

## **KNOWLEDGE OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW AMONG RESIDENTS OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

**MARC G. SINGER\***

*Middle Tennessee State University*

### **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether residents of the state of Oklahoma were cognizant of the provisions of the right-to-work law that they had enacted in 2001. One hundred randomly chosen Oklahoma residents were sampled by telephone and responded to an eight-item questionnaire. The results of the study indicated that average residents of Oklahoma were uninformed or misinformed about their rights under the law. Additionally, the results of the investigation were compared to results obtained sixteen years earlier in Idaho, immediately following the adoption of its right-to-work legislation. These comparisons indicated that significant differences existed between the states and between the males of the states.

There is probably no provision of any labor law that has generated as much interest and as much controversy as section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley), which enables states to enact right-to-work laws. These laws prohibit employers and labor organizations from entering into contract agreements requiring membership or nonmembership in unions as a condition for employment. As a result of this stipulation, covered bargaining unit employees are entitled to all the benefits obtained through the collective bargaining process,

\*The author would like to thank Kirsten Walls for her assistance in collecting the data for this study.

irrespective of whether they join the union or pay dues. Almost immediately, the law's passage brought forth an array of avid proponents (notably the National Right-to-Work Committee) and opponents (labor unions) who expended considerable resources in lobbying efforts aimed at either maintaining, expanding, or repealing the law. Currently, twenty-two states have active right-to-work laws. The right-to-work states, and their years of enactment, are: Alabama (1953), Arizona (1946), Arkansas (1944), Florida (1944), Georgia (1947), Idaho (1985), Iowa (1947), Kansas (1958), Louisiana (1976), Mississippi (1954), Nebraska (1946), Nevada (1951), North Carolina (1947), North Dakota (1947), Oklahoma (2001), South Carolina (1954), South Dakota (1946), Tennessee (1947), Texas (1947), Utah (1955), Virginia (1947), and Wyoming (1963).

The ensuing controversy over right-to-work laws has generated several decades of robust debates and fertile research grounds for academicians and practitioners alike. The initial and ongoing areas of investigation have centered on the impact right-to-work laws have exerted on union growth and collective bargaining activities [1, 2], whether these laws deter overall union membership [3-6], and the broad economic effects of these laws [7-10].

After many years of study, the results appear to be mixed. Some researchers determined that the presence or absence of right-to-work laws does little to deter union membership or significantly change a state's economy [3-7]. Other investigators concluded that union membership might indeed be substantially decreased, at least initially, in states that have existing right-to-work laws [9, 11-15]. Additionally, right-to-work laws may improve the economic conditions of right-to-work states (particularly in the manufacturing sector) [16, 17], the benefits for workers [10], and possibly contribute to higher wages than had been previously believed [18]. Still other researchers have postulated that perhaps the entire issue of the impact of right-to-work has little to do with the economic impacts of these laws, their effects on union membership, decertification activity, or the state's industrial growth. Instead, it is rooted in symbolism rather than substance [4, 8, 19, 20]. Furthermore, conflict over state right-to-work legislation itself may have the effect of molding the views of the populace toward unions [21].

In spite of nearly six decades of mixed results about the determinism and impacts of right-to-work laws, proponents of right-to-work laws still tirelessly embark on activities designed to maintain the existing state laws and expand these laws to additional states. In 2001, Carey stated, "The National Right-to-Work Committee plans to use the Oklahoma victory to boost its efforts to pass similar laws in six other targeted states: Colorado, Kentucky, Indiana, New Hampshire, Montana, and New Mexico" [17, p. 48]. Supporters of the law argue that to force unionization on employees who decline membership is tantamount to forcing them to become "captive passengers," forfeiting their constitutional rights of free

association. These arguments were advanced by Finn, who reported that right-to-work proponents contend that compulsory unionism violates freedoms [22], and Miller, who reiterated these arguments under the concept of “worker freedom” [1]. Finally, they cite the countless studies and statistics, both historically and recently, which indicate that right-to-work states enjoy a greater economic growth than their non-right-to-work state counterparts [10].

