

**Beyond Just the Job:**  
**Chicago Worker Centers Contesting Exclusion, Organizing for Full Citizenship Rights**

BY

JESSICA DIANNE COOK  
B.A., University of Kansas, 2006  
M.A., University of Illinois at Chicago, 2011

DISSERTATION

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology  
in the Graduate College of the  
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2016

Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee:

Dr. Nilda Flores-González, Chair and Advisor  
Dr. William Bielby  
Dr. Claire Laurier Decoteau  
Dr. Andrew Clarno  
Dr. Nik Theodore, Urban Planning and Policy  
Dr. Xóchitl Bada, Latin American and Latino Studies

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I want to first thank my advisor, chair, and mentor Dr. Nilda Flores-González for all of her support, encouragement, and mentorship for this dissertation, my graduate experience, and the next chapter in my career. I also want to thank her, Drs. Claire Decoteau, Andy Clarno, Bill Bielby, Xóchitl Bada, Nik Theodore, and all my other academic mentors over the years for being so supportive of my goals and interests, teaching me so much, cheering me on, and serving as an incredible role models in how to use your skills and resources to work for social justice. I also want to thank Dr. Mohamed El-Hodiri, who continues to be such an important person in my life and who pushed me to get my PhD in the first place. Of course I am forever grateful to my family and friends for all their support and encouragement through the tears, anxiety, and excitement since deciding to start this program. In addition, I want to thank Ana Padilla for all her help with translation, the UIC Chancellor's Graduate Research Fellowship committee for the much needed financial support, and everyone involved with the UIC IRRPP Dissertation WriteOuts, as they were integral for my progress at each step of the writing process. I could not have completed this project and program without all of you!

Finally, I am forever indebted to all the participants for taking the time to share their important insight and knowledge with me, allowing me to learn from them, and to write about their experiences. This dissertation is dedicated to all of you, and I will do my best to support and repay you throughout my career.

JDC

## Table of Contents

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>I. Introduction: Citizenship Exclusion and Worker Center Organizing .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Full Citizenship Inclusion and Exclusion .....	6
1. <i>Racialized Criminalization Under Neoliberalism</i> .....	10
2. <i>Neoliberal Labor Market Restructuring</i> .....	17
B. Worker Centers in the U.S. Labor Movement .....	23
C. Methods .....	33
D. Contribution .....	44
E. Organization of the Dissertation.....	46
<b>II. “I Go Get a Felony, I’m Not Really a Citizen Anymore”: Marginalization of Criminalized African Americans Compared to Undocumented Immigrants.....</b>	<b>48</b>
A. Full Citizenship, Criminalization, and Exclusion .....	52
B. “Lord Have Mercy, Sometimes I Feel Like I Have No Rights” .....	56
C. “I Go Get a Felony, I’m Really Not a Citizen Anymore” .....	63
1. <i>Work</i> .....	63
2. <i>Public Resources and Benefits</i> .....	70
3. <i>Family Trauma and Separation</i> .....	73
D. Discussion and Conclusion .....	76
<b>III. The Chicago area Temporary Staffing Industry’s Use of Racialized “Unfreeness” ....</b>	<b>80</b>
A. Racialization and Unfreeness at Work.....	84
B. “Mexicans Will Get Jobs But No Blacks” .....	87
C. Preference for “Unfree” Workers.....	92
D. “You’re Fired Now. I’m Gonna Hire These People ‘Cause They Work Like Crazy” .....	100
E. The TSI’s Fight to Protect This System: “They Can’t Exist Without Exploitation” .....	105
F. Discussion and Conclusion.....	109
<b>IV. Worker Centers as Space Makers .....</b>	<b>113</b>
A. Space Making in the U.S. Labor Movement.....	115
B. Worker Centers as Space Makers.....	122
1. <i>Inclusion: “The Unions Aren’t Helpin’ Us Out.”</i> .....	122
2. <i>Whole Worker Organizing: “‘Cause They Don’t Only Care About You as a Worker; They Care About Your Whole Life”</i> .....	129

3. <i>Social and Structural Transformation: “Let’s break down the structures of why this is happening.”</i> .....	133
C. Challenges to Space Making Efforts .....	137
D. Discussion and Conclusion .....	139
<b>V. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>142</b>
<b>CITED LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>VITA.....</b>	<b>185</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. 2014 CHICAGO POPULATION.....	34
II. FORMAL INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS.....	42

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

ATC	Adult Transitional Centers
ICE	Immigration and Customs Enforcement
ICI	Illinois Correctional Industries
IDOC	Illinois Department of Corrections
IDOL	Illinois Department of Labor
ISSA	Illinois Search and Staffing Association
SSAI	Staffing Services Association of Illinois
TSI	Temporary Staffing Industry
UWC	United Worker Center
WFF	Workers Fighting for Fairness

## SUMMARY

In this dissertation, I outline my findings from nearly two years of ethnographic research of two Chicago based worker centers, the “Unity Worker Center” (UWC) and “Workers Fighting for Fairness” (WFF). Building on existing descriptive literature on worker centers, I argue that these organizations are “space making” (Das Gupta 2006) organizations contesting members’ exclusion from full citizenship rights and the broader labor movement. By “full citizenship” I mean the legal nation state membership but also the social, civil, political, and economic rights (see Brubaker 1990; Marshall [1950] 1992; Somers 2008; Somers and Roberts 2008) and the respect to be considered worthy as a citizen of this nation state. As the UWC organized undocumented Latino immigrants and African Americans working in the contingent temporary staffing industry (TSI), and the WFF organizes low-wage and formerly incarcerated African-Americans, I found that their members’ exclusion was predominately facilitated through the nexus of neoliberal racialized criminalization and labor market restructuring

In the introduction chapter, I outline the theoretical background on citizenship, racialized criminalization, labor market restructuring, and literature regarding worker centers. I also include a description of my study, methods, findings and contributions. In the chapters that follow, I analyze the challenges these organizations’ members faced inside and outside the workplace, and then discuss the efforts of the WFF and UWC in addressing them. Specifically, in chapter two I describe my finding that the racialized criminalization of Latino immigrants and African Americans in Chicago produces a similar exclusion from substantive citizenship rights. In chapter three, I outline my second finding, that the restructuring of the labor market to a more nonstandard and “triangularized” structure such as that in the temporary staffing industry, also exacerbated the exclusion of these groups from full citizenship rights through taking advantage of and perpetuating their racialized “unfreeness” (see Glenn 2002). Finally, in chapter four I

## **SUMMARY (continued)**

argue that these worker centers were challenging this neoliberal exclusion and fighting for broader inclusion of these marginalized groups to citizenship rights and the larger labor movement. I outline how both organizations understood they can only address their members' exploitation by also addressing their citizenship exclusion, and thus were making space for more inclusivity, whole worker, and structurally focused organizing in the local labor movement, and addressing these forms of exclusion from full citizenship. To contextualize this, I contend that these organizations were employing what Monisha Das Gupta (2006) calls "space making politics" since they included people and issues not usually included in the larger labor movement, and thus were re-shaping the movement. I argue that this framework might be used to understand worker centers more broadly in the organization field of the labor movement.

In general, this study furthers scholarship on racialization, citizenship studies, structures of criminalization, labor market changes, and a group of "alternative" labor organizations. I argue that a better understanding on each of these themes are critical for contributing to a more effective labor movement. We cannot ignore or sideline the influence of race and criminalization on peoples' rights in our organizing because they create fundamentally differential statuses and vulnerability amongst workers, and enhance divisions between us. Without addressing the experiences of those who are marginalized, there will continue to be groups that are deemed easily exploited, which lowers standards for all workers, even if they are in unions. These nuances are particularly important to understand in the increasingly precarious, nonstandard labor market.



## **I. Introduction: Citizenship Exclusion and Worker Center Organizing**

On a July evening in 2013, over twenty African Americans sat in a circle to plan for an upcoming event aiming to get local “Ban the Box” legislation passed. This legislation would take the question about criminal convictions off of job applications (Natividad Rodriguez and Avery 2016; Von Bergen and Bressler 2016) and they hoped it would help African Americans and others with criminal convictions have a better chance of getting jobs. The meeting was organized by the black worker center I call “Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF),” and hosted by the Latino immigrant and African American worker center I call “United Worker Center (UWC).”<sup>1</sup> Before the meeting started, Benito, the director of UWC, welcomed everyone to the office and spoke about how Latino immigrants and African Americans are both mistreated in the workplace and pitted against each other. So, he said, as a multi-racial organization, they were happy to host this meeting and continue to grow the multi-racial collaboration between them and WFF.

WFF organizers went on to explain the importance of getting the “Ban the Box” law passed, while multiple members shared personal stories of having served time, lamenting on how much having a criminal record affected them. At one point, some participants shared information about how people can get their records expunged at the Cook county courthouse through a legal aid organization. The conversation then shifted to WFF organizers encouraging people to go to a protest the next day against the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), explaining how ALEC is directly behind laws that criminalize and marginalize people of color disproportionately, like “Stand your Ground” in Florida and anti-immigrant laws in Arizona. Eventually, the facilitators circled back to organizing the upcoming event. They then

---

<sup>1</sup> All individual, worker center, and staffing agency names are pseudonyms to protect anonymity. Other entities’ names are real.

handed out the tentative speaker line-up which included people from WFF, the UWC, and other coalition partners who were slated to talk about how having felony records affected their access to work and other areas of life, and how this legislation could help them.

As the meeting wrapped up, I reflected on my labor organizing and research experience over the years, and noted that this was not a typical meeting in the labor movement world. Instead, organizers had addressed issues not normally central to labor organizing, and this organizing was led by people rarely invited to the table in the movement – in this case, low income African Americans, many with criminal records and few with full time jobs or opportunities to be in unions. Furthermore the group was working to make significant social changes beyond just their working conditions at a particular workplace. These factors represented the importance of worker centers.

In this dissertation, I outline my findings from nearly two years of ethnographic research of the WFF and UWC, two Chicago based worker centers. First I analyze the challenges these organizations' members faced inside and outside the workplace, and then discuss the efforts by the WFF and UWC to address them. Specifically, my first two findings were that racialized criminalization of Latino immigrants and African Americans in Chicago, and the restructuring of the labor market to a more nonstandard and “flexible” structure were both exacerbating the exclusion of these groups from “full citizenship.” Here I refer to full citizenship as the formal legal membership of a nation state as well as the social, civil, political, and economic rights (see Brubaker 1990; Marshall [1950] 1992; Somers 2008; Somers and Roberts 2008) and the respect to be considered worthy of being citizen. I focus on citizenship because the dominant national discourse of rights in the U.S. as a state, in public rhetoric, and within civil society continues to be based on immigration status and civil rights boundaries, rather than rights at a universal or

transnational level. In addition, at the local level, citizenship is a key focus of policy and law enforcement, and most participants were constrained most concretely and immediately by local factors rather than transnational or global contexts. Finally, my third finding was that these worker centers were employing what Monisha Das Gupta (2006) calls “space making politics” by challenging this neoliberal exclusion from full citizenship and fighting for broader inclusion of these marginalized groups to citizenship rights, thus re-shaping the larger labor movement.

Regarding my first finding, through a long history of racialization and laws that affect people of color, many people have been deemed “second class citizens” or outside full inclusion of citizenship (see Glenn 2002). Like others, I argue that with the neoliberal projects of increased discriminatory legislation, mass detention, deportation, and incarceration particularly of low income people of color, these groups have faced increased criminalization and “marking” which has further reduced or blocked their access to full citizenship (see Alexander 2010; Bada, Fox, and Selee 2006; Bloemraad 2006; Fine 2006; Glenn 2000; Pager 2003; Peck and Theodore 2008; Purser 2012a). This racialized criminalization subsequently affects the relational assets and social validation of citizenship (Reiter 2013) for these groups through legal and social systems. It also illuminates the historical divisions of who really “belongs” in the U.S. let alone who is worthy of fair treatment as a human. Given this, both citizens and noncitizens who are racially criminalized face a heightened vulnerability in many areas of their life in similar ways, as well as the ongoing threat of further criminalization and exclusion. In chapter two, I discuss how this relates to Latino immigrants and African Americans in Chicago.

Secondly, poor and working people have been reeling from the effects of neoliberal economic restructuring policies, including cuts to state support and increasingly contingent labor market dynamics. The expanded anti-union efforts and employer use of outsourcing,

subcontracting, informal, part-time, contingent, “independent contractor,” or day labor work arrangements to cut labor costs and legal responsibilities has resulted in the significant growth of low-wage, contingent “precarious,” or “non-standard” jobs even during the so-called “recovery” following the 2008 recession (see Belous 1989; Carre et al. 2000; Gleason 2006; Kalleberg 2011; Kalleberg et al. 1997; Kalleberg, Reskin, and Hudson 2000; Peck and Theodore 2001, 2012; Theodore, Carlson, and Fahey 1995). This downgrading of jobs disproportionately affects women, people of color, and immigrants (see Bonacich, Alimahomed, and Wilson 2008; Cobble and Vosko 2000; Fox 2012; Mills 2003; Ong 2003; Roediger and Esch 2012; Peck and Theodore 2001, 2012). Facing even more limited access to stable, well-paying employment, exacerbates these groups’ experience of being caught in a cycle of poverty, social precarity, and exploitation. This was evident in the Chicago area light industrial temporary staffing industry. In this case, through a triangular employment relationship, temp staffing agencies served as intermediaries “supplying” workers to local factories. As I discuss further in chapter three, I found that this industry used the degree of racialized “unfreeness,” or lack of autonomy due to state control (see Glenn 2002), of undocumented Latino immigrant and low income African American applicants as the basis for sorting for the most “preferred” (i.e. exploitable), workers to send to these companies.

