## 1AC

### Framework

#### I affirm the resolution

#### Resolved: *A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.*

#### The value is morality since ought indicates a moral obligation

#### The value criterion is maximizing expected well-being which means causing the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of people.

#### There are two main reasons for this:

#### Everyone does not like painful or emotionally harmful experiences, so naturally we should try to replace these things with good experiences.

#### Things like death and oppression are intuitively bad, and affect everyone, so we should try to prevent them.

#### In summary, if I can prove to you that allowing the unconditional right of workers to strike would have a good impact on the world, then you should vote for the affirmative in today’s debate.

### C1: Income Inequality

#### Companies are facing massive job shortages because of drastically low wages. Labor Unions are essential to increase worker compensation and resist income inequality

**Lopezlira & Jacobs 9/23** [(Enrique, is the director of the Low-Wage Work program at the UC Berkeley Labor Center. He is a labor economist, directing and conducting research on how policies affect working families, with a particular focus on how these policies impact racial and gender equity. Doctorate in Economics from Howard University) (Ken, the chair of the University of California, Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, where he has been a labor specialist since 2002.) “Don’t Mistake the Disappointing Jobs Numbers for a Labor Shortage,” Barron’s, 9/3/21. <https://www.barrons.com/articles/dont-mistake-the-disappointing-jobs-numbers-for-a-labor-shortage-51630698151>] RR

Today’s jobs report shows a complicated picture for workers. The economy added only 235,000 jobs in August, despite near-record vacancies, while hourly wages grew faster than expected. But hold off a moment before calling it a labor shortage. Yes, some employers are experiencing difficulty filling jobs as the economy begins to recover from the effects of the pandemic. But this alone is just one part of the picture. A labor shortage means there aren’t enough workers, and that is simply not the current case. While there are plenty of workers available, there are far fewer available, willing, and able to work at the current wages being offered. **In other words, it isn’t that demand for workers is too high, it’s that wages are too low**. While it is true that wages have increased recently for some workers, it would be incorrect to believe that all workers now enjoy higher wages and greater bargaining power with employers. Unfortunately, the truth is **millions of workers continue to earn low wages that make it nearly impossible for them to make ends meet.** The pandemic has made the economic situation for low-wage workers more dire, but typical workers’ pay has been growing very slowly over the last 40 years. Economic theory states wages are tied to productivity, but this is only in theory. The reality is that since 1979 **the gap between pay and worker productivity has widened significantly**, with productivity growing 62% over this period, while wages only grew by 18%. But if workers are more productive than ever before, why have they received few of the benefits of this increased productivity? The answer is that a greater share of the gains are going to those at the top—through higher salaries at the high end of the income distribution, as well as ever-larger corporate profits. And this has been made even worse by the pandemic, during which the net worth of billionaires in the U.S. increased by $1 trillion at the same time that 20 million workers lost their jobs. Summer 2021 has seen some welcomed wage growth at the middle and bottom of the wage distribution. In terms of industries, the highest wage growth has been in leisure and hospitality (in restaurants and bars, for instance), which traditionally pays some of the lowest wages, and which saw the largest wage drops when Covid-19 hit. Even with these wage increases, real wages for these service-sector workers have rebounded only to prepandemic trends. For workers in these sectors to experience real improvements in earnings**, wages need to grow even further**. However, there is no guarantee that the recent wage growth will last, let alone that further increases will materialize. One way to help ensure a strong wage floor is by increasing the federal minimum wage, which has been stuck at $7.25 an hour since 2009. Twenty-nine states and the District of Columbia have higher minimum wages than the federal level, but that means there are 21 other states that do not. Increasing the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour, and indexing it to inflation, would help make sure all workers, regardless of where they live, receive decent pay—and that the value of their wages does not again erode over time. While the minimum wage raises the floor, more is needed to improve wages and working conditions for the rest of America’s workers. Central to achieving a broad-based improvement in pay is enabling workers who wish to do so to form unions and engage in collective bargaining. Unions have been shown to improve not just wages and benefits, but also to reduce socioeconomic disparities. Unions raise wages and increase access to benefits for all workers, with the largest gains for those who earn the least in nonunion workplaces: women and workers of color. Unions don’t only benefit their members. When more workers in an industry are unionized, pay rises across the industry. Unions also play an important role in promoting worker health and safety. As the Covid-19 crisis began, unionized workers were more likely to have access to personal protective equipment and paid sick days. Throughout the crisis, unions fought for strong worker protections on the job to reduce the spread of Covid-19 and to get the economy going again. **While support for unions is high, America’s labor laws make it extremely difficult for workers to organize and win collective bargaining**. In just one egregious example, currently if an employer violates the National Labor Relations Act, there are no financial penalties. The Protecting the Right to Organize Act (PRO Act), which has now passed the House of Representatives and is waiting to be heard in the Senate, would change that. The PRO Act would create stronger remedies, expand bargaining rights, and put the decision over whether or not to join a union in the hands of the workers, where it belongs. Many workers at the bottom have received raises over the last year. A growing body of evidence finds that policies which improve wages and family incomes help reduce racial disparities while having long-term, positive effects on a wide range of societal outcomes–from child and adult health to civic participation. These structural and legal factors provide an important roadmap for us to ensure a robust and sustainable recovery that works for all Americans. Whether wage increases for the majority of workers continue depends on the decisions we make as a society.