Equally feverishly, opponents expend countless hours, research efforts, and energy in attempting to have the laws repealed or modified. Organized labor and other opponents of right-to-work laws have long contended that the laws are inherently unfair because they promote “free riders.” Since unions are required by law to represent all bargaining unit employees, and these individuals benefit by law from the collective bargaining process, it seems only fair that all covered workers should share in the costs associated with obtaining and maintaining these rights. To do otherwise unfairly weakens unions and places an excessive cost burden for services on union members [3, 4]. This notion is supported by economists who maintain that right-to-work laws abate union viability by prohibiting union shop contract provisions, which in turn results in fewer covered employees opting for membership [11, 14]. It appears that instead of dissuading the opposing forces, the conflicting research results have served as an impetus to further energize the combatants.

After years of exhaustive and costly lobbying efforts, debates, extensive research, and efforts by both proponents and opponents of right-to-work laws to educate the populace, it seems logical to assume that knowledge of at least the basic provisions of section 14(b) is commonplace (at least in right-to-work states) among the general working populace. In fact, this exact argument, posed in the Virginia Senate in 1979 and 1980 by the AFL/CIO and affiliate unions, was used in opposition to a bill (Senate Bill No. 125, Sec 40.1-58.2) that would have required the posting of the right-to-work law provisions in all workplaces. Ultimately, the bill was defeated, apparently because the legislative committee members believed that posting would require needless expenditures, since all covered employees were cognizant of their labor rights [23].

Although the posting bill was defeated, the disagreement over whether average Virginians knew their rights under their right-to-work law persisted. In an effort to move the debate from conjecture to fact, Singer et al. embarked on a research endeavor designed to sample right-to-work knowledge among Virginia residents [23]. The results of their study supported the contention that Virginians were indeed uninformed or misinformed about their rights under the law. In seeking to explain their findings, the researchers conjectured that the lack of knowledge concerning right-to-work laws might be due to several factors. First, they hypothesized that both opponents and proponents relied on emotional appeals and propaganda. Second, they surmised that perhaps there was a lack of available

communication channels by which to disseminate factual information to the general populace. Third, they questioned whether the attitudes of Virginians toward unions were typical of residents in other right-to-work states. In support of this contention, they cited Sabato's statement that, ". . . right-to-work has become one of the most overreaching symbols of Virginia's conservatism. And while most people don't understand the issues involved, they accept it. . . ." [24, p. C-1]. Lastly, the researchers conjectured that the answer may be based on the fact that the provisions of Virginia's right-to-work law differ from the stipulations of other right-to-work states. As Schwab indicated, the legal impact of the various right-to-work states' laws varies in eleven of the twelve Sunbelt states [25].

Seeking to examine the above hypotheses, Singer expanded the work of Singer et al.'s research [23] to include the right-to-work states that had not previously been sampled. Similar results to those of the original study were obtained, indicating that average residents of right-to-work states were uninformed or misinformed concerning the provisions of their state laws. Additionally, Singer concluded that no new evidence was found that convincingly supported or invalidated the hypotheses about the impact that emotions, differing cultures, and adequate communication channels have on the average workers' knowledge of right-to-work laws [26].

On September 25, 2001, Oklahoma became the twenty-second state with a right-to-work law. The passage of Oklahoma's law occurred after it had first failed to pass on a statewide ballot in 1964 and sixteen years after Idaho had become the latest state to pass similar legislation. Prior to the passage of Oklahoma's law, proponents and opponents of the law waged a vigorous media campaign. Proponents claimed that passage of a right-to-work law would increase business retention and relocation by making the state more competitive with its neighbors [27]. This in turn would create a more favorable business environment and ultimately result in economic growth for the state. Additionally, supporters introduced the issue of "freedom of choice," by stressing the contention that no worker should be forced to join or pay dues to an organization against his or her wishes. Not surprisingly, opponents countered with the exact opposite. They stressed that the right-to-work legislation would weaken unions, resulting in the deterioration of wages, benefits, and working conditions, and ultimately result in a downturn in Oklahoma's economy [28]. As Krehbiel said, "many of the promises are speculative. Few, if any, are outright fabrications. Most are misleading. Most are open to interpretation" [29, p. 1]. For the average citizen of Oklahoma, the information that was distributed appears to have been, at best, confusing.

