## T

#### Interpretation: workers is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of a specific type of workers to strike.

Nebel 19 Jake Nebel [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs.] , 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/ SM

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. 1.1 “Colleges and Universities” “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the upward-entailment test for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution. Fourth, it is extremely unlikely that the topic committee would have written the resolution with the existential interpretation of “colleges and universities” in mind. If they intended the existential interpretation, they would have added explicit existential quantifiers like “some.” No such addition would be necessary or expected for the generic interpretation since generics lack explicit quantifiers by default. The topic committee’s likely intentions are not decisive, but they strongly suggest that the generic interpretation is correct, since it’s prima facie unlikely that a committee charged with writing a sentence to be debated would be so badly mistaken about what their sentence means (which they would be if they intended the existential interpretation). The committee, moreover, does not write resolutions for the 0.1 percent of debaters who debate on the national circuit; they write resolutions, at least in large part, to be debated by the vast majority of students on the vast majority of circuits, who would take the resolution to be (pretty obviously, I’d imagine) generic with respect to “colleges and universities,” given its face-value meaning and standard expectations about what LD resolutions tend to mean.

#### It applies to workers:

#### Upward entailment test – spec fails the upward entailment test because saying that a just government ought to recognize the right of one type of workers to strike does not entail that all nations ought to recognize the right of all workers to strike

#### Adverb test – adding “usually” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning

#### Vote neg:

#### Semantics outweigh: it’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement – there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it

#### Limits – there are countless affs accounting for thousands of different professions and any combination thereof– unlimited topics incentivize obscure affs that negs won’t have prep on – limits are key to reciprocal prep burden – potential abuse doesn’t justify foregoing the topic and 1AR theory checks PICs

#### TVA solves – read as an advantage to whole rez

#### Drop the debater to preserve fairness and education – use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

## NLRA CP

#### CP: A just government ought to extend the right to strike specified by the NLRA to teachers.

#### The NLRA provides the right to strike if certain conditions are met.

#### NLRB ND

"Right to strike and picket," No Publication, https://www.nlrb.gov/about-nlrb/rights-we-protect/the-law/employees/right-to-strike-and-picket

You cannot be fired for participating in a protected strike or picketing, depending on the purposes and means of the strike action. ¶Under federal law, you cannot be fired for participating in a protected strike or picketing against your employer. There are limitations and qualifications on the exercise of that right. Most strikes are protected, but certain kinds of strikes are not protected, depending on the object or purpose of the strike, on its timing, or on the conduct of the strikers. You can be lawfully fired for participating in an unprotected strike. ¶When a protected strike ends, you are entitled to return to work. If the reason for the strike was, in whole or in part, to protest one or more unfair labor practices, strikers must be immediately reinstated. If the strike was over economic issues, you are likewise entitled to immediate reinstatement except that if your employer hired permanent replacements, returning strikers are placed on a preferential hiring list. Your right to reinstatement may be lost if you have engaged in violence or other serious misconduct in connection with your strike or picketing activities.

#### The CP solves 100% of the aff – nowhere in the aff does it say an unconditional right to strike is necessary, just that a right to strike is.

**Strikes can be violent, South Africa proves. This link turns the AC by harming the affected sector and decking the economy.**

Tenzam ’20 - Mlungisi Tenzam LLB LLM LLD Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal, 2020, The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004

The Constitution guarantees every worker the right to join a trade union, participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union, and to strike.11The Constitution grants these rights to a "worker" as an individual.12However, the right to strike and any other conduct in contemplation or furtherance of a strike such as a picket13 can only be exercised by workers acting collectively.14¶ The right to strike and participation in the activities of a trade union were given more effect through the enactment of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 199515 (LRA). The main purpose of the LRA is to "advance economic development, social justice, labour peace and the democratisation of the workplace".16 The advancement of social justice means that the exercise of the right to strike must advance the interests of workers and at the same time workers must refrain from any conduct that can affect those who are not on strike as well members of society.¶ Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike 17 are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally.18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides, pickets are meant to be peaceful.19 Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public. A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.20 The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers' demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows:¶ "[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike ... A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won't win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say '1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC'. You won't win a strike like that."21¶ The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers' homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour.22 This points to the fact that for many workers and their families' living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU),23 it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.24In SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd,25striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Nqoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer's business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.26¶ These examples from case law show that South Africa is facing a problem that is affecting not only the industrial relations' sector but also the economy at large. For example, in 2012, during a strike by workers employed by Lonmin in Marikana, the then-new union Association of Mine & Construction Workers Union (AMCU) wanted to exert its presence after it appeared that many workers were not happy with the way the majority union, National Union of Mine Workers (NUM), handled negotiations with the employer (Lonmin Mine). AMCU went on an unprotected strike which was violent and resulted in the loss of lives, damage to property and negative economic consequences including a weakened currency, reduced global investment27, declining productivity, and increase unemployment in the affected sectors.27Further, the unreasonably long time it takes for strikes to get resolved in the Republic has a negative effect on the business of the employer, the economy and employment.