#### Strikes increase the influence and power of labor unions. -every strike encourages more strikes.

**Hertel-Fernandez et al. 20** [Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, associate professor of public affairs at Columbia University, where he studies American political economy, with a focus on the politics of business, labor, wealthy donors, and policy, Suresh Naidu, professor of economics and public affairs at Columbia University, where he researches economic effects of political transitions, the economic history of slavery and labor institutions, international migration, and economic applications of naturallanguage processing, and Adam Reich, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University, where he studies economic and cultural sociology, especially how people make sense of their economic activities and economic positions within organizations, 2020, “Schooled by Strikes? The Effects of Large-Scale Labor Unrest on Mass Attitudes toward the Labor Movement,” American Political Science Association, https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001279]/Kankee

Strikes and Labor Power in an Era of Union Decline We examined the political consequences of large-scale teacher strikes, studying how firsthand exposure changed mass **attitudes** and public preferences. Across a range of specifications and approaches, we find that increased exposure to the strikes led to **greater support** for the walkouts, more support for legal rights for teachers and unions, and, especially, greater personal interest in labor action at people’s own jobs, though not necessarily through traditional unions. Returning to the theoretical expectations we outlined earlier, the teacher strikes appear to have changed the ways that parents think about the labor movement, generating greater public support. The results regarding workers’ interest in undertaking labor action in their own jobs also suggests **evidence** in favor of the public inspiration and imitation hypothesis, underscoring the role that social movements and mobilizations can play in **teach**ing noninvolved members about the movement and tactics. Still, an important caveat to these findings is that strike-exposed parents were not more likely to say that they would vote for a traditional union at their jobs, possibly reflecting the fact that the strikes emphasized individual teachers and not necessarily teacher unions as organizations either in schools or in parents’ own workplaces. Further research might explore this difference, together with the fact that we find somewhat stronger evidence in favor of the imitation hypothesis (i.e., support for labor action at one’s own work) than for the public support hypothesis (i.e., support for the striking teachers). Before we discuss the broader implications of our findings for the understanding of the labor movement, we briefly review and address several caveats to the interpretation of our results. One concern is whether the results we identify from a single survey can speak to enduring changes in public opinion about the strikes and unions. Given the timing of the teacher strikes in the first half of 2018, our respondents were reflecting on events that happened 7–12 months in the past. We therefore think that our results represent more durable changes in opinion as a result of the strikes, in line with other studies of historical mobilizations and long-term changes in attitudes (Mazumder 2018). The AFL-CIO time-series polling data, moreover, further suggest that there were increases in aggregate public support for unions in the strike states after the strikes occurred. Nevertheless, follow-up studies should examine how opinion toward, and interest in, unions evolve in the mass teacher strike states, and it would be especially interesting to understand whether unions have begun capitalizing on the interest in the labor movement that the strikes generated. We also note that, despite the large sample size of our original survey, we still lack sufficient statistical power to fully explore the effects of the strikes on all of our survey outcomes. Future studies ought to consider alternative designs with the power to probe the individual outcomes that were not considered in this study. Another question is how to generalize from our results to other strikes and labor actions. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to develop and test a more general theory of strike action, there are factors that suggest that the teacher strikes we study here represent a hard test for building public support. The affected states had relatively weak public sector labor movements, meaning that few individuals had personal connections to unions; most were also generally conservative and Republican leaning, further potentially reducing the receptivity of the public to the teachers’ demands. And lastly, the type of work we study —teaching—involves close interaction with a very sympathetic constituency: children and their parents. This should make strike disruptions more controversial and increase the likelihood of political backlash (and indeed, we do find that the strikes were less persuasive for