There is little doubt that the advent of the Internet and other major advances in technology since the Idaho election have provided readily accessible channels

Table 1. Relevant Demographics of the Oklahoma and Idaho Participants

	Oklahoma			Idaho <sup>a</sup>		
	Total N	Males	Females	Total N	Males	Females
Sex	100	43	57	100	44	56
Age:						
18-25	18	09	09	21	14	07
26-35	21	09	12	25	11	14
36-45	14	09	05	23	07	16
46-55	12	02	10	10	02	08
56+	35	14	21	21	10	11
Employment status:						
Self-employed	15	08	07	06	03	03
Nongovernment	31	10	21	42	19	23
State or federal government	18	12	06	16	07	09
Seeking employment	05	01	04	08	05	03
Out of the workforce	31	12	19	28	10	12

<sup>a</sup>The data for Idaho are reprinted from M. G. Singer, Comprehension of Right-to-Work Laws among Residents of the Right-to-Work States, *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 16:4, p. 315, 1987.

of communication for both advocates and opponents of right-to-work laws to educate the populace about the issues. Consequently, it would be logical to assume that if the intent were to have a truly educated populace, knowledge of the provisions of right-to-work laws would have permeated every Oklahoma voter's household. However, if the antagonists believed that right-to-work law votes are based on symbolism rather than substance, then first and foremost, the information chosen for dissemination would have been designed to elicit strong emotional reactions.

The arguments preceding the vote and the vote to enact a right-to-work law in Oklahoma served as catalysts for the current investigation. Although the earlier studies by Singer et al. [23] and Singer [26] demonstrated that average workers in right-to-work states were uninformed or misinformed concerning the provisions of their law, the researchers were unable to reject or accept any of their conclusions about why this phenomenon existed. Of particular interest to the current investigator were the hypotheses dealing with the lack of communication channels available to disseminate right-to-work information to the general populace and the symbolism-versus-substance controversy.

First and foremost, the purpose of the current investigation was to examine the extent to which the average resident of Oklahoma was knowledgeable about the provisions of labor law and the state's right-to-work law. Second, in an attempt to shed light on Singer's premise regarding the impact communication has on knowledge of the law, the results of the current study were compared to the earlier results obtained from Idaho residents immediately after the enactment of the Idaho law. The researcher did not attempt to determine the effects, if any, that a right-to-work law has on a state's economic condition, nor did he try to determine whether workers or labor organizations are affected by these laws.

## METHOD

### Subjects

The subjects for the current investigation consisted of 100 (43 males and 57 females) randomly selected residents from the state of Oklahoma. The participants were classified into five age categories, with eighteen subjects ranging between 18 and 25 years of age, twenty-one subjects ranging between 26 and 35 years of age, fourteen subjects aged 36 to 45, twelve subjects aged 46 to 55, and the remaining 35 participants 56 years of age or older. Of the 100 subjects, fifteen indicated they were self-employed, thirty-one stated they were employed by a nongovernmental agency, eighteen said they were employed by either the federal or state government, five reported that they were unemployed but were actively seeking employment, and the remaining thirty-one were categorized as "out of the workforce" because they were either retired or unemployed and not actively seeking employment (see Table 1).

### Procedure

The questionnaire used in the present investigation was the same instrument originally developed by Singer et al. to sample right-to-work law knowledge in the state of Virginia [23]. This questionnaire requires respondents to answer true, false, or not sure, to eight questions about labor law [23, p. 113]. Since the questionnaire was validated for the original Singer et al. study, it was not modified for the current investigation. Additionally, demographic information about the subject's sex, age, and employment status was requested.