Together this neoliberal racialized criminalization and labor market restructuring operates to exacerbate and reinforce the legacies of exploitation, stigmatization, and exclusion of poor and working class people, particularly Latinos and African-Americans, from “full citizenship” in Chicago (see Marshall [1950] 1992; Somers 2008; Somers and Roberts 2008). Much of civil society strives to reverse these mechanisms of exclusion, yet these issues are not widely addressed in the mainstream labor movement, nor are the people most affected by them broadly

included in unions. On the other hand, my third finding was that the UWC and WFF were directly dealing with these issues of racialized criminalization and labor market restructuring, while organizing for broader inclusion to full citizenship for marginalized groups. To contextualize this, I borrow Das Gupta's (2006) idea of "space making politics" to argue that these two worker centers were serving to make space for more inclusivity, whole worker, and structurally focused organizing in the local labor movement, as a way to address these forms of exclusion from full citizenship. I discuss this in depth in chapter four, arguing that this framework could be used to understand worker centers more broadly in the organizational field (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) of the labor movement.

In general, this study furthers scholarship on racialization, citizenship studies, structures of criminalization, labor market changes, and a group of so-called "alternative" or "alt-labor" organizations (Eidelson 2013). I argue that a better understanding on each of these themes is critical for contributing to a more effective labor movement. We cannot ignore or sideline the influence of race and criminalization on peoples' rights in our organizing because they create fundamentally differential statuses and vulnerability amongst, and enhance divisions between, workers in the U.S. Ignoring the experiences of those who are most marginalized allows for the lowering of standards for all workers, even if they are in unions. This is particularly important with regards to the increasingly precarious, nonstandard labor market where divisions, isolation, and precarity make organizing more difficult. In the sections that follow, I outline the relevant literature on citizenship, racialized criminalization, and labor market restructuring to situate the struggles that UWC and WFF members face. I then describe the context that the UWC and WFF worker centers operated in with regards to the local Chicago labor movement and broader civil

society. Finally, I describe my research methods, outline the contributions of my study, and summarize the arguments that follow in the remaining chapters.

## FULL CITIZENSHIP INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

In this dissertation I refer to T.H. Marshall's (1964) classic definition of the ideal type of "full citizenship," which he says includes civil, political, and social aspects of inclusion and rights (see also Somers 2008; Somers and Roberts 2008). Describing the development of rights in Western democracies such as Great Britain, he outlines civil rights as rights of liberty, freedom, justice, and ownership. Regarding the political, he points to the right to be involved in politics as a voter or representative. And he argues social rights are the right to economic security and access to a decent, average standard of living (Marshall 1964:71-72). I work from these descriptions, yet emphasize economic rights more independently from the social. I also operate from the understanding that these rights are interdependent (Lister 2005), in that changes in one type of rights generally affects the others.

Furthermore I take as a given that access to these rights is not universal or constant. This relates to the ideas of Evelyn Nakano Glenn (2000) who states, "Because of its relation to equality/inequality, citizenship has been the site of continual contestation" (p. 1). Margaret Somers (2008) further explains that the lines of who is included is only clarified through who is deemed excluded. Along these lines, some scholars argue that there are clear boundaries defining nation state based citizenship, suggesting it is based on nativity or legal status, naturalization laws, and "ethno-cultural citizenship" (Glenn 2000) or levels of assimilation. Other scholars contend that the boundaries of citizenship are not dichotomous, but instead are a spectrum of inclusion and exclusion of citizenship (see Chauvin and Garces-Mascarenas 2012; Das Gupta 2006; Gleeson 2012; Reiter 2013; Somers 2008), such as "liminal inclusion" or "in-

between” (Menjívar 2006) or “inclusive exclusion” of being legally included but excluded in actual experiences and identity of full citizenship (Agamben 1998:21; Carbado 2005). This spectrum of fragmented citizenship means that people have varying amounts of access to civil, political, or social citizenship and rights or resources. And one’s position on the continuum of inclusion and exclusion is based on time, geographic location, and local, national, and global dynamics (see Chauvin and Garces-Mascareñas 2012). It is also shaped by demographic characteristics based on race, class, nationality, and gender. While language, culture, sexual orientation, and ability also shapes one’s access to citizenship rights, these are beyond the scope of this study.

In addition, access to rights associated with citizenship is not determined solely by whether or not one has formal “legal citizenship,” or membership to a nation state, but also access to the substantive aspects of citizenship. To contextualize this, I draw from Rogers Brubaker’s (1990) argument that there is both “formal” and “substantive” citizenship, and the former is “neither a sufficient nor a necessary condition” for the latter (p. 36; see also Glenn 2002). Formal citizenship boundaries are generally clear in that legally, a person either does or does not qualify as a “member” of a nation state based on a law at a particular time. But substantive citizenship is far more nuanced. A person can have some substantive citizenship rights even if they do not have formal citizenship, and can have little or none of it even if they do have formal citizenship. This is because, as Bernd Reiter (2013) explains, substantive citizenship, or the practical lived parts, is both a “relational asset” and “social role.” In other words, substantive citizenship is “...a social role that needs to be learned, accepted, and validated by others (Reiter 2013:32)” who may try to restrict it to maintain their privileges. In addition, Reiter (2013) explains that with its “gradual commodification” citizenship as an asset

“lost its muscle whenever it was extended to a greater number of people” (p. 35). Given this, those who possess the “asset” of citizenship rights generally strive to maintain their privilege by excluding others’ access to it, feeling that it can only remain valuable by limiting who can have it and how much of it they can have. For instance, many groups of immigrants in the early twentieth century were racialized and legally excluded from formal citizenship due to the dominating belief that giving citizenship to more people lowered its “value” (see Chavez 2008). And as a social role, citizenship has to be continuously negotiated and validated by others, who may try to restrict it to maintain their privileges, and thus guarantee “the reproduction of clients” who can be exploited, and who might become “loyal subjects” that support this system (Reiter 2013:28).

The boundaries that designate these dominant and subordinate groups, and justifies exclusion through differential treatment and access to citizenship has been structured along categories such as gender, sexuality, and religion, and especially along what Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (1997, 2015) calls a “racialized social system.” Specifically, the processes of racialization and racial hierarchy in the U.S. were founded on white supremacy, and reified through evolving political, economic, social structures and interactions that divide groups and have both material and symbolic consequences (see Omi and Winant 1994; Wacquant 2001). Indeed, citizenship and access to these rights in the West has historically been reserved for wealthy white men primarily, and some other privileged people to a limited extent (see Glenn 2002). Reiter (2013) explains that claiming whiteness is “one of the central tools used by historically privileged groups to explain their own privilege and justify their privileged access to rights....for explaining and justifying the exclusion of all “others” (38),” consequently relegating racialized people to “second-class,” or partial, citizenship status even if they are “formal” citizens (p. 36-37).



Furthermore, Reiter (2013) argues that throughout the colonialization and nation building in the West, non-European descendant “others” were not given full substantive rights or included as a true part of the “imagined community” (p. 40). This maintained social hierarchies in which whites had the most power and were the “worthy citizens” from which all others were judged by (Ong 2003:11). As a result, those who do not fit within the mythically homogenous white nation, including most indigenous people, immigrants from the global south, their descendants, and African-Americans, have been deemed as “marginal to the nation” (Ong 2003:11) and are thus excluded from full citizenship rights to varying degrees. These distinctions were determined starting from the colonizing and genocide of indigenous peoples, and enslavement of Africans. And they were reinforced through various laws including the early Naturalization Act of 1790 that defined citizenship as only “free white persons” of “good moral character,” as well as immigration related laws such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1880, which shaped who could be considered a citizenship. Later the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924 established quotas that favored new Europeans. This was followed by the Hart-Cellar Act of 1965, which formally ended racial quotas for immigrants, but created a more rigid boundary for Latin American immigrants suddenly subject to national origin quotas like all others (Glenn 2002; Gomberg-Muñoz 2012; Schneider 2011).

In addition to legal restrictions on formal citizenship, exclusion from the assets of full citizenship in the U.S. has been experienced most greatly by poor, female, and non-white people (Glenn 2000, 2002; Ngai 2004; Reiter 2013). Indeed, many people talk about these and other legally marginalized groups as “second class citizens,” or those who are legally included but still experience significant marginalization from the civil, political and social rights that Marshall (1964) argued were central to full citizenship. In particular, African Americans have

experienced exclusion from formal and substantive citizenship during slavery, had very limited substantive citizenship during the Jim Crow era, and due to continued racism are generally still denied full rights, particularly if they are poor (Alexander 2010; Bosniak 2012; Western 2007).

On the other hand, people who are legally noncitizens of the U.S. have access to some rights associated with substantive citizenship, including some educational, labor, health, and state welfare rights, and civil rights “such as freedom of speech and due process” (Glenn 2000:12-13; see also Bosniak 2006). Yet access to these rights are even more limited for those that are racially identified as from the Global South, who are also more likely to be restricted from having legal immigration statuses (Armenta 2016; Bosniak 2006; Chauvin and Garces-Mascarenas 2012; Gleeson and Gonzales 2012; Menjivar 2006). Additionally, access to full citizenship has been reshaped through neoliberal projects of privatization, market fundamentalism, and reduction of state benefits, policies, and market regulation. In particular, I argue below that neoliberal projects of racialized criminalization and labor market restructuring are exacerbating the “second class citizenship” and marginalization of racialized noncitizens.

### *Racialized Criminalization Under Neoliberalism*

While numerous groups are criminalized according to their religion, gender, and sexuality, mass incarceration and criminalization in the U.S. is overwhelmingly experienced by the poor and non-white, who are deemed “others” and “marginal to the nation” (Golash-Boza 2009; Ngai 2004; Ong 2003:11; Wacquant 2009). Here I focus on the racialized criminalization of African Americans and Latin American immigrants, describing how being racialized and criminalized as a person who is undocumented or has a criminal record becomes a stigma and label on both the individual and their community, thus justifying their exclusion from full rights (Gomberg-Muñoz 2012). In particular, I look at how neoliberal projects have facilitated the

increased criminalization of people of color through mass incarceration and new restrictive immigration laws aimed at Latin Americans, and how these continue the projects that have historically kept these groups in a subordinate position in our racialized social system (Bonilla-Silva 1997).

As of 2013, there were 6,899,000 people in the U.S. under adult correctional system supervision, which includes incarceration, probation and parole (Glaze and Kaeble 2014). Subsequently, over sixty five million adults in the U.S. have a criminal record (Rodriguez and Emsellem 2011) and more than sixteen million of these are felonies specifically (Uggen, Manza, and Thompson 2006). These numbers disproportionately represent people of color, and particularly African American men, who are much more likely to be incarcerated than whites and even Latinos (Mauer 2013). Locally, the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) stated that as of June 30, 2015, there were 47,165 people incarcerated in Illinois (Short 2016:75). Of these, 94.2% of were male, 57.6% of the total number incarcerated were black, compared with 29.3% who were white, and 12.5% who were Hispanic (Short 2016:76). At the same time, there were 28,478 people on parole in Illinois. Of them, 90.7% were male, 60.2% were black, 29.1% were white, and 10.3% were Hispanic (Short 2016:78-79).

This disproportionate criminalization of African Americans has a long history. To begin with, following emancipation from slavery, the Black codes and convict leasing system were key structures created by whites to maintain control over formerly enslaved African Americans. These structures served to maintain African Americans' subordinate status, re-secure their free labor, and served as a foundation for their criminalization (Alexander 2010; Mauer 2006; Western 2007). According to Khalil Gibran Muhammad (2010), statistics on prisoners started being recorded in the 1890 census, and this official documentation further facilitated African

Americans being characterized as “a distinct and dangerous criminal population” (p. 3).

Muhammad (2010) explains that this made black criminality “became one of the most widely accepted bases for justifying prejudicial thinking, discriminatory treatment, and/or acceptance of racial violence as an instrument of public safety” (p. 4). Yet even after Jim Crow was challenged and civil rights gains were made in the 1960s, these ideas were again reinforced through neoliberalism. This was facilitated through the emergence of “Tough on Crime” laws starting in the 1970s, along with the “War on Drugs” and more punitive sentencing through “mandatory minimum,” “zero tolerance,” and “three-strikes” laws that encompassed even non-violent offenses such as marijuana possession, loitering, selling “loose squares” or single cigarettes, parking tickets, and public fines (Bannon, Nagrecha, and Diller 2010; LeBaron 2012). These legal interventions led to the dramatic increase in felony convictions and incarceration of people of color, particularly African Americans, and particularly men (Alexander 2010; Beale 2003; Gomborg-Muñoz 2012; Greene 2002; Mauer 2006; Wacquant 2009; Western 2007; Western and Wildeman 2009).