parents who may have lacked access to childcare). Nevertheless, additional factors may have strengthened the effects of the strikes; namely, that education spending in the strike and walkout states had dropped so precipitously since the Great Recession, giving teachers the opportunity to connect their demands to broader public goods. Considering these factors together, we feel comfortable arguing that strikes are likely to be successful in other contexts where involved employees can successfully leverage close connections to the clients and customers they serve and connect their grievances to the interests of the broader community. This is likely to be especially true in cases where individuals feel they are not receiving the level of quality service they deserve from businesses or governments. The flip side of our argument is that strikes are less likely to be successful—and may produce backlash—when the mass public views striking workers’ demands as illegitimate or opposed to their own interests or when individuals are especially inconvenienced by labor action and do not have readily available alternatives (such as lacking childcare during school strikes). This suggests that teachers’ unions’ provision of meals and childcare to parents (as happened in a number of the recent strikes) is a particularly important tactic to avoid public backlash. In addition, our results suggest that future strikes on their own are unlikely to change public opinion if all they do is to provide information about workers’ grievances or disrupt work routines. Our exploratory analysis of the mechanisms driving our results suggests that it was not necessarily information about poor school quality or the strikes themselves that changed parents’ minds, but perhaps the fact that the teachers were discussing the public goods they were seeking for the broader community. We anticipate that strikes or walkouts that adopt a similar strategy—similar to the notion of “bargaining for the common good”—would be most likely to register effects like ours in the future (McCartin 2016). Notably, that is exactly the strategy deployed by teachers in Los Angeles, who spent several years building ties to community members and explaining the broader benefits that a stronger union could offer to their community in the run-up to a strike in early 2019 (Caputo-Pearl and McAlevey 2019). In all, our results complement a long line of work arguing for the primacy of the strike as a tactic for labor influence (e.g. Burns 2011; Rosenfeld 2006; Rubin 1986). Although this literature generally has focused on the economic consequences of strikes, we have shown that strikes can also have significant effects on public opinion. Even though private sector strikes have long sought to amass public support, public-facing strikes are even more important for public sector labor unions, given their structure of production and the fact that their“managers”are ultimately elected officials. But how should we view strikes relative to the other strategies that public sector unions might deploy in politics, such as campaign contributions, inside lobbying, or mobilization of their members (cf. DiSalvo 2015; Moe 2011)? Given the large cost of mass strikes in terms of time and grassroots organizing, we expect that public sector unions will be most likely to turn to public-facing strikes (like the 2018 teacher walkouts) when these other lower-cost inside strategies are unsuccessful and when their demands are popular in the mass public. Under these circumstances, government unions have every reason to broaden the scope of conflict to include the mass public (cf. Schattschneider 1960). But when unions can deploy less costly activities (like simply having a lobbyist meet with lawmakers) or when they are pursuing demands that are more controversial with the public, we suspect that unions will opt for less public-facing strategies (on the logic of inside versus outside lobbying more generally, see, for example, Kollman 1998). Indeed, our results complement work by Terry Moe and Sarah Anzia describing how teacher unions work through low-salience and low-visibility strategies, such as capturing school boards, pension boards, or education bureaucracies, when they are pushing policies that tend not to be supported by the public (Anzia 2013; Anzia and Moe 2015; Moe 2011). Our results yield a final implication for thinking about the historical development of the labor smovement: they suggest that the decline of strikes we tracked in Figure 1 may form a vicious cycle for the long-term political power of labor. As we have documented, strikes seem to be an important way that people form opinions about unions and develop interest in labor action. As both strikes and union membership have declined precipitously over the past decades, few members of the public have had opportunities to gain firsthand knowledge and interest in unions. Moreover, strikes appear to foster greater interest in further strikes, feeding on one another. If unions are to regain any economic or political clout in the coming years, our study suggests that the strike **must** be a **central strategy** of the labor movement.