To facilitate accurate comparisons between recent data collected in Oklahoma and the previous data collected in Idaho, the procedure used earlier in the Singer et al. [23], and Singer [26] studies was replicated. The first phase of this procedure involved the selection and training of a telephone surveyor. The interviewer selected was a female college senior with previous human

resource management experience. She was provided with a standardized letter of introduction to be read to each prospective participant, advised of the purpose of the study, and instructed in basic survey techniques. Additionally, she was provided with literature on right-to-work laws so she could familiarize herself with the basic tenets of the law.

Phase two involved choosing the subjects to be sampled. Initially, the percentage of Oklahoma's population residing in each of its cities and counties was determined through the use of the United States 2000 census information [30]. To capture a representative sample, these percentages were subsequently multiplied by 100 (the predetermined number of completed surveys sought) to determine how many calls needed to be completed within that particular geographic area. Next, the telephone area codes and exchanges for each geographic area were obtained, and random numbers were generated to complete the last four digits of the telephone numbers. Since previous research efforts using similar random selection procedures had resulted in a relatively large number of unusable numbers (nonexistent, out-of-service, etc.), a total of 1000 numbers were drawn. Ultimately, 799 calls were needed before the targeted sample of 100 completed surveys was achieved.

After the random numbers had been selected, the surveying phase began. All of the telephone calls were placed between the hours of six and nine (CDT) o'clock in the evenings and throughout the day and evening on weekends. These time slots were chosen to minimize the potential for selecting businesses and to avoid the possibility of obtaining a skewed sample of females or individuals "out of the workforce." If a minor answered the telephone, the interviewer requested to speak to "one of his or her parents," thus allowing the sex of the participant to be determined by the minor rather than by the interviewer. The interviewer read participants the standard letter of introduction, requested their participation, and explained that the purpose of the study was to sample their knowledge of the state's labor law. After concluding the survey, the interviewer answered any questions the responders posed, and thanked them for their willingness to participate.

The data collected were aggregated and analyzed through the use of the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences [31]. For the state of Oklahoma, frequency data were calculated for the eight questionnaire items and for the demographic information. Additionally chi square analyses were performed to determine whether any significant differences existed between the male and female respondents. Lastly, the Idaho data collected by Singer (for demographic data, see Table 1) immediately following the enactment of their state right-to-work law were retrieved [26] and compared with the results obtained in Oklahoma. Chi square analyses were calculated to determine any significant differences between the samples of the states and the males and females.

## RESULTS

Table 2 details the percentage of correct responses obtained for the respondents from Oklahoma and Idaho. For the entire survey, Oklahoma residents averaged 57 percent correct answers while Idaho's residents correctly responded to 52 percent of the questionnaire items. The question that received the largest number of correct responses for Oklahoma and Idaho combined was question one (79% and 64%, respectively), while the question that produced the lowest number of correct answers was item seven (49% and 33%, respectively). For both males and females in Oklahoma, question one resulted in the most correct responses, with 84 percent of the males and 75 percent of the females responding correctly. For Idaho residents, the item that elicited the most correct responses was question two, with males responding correctly 68 percent of the time and females answering correctly 64 percent of the time. The question that elicited the least number of correct responses for both males and females in Oklahoma was question two, with only 44 percent of the males and 23 percent of the females providing the correct response. Idaho residents had the most difficulty with questions three and seven, with males answering question three correctly in only 34 percent of the cases, and only 30 percent of the females providing correct answers to item seven. The average number of correct responses for individual subjects in Oklahoma and Idaho was 4.60 and 4.13, respectively. Oklahoma males achieved the largest number of correct responses, with each respondent averaging 4.95 items accurately. The Idaho females obtained the lowest average individual item score, with each respondent answering only 3.99 items correctly.