On the one hand, some scholars argue that mass incarceration operated to control those people most affected by neoliberal changes such as increased economic precarity due to deindustrialization and cuts to welfare benefits. For instance, Jamie Peck and Adam Tickell (2002) explain that mass incarceration focused on “aggressive reregulation, disciplining, and containment of those marginalized or dispossessed by the neoliberalization of the 1980s” (p. 389; see also Wacquant 2008, 2009). In another vein, some scholars argue that this mass incarceration is related to neoliberalism in a way that directly relates to racism (see Alexander 2010; Omi and Winant 2015). For instance, Omi and Winant (2015) argue mass incarceration is part of the conservative efforts of “containment and rearticulation” of the democratic values and

egalitarian state social policies born from the civil rights and anti-racist movements that had directly threatened white elite interests. They explain that elites played on the racial resentment of whites', particularly from the South, to legitimate and move neoliberal policies and politicians forward. To do this, rather than using overt racist language that had become less acceptable, words like "tough on crime" and "welfare queens" were used, thereby perpetuating coded racial and criminalizing stereotypes. Elites also perpetuated the idea of "reverse racism" which urged larger groups of white people to be fearful of how racial equality would affect their access to "fairness" in relation to things like Affirmative Action (Omi and Winant 2015:218-222). Omi and Winant (2015) also describe that the growth of the concept of colorblindness has been key to hiding race from most people's understanding of inequality. This then "had the concrete consequences of impeding redistributive efforts in such areas as university admissions, employment, government contracting and licensing, and civil rights in general" (p. 219), allowing elites to better challenge democracy and redistribution. Furthermore, they explain that this mass incarceration served to open up a lucrative market within and in relation to prisons. This includes the unpaid or extremely underpaid labor happening inside prisons allowable thanks to the provision in the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment to the U.S. constitution which states slavery could no longer exist except if someone was convicted of a crime. This exploitative labor occurs even in public prisons, such as the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC), which includes the Illinois Correctional Industries or "ICI." The ICI touts that the work they provide to prisoners helps prisoners make some money, reduces time on their sentences, and have more chances for employment post release, as well as save the prison money on supplies and services, and even bring in some revenue for IDOC, for instance through their recycling or laundry programs (Short

2016). According to a spokesperson of the program, as of 2015, prisoners received between the thirty cents per hour “training wage” up to \$2.25 per hour (Esters 2015).

Regardless of the intent, the mass incarceration of African Americans has had significant consequences on access to full citizenship, not only during incarceration but also after release. As Michelle Alexander (2010) explains, this system creates “legalized discrimination and permanent social exclusion” which “permanently locks a huge percentage of the African American community out of the mainstream society and economy (p. 13).” In addition, Western (2007) explains that this “the prison boom shrank the circle American citizens,” and that “The men of the mass-imprisonment generation and their families are excluded from the “basic human equality” that Marshall associated with full membership in a community” (p. 35-36). Indeed Peck and Theodore (2008) describe how being targeted by the law enforcement and criminal justice systems in deindustrialized cities such as Chicago creates an image of black males to be broadly designated as “a criminalized class, the employability deficits of which are made, understood, and acted upon as if they represented a *collective condition*” (p. 276). And Kelly Lytle Hernández (2011) argues that exclusion from public housing and benefits “are the material evidence that the criminal justice system operates as a broad-reaching system of social stratification that holds persons aloft from full citizenship and social belonging” (p. 64). This means less access to assets and rights, separating people from opportunities and access to their communities.

These neoliberal projects have functioned in similar ways for many immigrants. For instance, racialized and poor immigrants have also experienced heightened criminalization, further excluding them from access to legal, civic, political, and social citizenship inclusion (Schneider 2011). As Chavez (2008) explains, the great influx of immigrants, particularly from

poor and non-European countries following the Hart-Cellar Act of 1965, stoked great public anxiety about the changing racial demographic landscape, distribution of resources, and “cheapening citizenship.” In other words, from the perspective of Reiter (2013) they were seen as threatening to change the relational distribution of assets. Fear that these immigrants were not assimilating, took too many public resources, and were too radically changing national racial demographics, contributed to subsequent efforts to restrict their numbers and rights, and characterize them as “illegal.” This was particularly in regards to those coming from Latin America, and especially Mexico (Armenta 2016; Chavez 2008; Menjívar and Kanstroom 2014; Ngai 2004), who also happen to be the people most dispossessed from neoliberal trade laws like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). In response to this fear, policy makers at the local and federal levels started passing laws that criminalized these immigrants, making them increasingly seen as and treated as criminals, ostensibly because they have “broken the law” through entering or residing in the U.S. unlawfully even though these immigration violations are civil in nature (see Stumpf 2006). And within towards the end of the last century, local and federal laws were passed that limited immigrants’ access to rights and resources and criminalized many of them, arguably as a result of this anxiety. Such laws included California’s Proposition 187, the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), the 1996 federal Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) and Illegal Immigrant Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), and later the Patriot Act with its ensuing creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in 2003. Collectively these laws significantly increased immigration enforcement, the severity of classification for certain crimes even if committed in the past, Expedited Removal, and facilitated the way for increased deportation, even for convictions in the past. For instance, Hernández (2011) explained that the passage of

IIRIRA increased the amount of Latinos in prison even for non-violent crimes, as well as increased the number of minor offenses that could be considered worthy of deportation for undocumented immigrants. She said that

Today, over 60 percent of all deportations from the United States are triggered by criminal convictions, mostly traffic offenses, nonviolent drug crimes, and immigration related violations....After serving their criminal sentence, most immigrants who are identified for deportation will spend over one month in a detention facility, most likely a rented-out jail bed in one of several hundred jail facilities throughout the country that contract with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (Hernández 2011:63)

All of this paved the way in the late 1990s and early 2000s for more local police involvement in immigration enforcement through Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) Section 287(g) and Secure Communities agreements, and the passage of numerous local and state laws that further marginalize and criminalize immigrants such as English only laws, and residency limits (see Gomberg-Munoz and Nussbaum-Barberena 2014). While the legal consequences of these laws are substantial, scholars note that their effect was particularly that of keeping people in fear of their “deportability” (Gomberg-Munoz and Nussbaum-Barberena 2011; Ridgley 2008 citing De Genova 2005).

Given this, the detention and deportation of undocumented immigrants has escalated dramatically in recent years. This has created another large and profitable industry, and had immense effects on immigrant criminalization. In 2014, there were around 11.3 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S. (Obeidat 2015). About half of these are Mexican born, and a majority of the rest are from Central America. In addition, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) reports that reported that ICE deported 315,943 people in 2014, and reportedly 85 percent of these were people with criminal convictions (p. 7). Rates of detention also increased significantly. Detention Watch Network (DWN 2016) reports that “The average daily population of detained immigrants increased from approximately 5,000 in 1994, to 19,000



in 2001, and to over 34,000 in 2014...the detention system now captures and holds as many as 400,000 immigrants each year” (see also Detention Watch Network 2015). With this incarceration, immigrants are criminalized, leaving them excluded from opportunities to gain full citizenship and more open to future criminalization (see Golash-Boza 2009, 2012). In this vein, Juliet Stumpf (2006) argues that over the past forty years, and particularly since the 1980s, the growing prison industrial complex, criminal and immigration law, enforcement, and prosecution procedures have become increasingly intertwined (p. 381), creating what some call “crimmigration” (see also Hernández 2011), or what Golash-Boza (2009) describes as the “immigrant industrial complex,” which results in increased criminal convictions and the cycle of incarceration and deportation.

I describe this criminalization more in chapter two, arguing that it affects African Americans and Latino immigrants in Chicago in similar ways. While this relationship has gained increasing attention in activist circles, the academic literature on this similarity is still limited. I add to these emerging conversations by making the case that for poor people of color, the experience of having a criminal record and a subsequent decrease in access to rights associated with citizenship, has significant similarities to the lived or substantive experiences of undocumented immigrants. In particular, it has reinforced their vulnerability as workers and outsider status. Because the UWC and WFF were not working with the following groups in any significant numbers, at this time I do not address these parallels for 1.5 generation or native born Latinos, nor for immigrant and native born Asians, Africans, or Caribbeans, who are also racialized and disproportionately criminalized.

### *Neoliberal Labor Market Restructuring*

Marginalization from full citizenship has also been exacerbated by the downgrading of the labor market, in that there are less opportunities for employment that support a reasonable

standard of living, and conditions become even more ripe for exploitation. In combination with an environment of deregulation, free trade, and market driven governance (Glenn 2000; Harvey 2005; Ong 2006; Peck and Tickell 2002; Rose 1999; Sassen 1996; Somers 2008), a broad scale labor market restructuring has occurred wherein nonstandard, contingent and precarious work have become key fixtures in the labor market. This has materialized particularly through subcontracting, informal, part-time, temporary, and “independent contractor” work arrangements which function to cut labor costs, legal responsibilities, and potential for collective organizing by workers (see Belous 1989; Bernhardt et al. 2008; Carre et al. 2000; Gleason 2006; Kalleberg 2011; Kalleberg et al. 1997, 2000; Peck and Theodore 2001, 2012; Theodore et al. 1995).

Such nonstandard and precarious employment was actually quite common at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Milkman 2014). It was only after World War II and the New Deal that the direct hire, full time jobs with benefits, or the “standard employment relationship” (SER) model, became more common, shaping the culture of employment broadly (Hatton 2011; Vosko 2000, 2010). This SER model emerged from mass unionization efforts and employer interest in quelling labor unrest. It was based on a male breadwinner and a cultural investment of giving men their “rightful” place in the labor markets following the war, displacing women who had been in the workforce. Thus, while this labor market structure was a great relief to many, it primarily benefitted white, middle class men and their families by extension, and was still not the “standard” for people of color, women, and immigrants. Nevertheless, it began to set the baseline for labor market standards generally, leading employers to operate from an “asset” model (Hatton 2011) wherein they viewed employees as assets to a company and felt an obligation to repay their labor with a fair wage and standards. But during the 1970s, with deunionization and neoliberal policies (see Harvey 2005; Louie 2001; Sassen 1996; Somers

2008) this norm was reversed, and shifted towards a “liability model of work” (Hatton 2011). In other words, employees became characterized as “liabilities” to profit and increasingly seen as a line item to reduce in order to cut costs.

Part of this shift in employment models has been carried out through a regrowth of secondary and nonstandard employment as the “new normal” (Fudge and Strauss 2014), which includes more flexible, subcontracted and “temporary employment relationship” (TER) (see also Bernhardt 2011, 2012; Hudson 2007; Peck and Theodore 2012; Vosko 2000, 2010). Indeed, the majority of the newly created jobs since the “end” of the most recent 2008 recession have been temporary, part time, low-wage, and non-standard forms of employment (Bernhardt 2011, 2012). At the lower end of the scale, these jobs are characterized by irregular hours, temporary employment, a lack of benefits, non-unionization, minimal protection through labor laws, low wages, wage theft, sexual and verbal harassment, and substandard and dangerous working conditions (Bernhardt et al. 2005, 2008; Fine 2006; Kalleberg et al. 2000). And it is woman, people of color, and immigrants who disproportionately work in these non-standard jobs, particularly those with “bad” job characteristics (Bookman 1995; Carre et al. 2000; Cobble 2007; Gleason 2006; Hudson 2007; Kalleberg et al. 2000:270; Theodore 1995).

One example of this nonstandard, flexible shift is the temporary staffing industry (TSI), whose “product” is commodified, “just-in-time” labor. While only equaling 2.5 percent of U.S. employment (Smith and McKenna 2014),<sup>2</sup> Theodore and Peck (2014) argue it has become an ““infrastructural-scale” labour market intermediary” (p. 29), restructuring the national and even global labor markets, and causing a “suppression” of “sustained employment growth” (p. 41).

---

<sup>2</sup> Tracking the exact number of agencies and workers at any given time is difficult due to how government statistics on the industry are highly aggregated (Luo et al. 2010), the fact that workers frequently move between them, there are frequent changes in agency names and registrations (Purser 2012; Smith and McKenna 2014), and there is a lack of transparency from client companies regarding who they contract with.

This is significant given how the industry has been widely documented as downgrading standards such as wages, increasing accident rates, and undercutting unionization. The TSI operates through the triangular employment relationship between the worker, client company and temporary staffing agency (Freeman and Gonos 2005; Gonos 1997, 1998; Hatton 2014; Vosko 2000; Peck and Theodore 2002). This obscures who is accountable or responsible for workers (Purser 2012b) as client companies are not obligated to hire long term, and agencies deal with the “social and managerial costs” and insurance (Peck and Theodore 2001:485). In this relationship, the intermediary “flesh peddlers” (Parker 1994) or agencies keep labor costs as low as possible to beat their competition and be able to “sell” commodified workers (Peck and Theodore 2001; Vosko 2000). Indeed, workers are generally paid nearly minimum wage, if not below, due agencies seeking to make a profit off the difference and rampant wage theft (Doussard, Peck, and Theodore 2009), while agencies mark up the price at least 25-100% for the “service” of providing the clients with workers and minimal managements responsibilities. These agencies then function as a mechanism for client companies to avoid legal liability and unionization, and circumvent safety, wage, and citizenship laws by recruiting and controlling the marginalized group’s workers. Additionally, while this industry operates under the pretense of facilitating “temp to hire” opportunities, few workers get hired directly or “permanently” with the client company. Some workers are even employed by a single temp agency and assigned to one or more client companies for an extended amount of time, resulting in them becoming “permatemps.”