#### Unions allow effective collective bargaining which is key to reducing income inequality.

**Bivens et al, 17** (Josh, director of research at the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), “How today’s unions help working people,” 8/24/17, Economic Policy Institute, https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/)

As union coverage has declined and the voice of workers has correspondingly diminished, many of the key workplace standards past generations counted on have been eroded. For instance, there has been an erosion of overtime pay protection, slashing of workers’ compensation programs, and a decline in the real value of the minimum wage, which is lower now than it was in 1968. Unions reduce inequality and are essential for low- and middle-wage workers’ ability to obtain a fair share of economic growth The spread of collective bargaining that followed the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 led to decades of faster and fairer economic growth that persisted until the late 1970s. But since the 1970s, declining unionization has fueled rising inequality and stalled economic progress for the broad American middle class. Figures A and B show that when unions are weak, the highest incomes go up even more, but when unions are strong, middle incomes go up. Research by EPI and other institutions shows this correlation is no accident. First, unions have strong positive effects not only on the wages of union workers but also on the wages of comparable nonunion workers, as unions set standards for entire industries and occupations (these union and nonunion wage boosts are explored in detail in the next section of this report). Second, unions make wages among occupations more equal because they give a larger wage boost to low- and middle-wage occupations than to high-wage occupations. Third, unions make wages of workers with similar characteristics more equal because of the standards unions set. Fourth, unions have historically been more likely to organize middle-wage than high-wage workers, which lowers inequality by closing gaps between, say, blue-collar and white-collar workers. Finally, the union wage boost is largest for low-wage workers and larger at the middle than at the highest wage levels, larger for black and Hispanic workers than for white workers, and larger for those with lower levels of education—wage increases for these groups help narrow wage inequalities.[16](https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/#_note16) We know how big a force for equality unions are by looking at how much their decline has contributed to inequality between middle- and high-wage workers: union decline can explain one-third of the rise in wage inequality among men and one-fifth of the rise in wage inequality among women from 1973 to 2007. Among men, **the erosion of collective bargaining has been the largest single factor driving a wedge between middle- and high-wage workers**.[17](https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/#_note17)

#### Higher wages boost economic growth- research consensus- multiple reasons

**Wolfers 15** (Justin is professor of economics and professor of public policy at University of Michigan. “Higher Wages for Low-Income Workers Lead to Higher Productivity.” January 13, 2015. Peterson Institute for International Economics. https://piie.com/blogs/realtime-economic-issues-watch/higher-wages-low-income-workers-lead-higher-productivity)