The results of Pearson chi square analyses on the questionnaire items between states, and between and within the males and females of the states are reported in Table 3. Comparisons between the overall state populations demonstrated significant differences on questions one, two, and seven. Correct responses from the Oklahoma males differed significantly from the males in Idaho on questions two, three, and eight, and for all eight items. Females showed significant differences for questions one and two, but overall there were no significant differences between the state's female samples. Within their respective states, males and females did not significantly differ from each other in total correct response rates, but did significantly differ on one item (question one in Idaho and question two in Oklahoma). Lastly, no significant differences existed between the populations with regard to sex, age, or occupational classification.

## DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

In light of the emotion-laden environment that seems to perpetually accompany right-to-work law debates, it appears prudent to keep the purposes of the present



Table 2. Response Percentages for the Questionnaire Items

Question	Oklahoma			Idaho <sup>a</sup>		
	Total N	Males	Females	Total N	Males	Females
1 True	9	9	9	16	18	14
False*	79	84	75	64	75	55
Not sure	12	7	16	20	7	31
2 True*	32	44	23	66	68	64
False	56	49	61	17	18	16
Not sure	12	7	16	17	14	20
3 True	40	35	44	47	50	45
False*	49	56	44	36	34	37
Not sure	11	9	12	17	16	18
4 True	21	26	18	32	29	34
False*	63	65	61	53	61	46
Not sure	16	9	21	15	9	20
5 True	20	23	18	29	32	27
False*	68	65	70	58	61	55
Not sure	12	12	12	13	7	18
6 True*	63	67	60	58	59	57
False	24	26	23	18	14	21
Not sure	13	7	17	24	27	22
7 True*	49	54	46	33	36	30
False	23	28	19	34	43	27
Not sure	28	18	35	33	21	43
8 True	31	26	35	42	52	34
False*	57	60	54	44	39	48
Not sure	12	14	11	14	9	18
All eight questions:	57	62	54	52	54	51
Avg. # correct answers per respondent:	4.60	4.95	4.33	4.13	4.33	3.99

\*Denotes correct response.

<sup>a</sup>The data for Idaho are reprinted from M. G. Singer, Comprehension of Right-to-Work Laws among Residents of the Right-to-Work States, *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 16:4, pp. 318-319, 1987.

Table 3. Significant Differences on the Questionnaire Items

Question	Total N $\chi^2$	Oklahoma/Idaho		Oklahoma	Idaho
		Males/ Males $\chi^2$	Females/ Females $\chi^2$	Males/ Females $\chi^2$	Males/ Females $\chi^2$
1	5.52**	1.01	5.04*	1.01	4.13*
2	23.13***	5.09*	19.79***	5.15*	.17
3	3.46	4.15*	.47	1.41	.12
4	2.05	.13	2.55	.14	2.21
5	2.15	.13	2.66	.29	.37
6	.52	.65	.07	.63	.04
7	5.29*	2.58	2.79	.61	.40
8	3.38	4.15*	.43	.37	.92
All eight questions:	19.69**	18.32**	9.58	5.84	14.42
Sex	.02	—	—	—	—
Age	6.45	2.19	8.50	6.47	8.55
Occupational status:	6.48	9.20	2.45	7.54	2.01

\* $p \leq .05$ \*\* $p \leq .01$ \*\*\* $p \leq .001$ 

investigation in perspective. First and foremost, the research was designed to determine whether residents of Oklahoma were knowledgeable about labor law, particularly the provisions of the right-to-work law that they voted to enact in 2001. Second, the research attempted to determine the merits of earlier hypotheses that Singer et al. [23] and Singer [26] had formulated to explain why average workers in right-to-work states are either uninformed or misinformed regarding

their rights under their labor laws. The current research did not intend to determine the impact that right-to-work laws have on unionization, nor was it designed to ascertain whether states, unions, employers, or workers prosper or suffer economically because of the enactment of these laws. Lastly, the present investigation was not undertaken to lend credence to arguments for, or against, the enactment of right-to-work laws.