#### Economic downturns devastate people’s lives.

EPI ’09 – Economic Policy Institute, “Economic Scarring: The long-term impacts of the recession,” Economic Policy Institute (Web). Briefing Paper #243. Sept. 30, 2009. Accessed Nov. 8, 2021. <https://www.epi.org/publication/bp243/> AT

Economic recessions are often portrayed as short-term events. However, as a substantial body of economic literature shows, the consequences of high unemployment, falling incomes, and reduced economic activity can have lasting consequences. For example, job loss and falling incomes can force families to delay or forgo a college education for their children. Frozen credit markets and depressed consumer spending can stop the creation of otherwise vibrant small businesses. Larger companies may delay or reduce spending on R&D.¶ In each of these cases, an economic recession can lead to “scarring”—that is, long-lasting damage to individuals’ economic situations and the economy more broadly. This report examines some of the evidence demonstrating the long-run consequences of recessions. Findings include:¶ Educational achievement: Unemployment and income losses can reduce educational achievement by threatening early childhood nutrition; reducing families’ abilities to provide a supportive learning environment (including adequate health care, summer activities, and stable housing); and by forcing a delay or abandonment of college plans.¶ Opportunity: Recession-induced job and income losses can have lasting consequences on individuals and families. The increase in poverty that will occur as a result of the recession, for example, will have lasting consequences for kids, and will impose long-lasting costs on the economy.¶ Private investment: Total non-residential investment is down by 20% from peak levels through the second quarter of 2009. The reduction in investment will lead to reduced production capacity for years to come. Furthermore, since technology is often embedded in new capital equipment, the investment slowdown can also be expected to reduce the adoption of new innovations.¶ Entrepreneurial activity and business formation: New and small businesses are often at the forefront of technological advancement. With the credit crunch and the reduction in consumer demand, small businesses are seeing a double squeeze. For example, in 2008, 43,500 businesses filed for bankruptcy, up from 28,300 businesses in 2007 and more than double the 19,700 filings in 2006. Only 21 active firms had an initial public offering in 2008, down from an average of 163 in the four years prior.¶ There is also substantial evidence that economic outcomes are passed across generations. As such, economic hardships for parents will mean more economic hurdles for their children. While it is often said that deficits can cause transfers of wealth from future generations of taxpayers to the present, this cost must also be compared with the economic consequences of recessions that are also passed to future generations.¶ This analysis also suggests that efforts to stimulate the economy can be very effective over both the short- and long-run. Using a simple illustrative accounting framework, it is shown that an economic stimulus can lead to a short-run boost in output that outweighs the additional interest costs of the associated debt increase. This is especially true over a short horizon.¶ A recession, therefore, should not be thought of as a one-time event that stresses individuals and families for a couple of years. Rather, economic downturns will impact the future prospects of all family members, including children, and will have consequences for years to come.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war – collapses faith in deterrence

Tønnesson, 15—Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University (Stein, “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” International Area Studies Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311, dml)

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party.Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

The best way to enhance global peace is no doubt to multiply the factors protecting it: build a Pacific security community by topping up economic interdependence with political rapprochement and trust, institutionalized cooperation, and shared international norms. Yet even without such accomplishments, the combination of deterrence and economic interdependence may be enough to prevent war among the major powers. Because the leaders of nuclear armed nations are fearful of getting into a situation where peace relies uniquely on nuclear deterrence, and because they know that their adversaries have the same fear, they may accept the risks entailed by depending economically on others. And then there will be neither trade wars nor shooting wars, just disputes and diplomacy.

#### The NB turns their IL – they destroy the economy

## Teacher Pay CP

#### CP: A just government ought increase teacher salaries by the equivalent of $13,500 a year as per Scott ’19.

Dylan Scott, 3-26-2019, "Kamala Harris’s plan to dramatically increase teacher salaries, explained," Vox, [https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/3/26/18280734/kamala-harris-2020-election-policies-teachers-salaries //Accessed 11/21/2021](https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/3/26/18280734/kamala-harris-2020-election-policies-teachers-salaries%20//Accessed%2011/21/2021) //marlborough JH

[Sen. Kamala Harris (D-CA)](https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/2/18/18224972/kamala-harris-democrat-presidential-candidate-2020) has the first major K-12 education proposal of the Democratic presidential primary so far: giving American teachers a significant raise. ¶The California senator is proposing the federal government spend $315 billion to increase teacher salaries over the next 10 years. Through a combination of direct federal spending and matching funds from states, the goal is to give the average US teacher a $13,500 pay increase in her first term, paid for by hiking taxes on wealthy estates. The average teacher salary is currently about [$60,000](http://money.com/money/5287489/average-teacher-salary-by-state/), though there is considerable variation across states.