Economists have long argued that increases in worker pay can lead to improvements in productivity—indeed, that it can actually **be profitable to pay workers higher wages.** As Alfred Marshall, the father of modern economics, argued almost 125 years ago, "any change in the distribution of wealth which gives more to the wage receivers and less to the capitalists is likely, other things being equal, to hasten the increase of material production." Since then, **economists have compiled rich data validating Marshall's hypothesis that paying higher wages generates savings: Higher wages motivate employees to work harder**. Janet Yellen (1984) [pdf] suggested that higher wages create the conditions for workers to be more productive, pointing to "reduced shirking by employees due to a higher cost of job loss; lower turnover; an improvement in the average quality of job applicants and improved morale." Among the studies documenting this point are Levine (1992), [pdf] which analyzed a sample of large (mostly Fortune 500) manufacturing companies, and Holzer (1990), [pdf] which used data from a national sample of firms finding that "high-wage firms can sometimes offset more than half of their higher wage costs through improved productivity and lower hiring and turnover cost." Reich et al. (2003) [pdf] surveyed employers at the San Francisco airport after a broad-based increase in wages and found that the employers of the majority of affected workers reported that their overall performance had improved. Mas (2006) [pdf] analyzed the case of New Jersey police officers who were granted a wage increase of 17 percent, and who were 12 percent more productive in clearing cases than those who were refused the increase. **Higher wages attract more capable and productive workers**. The evidence that higher wages attract more high quality applicants for new jobs is voluminous. Dal Bó et al. (2013) show that offering higher salaries yielded an applicant pool with a higher IQ and with personality scores and motivation that made them a better fit for the advertised jobs. Moreover, the first firm to offer higher wages is more likely to attract and retain more productive workers. **Higher wages lead to lower turnover, reducing the costs of hiring and training new workers**. Reich et al (2003) [pdf] calculated that typical turnover costs exceed $4,000 for each worker and that an increase in wages at the San Francisco airport led to a decline in turnover of 34 percent, yielding turnover-related savings of $6.6 million per year. Dube et al. (2007) [pdf] found that when a San Francisco living wage ordinance raised wages among low-paid workers, those workers were more likely to stay with their employers. Reich and his coauthors also documented a stunning turnover rate of nearly 95 percent per year among security screeners in mid-2000, which fell to 18.7 percent when pay improved. Fairris et al. (2005) [pdf] examined evidence from Los Angeles, finding that when employers were directed to offer higher wages, the decline in worker turnover yielded savings equal to around one-sixth of the cost incurred. **Higher wages enhance quality and customer service.** The Reich et al. (2003) [pdf] study also found that almost half of employers reported improvements in customer service following a wage rise for low-wage workers, and indeed, higher wages at the San Francisco airport led to shorter airport lines. Cowherd and Levine (1992) found that an increase in the pay of lower-level employees relative to management increased the quality of production. Using data from more than 500 retail stores, Fisher et al. (2006) [pdf] found a positive relationship between customer satisfaction and the payroll level of associates and managers in the store. Higher wages were also associated with employers having more knowledge about the inventory. **Higher wages reduce disciplinary problems and absenteeism**. Cappelli and Chauvin (1991) [pdf] documented that in plants where pay was higher relative to the local labor market, fewer disciplinary actions were required. Likewise, nearly half of those employers surveyed by Reich et al. (2003) [pdf] reported a decrease in disciplinary issues following a wage rise. Zhang et al. [pdf] (2013) showed in a survey of Canadian firms that absenteeism was less likely when wages were higher. Pfeifer (2010) found a similar result in a large German survey. Firms with higher wages need to devote fewer resources to monitoring. **High-paying firms have been found to create a culture of hard work** in which employees monitor their coworkers, reducing the need to hire supervisors. Rebitzer (1995) found that low-wage maintenance workers needed more supervision in the petrochemical industry. Groshen and Krueger (1990) showed that more highly paid nurses were also supervised less. Georgiadis (2008) found that in residential care homes in the United Kingdom "higher wage costs were more than offset by lower monitoring costs." Workers excessively concerned about income security perform less well at work. A variety of recent experiments have demonstrated this proposition. Mani et al. (2013) recruited buyers in a shopping mall and asked them to think about their finances. Researchers observed that the performance of poor subjects on a cognitive test deteriorated if they were asked to imagine a large emergency expenditure (a $1,500 car repair), but no such deterioration was observed for well-off subjects. Mullainathan and Shafir (2013) assessed a range of related experiments, finding that mental tasks that simulate the constant stress of poverty led people to act in compulsive and improper ways. Indeed, the World Bank Development Report (2015), [pdf] citing numerous field studies, recognizes that poverty taxes people's mental capacities and self-control. Other mechanisms by which higher wages can yield offsetting benefits include: **Higher wages are associated with better health—less illness and more stamina, which enhance worker productivity.** Greater job satisfaction can result in less conflict between employers and labor groups. Enhanced reputation with consumers (compare the reputations of Costco and Walmart). All of these positive effects may interact to yield even larger aggregate effects, **as the productivity of one worker often raises the productivity of their coworkers**. Mas and Moretti (2009) [pdf] offer persuasive data on this point, showing that productive cashiers motivate their coworkers to work faster.

#### Income inequality leads to violence and magnifies every other impact – outweighs on probability because it’s continually happening in the squo

**Pileberg 17** Silje Pileberg, 7-7-2017, “Inequality may lead to violence and extremism,” UiO Department of Psychology, <https://www.sv.uio.no/psi/english/research/news-and-events/news/inequality-may-lead-to-violence-and-extremism.html>, SJBE