The early administrative TSI jobs in the 1940s were primarily comprised of clerical positions for women assumed to be attached to a male breadwinner (Hatton 2011; Peck and Theodore 1998; Vosko 2010). Their status as dependents was used to justify the flexible, short

term and low paying positions it “provided” to them. Over time, the industry started spreading - first in the Midwest and then into more occupations (Peck and Theodore 1998:657). Since then, this paternalistic, exploitative structure and transfer of “liability” and “risk” has been expanded to many other jobs and more marginalized people. Contemporarily, temporary work in the manufacturing industry is the fastest growing, lowest paid temp work, now comprising at least 42 percent of the TSI market (Luo, Mann, and Holden 2010; Peck and Theodore 2001, 2008; Smith and McKenna 2014:1). This means it is a restrictive gatekeeper to many key low-skill jobs in labor markets like Chicago.

People of color and undocumented immigrants, who are racially, economically, and often legally marginalized are thus primary targets for recruitment, seen as an exploitable labor supply (Fudge and Strauss 2014; Peck and Theodore 1998, 2001, 2008; Peck, Theodore, and Ward 2005). In this vein, Peck and Theodore (2001, 2008) point to the “Race-structured hiring regime” (2001:489) of the TSI in Chicago which they say is “designed to perpetuate socioeconomic exclusion” (2008:255-256). The low-skill TSI had its early beginnings in the late 1920s in Chicago, developing particularly in the 1940s (Moore 1965). It grew significantly though starting in the 1980s (Gonos 1997; Hatton 2011; Kalleberg et al. 2000; Luo et al. 2010; Peck and Theodore 2001; Segal and Sullivan 1997; Vosko 2000). Indeed, despite widespread deindustrialization, Chicago is still “one of the most important manufacturing, transportation, and distribution hubs in the world” (Smith and McKenna 2014:8). And with the deunionization in manufacturing since the 1980s, much of the industry became dominated by temporary staffing workers and worsening conditions (Doussard et al. 2009; Peck and Theodore 1998, 2001; Theodore 2003). Smith and McKenna (2014) report that in 2013 there were more than 700 agencies in the Chicago metro area (p. 8), and that

According to research by EMSI, a private labor market research firm, Chicago gained more than 45,000 temporary jobs between 2009 and 2013, some 40 percent of total jobs added to its economy. Hundreds of staffing agencies are registered with the Illinois Department of Labor, double the number that existed a decade ago. (P. 9)

Indeed, while some were from the same agency, the Illinois Department of Labor lists 989 offices registered under the Illinois Day and Temporary Labor Services Act (820 ILCS 175) in 2015, which is up from just 772 in 2011 (IDOL 2015). This not count the unregistered agencies or van drivers that recruit directly in immigrant neighborhoods, called “raiteros”.

Most of the hundreds of temporary staffing agency offices are located on the periphery of impoverished communities of color on the West side of the city, to take advantage of the density of vulnerable and “reliably contingent” people in need of work who are less likely or able to demand fair treatment (Peck and Theodore 2001, 2008; Purser 2012a). Additionally, many manufacturing facilities and agencies have relocated to the suburbs, leaving people in the city without much access to these jobs (Doussard et al. 2009; Theodore 2003). Participants from UWC argued that this suburban move was due to laws inside the city of Chicago getting stricter, particularly with the passage of the Illinois Day and Temporary Labor Services Act in 2000. Peck and Theodore (2001) explain that temp agencies are influential then due to connecting “the under-employed labor pools of inner-city areas and the tight job markets of the suburbs” (p. 477).

In chapter three I outline the particular recruitment and treatment of workers within the Chicagoland light manufacturing TSI, and point to the tactics that are used to pit undocumented Latino immigrant and African Americans workers against each other and to keep them in competition and desperation. I argue that this discriminatory dynamic facilitated through this triangular employment relationship is best understood as an intentional and systematic race management project. This project takes advantage of low income and overly criminalized Latino

immigrants and African-Americans' racialized "unfreeness" (see Glenn 2002) as the basis of their operation that relies on dividing and exploiting workers.

## WORKER CENTERS IN THE U.S. LABOR MOVEMENT

Resisting neoliberal projects like racialized criminalization and downgrading labor market standards requires efforts at multiple levels (Harvey 2005; Peck and Tickell 2002). Some civil society entities have been putting in this effort, but that is not a given. The long history of philosophical thought regarding civil society theorizes how actors within it can vary in terms of their relationships with individuals, markets and states. Early models of civil society described it as a sphere supporting individualism and the market in opposition to the state, or as a sphere resisting a too powerful state. Jeffrey C. Alexander (2006) explained that the first dyadic ideal type of civil society emerged in late 17<sup>th</sup> century, when theorists such as John Locke, and later with Hegel, Adam Smith, and Alexis de Tocqueville, thought that civil society could make society stronger and more "peaceful." Following the emergence of the first industrial revolution though, civil society came to be seen by some theorists, including Marx, as a part of the bourgeoisie efforts to support their markets (Alexander 2006; Laine 2014). Triadic models became more prominent since the renewed focus on civil society in the 1990s. Hegel was an early proponent of this type of model, citing it as essentially all those associations of people between the state and family (Laine 2014).

In this dissertation I am drawing from the approach that civil society is a third space between the market and the state (see Alexander 2006; Gleeson 2009; Laine 2014; Somers 2008). More specifically, I operate from a definition by Cohen and Arato (1992) who describe civil society as institutions or the institutionalizing

sphere of social interaction between economy and state, composed above all of the intimate sphere (especially the family), the sphere of associations (especially voluntary associations), social movements, and forms of public communication. (P. ix)

Its position between the state and market does not mean though that civil society balances these powers or that all of civil society is inclusive or focused on helping marginalized people contest exclusion. Indeed, Gramsci saw civil society as a sphere between economic and state power that was often embedded or supportive of elites, capitalism, and hegemonic norms (see Cohen and Arato 1992; Laine 2014). Contemporarily, Somers (2008) points out that civil society's autonomy is precarious, and can be used by the state or market to increase inequality and create more exclusion, and encourage the nation state to see individuals only through the lens of their market worth and social capital (p. 41-42). This is particularly complicated in the neoliberal era, as much of civil society relies on foundation and corporate funding, is molded by neoliberal "market" and individualistic values, fulfills gaps in services once provided by the state, and are sometimes direct branches of government and market entities, even if called "non-governmental" or "non-profit" (see Bartley 2007; Clemens and Guthrie 2011).

On the other hand, Somers (2008) also says civil society is "the site of citizenship" (p. 29), arguing that it is crucial to democratic and inclusive citizenship and a balance of power in society. To ensure this she says that civil society needs to be very involved in both the state and market, while still maintaining autonomy and boundaries, to resist against total control or manipulation by either (Somers 2008). Social movement organizations and voluntary associations are a good example of this (see Clemens and Guthrie 2011). Similarly, Alexander (2006) expressed that

Real civil societies are contradictory and fragmented. These dynamics create the conditions for suppressing the very existence of the civil sphere. They also create the possibility for its civil repair. The ideals of civil society are never completely negated. They hold before us alternative possibilities, and from these general principles there emerge counterproposals for reform. (P. 7)



In addition, Laine (2014) explains

While not all civil society organizations are necessarily civil nor do they necessarily pursue the common good, the democratizing role of civil society as a whole cannot be denied. By virtue of their mere existence as *autonomous* actors, the various types of CSOs have pluralizing effect and consequently strengthen the institutional arena and the entire society. (P. 72)

Finally Jürgen Habermas (1996) says that in some cases, over time civil society can have “influence in the public sphere” and political systems (p. 373).

This struggle of autonomy and influence on the economic and political spheres within civil society can be seen within the labor movement. To begin with, as institutional actors (Scott et al. 2000) labor unions are the largest and most prominent part of the larger organizational field of the labor movement. Despite a significant decline of membership from its height of one third of the national labor force in the middle of the 1950s (Milkman 2014:3), currently around 11% of the national labor force remains unionized (see Manzo IV, Bruno, and Parks 2016:3) in one of the 56 unions in the AFL-CIO (AFL-CIO 2016a) or four unions in Change to Win. Similar to this national decline, there are fewer union workers overall in Illinois currently than even a decade ago. This decline is in spite of some growth in African American and public sector union membership. Still, as of 2015 the unionization rate in Illinois (15.22%) and in Chicago (13.82%) remain higher than the national average (Manzo IV et al. 2016:3), and are a key entity in politics and the broader civil society and labor market.

Regarding their impact on full citizenship, Marshall (1964) explains that unions became key in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century for facilitating workers to use “their civil rights collectively” to make claims for social, and specifically economic, rights that they were entitled to as citizens (p. 94, 111-112). Yet unions have also supported capitalist political leaders (Beachler 2001; Bruno 2003; Dark 1999), sometimes make conciliatory agreements with employers, and have too often willingly or neglectfully perpetrated white and male supremacy (Milkman 1990; Milkman and

Voss 2004; Moreno 2006; Nelson 2001) through organizational structures and relationships with the state. Contemporarily they have also focused on maintaining a middle class, and painting members as part of that class and thus “deserving” of rights, while generally erasing the concerns of the poor. In addition, few unions are explicitly organizing workers in non-standard jobs as they are difficult to organize since workers are in highly fragmented, small, and mobile groups, which are often not covered by the NLRA since they do not fit the mold of large scale, long term workplaces that were dominant when it was created (see Fine 2003, 2005; Gordon 2000, 2005; Martin, Morales, and Theodore 2007; Milkman 2007; Narro 2005; Ness 2005; Rivchin 2004; Smith 1998; Sullivan 2010). This lack of organizing in such jobs that are disproportionately comprised of women and people of color perpetuates their absences as members, staff, or leadership of unions (Bronfenbrenner and Warren 2007).

Together this continues the legacies of racism, sexism, and xenophobia in unions and the broader labor movement (see Asher and Stephenson 1990; Bronfenbrenner and Warren 2007; Collins 2006; Collomp 1988; Cranford 2007, 2012; Foerster 2004; Göbel 1988; Milkman 2000, 2007; Milkman and Voss 2004; Rivchin 2004; Tait 2005). This exclusionary membership was rooted in the early years following emancipation, from the mid-1800s to mid-1900s, when people of color, women, and “non-skilled” workers were often formally excluded from unions, particularly within the American Federation of Labor (AFL) trade unions. And while the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) was formed in the 1930s and included more industrial workers, most marginalized groups were still excluded (Milkman 1990). For instance, Vargas (2005) describes how Mexican and Mexican American workers were officially excluded from most AFL unions and had to create their own locals or got involved in CIO unions, but also organized their own organizations to stand up for themselves. They used the CIO unions as an

avenue for action and inclusion, and actively organized men as well as women even during the depression. And for those involved, Mexican American union activists faced ample discrimination, but were at the front of the struggles for full citizenship, including economic and social justice, and ending discrimination.

In addition, there were numerous separate historical labor organizations like the Colored National Labor Union (CNLU) (in contrast to the National Labor Union), Women's Trade Union League (WTUL), Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters which similarly pushed for rights of more workers. And more recently in the AFL-CIO, or the subsequent unification of nearly all unions in 1955, there have been “constituency” or affinity groups. Such groups include the A. Phillip Randolph Institute, the Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA), the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists (CBTU), the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA), and Pride at Work. These groups continue to bring together marginalized groups in unions, yet their members are generally still outside the main power structures of their unions and the national labor movement. Even the AFL-CIO’s (2016b) description of these groups signal a peripheral standing in the broader movement, saying these are

unions' bridge to diverse communities, creating and strengthening partnerships to enhance the standard of living for all workers and their families. ...The groups also promote the full participation of women and minorities in the union movement and ensure unions hear and respond to the concerns of the communities they represent.

Similarly, the AFL-CIO proudly promotes its efforts to incorporate worker centers, and racial, environmental, and other social justice organizations as affiliates, but it is not clear that organizations are included or influential in a substantial way in the larger structure.

On the other hand, numerous unions, particularly those focused on the public and service sectors, have become more diverse in recent decades due to their broad scale organizing efforts.

These is characteristic of what many call “social movement unionism” which is generally understood as some unions’ efforts starting in the 1990s to move from a more “business model” of just servicing existing members, to a more “organizing model” (Milkman 2014; Turner and Hurd 2001; Voss and Sherman 2000; Waterman 1993). This meant organizing new members, people in new industries, people often not organized like immigrants and even challenging some structural inequality. For instance, numerous unions have actively supported undocumented immigrant workers, particularly since 2000 when the AFL-CIO reversed its’ earlier support of the 1986 Immigration and Reform Control Act’s (IRCA) (Voss and Sherman 2000). And multiple large national unions have begun talking more about race and police brutality, and threats from trade deals and flexibilization of the labor market.

There is not a consensus though regarding how much of a real social movement is being led even by the most progressive and diverse unions. While some individual locals embrace and implement social movement ideals, it is not particularly widespread, especially where there is not substantial member education and involvement. And most unions still focus primarily on workplace rights rather than the spectrum of rights associated with full citizenship. One of the most prominent exceptions to this, and examples of a social movement union, is the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU). In recent years, they have become active advocates for non-workplace issues, while trying to transform the industry they are in and challenging a corrupt and neoliberal market focused Mayor. But this was only able to happen after a significant shift in leadership by the Caucus of Rank-and-File Educators (CORE) where rank and file CTU leaders began to truly lead the union, organize and activate members, and advocate for broader issues of racial and economic inequality in Chicago (for a historical overview see Uetricht and Perez 2012).

