rights by the government and U.S. courts is consistent with international standards.

Annotated Bibliography

Béland, Daniel. "Does Labor Matter? Institutions, Labor Unions and Pension Reform in France and the United States." *Journal of Public Policy*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2001, pp. 153–172. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4007774.

This article challenges Paul Pierson's account on the (supposedly declining) role of labor unions in the 'new politics of the welfare state'. More specifically, the text compares labor's influence on the French and the American politics of pension reform since the 1980s. The analysis of recent reforms undertaken in both countries demonstrates the impact of institutions and managerial settings on labor's political strategies. These institutional variables explain the fact that French unions have a much more direct influence on public pension reform than their American counterparts. In France, labor unions have an ideological 'veto point' derived from their integration into the management process. Their strong influence on the 'new politics of the welfare state' is undeniable: labor still matters. I didn't want to just focus on the United States I wanted to include other countries in my paper that are going through similarities with labor unions and their initial workers rights.

GROSS, JAMES A. "THE HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT AT U.S. WORKPLACES: CHALLENGES AND CHANGES." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2012, pp. 3–16. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/41343662.

The concept of workers' rights as human rights has only recently begun to influence the formation and implementation of labor policy in the United States. In the workplace, the growing

human rights movement challenges long-held beliefs and practices in labor relations. The author explores this issue and its implications for U.S. labor policy and practice, focusing specifically on individual versus collective rights, exclusive representation, coverage of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), employer resistance to workers' freedom of association, the right to strike, the statutory purposes of the NLRA, and the underpinnings of the traditional U.S. industrial relations system. These challenges also affect U.S. legal isolationism, the role of labor unions, the status and implementation of economic as well as civil and political rights, and the U.S. labor and employment relations research agenda.

Jacobs, Paul. *The State of the Unions*. Greenwood Press, 1982.

According to this book it has essays and the opinions of how the labor unions have been ran since the 1960's what has been right and wrong from that time in period till now. Paul Jacobs is one of the fewest labor reporters who writes intellectually with superb knowledge. He was for numerous of years a union organizer and officially remained in close touch with the labor movement after leaving it to become a journalist. This book is a touch on how the Labor Unions evolved in the United States and the ins- and- outs.

Panagopoulos, Costas, and Peter L. Francia. "Trends: Labor Unions in the United States." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 72, no. 1, 2008, pp. 134–159. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/25167616.

In this study, the data on public opinion and attitudes toward labor unions from the iPOLL Databank at the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research (University of Connecticut), the American National Election Study, and the Current Population Survey. Despite recent

developments that suggest labor unions are in decline, I found that organized labor has maintained reasonably strong public support. Although the data indicate that Americans remain skeptical about how much confidence they can place in unions and their leaders, the results make clear that the public continues to recognize the need for unions to protect the rights of workers. These results hold potentially important implications for the future of organized labor in the United States.

Pier, Carol. "Workers' Rights Provisions in Fast Track Authority, 1974-2007: An Historical Perspective and Current Analysis." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2006, pp. 77–103. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/gls.2006.13.1.77.

This article examines the trajectory of workers' rights provisions in "fast track" authority legislation allowing the U.S. president to negotiate free trade agreements that Congress can only approve or reject, not amend. It explains with the Trade Act of 1974 and continue through the expiration of fast track authority in 1994. Against this backdrop, this article critique the workers' rights negotiating objectives and priorities in the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002 (TPA). It concludes by examining the practical implications of TPA's workers' rights negotiating objectives and priorities, as currently applied, by assessing the workers' rights provisions in the trade accords concluded under TPA. It debates over the linking workers' trade and rights as well as the means for achieving linkage in trade accords.

Pinch, Steven, and Angele Storey. "Flexibility, Gender and Part-Time Work: Evidence from a Survey of the Economically Active." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1992, pp. 198–214. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/622546.

This paper explores one of the most controversial issues in economic geography - the relationship between industrial restructuring, gender and part-time work. A review of the main labour market theories indicates that they provide only partial explanations for the growth of part-time work. This point is illustrated with a household survey of the economically active in the Southampton city-region. The results indicate that the formal paid work undertaken by women cannot be universally designated as peripheral, for in many respects there are greater differences between part-time work and full-time work than between men and women's full-time jobs. Despite the inferior pay and conditions experienced by women part-time workers, the survey indicated considerable satisfaction amongst part-time workers. These findings are related to the relatively buoyant economic conditions prevailing in the Southampton city-region at the time of the survey.

Reynolds, Jeremy. "When Too Much Is Not Enough: Actual and Preferred Work Hours in the United States and Abroad." *Sociological Forum*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2004, pp. 89–120. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/4148808.

This paper places the story of the overworked American in context by examining mismatches between preferred and actual work hours among Japanese, Swedish, West German, and U.S. workers. Although many full-timers in all four countries want to work fewer hours, mismatches come in many forms, and their distributions and determinants vary cross-nationally. The United States, for instance, has an unusually large number of full-time workers who want to work more hours, and a workforce that is especially motivated by opportunities for advancement and a desire for high incomes. Ultimately, the prevalence and determinants of hour mismatches are found to reflect cross-national differences in social, political, and economic environments.

Marchese, Marc C., and Jack Ryan. "Capitalizing on the Benefits of Utilizing Part-Time Employees through Job Autonomy." *Journal of Business and Psychology*, vol. 15, no. 4, 2001, pp. 549–560. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/25092741.

There are over 20 million part-time employees in the United States, however research on part-time employees is quite limited. Research has revealed inconsistencies when comparing part-time and full-time employees on various job outcomes (e.g., performance, commitment). As a test of Feldman's (1990) causal model of part-time work, this study provides evidence that autonomy mediates the relationship between job status (part-time vs. full-time) and such outcomes, which can help explain some of the inconsistencies in previous research. Managerial implications are discussed.

Shimada, Haruo. "The Employment of Foreign Labor in Japan." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 513, 1991, pp. 117–129. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1047085.

The problems of foreign labor in Japan have become increasingly serious economically, politically, and socially in recent years. In response to increasing labor shortages and high wages in Japan, ever larger numbers of foreign workers are entering Japan and illegally engaging in unskilled work under poor working conditions. The amended law of immigration control was put into effect on 1 June 1990, strictly prohibiting the entrance of foreigners for unauthorized work while opening doors more widely for highly skilled and knowledgeable workers. This article first

briefly reviews the recent penetration of the Japanese labor market by foreign workers and then discusses potential merits of international migration of workers as well as likely demerits or dangers associated with the spontaneous influx of foreign workers into Japan under the current institutional and social conditions. The article finally proposes a large-scale work and learn program jointly administered by the government and private sector as a policy remedy to maximize the merits, and to minimize the demerits, of accepting foreign workers.

Falk, Richard. "Human Rights." *Foreign Policy*, no. 141, 2004, pp. 18–28. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4147546.

The concept of human rights is the mother's milk of the international community. Problem is, these days human rights come in more flavors than coffee or soft drinks. Would you like the Asian, Islamic, indigenous, economic, European, or U.S. version? And how would you like your human rights served: with sanctions, regime change, corporate window dressing, or good old-fashioned moral suasion? Here's a look at the most effective-and most misguided-recipes for promoting human dignity around the world.

US Legal, Inc. "Wage Discrimination Law and Legal Definition." *Wage Discrimination Law and Legal Definition* | *USLegal, Inc.*, definitions.uslegal.com/w/wage-discrimination/.