#### Solves the entirety of the aff – teachers get paid significantly more, keeping them in education. It also solves for activism – passage of the CP creates the perception that the government met teachers’ demands, encouraging more activism in students and other sectors. It also gives teachers more a greater ability to advocate for their needs – they aren’t living paycheck to paycheck.

#### The net benefit is learning loss:

#### Teacher strikes mean that students miss out on learning – turns case. Norton and Hernandez ‘18

Hilary Norton and Tracy Hernandez, 10-10-2018, "Commentary: A teachers strike is bad for our students, families and economy ," No Publication, <http://laschoolreport.com/commentary-a-teachers-strike-is-bad-for-our-students-families-and-economy/> //Accessed 11/21/2021 //marlborough JH

While a strike looms within our nation’s second-largest school district, the business community of Los Angeles urges the Los Angeles Unified School District and United Teachers Los Angeles to resolve their differences in a way that doesn’t put students at risk. ¶As the organized, grassroots voice of the business community in Greater Los Angeles, BizFed works to support the public institutions that serve our community and the families that work to build our region’s economy. BizFed represents 390,000 businesses that employ nearly 4 million people throughout Los Angeles County. The majority of these employees are working to support their families, many of which include LAUSD students. It is important that the needs of students are placed first in the negotiations. ¶Last week, BizFed wrote a letter to the LAUSD board and the UTLA executive officers urging them to do everything possible to avoid a strike. We received appreciative and positive feedback from LAUSD Board President Mónica García and Superintendent Austin Beutner as well as UTLA President Alex Caputo-Pearl. ¶When schools are closed due to strikes, students miss learning opportunities, parents must take days off from work and our region is disrupted. Beyond hurting families, this strike will hurt our businesses and their ability to sustain and create new jobs. ¶This potential strike by LAUSD teachers will be the first in nearly three decades. The strike in 1989 lasted nine days; the most recent teachers strike in West Virginia lasted seven days. For a family living paycheck to paycheck, over a week of unpaid time off to watch their children should not be the deciding factor between paying the rent and putting food on the table; the entire family’s livelihood is threatened. Imagine a single mom who is a nurse and has no one to watch her children. She must choose between leaving her children at home or missing a shift. That money cannot be paid back. ¶Every day that a student is not in the classroom, they lose learning opportunities. Students fall behind the content standards set by the California State Board of Education, and teachers have to add those lost days into their curriculum. Students lose daily social interactions with their peers, which helps build character and good citizenship. Think of a student who has the dream of being a doctor. They miss school and now are discouraged and lose the aspiration of being a doctor. ¶At-risk youth are the most vulnerable when there are school closures. If parents don’t have the ability to skip work during a teacher strike, can’t afford childcare or don’t have family that can help out, that means students are left unsupervised. Anyone who has children knows that the course of their lives can change in an instant. We must avoid putting our children’s health and safety at risk. ¶ In LAUSD, over 84 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price meals; the district serves over 700,000 meals each day. For many of these students, this is their only chance to eat a healthy breakfast, lunch and supper after school. A child’s nutrition should not be compromised at the hands of this potential strike. **¶**As business leaders, we value the importance of treating teachers fairly while maintaining fiscal solvency. We urge LAUSD and UTLA to find a resolution that accomplishes both. Employers care deeply for the strength and effectiveness of our K-12 educational systems. These students will also become the workforce that will grow our economy into the future. **¶**We understand that LAUSD needs more resources and support from the state, but they do not need to exacerbate the problem by cutting off the current stream of per-pupil state funding each day the strike occurs. **¶**The business community is ready to stand with its school district and teachers to support our public education system. We implore LAUSD and UTLA to avoid public fights, come to a resolution and work with the larger community to improve our city’s education system for all. Keep our future leaders learning!

#### Strikes harm students – numerous studies prove learning loss. Matthews ‘12

Dylan Matthews, 9-10-2012, "How teacher strikes hurt student achievement," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2012/09/10/how-teacher-strikes-hurt-student-achievement/