In contrast, there are numerous other “alt-labor” (Eidelson 2013) organizations within the organizational field of the labor movement working to build inclusion and change these structural obstacles to full citizenship. Among these are “community-based, worker organizing projects” (Fine 2006), “community unions” (Cranford and Ladd 2003; Cranford et al. 2005; Cranford et al. 2006; Fine 2005), or “poor workers’ unions” (Tait 2005), and worker centers (Fine 2006; United Workers Congress 2014). Worker centers in particular have become a significant part of the labor movement, having grown significantly from a handful of centers in the late 1970s, and expanding rapidly starting in the early 2000s to currently number over 200 (Fine 2006:7, 2011; Milkman 2007:97; Narro 2005:467). Numerous national alliances have also emerged, such as the National Domestic Worker Alliance and the National Staffing Workers Alliance (see Fine 2011; Cordero-Guzmán 2015). While some centers are directly and indirectly affiliated with other unions or nonprofits, they are generally “independent” organizations. In addition, they are seen as a range between social movement organizations or “SMOs” and sometimes as “labor market institutions,” particularly in regards to day labor and hiring hall focused worker centers (see Fine 2006, 2011; Theodore, Valenzuela Jr., and Meléndez 2009).

Worker centers are frequently compared to organizations that existed during the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century before the institutionalization of unions and during the waves of European immigrants, such as mutual aid organizations, fraternal organizations, settlement houses (Fine 2006; Milkman 2014). There are countless other examples, including organizing through religious organizations, social service and non-profit organizations, and women’s organizations that historically and contemporarily help incorporate Mexican and other immigrant workers (see Fine 2006).

Through service, advocacy, and organizing, worker centers help low-wage and immigrant workers develop as leaders, fight labor violations, improve their wages and working conditions, demand increased access to jobs, and push for better types and enforcement of labor and immigrant rights laws (Bada 2006; Fine 2006; Gordon 2000, 2005; Louie 2001; Milkman 2007; Narro 2005, 2009; Ness 2005). Worker centers are different from other non-profit and social service organizations in that they focus on consciousness raising and challenging structural inequality. And they differ from unions through being less bureaucratic, driven more by members, being more grassroots, and providing a range of services and advocacy even outside the context of work. They also work with people who often do not have a stable job. On the other hand, they face the challenge of dependence on outside foundation funding for most of their budgets, and small and informal membership structures which limit organizing and self-financing capacity (Fine 2003, 2006, 2007; Milkman 2007; Sullivan 2010). These centers also strain to prevent members from becoming dependent on individual legal services and uninvolved in larger organizing efforts (Gordon 2005; Jayaraman 2005a; Jayaraman and Ness 2005). In addition, they are often unable to force large scale labor market changes (Fine 2006; Ness 2005; Sullivan 2010) and do not have the protection to organize and bargain collectively like unions do since they are not part of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) passed in 1935. In turn though, worker centers are freer to take risky actions since they are not as controlled or legally restricted from doing so. Yet, they are increasingly facing legal attacks due to anti-labor advocates suggesting they are merely covers for unions and have too many rights (Gottheil 2014).

Additionally, worker centers have generally been ignored and unsupported by the larger labor movement despite some examples of union-worker center collaboration. Fine (2007) explains that

Unions are often alienated by worker centres' non-connection to industry and employer, broad and blunt internal organizational structures, loose membership bases, and ad hoc and reactive organizational ways of operating. Ideologically, some unions are annoyed by some centres' anti-capitalist rhetoric and are perplexed by their tendency to focus on the distant horizon as opposed to shorter-term political, policy and industry organizing goals. Until fairly recently, many unions chafed at worker centres' organization of undocumented workers and defence of their employment and immigration rights, believing them to come at the expense of the native born. (P. 341-342)

While the AFL-CIO has recently shown more interest in incorporating them under their umbrella, and there are some examples of ongoing union and worker center collaboration in Los Angeles (Milkman, Bloom, and Narro 2010), there is not a significant amount of collaboration between unions and worker centers on the local level (Fine 2007). Even in Chicago, such alliances are generally superficial or short lived for individual campaigns (Fine 2007). Some argue this is due to feelings of competition by some unions, particularly in the trades, racism and xenophobia, different longevity of members, and different organizational structures, cultures and immediate goals (Fine 2007; Fine, Grabelsky and Narro 2008). Nevertheless, Fine (2011) notes the growing collaboration between these organizations, particularly as worker centers are institutionalizing.

Still, currently these organizations are among the few resources that low-wage, marginalized workers, particularly those who are undocumented immigrants, have to support them and contest their exploitation (Fine 2006; Gordon 2005). Worker centers are typically comprised of a particular ethnic, racial, or gender group since many low-wage jobs and neighborhoods are divided along these lines, and language barriers and discrimination can make organizing across differences difficult (see Fine 2006; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Louie 2001;

Narro 2005; Rivchin 2004; Sullivan 2010; Sullivan and Lee 2008). Additionally, worker centers are often grounded in a specific community or industry rather than a particular worksite, so that people who move between jobs can remain connected and involved. There are certainly plenty of exceptions to this, as many centers organize both women and men, and multiple ethnicities, particularly if they are in the same industry or from the same world region.

In addition, most worker centers are known as immigrant organizations or part of “migrant civil society” (Bada et al. 2006; Cordero-Guzmán et al. 2008; Davis, Martinez, and Warner 2010; Fink 2010; Fox and Bada 2011; Fox and Rivera-Salgado 2004; Palleres and Flores-González 2010; Theodore and Martin 2007) because most worker center members are low income Asian and Latin American immigrants. Yet some centers include other marginalized workers such as African-Americans, who were among the first to open worker centers in the south (Fine 2006; Pitts 2004; Tait 2005). Certainly, African Americans have had a strained relationship with the labor movement for most of its history. Pitts (2004) explained that even when unions had hiring control, white union members would often deny jobs or give the worst and most segregated jobs to black workers, and if they got jobs, the seniority in contracts often meant their jobs were most precarious since they were often the most recently hired. As a result, some black labor community organizations started forming as early as the 1960s. And in the past decade, there has slowly been an emergence of new black worker centers focused on African Americans and black immigrants (Fine 2006; Tait 2005; Thomas-Breitfeld 2015). Due to their recent growth and that they comprise less than ten centers in total, there is still very little literature on them (see Appelbaum and Smallwood Cuevas 2011; Thomas-Breitfeld et al. 2015). Thus here I attempt to add to the early scholarship on them. It seems that these centers are



emerging because African Americans in low-wage work deal with discrimination and racism that limit occupational opportunities, and disproportionately face over-policing and incarceration.

I describe the efforts of worker centers more in depth in chapter four, focusing particularly on the United Worker Center (UWC) and Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF). I describe how participants at both organizations operated from an understanding that they could only address inequality and labor exploitation in their communities by also addressing workers' exclusion from full citizenship rights. Through education, advocacy, organizing, legislation, and challenging negative stereotypes of people of color they were struggling to dismantle these structures of exclusion, and struggle for full citizenship inclusion and rights. In this way, they challenged the pervading structural exclusion and inequality in society as well as the broader labor movement. Given this and building from the descriptive scholarship on worker centers (see Collins 2006; Cordero-Guzmán et al. 2008; Fine 2006; Gleeson 2012; Gordon 2000, 2005; Peck and Theodore 2012), in chapter four I develop a theoretical framework in which I argue that the UWC and WFF were "space making" (Das Gupta 2006) institutions in regards to both the local and national labor movement.

## METHODS

Building from my nearly ten years of professional, research, and membership related experience in the Chicago area labor movement, this dissertation is based specifically on my qualitative research conducted from the spring of 2013 until the spring of 2015 with two local worker centers, the Unity Worker Center (UWC) and Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF). My project was based on the question of why worker centers, as community based labor organizations, might be key civil society institutions that are working not only for labor rights, but also for broader economic, political, gender and racial justice or full citizenship inclusion for

marginalized workers. This work was situated in a city that is widely known as a diverse, working class city that has long been a destination for migrants and immigrants. It was a key destination for African Americans moving from the south during the great migrations (Grossman 1989) and has a history of being more accepting and accommodating of immigrants than many other places (see Fox 2012). Indeed Chicago is officially recognized as a “sanctuary city,” meaning the police are not permitted to conduct immigration related surveillance. In 2014, 13.9% of the total population in Chicago specifically are foreign born, and of these, 45.3% are from Latin America (Migration Policy Institute 2016). As a result, the city’s population is roughly a third white, a third African American, and a third Latino, with smaller numbers of other groups.

TABLE I: 2014 CHICAGO POPULATION

	Total Population= 2,712,608
African Americans	31.9%
Latinos	28.9% (21.5% was Mexican alone)
White	48.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Given these demographics, and a reputation for being run by the Democratic party, one might expect for African Americans and Latino immigrants to be relatively less marginalized in Chicago than other places. Yet, the city is also known for its historical and ongoing police brutality, class and race based discrimination, violence, labor exploitation, and segregation and gentrification, particularly of people of color and Latino immigrants. And while there are numerous unions and social service agencies supporting people dealing with these issues, their reach is not enough, particularly for marginalized populations. At the time of my research, there were eight worker centers operating in the Chicago metro area, each trying fill this gap and

challenge this oppression. These centers collaborated with and supported each other at events, worker actions, collaborated to pass improved labor laws, and recently entered into a city wide coalition organization called “Raise the Floor” alliance. These centers also represented a range of worker center structures. One of them was affiliated with a union, another with a national non-profit organization, while the other six, including UWC and WFF, fell between a more non-profit and grassroots style of worker centers that are “typical” (see Fine 2006).

While each of these centers did important work, I focused my research on the Unity Worker Center (UWC) and Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF), as they actively framed their work around the exclusion from full citizenship rights that Latinos and African Americans experience, as well as racialized criminalization, and labor market restructuring, specifically in relationship to the temporary staffing industry which was a key interest at the outset of my study. I also chose them because they are among the few centers in the country that actively organize African Americans, making them an important addition to the field of labor organizing and the relevant literature.

More specifically, the Unity Worker Center (UWC) was a worker center that focuses on organizing Latino and African-American workers in the temporary staffing industry (TSI) and building inter-racial unity. It opened in 2000 primarily for Latino immigrants, and began focusing on organizing against the TSI locally since 2003, later actively working with African Americans in the TSI as well. The majority of their members worked in warehouse, shipping, and production jobs for brand name companies through temporary staffing agencies. Some of their members were “permatemps” which are long time temp workers that work at one place for years but do not get hired on directly by client companies, some were day laborers, and all of them had little or no job security. Using targeted actions and sector wide organizing, their hope

was to be able to first push individual agencies and later the majority of them to sign on to a legally binding agreement similar to a union contract, that included language on conditions such as seniority, grievances, and a steward structure. To that end, a few years ago they founded a national organization bringing together other worker centers organizing temp workers, in order to organize on a national scale with other allies. The UWC also tried to improve standards within the TSI through legislation, making wage theft claims easier to win and to put an end to systematic hiring discrimination against African Americans. Additionally the staff and member leaders organized for immigrant rights, pushing for more general inclusion of undocumented and marginalized immigrants in civic, political, economic, and social spheres. And finally they worked to build inter-racial dialogue and unity among African American and Latino members, guiding discussions on similar and unique forms of marginalization they experience, and how unity will help both groups gain power.

While the UWC is based in Chicago, it also has satellite offices in two nearby suburbs. The Chicago location was located in the south central part of the city. This was the headquarters of the organization and the location where I gathered the bulk of my data. Most active members there were Latino and Latina immigrant members, and African-American members of both genders, though most were men. The north suburban office was started by a group of local Latino immigrant activists who saw a need for immigrant labor support in their community and asked for training by the UWC in 2009. They went on to organize an informal worker center, and after multiple location and affiliation changes, officially affiliated with the UWC in 2011. The west suburban office consisted almost entirely of Latino immigrant members, most of whom worked for the TempLeaders agency, though many of them worked at other agencies. While the membership was split fairly evenly between genders, women had previously had their own

committee and continued to be the primary leadership in this location. Notably, during the time I did fieldwork, there were fewer African Americans consistently involved than what I heard had been the case before and saw after. This was largely due to staff turnover, fragmented employment with the TSI, and because most of the African American members at the time were tied up in a class action lawsuit about racial discrimination at the agencies, so were advised not to do interviews with me for their legal protection. Nevertheless, I was still able to interview some African American participants, and was made aware of others' involvement and positionality in the organization before and after my fieldwork.

Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) also organized some TSI workers, and some of its leadership comes out of a now defunct worker center that organized TSI workers explicitly. Yet WFF's main focus was organizing and advocating more broadly for better conditions and access to work among low income, unemployed, and formerly incarcerated black, primarily African-American, workers. Indeed, it is one of only a handful of black worker centers in the country, and accordingly focused heavily on rights for and discrimination against black workers. This included removing barriers to their employment and pushing for higher quality job creation through public policy, advocating for better employer practices, providing political education to raise consciousness, and organizing black workers. In addition, they focused on civic engagement and explicit organizing against the degradation of African Americans' access to the civil, political, and social rights due to them as legal citizens. For instance, they worked to limit the disproportionate levels of racial profiling, state violence, and incarceration for African Americans. They also worked to reduce mandatory minimums on sentencing, and limit the effects of such incarceration on returning citizens who are stripped of numerous rights and access to employment through having a stigma of being formerly incarcerated. For instance, WFF

organized the “Ban the Box” event I described at the start of this chapter, where they were pushing for state legislation making it illegal for employers to ask job applicants about criminal records on their applications. Finally, they organized around women’s leadership, and against community divestment in majority African-American neighborhoods by the city and state on issues of economic development and education.