**The gap between rich and poor keeps growing. According to a** [**2015 OECD report**](http://www.oecd.org/social/in-it-together-why-less-inequality-benefits-all-9789264235120-en.htm)**, the richest 10 percent of the OECD population earn 9.6 times more than the poorest 10 percent.** In the 1980’s the same figure was 7. **According to recent findings, increased inequality leads to more violent and extreme attitudes. ”We see a vicious circle: The larger the inequality in a society, the more the privileged group supports the hierarchy. People in this group will also be more willing to use violence in order to keep their position,” said associate professor of psychology Lotte Thomsen at the University of Oslo / Aarhus University.** Researchers from Norway, Denmark, New Zealand (Victoria Wellington University), and the U.S. (Harvard University) recently published the article “[Preferences for group dominance track and mediate the effects of macro-level social inequality and violence across societies](http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2017/05/02/1616572114?utm_source=TrendMD&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=Proc_Natl_Acad_Sci_U_S_A_TrendMD_0)” in the journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS). The more privileged, the less willing to share The researchers base their findings on a large amount of data. **Research demonstrating peoples’ attitudes towards social hierarchies has been combined with international indexes from organizations such as the World Bank and the UN. The findings indicate a clear trend: Across 27 countries and almost 42.000 people, there is a close link between inequality and the privileged group’s support of the hierarchy. ”This applies whether you belong to the white majority in the U.S. or the highest caste in India,” Thomsen said. The privileged group’s support of the hierarchy has been measured though their ”social dominance orientation” (SDO). The SDO turns out to be higher in countries with a larger risk of violent conflicts, corruption and absence of good governance, such as corruption and lack of the rule of law. It also increases with lack of access to health care and education, lack of democracy, lack of a free press, and lack of gender equality.** White U. S. citizens are willing to use violence The researchers also investigated how being at the top of the hierarchy, and supporting it, may affect peoples’ attitudes and behavior towards groups with a lower status. **More than 4.600 white U. S. Citizens from 30 states were asked. In states where the inequalities and societal problems are relatively high, such as Florida, Indiana, and Alabama, white people turned out more likely to support the hierarchy. Consequently, they were also willing to suppress others in order to defend their position on the top of the hierarchy.** “To a larger degree than others, white research participants in such states agreed in sayings like “Some groups of people are just more worthy than others” or “To get what your group wants, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups””, explained post doc of psychology Jonas Kunst at the University of Oslo. **He believes that societal problems and inequalities in a society may increase these kinds of attitudes: “In a society with large inequalities, supporting the hierarchy may be a way to secure one’s own privileged position.”**

### C2: Education

#### Current labor laws make it very difficult for teachers to go on strike. An unconditional right is key

**Casey 20** Leo Casey, 12-2-2020, "The Teacher Strike: Conditions for Success," Dissent Magazine, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/the-teacher-strike-conditions-for-success>

The most essential organizational task is winning and keeping the allegiance of teachers to the strike. Teachers are knowledgeable and discerning political actors. They understand full well that strikes are a high-intensity and high-risk tactic, with the potential both to deliver advances and victories that could not be otherwise obtained and to end in major setbacks and defeats. The risk side of this equation is particularly acute in the three-quarters of all states where teacher strikes are illegal; in these states, striking becomes an act of civil disobedience and can result in severe penalties to teachers and their unions. To be willing to go on strike and stay out until a settlement is won, therefore, teachers need to be convinced on a number of different counts: first, that they are fighting for important, worthwhile objectives; second, that those objectives cannot be achieved through other means that are not as high-intensity and high-risk as a strike; third, that the strike has reasonable prospects of success; fourth, that the strike objectives have strong support in the community; and fifth, that the solidarity among teachers, which is essential to a strike’s success, is strong and will hold. In significant measure, the last of these points is dependent not simply on the organization and mobilization of the strike, but also on the four antecedent conditions. If teachers become doubtful on any of these points, it will become difficult to mount or sustain a successful strike.

#### Absent the ability to strike and have their voices heard, teachers will quit leading to large teacher shortages

**Carpenter 17** Jennifer Carpenter., 05-17-17, "Opinion: Protect local control for schools," Burlington Free Press, https://www.burlingtonfreepress.com/story/opinion/my-turn/2017/05/17/opinion-protect-local-control-schools/101726614/