Talks between the Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Teachers Union broke down yesterday, and now [the city's teachers are on strike](http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/chicago-teachers-and-school-district-officials-halt-strike-talks/2012/09/09/f73a4364-faf2-11e1-a65a-d6e62f9f2a5a_story.html?hpid=z1&itid=lk_inline_manual_4), just as class was about to start for the 2012-13 school year. Labor will insist that the strikes lead to contracts that attract good teachers who promote student learning in the long-run, while Emanuel notes that the teachers are striking over his proposed evaluation system, which he argues will help achievement going forward. Leaving that debate aside, what does the strike itself mean for students? ¶Nothing good, the best empirical evidence suggests. Two of the best recent studies on the effects of teacher work stoppages and strikes concern labor disputes in Ontario schools in the late '90s and early 2000s. One, by the University of Toronto's Michael Baker, [compared](http://www.nber.org/papers/w16846) how standardized test scores rose between grade 3 and grade 6 for students who lost instructional time because of the Ontario strikes, and for students who were unaffected. ¶Baker found that if the strike happened when a student was in grade 2 or 3, their scores rose by slightly less. But if the strike happened when the student was in grade 5 or 6, their scores rose by a whole lot less. Scores for strike-affected fifth-graders were a full 3.8 percent lower than those for fifth-graders in schools and grades not affected. If that doesn't seem like much, it's 29 percent of the standard deviation (or the typical amount by which students differ from their class average). ¶Wilfrid Laurer's David Johnson [studied](http://ideas.repec.org/p/cdh/ebrief/74.html) the same Ontario strikes and also found that they hurt student achievement. Like Baker, he found only small effects for students for whom the strike occurred in third grade, but large effects if the student was in sixth grade. In the latter case, the percentage of students getting a passing score on math standardized tests fell by 0.21 percentage points per day, and the percentage getting a non-failing score across all tests fell by 0.10 points per day. The effects were much more dramatic in poorer and more socially disadvantaged school districts, where overall passing scores went down by 0.35 points per day. Given that strikes typically last a week or more, these results can add up. A nine-day strike, for instance, reduces passing rates 3.15 percentage points. ¶And it's not just Ontario. Michèle Belot and Dinand Webbink, now of the Universities of Edinburgh and Rotterdam, respectively, [found](http://ideas.repec.org/a/bla/labour/v24y2010i4p391-406.html) that work stoppages hurt student achievement, increased the number of students repeating grades and reduced higher education attainment in Belgium. What's more, studies dealing with teacher absences for reasons other than strikes bolster these findings. ¶A [study](http://www.nctq.org/nctq/research/1190910822841.pdf) (pdf) by Harvard's Raegen Miller, Richard Murnane and John Willett tracked the effects of teacher absences while controlling for teacher experience and skill level. They noted that teachers who are absent more regularly may be less motivated and skilled, and so they isolated absences due to poor weather, the idea being that even highly skilled teachers will be absent if the weather prevents them form getting to work. ¶The study found that absences lead to statistically significant drops in student math and reading scores. The drops are lower than those found in the Baker and Johnson studies, but then again, the students in the Harvard study received instruction from substitutes, whereas students in strikes get no instruction at all. Studies by [Charles Clotfelder, Helen Ladd and Jacob Vigdor](http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/edfp.2009.4.2.115) at Duke and by [Mariesa Herrmann and Jonah Rockoff](http://www0.gsb.columbia.edu/faculty/jrockoff/herrmann_rockoff_teaching_disruptions_July_09.pdf) (pdf) at Columbia found significant drops in student achievement because of absences in North Carolina and New York schools, respectively, with the latter finding that a lengthy absence had the same effect as replacing an average teacher with one at the 30th percentile. ¶The only recent [study](http://sersanea.org/Pennsylvania%20Teachers'%20Strikes%20and%20Academic%20Performance%20Final%20.pdf) (pdf) to find no significant results from teacher strikes was conducted by Harris Zwerling, a researcher at the Pennsylvania State Education Association, the state's largest teacher's union. That study compared Pennsylvania school districts that experienced strikes to those that didn't, and found no difference in outcomes once one controls for demographics and years of teacher service; this is much the same methodology as the Ontario studies. One could argue that because the study focused on U.S. schools rather than Canadian or Belgian ones, it is more directly relevant. ¶But then again, Pennsylvania requires schools to make up lost time due to teacher strikes at the end of the school year, which Canadian and Belgian schools don't. Illinois schools are required to teach 176 days a year, and the union [insists](http://stand.org/illinois/action/chicago/frequently-asked-questions) that agreements to make up lost school days are traditional in bargaining agreements. But the 176-day requirement is frequently ignored, with [400,000 Chicago schoolchildren](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2010-09-21/news/ct-met-time-school-year-20100921_1_school-improvement-school-days-districts) only attending school for 170 days. So there's a real possibility that the Chicago strike will end up like the Canadian and Belgian ones, with real lost instructional time and big effects on student learning as a result, rather than like the Pennsylvania one, with no lost time and no effect on learning. One last thing — one could protest that all these results rely on standardized testing, which may or may not correlate to real learning. That's fair enough, but there's a bounty of evidence, from Harvard's [Raj Chetty](http://obs.rc.fas.harvard.edu/chetty/STAR.pdf) (pdf) and Stanford's [Eric Hanushek](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0327.2011.00265.x/abstract), among others, suggesting that standardized test scores correlate with higher education achievement, lifetime earnings and more. So if the Chicago strike does end up hurting student scores, it could affect their lives for years into the future.