The WFF office was located in the south east part of the city. Until recently the staff and members mostly recruited people from the south side of Chicago, though after hiring an organizer who lives in the west side, they have brought on more members from that region, bringing people together across gang boundaries. While there were two full time staff people, much of WFF’s organizing, canvassing and phone banking work was done by a close knit group of members who worked as volunteers and as part time organizers. Most of these members were men and most were formerly incarcerated. The work was also supported by numerous board members and volunteers like myself.

My positionality in this work was complicated in that I was an “insider” as a union member, activist in the local labor and immigrant rights movement for the past nine years, and former paid union organizer and worker center volunteer. These “credentials” proved my familiarity and commitment to labor issues and organizations. On the other hand, I was outsider to these groups as a white, native born woman in academia with no criminalized status. While I was able to build trust with the leaders of the organizations and eventually the members through showing my commitment to the issues they were striving for, asking detailed questions about individual incarceration and deportation sometimes caused participants to be vague, decline answering questions, or keep me at a distance. Understandably, I had to give people time to open up, and thus took advantage of downtime while volunteering, informal conversations, and

the focus groups to gain more insight into the organization and participants. And while I am able to understand, read, and speak intermediate level Spanish, I am not fluent in it and thus did not have a chance to capture in-depth insight in meetings and informal settings with Latino immigrant participants unless a bilingual person was nearby. Additionally, I had to rely on undergrad student interpreters for formal interviews, which was very insightful but limited my ability to ask as detailed questions or build the same rapport with Spanish only speaking participants as I did with English speaking ones.

I originally gained access to these two organizations from working with other worker centers and labor movement stakeholders during my master's research, particularly the north suburban UWC office, and through personal networks and reputation from my ongoing labor, immigrant rights, and racial justice activism. To start the project, I initiated communication about the research with staff at UWC in the winter of 2012/2013, but did not start fieldwork with them until late spring 2013. I met some WFF staff in late July and started working with them in August of 2013. From then on I volunteered with both organizations, usually spending the better part of a day with each two times a week. My formal fieldwork ended mid spring in 2015, though I continue to be in touch and go to events and meetings periodically. During these two years of qualitative research I conducted ethnographic fieldwork, participant observation, two focus groups, archival research, seventy in-depth semi-structured interviews (see participant demographic chart below), and ongoing informal interviews with leaders, staff, members, and allies of both organizations.

I used this blend of qualitative methods in order to capture the day to day activities, messaging and relationships of both organizations. For instance, these methods allowed me to attend numerous meetings and events, participate in organizing actions, see archival and

financial data, and observe staffs' day-to-day activities. I was also able to learn how members and allies understood the organizations' work, how the two organizations worked together, the political and social spheres they operated in, as well as the allies and resources they relied upon. Finally, these methods allowed me to build relationships and trust, corroborate self-reported information, and observe the complex identities and experiences of participants.

The formal interview participants represented a mix ethnicities, races, nationality, and ranged in age generally from early 20s to late 60s. For these interviews, I recruited staff and key members of UWC and WFF as we became familiar with each other, and reached more tangential or new members and allies with the help of staff members. In addition, due to some turnover of staff and active members at both organizations, I tried to meet with new people as soon as possible to capture their initial impressions of the organization, and continue to talk with them as they got more involved. Unfortunately, I was not generally successful in getting follow up interviews for those staff and members that chose to or were asked to leave the organizations. While I tried to recruit participants personally as often as possible to get a less organizationally "cherry picked" sample, I found that for sake of keeping my "in" it was generally important to respect the gatekeeping position of the staff. For example, some staff, especially at UWC, were a bit protective of other staff, volunteers, and members' time, and thus tried to avoid overwhelming them or scare them away with too many demands, and sometimes took their time connecting me or deciding not to. While this sometimes felt restrictive, and having a broader sample could have been useful, I was still able to collect a large number of interviews. I also felt that it was important to respect the wishes of the staff and the members' time due to the power imbalance of my positionality as a researcher and the organizations'



limited resources. Regardless of how they were recruited, the interviews were in private and often away from the worker center offices.

During these interviews, which were recorded and transcribed, I asked questions pertaining participants' work history, as well as their involvement in and knowledge about the worker centers and other labor organizations. I also asked how they defined citizenship, what economic, social, and political rights they had in the U.S. generally and in the workplace, and how they perceived other racial and ethnic groups' access to rights. For participants who were immigrants, I also asked them to compare their rights and experiences here and in their home country, which was most often Mexico. In addition to these formal interviews I was able to have informal, non-recorded interviews with these participants as well as numerous additional members, volunteers and allies of both organizations about related topics. I was not able to go back to many people for formal follow up interviews due to participant time constraints. But through volunteering, I had frequent access to participants for observation and to ask questions through informal interviews.

TABLE II: FORMAL INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

UWC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 members: 2 African American men, and 18 Mexican immigrants (13 women, 5 men) with a range of immigration statuses but mostly undocumented.</li> <li>• 10 people who were staff at some point: 5 Latinas, 2 Latinos, 1 African American man, 1 African American woman, and 1 white man. Was not able to interview the other African American man before he was fired.</li> <li>• 7 board members/volunteers/interns – 1 European woman, 1 African American woman, 2 African American men, 1 white man, 1 Latina, 1 white woman. I was not able to interview 1 African and 1 African American interns from the beginning of my fieldwork.</li> </ul>
WFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 members: 2 African American women, 6 African American men,</li> <li>• 4 people who were staff at some point: 2 African American women, 2 African American men</li> <li>• 11 board members/volunteers/allies: 8 African American women, 3 African American men</li> </ul>
Academic and Labor allies of UWC and WFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Latino man, 1 Asian woman, 1 Asian American woman, 2 white men, and 1 white woman.</li> </ul>

To gather participant observations, I spent many hours at the offices or activities of both organizations. During my time at the UWC office, I often helped format or translate organizing materials, updated their social media accounts, leafleted in the neighborhood or at worksites with staff and members, and attended trainings or meetings. I also helped with a small research project about the local temp industry with another volunteer, and assisted Occupational Health Internship Program (OHIP) interns assigned to UWC with their worker survey projects over two summers. In addition, I spent time with the UWC attending fundraisers, rallies, organizing meetings, and other events held by organizations they collaborated with. I also drove for some events and trips since I was old enough to rent a car and had a valid driver's license. Finally, I

helped with planning and day-of support for a multi-week health and safety training for UWC's leading members.

I did very similar activities while volunteering for the WFF, while also helping with press releases and a national research project they were involved in. As a collaboration of over twenty legal, social justice, and labor based organizations, this research project focused on gathering data on the financial and social effects of incarceration on individuals and families. For my part, I went with WFF members to collect informal survey data from people in public spaces in nearby neighborhoods. And due to my interviewing skills, I was asked to facilitate two focus groups. The first focus group was comprised of six African American formerly incarcerated male members of the WFF. Thea, one of the WFF board members, recruited for the second focus group. This group was comprised of eight African American women neighbors of hers with family members who had been incarcerated. While I did not recruit the participants of these groups or create the questions asked, both sessions were very pertinent to my study. I was allowed to use the archival transcripts of these for my own analysis, and my participation in these groups made it more comfortable for individuals to share their experiences of criminalization with me than in a one on one interview, particularly with me being a racial and class outsider.

My data thus comes from these interviews and my nearly 1000 pages of typed fieldnotes from observations and information interviews, as well as archival materials and memos. Using Atlas.ti and coding by hand, I coded interview and focus group transcripts beginning with broad codes including immigrant status, immigrant rights, policing/prison, race, citizenship, immigration/criminalization status, class, rights/benefits (of citizenship), labor conditions, labor market, labor rights, temp work/industry, discrimination, work experience, community, worker

center tactics, and social geography of Chicago. These themes emerged frequently through my fieldwork and became even more central as I began coding. From there I organized text from these codes into smaller themes such as experiences with incarceration, challenges while incarcerated and after, effect on families and relationships, access to rights, what it means to have a criminal record and/or undocumented status, comparison between groups as they understood it, experiences getting work and what type of work (both with an undocumented and criminal record statuses), additional barriers with these statuses (i.e. housing, loans), and recidivism.

It is notable that while gender was certainly discussed occasionally during my interviews and fieldwork, most discussions regarding rights and exclusion focused on race, immigration status, criminalization, and class. This was perhaps because both organizations were comprised of members and staff that identified as both men and women, and due to the focus of the organizing by staff. While in future work I will delve into gender more, I found that these other identities and positionalities were expressed as more salient to their lives, rights, and experiences, and they are thus the focus of my analysis.

## CONTRIBUTION

In this dissertation, I delve into the relationships between racialized criminalization, labor market restructuring, and the space making of worker centers to push back against these forces for access to full citizenship. I illustrate how worker centers do this by not only creating a voice or place at the table for otherwise marginalized and excluded workers, but also by changing the conversations in the broader labor movement and society, and facilitating solidarity building. My research builds on the theoretical discussions regarding access to “full citizenship” and rights, and how they are changing in this time of neoliberal racialized criminalization and labor market

restructuring. I also contribute by analyzing efforts by civil society to push for increased inclusion through a space making entity in the labor movement. By doing this, I illuminate on-the-ground understandings of what “full citizenship” means for people, and how workers, organizers, and even employers seek or restrict access to it. I agree with those scholars and activists who suggest that connecting struggles for rights to nation state based citizenship is limiting due to our increasingly transnational lives (e.g. Appadurai 1996; Bauman 1998; Meyer 2010; Ong 2006; Sklair 2001; Soysal 1995), and I believe the end goal of these struggles should actually be broader human rights for all, regardless of race, class, nativity, and borders. Yet I focus here on national citizenship boundaries because I agree with those who contend that national laws and social structures still very much affect people’s access to belonging and rights, and thus should serve as a starting point in understanding inclusion (Bloemraad 2006; Bosniak 2006; Somers 2008; Somers and Roberts 2008). This is key for a better understanding of what we mean when we are striving for things like immigration reform, racial and gender justice, and countering the prison industrial complex, and also help us frame our movements on the local level, in the context of particular nation states such as the U.S., and transnationally.

In addition, my research contributes to the literature in capturing how economic restructuring and the increase of low-wage, non-standard, racialized work such as the TSI operates and utilizes as well as contributes to the exclusion of marginalized workers from full citizenship rights. Finally, building off of descriptive literature on worker centers, I contribute to the theoretical debates around the significance of worker centers, arguing that they are key space making civil society institutions challenging state and market institutions, and the larger labor movement. Additionally, because labor movement, citizenship, and political incorporation literature is often limited in its analysis of intersections of race, gender, and nativity, I contribute

insight on these areas as well. This has broad implications for more effective and inclusive organizing efforts and key lenses for literature on citizenship.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

In the following three chapters I describe my three main findings. My initial research question was why these community based, non-union labor organizations would focus rights associated with full citizenship inclusion for marginalized workers rather than just labor rights. I found that this was because their members lives as workers were inherently tied to racialized criminalization and labor market restructuring. These were central reasons why they were marginalized inside and outside the workplace, and even from most unions, thus creating a need for these worker centers. More specifically, in chapter two, I theorize how low income African Americans with a felony record experience such heightened marginalization from full citizenship that their experiences are similar to undocumented Latino immigrants in the areas of work, access to public resources, and ability to stay with their families and communities. Certainly there are numerous ways in which they are different, including that people with felony records can vote in Illinois even if they are on parole or on probation, while people who are undocumented cannot. And formal citizens cannot be deported while non-formal citizens, even with documentation, can be. But I argue that understanding the parallels that exist are essential for understanding the effects of racialized criminalization in our communities and how it increases workers marginalization and vulnerability. In chapter three, I outline my findings that the restructuring of the labor market to a more nonstandard and “flexible” structure facilitates further exclusion of vulnerable workers of color in Chicago. Specifically, the contingent, flexible local temporary staffing industry (TSI) uses methods to recruit and hire the most “unfree” workers (see Glenn 2002). This race management (Roediger and Esch 2012) project divides Latino immigrant and African American workers, and the ability to do this is a key

priority for the agencies in order to meet the demands from client companies interested in extract maximum profits through exploitation. In chapter four, argue that the UWC and WFF were challenging this neoliberal exclusion and fighting for broader inclusion of these marginalized groups to citizenship rights and the larger labor movement through “space making politics” (Das Gupta 2006). Specifically, I outline how the make space through broader inclusion, organizing members’ whole selves, and working for broader structural change. Finally, I end the dissertation with a conclusion chapter outlining the academic, policy, and practical labor implications of these findings, as well as plans for future research.