The current results corroborate Singer's earlier findings that the average resident of a right-to-work state is either uninformed or misinformed about the provisions of labor law. On the eight questions posed, Oklahoma respondents achieved an average correct response rate of 4.60 items per subject. Generally, males scored better than the average, with a response rate of 4.95, while females performed more poorly, with an average rate of 4.33 correct answers per respondent (see Table 2). These numbers mirror the averages of 4.64 (total sample), 5.00 (males), and 4.37 (females) reported in Singer's earlier study of the other twenty-one right-to-work states [26]. Based on Singer's findings among all right-to-work states, Oklahoma's populace ranks thirteenth, its males rank fourteenth, and its females rank twelfth in the amount of knowledge they exhibit about the law. Additionally, on question three (the item for which the correct answer differs based on whether a right-to-work law exists), Oklahoma's percentage of correct responses, although higher than the 46.3 percent average for all right-to-work states, was still only 49 percent.

As reported, the results are puzzling. The initial design of the current research was based on two possibilities. First, it seemed logical that Oklahoma residents would demonstrate less knowledge of right-to-work laws than most other right-to-work states since its residents did not have extensive experience living under a right-to-work law. With the exception of Idaho, the residents of the other right-to-work states had been sampled after their laws had been in existence for at least a decade. Eighteen of the states had enacted their laws in the 1940s and 1950s, and the remaining two, Wyoming and Louisiana, had established their laws in 1963 and 1976, respectively. Second, it was assumed that Oklahoma's populace would not differ significantly from Idaho's residents. Both of these state's samples were drawn between one and two years after the states had enacted the laws; neither states' subjects had lived under the law for any extensive period of time; and both states' residents were exposed to extensive communications about the law. However, the fact remains that neither of these outcomes occurred. The knowledge of laws demonstrated by Oklahoma residents was neither better nor worse on average than that of the residents of other right-to-work states. Furthermore, Oklahoma's residents demonstrated significantly greater knowledge than Idaho's populace, and the males of Oklahoma significantly outperformed their Idaho counterparts (see Table 3).

One conclusion that may be drawn from the failure to determine whether experience with the law or exposure to communication about the law fosters comprehension is that perhaps they are equivalent learning techniques. Either living under provisions of laws or learning about them through educational materials might result in the acquisition of equal knowledge. Unfortunately, while this rationalization appears to viably explain the similarity in scores between Oklahoma and the other right-to-work states, it fails to address the question of why Oklahoma residents demonstrated significantly greater knowledge than the Idaho populace did.

Perhaps the answer to this latter question is not related to the availability of communication channels as earlier hypothesized by Singer et al. [23], and Singer [26], but lies instead in an analysis of the type of information disseminated. Since sixteen years had elapsed between Idaho and Oklahoma's elections, it seems logical to conclude that advances in communication networks, e.g., the Internet, would have facilitated the dissemination of information to a wider audience during the Oklahoma campaign. As a result, the average residents of Oklahoma should have been better informed solely because advocates had been abler to reach them with appropriate information. However, this supposition assumes that the channels were used to disseminate information designed to educate the populace. Instead, it appears that both proponents and opponents of the legislation chose to rely on emotional appeals rather than facts to garner votes. As several sources suggested, even the vociferous debate over the economic impact of adopting right-to-work laws paled in light of the arguments about "freedom of choice" [17, 32]. In spite of extensive publicity regarding the legislative debate surrounding the right-to-work issue, an Oklahoma poll indicated that many Oklahomans were not well-educated about the question [33].

Of all the possible explanations for why Oklahoma voters and those of other right-to-work states enact a law they do not understand, the "freedom" issue seems to be most plausible. Over the years, attempts to explain the impact right-to-work (RTW) laws have had on unionization have led some researchers to propose a "taste hypothesis." This concept maintains that "RTW laws do not have an independent effect on the demand for, supply of, or extent of union membership, but simply represent underlying hostile attitudes toward unionism" [2, p. 574]. Consequently, strong, emotional, anti-union feelings among a populace might explain why individuals would be so passionate about enacting legislation they may not fully comprehend.