The most crucial part of the proposal put forward by House Speaker Mitzi Johnson and President Pro Tem Tim Ashe is that it protects local control of schools. Statewide health insurance negotiations for teachers is the first step towards a statewide teachers’ contract, kneecapping school boards and paving the way towards a single, statewide school district. That is unacceptable, but it is the hill Gov. Scott and his Republican allies have decided to make their stand on. It is telling that Sen. Degree, one of Gov. Scott’s strongest supporters, included in his proposed amendment a clause that would have removed teachers’ right to strike. That shows their true intentions. When teachers’ needs are not met, students’ needs will not be met, and we will be unable to retain and attract a workforce of young families which is critical to the revitalization of our state’s economy. There will be no incentive for the teaching profession to attract and retain new teachers to the field if our state government teaches our community that teachers have no say over their working conditions and therefore are not valued. Schools need teachers and we need enrollment of students. Teachers and families of school age children will simply uproot and go elsewhere to have their needs met, jeopardizing our educational system, our school-age population and workforce. A “one-size-fits-all” approach from our state government cannot possibly work across the board for every school. Having worked in four different school districts in the state, I have been exposed to potential consequences of centralized control. I recall an emergency meeting at one of those districts in 2016 between administration and teachers where there were very tense discussions on what the initial proposal of Act 46 per-pupil spending cap would have meant for the school. Had the administration and teachers not pulled together to discuss and demand more for their programs and allowed a reckless centralized decision to go forth, to paraphrase one of the teachers present at this meeting, the initial Act 46 proposal would have destroyed the institution, as it would have meant dismantling most aspects of the curriculum that would render the students to be competitive for college and in the workforce, as the cuts were too severe of an impact on the school programs to justify sending anyone there. As a result, several teachers said they would have been prepared to pull their own children from the school and move out of the area. This is only one example of how allowing the state to have centralized control, which has proved to be an approach lacking in carefully frontloaded research and detailed examination of impact on programs and teachers, would have devastating consequences on local communities.

#### Teacher Shortages ruin quality education. Only a right to strike can satisfy teachers securing children’s schooling.

**Boyce 19** Paul Boyce, 9-17-2019, "The Teacher Shortage Is Real and about to Get Much Worse. Here's Why," No Publication, https://fee.org/articles/the-teacher-shortage-is-real-and-about-to-get-much-worse-heres-why/

Teacher Shortage According to research by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), the teacher shortage could reach 200,000 by 2025, up from 110,000 in 2018. This shortage of workers is due to a number of factors. Among them are pay, working conditions, lack of support, lack of autonomy, and the changing curriculum. The shortage of teachers will inevitably cause a decline in educational standards. The shortage is crucially important to educational outcomes. Class sizes are rising, causing a detrimental effect on these outcomes. As the number of available teachers declines, class sizes have to increase to compensate. Having more kids in a class can also affect teacher performance—more books to mark, more children to monitor, more children's behavior that needs managing. The pressure on teachers to obtain high test scores amps up stress further. It creates a vicious cycle, and it is starting to snowball. The shortage is only set to increase unless something changes. Impact on Quality The shortage of teachers will inevitably cause a decline in educational standards. Principals face a shortage of highly qualified teachers. The natural response for them is to hire less qualified teachers, hire teachers trained in another field or grade, or make use of unqualified substitute teachers. This means students are being taught by teachers who lack sufficient skills and knowledge. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future: Studies discover again and again that teacher expertise is one of the most important factors in determining student achievement, followed by the smaller but generally positive influences of small schools and small class sizes. That is, teachers who know a lot about teaching and learning who work in environments that allow them to know students well are the critical elements of successful learning. Teachers matter more to student achievement than any other factor. In fact, research by Chlotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor states that teacher qualifications predict more of the difference in educational gains than race and parent education combined.

#### Improving the quality of our education system is key for innovation.

**OECD 16** - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, The OECD provides a forum in which governments can work together to share experiences and seek solutions to common problems, 2016("Innovating Education and Educating for Innovation THE POWER OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES AND SKILLS", Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Available Online from http://www.oecd.org/edu/ceri/GEIS2016-Background-document.pdf, Accessed on 6-27-2017)//BM