## **II. “I Go Get a Felony, I’m Not Really a Citizen Anymore”: Marginalization of Criminalized African Americans Compared to Undocumented Immigrants**

The forum described in the previous chapter was held in a south side Chicago restaurant in August 2013. There, multiple formerly incarcerated African American men shared stories about the discrimination they had experienced due to having a felony on their records. Hosted by Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF), the forum was intended to give a space for people to share their experiences and assert that they deserve a fair shot at a “second chance.” It also aimed to push policymakers to pass legislation that would help people with a record access more rights and be more fully included in society again. In particular, they were pushing for a local “Ban the Box” law which would take questions about criminal convictions off job applications (see Natividad Rodriguez and Avery 2016; Von Bergen and Bressler 2016). Participants knew it would not solve all problems, but at least having such a law in place would contribute to more legal protection from initial discrimination, and facilitate access to some substantive rights. When emphasizing the need for the law, some speakers gave testimonies about the financial struggles they faced post incarceration because it was difficult getting employment. Others performed spoken word about how people see them negatively because of their record. One woman even spoke about how her partner’s criminal record limits what housing options the family has, and how much of a hardship it has been on them. This exclusion from resources, rights, and social approval was reminiscent of the stories shared with me by undocumented Latino immigrants.

Millions of people in the U.S. are marked by with a criminal record; 16 million of these with a felony specifically (Uggen et al. 2006). It is widely accepted that these criminal records confer a marginalized citizenship status, particularly for people of color (i.e. Uggen et al. 2006; Western 2007). Branded with this criminalized status, or what Devah Pager (2003) calls a



“criminal mark,” from having a criminal record, people like the speakers above are identified as outside the community of “deserving,” “law-abiding citizens,” and subsequently denied access to numerous rights associated with citizenship (Uggen et al. 2006). While this framework is helpful to see the injustice they experience, this marginalization is generally compared only to other citizens, rather than noncitizens. This limits our understanding of the extent of their exclusion and the similarities to other structurally marginalized peoples, and more specifically, undocumented immigrants. For example, while criminalized citizens and undocumented immigrants are often seen as very different, I argue that their experiences of exclusion from full citizenship, which includes both formal, or legal, and substantive, or practical lived, political, civil, economic and social citizenship rights (Brubaker 1990; Glenn 2002; Marshall 1964; Reiter 2013) are quite analogous.

In my research, I found that in addition to the racism and “second class citizenship” that African American participants already experience due to our nation’s racialized systems of stratification (Bonilla-Silva 2004, 2015), having a criminal record, and particularly a felony, meant a further reduction of their substantive citizenship rights. Nearly all of the African American staff, allies, and members in both the Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) and United Worker Center (UWC) have had direct contact with the criminal justice system at some point in their own or their families’ lives, and a majority of the African American male participants had a felony on their record. I argue that those with a felony experienced structural marginalization similar to that of undocumented immigrants particularly in the areas of work, access to public resources, and ability to stay in their communities. In other words, this criminal mark has made it difficult for these participants to find well paying, full time, formal work. It has also meant they are not eligible for various public resources and benefits like welfare, federal loans for higher

education, and public housing. Finally, having a felony curtailed their ability to provide for and be with their families and communities, particularly as the threat of reincarceration loomed due over-policing in neighborhoods of color, state surveillance through parole and probation, and limited choices for making an income (see Kleis 2010; Opsal 2009; Petersilia 2003; Zatz et al. 2016). Each of these experiences are widely cited as key areas of exclusion that immigrants marked with an undocumented status experience as well (see Arbona et al. 2010; Derby 2012; Fix and Zimmermann 2001; Gomberg-Muñoz 2011; Kullgren 2003; Milkman 2006; Phillips and Massey 1999; Tumlin and Zimmermann 2003).

In this chapter I build on work by legal scholar Juliet Stumpf (2006), historian Kelly Lytle Hernández (2011), sociologist Patrisia Macías-Rojas (2016), and anthropologist Ruth Gomberg-Muñoz (2012) regarding the similarities shared by criminalized citizens and immigrants. I do this by adding ethnographic and interview data founded on the perspective of African Americans to the literature. Specifically I describe how low income African Americans with a felony criminal record in Chicago face exclusion from aspects of full citizenship similar to racialized undocumented immigrants. Applying frameworks generally used to describe the exclusion experienced by undocumented immigrants, I argue that there are historical and ongoing parallels in the racialized marginalization, criminalization, and “collateral consequences” in the areas of work, access to public resources and benefits, and family trauma and separation through detention, deportation and incarceration between African Americans with felony “criminal mark” and undocumented immigrants of color.

Naming this parallel between criminalized formal citizens of color and undocumented immigrants is becoming increasingly common in activist circles, particularly with increased publicity about the political and economic connections between the police, Immigration and

Customs Enforcement (ICE), prisons and immigrant detention centers. But the sociological literature on these parallels, particularly those with empirical evidence, is still minimal, and most citizenship related literature focuses solely on immigrants rather than how it affects formal citizens. Thus, in this chapter I pose an extension of theories on nationally based formal citizenship by offering an empirical example of how the criminalization of formal citizens can mean the stripping of social validation and access to the assets of citizenship. I argue that this results in exclusion similar to that of being an undocumented immigrant, particularly for those who are racialized. To illustrate these commonalities, in the following sections I share how African American participants understand their marginalized “second class citizen” status based particularly on race and class, and then describe ways they are further stripped of rights and excluded from full citizenship upon being marked with a criminal record.

While a direct comparison with empirical data from undocumented Latino immigrant participants in areas of work, access to public resources, and family separation would have been preferred for this analysis, it was not feasible due to my minimal Spanish language abilities and limited access to interpreters. On the other hand, the exclusion of Latino immigrants in Chicago and across the U.S. is already well documented through ample literature (i.e. Bosniak 2006; De Genova 2002, 2005, 2013; Glenn 2000, 2002; Mehta et al. 2002; Ngai 2004; Pallares and Flores-González 2010; Peck and Theodore 2001). Referring to this literature, I focus on how a similar framework can be helpful to understand African American experiences of exclusion from racialized criminalization.

Such an analysis of empirical data on “legal citizens” in conversation with literature on noncitizens enhances sociological citizenship and critical race theories. Furthermore, illuminating the similarities of these experiences is crucial for a better understanding of the

structural obstacles marginalized people face in combatting poverty, improving access to rights, and having a voice in their labor conditions. This analogy is particularly important in Chicago since it is home to significant numbers of both undocumented Latino immigrants and African Americans with a criminal record. As I describe in the next two chapters, having two sizeable populations in the city with blatant political, civil, social and economic marginality, who are largely treated as disposable, exploitable workers, warrants an urgency to better understand their comparable experiences as those most affected by structural racism, racialized criminalization, and downgrading labor markets. Finally, a fuller understanding of the commonalities between undocumented immigrants and criminalized citizens of color is an important for increased organizing of and solidarity between these groups.

#### FULL CITIZENSHIP, CRIMINALIZATION, AND EXCLUSION

The assets of substantive citizenship are accessible to native born or naturalized people with “formal” citizenship in unequal amounts based on their social location in hierarchies of race, class, gender, sexuality, nativity, religion, and so forth. For example, due to structural class inequality, white supremacy, and patriarchy, those formal citizens who are poor, of color, and female have always experienced less access to substantive citizenship rights than their counterparts (see Glenn 2000, 2002; Ngai 2004; Reiter 2013). And despite many legal gains for marginalized peoples in the U.S. over the past century and a half, poor people of color in particular still experience significant marginalization from the civil, political and social rights T.H. Marshall (1964) argued were central to full citizenship. These groups are often understood to experience a “second class citizenship” as a result.

This “second class” marginalization is further increased for those affected by mass incarceration and criminalization. This is particularly the case for low income African

Americans, who are the largest numbers of criminalized and incarcerated native born citizens both nationally and in Chicago, where I conducted my research. Overall, focusing on men, Western (2007) explains that mass incarceration of African Americans has created a “novel social experience for African Americans” for those born after 1965, in that they “suffer the civil disabilities which restrict their social rights to welfare and certain occupations and political rights to the franchise” (p. 35-36) and that “children and wives of ex-prisoners are also drawn into the orbit of the penal system through the disruption of family life and the contagious stigma of incarceration” (p. 35-36). He argues then that this system creates a “class of outsiders” (p. 36).

Criminalization of immigrants has increased during a similar time period, shaping the lives of immigrants in similar ways, particularly for those from Latin America. The influx of immigrants from Latin America and Asia in the 1960s began around the same time period that African Americans gained significant civil rights (Golash-Boza 2009; Gomberg-Muñoz 2012; Stumpf 2006). And just as there was conservative backlash to civil rights gains (Greene 2002; Western 2007; Western and Wildeman 2009) significant anxiety arose regarding the influx of immigrants from the Global South following the 1965 passage of the Hart-Cellar Act. While immigration violations are civil in nature, undocumented immigrants are increasingly seen as and treated as criminals, ostensibly because they have “broken the law” through entering or residing in the U.S. unlawfully. Due to legal and social changes millions of undocumented immigrants have been detained, deported, and caught in a cycle of exclusion and criminalization (Aranda and Vasquera 2015; Armenta 2016; Golash-Boza 2012; Gomberg-Muñoz 2012; Gomberg-Muñoz and Nussbaum-Barberena 2014). This makes them susceptible to increased criminal charges, detention, and deportation, exaggerating their distance from the more of the substantive rights afforded even to noncitizens.

This has led to what Stumpf (2006) calls “crimmigration law,” or the merger of the criminal and immigration systems that expanded in the 1980s, alongside the growth of mass incarceration (see also Armenta 2016; Hernández 2011). As Gomberg-Muñoz (2012) says, the rhetoric that criminalizes Latino immigrants is closely tied to that which criminalizes African Americans, especially men. For both groups, this subjects them and their communities to “profound stigmatization” (p. 349). She explains that “Like racism, the assignment of criminal status to a broad segment of the non-White population is a double-edged sword that at once reinforces existing inequality and legitimizes it with a rhetoric of inherent immorality” (Gomberg-Muñoz 2012:349-350). Indeed, as she points out, a key part of criminalization and the justification for exclusion from rights is that those who are criminalized did something wrong, are immoral, do not “deserve” rights, benefits, stability, or even good jobs like those who “follow the rules.” These constructed lines of “illegality” and “criminality,” and rhetoric about morality is prevalent in regards to both conversations of mass incarceration and in conversations about immigration reform (Armenta 2016; De Genova 2002, 2005, 2013; Menjívar and Kanstroom 2014; Ngai 2004; Uggen et al. 2006). Given this relationship, legal scholar Stumpf (2006) explains, people with felonies are “alienated” and thus resemble “illegal aliens.” This is particularly important since, as she says, previous perceptions of immigrants as “hardworking” have been changing, and they are increasingly seen in a negative light. She explains,

Public perceptions of immigrants have tended to be more positive than perceptions of criminal offenders. Scholars describe the archetype of the undocumented immigrant as a hard-working individual drawn to enter the United States clandestinely with the hope of rising economic prospects and a better life for herself and her family. This vision, however, is in transition. Undocumented immigrants are increasingly perceived as criminals, likely to commit future criminal acts because of their history of entering the country unlawfully. More recently, immigrants have been identified with terrorism, perceived as either complicit in the acts precipitating September 11 or prone to such acts in the future. (Stumpf 2006:395)

Notably, while the laws facilitating the criminalization of both immigrants and legal citizens of color is “raceless,” Golash-Boza (2009) reminds us that “Ideas of racial otherness play an important role in the demonization of criminals and the undocumented. This other-ization allows politicians to play on public fears and portray these groups as threatening to public safety (p. 303).” And Hernández (2011) explains that “Since the era of emancipation, the rise of immigration control and mass incarceration has created a racialized caste of outsiders within the United States (p. 65).” Given this, I argue that while people of color are often described as being treated like “second class” citizens, attention should be given to how a criminal mark goes on to effectively cause native born people of color like African Americans in Chicago to experience a loss of access to substantive citizenship, rendering their positionality similar to that of undocumented Latino immigrants.

Of course, numerous other racialized native born and immigrant groups face similar exclusions at intersections of mass criminalization with race and citizenship. This includes, though is not limited to, non-white immigrants and racialized formal citizens such as Native Americans and native born Latinos. In this chapter though I focus on low income African Americans in particular since they are the largest native born population experiencing mass criminalization, both nationally and locally. Thus, while my sample is not representative of every immigration status or criminalized racial group, my findings offer insight on the effects of criminalization on citizenship. They also contribute to emerging research on the connections between criminal, racialized, and undocumented statuses, and the dimension of potential solidarity between these groups in their fight for inclusion and rights, particularly as workers.

Below I apply a framework regarding the how criminalization of immigrants increases their vulnerability, further pushing them into the “shadows” (Oboler 2008) and marginalizing

them from access to the rights and social position associated with citizenship, and compare it to the effects of a criminal record on low income African Americans. First though, I share how African American participants viewed and defined their citizenship status, detailing how they felt they are treated even without a criminal mark.

“LORD HAVE MERCY, SOMETIMES I FEEL LIKE I HAVE NO RIGHTS”

In general, there was a strong consciousness among participants that being people of color generally, and African American in particular, kept them from complete access to substantive rights, and thus excluded from full citizenship and treated as “second class citizens.” When I asked African American participants to describe what citizenship was and what rights were related to it, they generally responded that it was related to freedom, opportunity and not being discriminated against. When I asked who had citizenship rights, most participants lamented it was primarily white and wealthy people, and that everyone else had “second class citizenship” to varying degrees. For instance, Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) members, Jayden and Jonathan, said citizenship is based on money, and Jimmy and Jonathan talked about it being connected to having land. When I asked her who has citizenship rights, Tamara, a staff person at WFF, insisted that people of color do not have citizenship rights at all. She said,

*Tamara:* We don’t have citizenship rights.

*Author:* Black folks?

*Tamara:* Black folks, um, anybody who's not white I would say. Only white people do.