For nearly twenty-five years, this researcher, together with several colleagues, has attempted to postulate and test various hypotheses that would explain the differences in knowledge about right-to-work law among residents of right-to-work states. These assumptions have included the effects

of cultural differences between the states, the impact of past experience with unionization, a lack of interest by the average worker in the controversy, the lack of available communication networks to reach the average resident, the recency of the controversy, the general educational level of the states' residents, and differences between the sexes [23, 26, 34]. Ultimately, the conclusions reached at the end of each study have been the same. The only certainty is that the average resident of a right-to-work state is either uninformed or misinformed about the provisions of a law that affects his/her every working day, and the controversy appears to be embroiled in symbolism rather than in fact.

Obviously, variations exist between the right-to-work states in terms of knowledge of the laws, and there must be reasons for these differences. It is this investigator's belief that the best explanation for this phenomenon lies in the cultural and educational disparities between the populations. The present investigation sought to compare two states that on the surface appeared to be similar. Realistically, however, the environment of the 1980s immediately preceding the onset of the information age was substantially different from the one that existed prior to the Oklahoma vote. In reality, even though there were no significant differences between the ages of the participants sampled in Oklahoma and Idaho, the average Oklahoman surveyed would actually represent a different generation from the respondents of the same ages sampled in Idaho.

It is interesting to ponder what effect an informed populace might have on the future of right-to-work legislation. However, if past actions are truly an indicator of future behavior, it seems highly unlikely that the current state of affairs will change. Decades of mixed research results on the economic impact of right-to-work laws seem to show only that voters are polarized toward the position they were predisposed to accept. The results of ongoing research and the subsequent information disseminated throughout the literature and the media continue to be, at best, confusing. Educators appear to regard the subject as unworthy of emphasis in school curricula. Finally, it seems that proponents and opponents of right-to-work laws have agreed on at least one issue. They have decided that emotional appeals, rather than an informed populace, will best serve the goals of their respective causes. Pragmatically, the significant differences found between the right-to-work states regarding the residents' overall knowledge of the law are unimportant. The research fails to indicate which states' residents are informed about right-to-work laws and which states' citizens are unfamiliar with the law. Rather, it appears that the residents are minimally informed about the provisions of a law that affects their everyday working life—some less informed than others.

## ENDNOTES

1. R. L. Miller, Right-to-Work Laws and Compulsory Union Membership in the United States, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 14:2, pp. 186-193, 1976.
2. W. J. Moore and R. J. Newman, The Effects of Right-to-Work Laws: A Review of the Literature, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 38:4, pp. 571-585, 1985.
3. B. T. Hirsch, The Determinants of Unionization: An Analysis of Interarea Differences, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 33:2, pp. 147-162, 1980.
4. K. Lumsden and C. Peterson, The Effect of Right-to-Work Laws on Unionization in the United States, *Journal of Political Economy*, 83:6, pp. 1237-1248, 1975.
5. W. J. Moore and R. J. Newman, On the Prospects for American Trade Union Growth: A Cross-Section Analysis, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 57:4, pp. 435-445, 1975.
6. G. Hundley, Who Joins Unions in the Public Sector? The Effects of Individual Characteristics and the Law, *Journal of Labor Research*, 9:4, pp. 301-323, 1988.
7. W. J. Wessels, Economic Effects of Right-to-Work Laws, *Journal of Labor Research*, 2:1, pp. 55-75, 1981.
8. R. D. Elliott, Right-to-Work Laws: The Recent Evidence on Their Economic Effects, *Business and Economic Review*, 28:3, pp. 29-31, 1981.
9. G. A. Garofalo and D. M. Malhotra, An Integrated Model of the Economic Effects of Right-to-Work Laws, *Journal of Labor Research*, 13:3, pp. 293-305, 1992.
10. W. T. Wilson, The Effect of Right-to-Work Laws on Economic Development, *The Mackinac Center for Public Policy*, Midland, Michigan, June 2002.
11. J. C. Davis and J. H. Huston, Right-to-Work Laws and Free Riding, *Economic Inquiry*, 31:1, pp. 52-58, 1993.
12. G. T. Ellwood and G. Fine, The Impact of Right-to-Work Laws on Union Organizing, *Journal of Political Economy*, 95:2, pp. 250-273, 1987.
13. G. Hundley, Who Joins Unions in the Public Sector? The Effects of Individual Characteristics and the Law, *Journal of Labor Research*, 9:4, pp. 301-323, 1988.
14. C. Ichniowski and J. S. Zax, Right-to-Work Laws, Free Riders, and Unionization in the Local Public Sector, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 9:3, pp. 255-275, 1991.
15. R. S. Warren, Jr. and R. P. Strauss, A Mixed Logit Model of the Relationship Between Unionization and Right-to-Work Legislation, *Journal of Political Economy*, 87:3, pp. 648-655, 1979.
16. T. J. Holmes, The Effect of State Policies on the Location of Manufacturing: Evidence from State Borders, *Journal of Political Economy*, 106:4, pp. 667-705, 1998.
17. J. Carey, Are We Ready for Right-to-Work?, *New Mexico Business Journal*, 25:10, p. 48(2), Dec. 2001.
18. W. R. Reed, How Right-to-Work Laws Affect Wages, *Journal of Labor Research*, 24:4, pp. 713-730, 2003.
19. T. Aebi and R. A. McLean, Right-to-Work Laws and Industrial Expansion, *Indiana Business Review*, 53, pp. 7-10, 1978.
20. R. Swidinsky, Bargaining Power Under Compulsory Unionism, *Industrial Relations*, 21:1, pp. 62-72, 1982.