The problem education is facing is mainly one of productivity and efficiency. Here, efficiency means the balance between resources invested and the outcomes in terms of students’ performance and equity. Over the past decades ever more resources have been invested in education. Looking just at school education, the average expenditure per student across OECD countries increased by no less than 17% between 2005 and 2013 in constant prices (OECD, 2016). But over roughly the same period, the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) data from the 2003 and 2012 surveys show no significant improvement in test scores. Instead, in most countries the percentage of top performers has declined. And, while the PISA data show some progress in equity, huge gaps remain in equality of opportunity and education outcomes between various social groups (OECD, 2013). The problem of productivity and efficiency in education is even more striking when education is compared with other public policy sectors, which have realised enormous productivity gains in past decades. In sectors such as health, technology has been a major driver of increased productivity and efficiency with much improved outcomes even if the cost has also gone up. Many observers wonder why enormous advances in technology has not yet led to similar improvements in education. Governments have invested a lot in bringing technology, mainly information and communications technology (ICT), to schools. But, as the analysis of PISA data discussed in Chapter 3 will show, it has not yet been possible to 13 1. The innovation imperative in education Innovating Education and Educating for Innovation: The power of digital technologies and skills © OECD 2016 associate increased availability and use of computers in schools with improvements in learning outcomes. This book argues that innovation in education – as in all sectors of the economy and society – is imperative to bring about qualitative changes, in contrast to the mere quantitative expansion that we have seen so far. This will lead to more efficiency and improved outcomes in quality and equity of learning opportunities. Innovation in education as part of innovation in economies and societies In the last few decades, innovation in general has been increasingly regarded as a crucial factor in maintaining competitiveness in a globalised economy. Innovation can breathe new life into slowing stagnant markets, and act as a mechanism to enhance any organisation’s ability to adapt to changing environments (Damanpour and Gopalakrishnan, 1998; Hargadon and Sutton, 2000). Both policies and theories on innovation have mainly focused on the business sector (Lekhi, 2007). Businesses need to innovate in order to keep up with their competition by introducing new products or services, improving the efficiency of their production processes and organisational arrangements, or enhancing the marketing of their activities in order to guarantee their survival. Much more recently, policy interest has extended this “innovation imperative” from private organisations to the provision of public services. Although public services, including education, tend neither to operate within competitive markets nor have the same incentives to innovate as businesses do (Lekhi, 2007), there are important arguments to push for innovation in education to maximise the value of public investment (Box 1.1). Several recent national innovation strategies include provisions for more innovation in the public sector (such as Australia, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom). Demographic pressures, burgeoning demand for government services, higher public expectations and ever-tighter fiscal constraints mean that the public sector needs innovative solutions to enhance productivity, contain costs and boost public satisfaction. Innovation in the public sector in general, and in education in particular, could be a major driver for significant welfare gains. Governments provide a large number of services in OECD countries and these services account for a considerable share of national income. Government expenditure in OECD countries represents about 48% of gross domestic product (GDP) on average, and in some cases corresponds to more than half of national GDP. Education is a major component of government services: in 2012, public expenditure on educational institutions accounted for 5.3% of national income on average for OECD countries (OECD, 2015b). Innovations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of such a large area of government spending could yield important benefits. Why innovation in education matters How could innovation add value in the case of education? First of all, educational innovations can improve learning outcomes and the quality of education provision. For example, changes in the educational system or in teaching methods can help customise the educational process. New trends in personalised learning rely heavily on new ways of organising schools and the use of ICT. Second, education is perceived in most countries as a means of enhancing equity and equality. Innovations could help enhance equity in the access to and use of education, as well as equality in learning outcomes. 1. The innovation imperative in education 14 Innovating Education and Educating for Innovation: The power of digital technologies and skills © OECD 2016 Third, public organisations are often under as much pressure as businesses to improve efficiency, minimise costs and maximise the “bang for the buck”. Mulgan and Albury (2003) argue that there has been a tendency for costs in all public services to rise faster than those in the rest of the economy, and education is no exception. While this could be attributed to Baumol’s “cost disease” (see Chapter 6), inherent to any public-service provision which faces ever-rising labour costs and limited scope for transformative productivity gains, this may also be due to a lack of innovation, (Foray and Raffo, 2012). Innovation, then, could stimulate more efficient provision of these services. Finally, education should remain relevant in the face of rapid changes to society and the national economy (Barrett, 1998: 288). The education sector should therefore introduce the changes it needs to adapt to societal needs. For example, education systems need to adopt teaching, learning or organisational practices that have been identified as helping 1. The innovation imperative in education Innovating Education and Educating for Innovation : The power of digital technologies and skills © OECD 2016 to foster “skills for innovation” (Dumont et al., 2010; Schleicher, 2012; Winner et al., 2013). The results from PISA, as well as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) and the OECD Survey on Adult Skills point to the need for innovation to improve results in literacy, numeracy or scientific literacy in many countries.