21. S. E. Abraham and P. B. Voost, Right-to-Work Laws: New Evidence from the Stock Market, *Southern Economic Journal*, 67:2, pp. 345-364, 2000.
22. E. Finn, The Case Against Right-to-Work Laws, *Labour Gazette*, 77:10, pp. 446-449, 1977.
23. M. G. Singer, H. L. Durrett, K. C. Williamson, and K. L. Shannon, An Empirical Investigation of Comprehension of the Right-to-Work Law Among Residents of the State of Virginia, *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 12:2, pp. 109-117, 1983.
24. G. Frankel, Virginia Ad Campaign Entices Industry, *Washington Post*, p. C-1, October 7, 1980.
25. P. A. Schwab, The Unions' Southern Discomfort, *Nation's Business*, 69:6, pp. 35-39, 1981.
26. M. G. Singer, Comprehension of Right-to-Work Laws Among Residents of the Right-to-Work States, *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 16:4, pp. 311-326, 1987.
27. R. L. Hogler and R. LaJeunesse, Oklahoma's Right-to-Work Initiative: Labor Policy and Ideology, *Labor Law Journal*, pp. 109-121, Fall 2002.
28. L. Mishel, ed., Right-to-Work Laws and Economic Development in Oklahoma, *Briefing Paper*, Economic Policy Institute, August, 2001.
29. R. Krehbiel, Both Sides' Rhetoric at Full Throttle in Right-to-Work Battle, *The Tulsa World*, p. 1, August 26, 2001.
30. U.S. Census Bureau, <http://www.census.gov/census2000/states/ok.html>
31. *SPSS 12.0 for Windows*, SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL: 2003.
32. L. Burlett, Right to Work. It's All About Freedom, *Southern Business and Development*, accessed October 7, 2003, <http://www.sb-d.com/issues/winter2002/features/fallcover.asp> (Winter 2002).
33. M. Strain, Right-to-Work Favored in Poll—Majority Supports Statewide Vote on Issue, *The Oklahoman*, pp. 1A, 4A, May 14, 2000.
34. M. G. Singer and B. Hastings, Comprehension of Right-to-Work Knowledge Among Residents of the States of Arizona and Virginia: A Comparison, *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 14:2, pp. 173-182, 1985.

Direct reprint requests to:

Marc G. Singer, Ph.D.  
 Professor of Management  
 P.O. Box X023  
 Middle Tennessee State University  
 Murfreesboro, TN 37132  
 e-mail: [mmsinger@mtsu.edu](mailto:mmsinger@mtsu.edu)