When I asked the same question to Shirley, an older WFF member, she responded with “Lord have mercy, sometimes I feel like I have no rights.” When I asked her to elaborate, she explained that while she is a citizen formally, her lived experience felt otherwise, and that no matter what level of education or social status you may get it would not help if you were not white. Malcolm, a WFF member with a felony criminal record, said that citizenship just meant



“That I was born over here. That’s about it.....It doesn’t mean that I have any better rights than anybody else.” He went on to say that because he is black, being a citizen does not mean anything for him if he does not get the same justice as non-black people, stating “I mean, it doesn’t, not if I can go outside right now and get shot by a police officer, and it’s like it’s cool.” Similarly, when I asked Renee, a WFF staff person, about what citizenship was and who had it, she laughed and said

I feel like this whole idea of me being considered a citizen is a smokescreen [*laughter*]. . . It's like, "We're gonna consider you a citizen only so much. We're not gonna consider you a whole citizen." On top of the fact that I feel like a lotta systems that are set up is like—it's like we're guinea pigs.

When I asked her who “we” was, she said “people of color,” and explained that they are experimented on for various policies related to systems of poverty. She also said that citizenship means freedom of speech but really only white people have that. Other than that, she said citizenship is about being treated like a human being with access to health care, education, and learning how to get jobs. Similarly, Amaya, a WFF member, compared the connections between Latinos and African Americans and the blurry lines of race and citizenship, noting that only whites have real rights. She said,

*Amaya:* I think, (*long pause*) Caucasian people have citizen rights. I don’t think black people have citizen rights; I don’t think Latinos have citizen rights. I mean hell, we know Latinos DON’T have citizen rights, (*laughs*) cuz they're not citizens, so I mean, whether they’re aliens or whatever, however they want to say it in so many ways, but, that’s how they view ‘em, that’s how they treat ‘em -

*Author:* even if they're citizens?

*Amaya:* even if they ARE citizens! What IS a citizen? a citizen you treat with respect; a citizen has rights, and that’s something that I don’t feel like I have, that’s something that I don’t feel like I probably will ever have.... Not in America....

When I later asked her what some of the rights are for citizens, she said

I think citizenship should, is the right to education, the right to fair housing, the right to live in happiness. I think that’s what citizenship is - just the right to be able to live the way YOU want to live - not the way nobody else wants you to live.

I asked her to clarify what that meant and she said

hmm not with somebody just monitoring your every move, because when you're not white, you're not a citizen because you're being monitored by a higher power which is the police or whatever you want to call it - and they're already like racially profiling your ass so you're not a citizen.

In this quote Amaya pointed to how just having “legal” citizenship did not mean a person had access to citizenship rights. Specifically she explained that being black, she probably would never have full citizenship rights, and that in addition to economic rights, having citizenship meant having the freedom to live how you want and not being monitored by the state. Along these same lines, when I asked what rights we have in the U.S., Malcolm argued that the constitution was never for African Americans but instead written for and by whites, who enslaved them. He said,

*Malcolm:* I don't think we have any rights.

*Author:* Who's we, and what do you mean?

*Malcolm:* I'm talkin' about us as an African American race.

*Author:* No rights?

*Malcolm:* I don't believe we have any rights at all. Freedom of speech only goes so far. Freedom to bear arms only goes so far. The Constitution was written for the other race that brought us here. I don't wanna sound like I'm a racist or anything, but... the Caucasians that brought us here. That is who the Constitution was written for. They threw in certain clause to make us equal, but where's the equality? I mean, they still look at us as what they call as lower-class citizens, and if we're equal, there is no such thing as high class, middle class and lower class. We're all the same class. In my eyesight, if it's gonna be equal, it needs to be really equal.

Here Malcolm pointed to how those in power, whites, may have added amendments in later years, but that these laws have not meant more equality. He felt that instead, if there was to be true equality, it needed to be “real” or actualized rather than just on paper. Similarly, a WFF staff person, Omar, expressed how he does not feel like a citizen either and how the category was

constructed and controlled by powerful people that can give it or revoke it. He said,

um, shit, TRUTHFULLY, I mean I don't believe I'M a citizen! I believe that citizenship, (*blows out air, then laughs*) I meant like, it's, it's a hard thing to really say because it's like...who's able to give you citizenship- you know what I'm saying, a person - if somebody can give you, make you a citizen then that person could take it away, so it's like, I guess you have to look at the powers that be, you know what I am saying, like the people that's been running this country since DAY 1...

In this quote Omar described how citizenship has been and continues to be socially constructed by white people with power, leaving non-white, less privileged people's status in a precarious state. Omar then went on to explain that a person cannot really feel like a citizen if they are always perceived as dangerous. So even on the interpersonal level, not just from the state, people can make you feel excluded if they are scared of you, which he said makes a person "feel less than a citizen... makes you feel like a second class citizen you know." And giving intersectional insight, Brandi, a WFF board member, argued that anyone who faces oppression, even white women like myself, is fundamentally not experiencing full citizenship. She emphasized this was particularly the case if you were seen with suspicion. She said,

I think anybody who's of color doesn't have citizenship. I think anyone's who's oppressed does not. You know I think women and people of color are—people who are not as privileged do not have citizenship. Hell, I'm privileged and I still don't think I have citizenship. I don't think YOU have citizenship. When I think of citizenship, I think you're able to ... go into a clothing store and not have somebody following you...not having a person walk on the other side of the street if you're a black man or a person of color because they don't—they think you're gonna do something.

She noted that being singled out and experiencing everyday discrimination (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Essed 1991) and racial micro aggressions (Pierce et al. 1978) meant that people of color and other marginalized people did not experience full substantive citizenship.

Similarly, other participants expressed how often they experienced racial bias and being seen as though they have or will commit a criminal act. Thus they felt perceived as inherently criminal, which invalidated their social role as citizens. This sentiment was even more present in

informal discussions and interviews as the “Black Lives Matter”<sup>3</sup> movement gained increasing visibility, particularly following Michael Brown’s murder in 2014. For instance, Corey, a UWC staff person, asserted that citizenship is built off discrimination so people do not have the same amount of rights, and that for African Americans, “things like what happened to Trayvon Martin”<sup>4</sup> wouldn’t happen if they was a full citizen.” He also spoke about how African Americans and Latinos are in really similar situations. He said

I think the color of your skin defines your citizenship as much as a document does. That's not to say that the struggles between the Latinos and the African-American are extremely the same or exactly the same. It's just that they both struggle and in that struggle, that's where the citizenship lies.

Malcolm similarly argued that the criminal justice system treated African Americans differently than others, particularly whites, both in terms of the value of their lives and punishments they are given for crimes. He said,

Man, America like ...America, man, it is so evil....I just think it’s evil because the minorities like myself do not get treated with the same respect as everybody else, but yet they say we equal. That doesn’t sit with me well. Okay, another thing that was on Facebook.... I think the dude was 23. I’m not sure. He shot a police dog.....killed the police dog. They gave the man 23 years in prison, yet Trayvon Martin is dead. Mike Brown is dead, and neither one of these men are—not gonna even do one day in jail for that due to the color of they skin. If it was a black officer who killed Mike Brown, I’m pretty sure he would’ve got fired or somethin’. It would’ve been some type of reaction other than the reaction we’re seeing.

Malcolm expressed how the life of a police dog seemed to him to be valued higher than an African American boy’s, and expressed the opinion that African American cops are scrutinized more than their white colleagues. He also noted how due to this differential treatment, even though he is a legal citizen, he does not feel like he is safe out in the world, never knowing if a

---

<sup>3</sup> See <http://blacklivesmatter.com/about/>

<sup>4</sup> Referencing the murder of Trayvon Martin by neighborhood vigilante George Zimmerman in 2012.

police officer will target him. Later in our conversation he said

I mean, I feel like I'm blessed to be an American, but I still feel like I'm oppressed to be an American because I still got Uncle Sam's foot on my neck. You know what I'm sayin'? I can't go out in the streets,...and be safe. It's hard to walk the streets every day lookin' over your shoulder or seein' a police officer and wondering in your head, 'Is he gonna pull me over? Is he gonna bother me today?'

Similarly, Malik, a board member of WFF with a felony criminal record, said "I don't know, sometimes I don't get my rights totally respected." When I asked him to clarify what he meant, he said,

I might...walk down the street today, illegal stop and search, whatever you just, you never know. I guess that depends on how you feel, your stance and your position in society at this point, going to back to the citizenship issue whether without a full rights, I mean what are the full rights? Social security, unemployment, so-so health benefits I suppose, just certain things we don't consider that we take advantage of every single day versus someone that may or may not have those same benefits to them at their disposal.

Malik described rights and benefits that people have as citizens that they might overlook, but that at the heart of it, as an African American man walking down the street he could be racially profiled by police, patted down, or brutalized at any moment. Relatedly, James, a WFF member with a felony criminal record, shared that he had once been harassed smoking a cigarette while waiting for a bus. Police saw him and accused him of trying to make money selling "loose squares," or single cigarettes, which he felt was just the police making an excuse to justify profiling, and possibly ticketing and arresting him.

These statements and the many that emerged in informal conversations captured how African American participants saw they were excluded from full citizenship and generally relegated to a "second class citizens." This sentiment seemed even more pronounced during and after a trip members from the WFF, the United Worker Center (UWC) and myself went on in October 2014 to Ferguson, Missouri to join others in protesting African American Mike Brown's fatal shooting by white police officer Darren Wilson. As I discuss further in chapter four, this

trip was important to participants because it was a chance to challenge this devaluing of black people's lives and exclusion from full citizenship.

This “second class citizenship” based on racialization is not so different from other marginalized groups such as religious minorities, LGBTQ folks, women, and transgendered people in that they face discrimination and invalidation in their roles as citizens, access to rights and assets, and disproportionately experience violence by other people and the state. Yet, these groups and people who are “second class citizens” are contemporarily protected by anti-discrimination laws, at least in word, and are generally no longer legally banned from work, resources, and their communities. On the other hand, the growth of criminalization and mass incarceration over the past four decades has legally exacerbated this marginalization for low income, racialized “second class citizens,” particularly low income African Americans (Purser 2012a; Stumpf 2006). Thus despite still having formal citizenship, the criminal mark left on millions of low income African Americans with a criminal record, particularly felonies, has led to the reduction of access to their substantive citizenship including voting in some states<sup>5</sup>, as well access to employment, public resources, and to be with their communities. I argue that this reduction of access to substantive citizenship renders their positionality closer to a level of marginalization similar to that experienced by undocumented immigrants. This is particularly so for those immigrants from Latin America who are also racialized as non-white, as they have become similarly positioned legally as outside the boundaries of who is “deserving” enough to access to most substantive citizenship rights and inclusion.

---

<sup>5</sup> While voting rights are reduced or taken away for people convicted of a crime in many states, Illinois residents are able to vote post incarceration.

“I GO GET A FELONY, I’M REALLY NOT A CITIZEN ANYMORE”

Throughout my research, African American participants expressed that having a record meant they were not treated like citizens at all. For instance, during our interview, Omar, a WFF staff person, expressed frankly that if he got a felony as a black man, it would mean he was not a citizen in any real way. He said,

I mean like, that’s a hard thing to really think about - citizenship - because at any given moment, I might consider- say even if I am a black man, I consider myself a citizen, I go get a felony, I’m really not a citizen anymore, you know what I’m saying, AT ALL, LEGALLY not a citizen no matter how I feel, I’m not a citizen - there’s certain things that I wouldn’t be able to do, that other people can do - you know what I’m saying....

Along these lines, Angela, a WFF member, stated that people with felony records are so marginalized from full citizenship that they are essentially treated as undocumented immigrants.

She said

When you remove someone’s citizenship for criminalization, which is what happens particularly to felons, you have reduced them to that same level as somebody trying to come in undocumented. That’s, in effect, what you’ve done. It is really the same.

These and other comments below mirrored descriptions of ways undocumented immigrants have become marginalized from rights and inclusion. I outline these similarities in the following sections. Specifically, I compare the marginalization from access to formal work, public resources and benefits, and community that African Americans with felony records experience to the types of exclusion racialized undocumented immigrants experience.

### *Work*

Exclusion from well paying, full time, formal work for African Americans because of a criminal record was a constant story at both worker centers, and mirrored accounts of undocumented Latino immigrant worker marginalization in formal employment (see Gomberg-Muñoz 2011; Milkman 2006). As I discuss below, both groups face legal and social

discrimination in many jobs, and are formally barred from some jobs even if they have the required training and credentials. In addition, both groups face increased exploitation due to their vulnerable legal statues hanging over their heads, and are often forced to take on work that could further criminalize them.

It is well documented that racial discrimination and exclusion from well paying, “good” jobs is common for African Americans (e.g. Lyons and Pettit 2001; Neckerman and Kirschenman 1991; Peck and Theodore 2001) but this discrimination is exacerbated significantly with a criminal and particularly felony records (Peck and Theodore 2008; Pager 2003; Purser 2012a; Uggen and McElrath 2014; Uggen et al. 2014; Western 2006). Indeed, in reference to the explosion of numbers of African Americans with felonies, Peck and Theodore (2008) refer to a “criminalized *class*” which they describe as a “structurally salient, racialized labor market category (7).” Along these lines, Bryan, the director of WFF, frequently explained that such exclusion made labor organizing of low income African Americans particularly pressing. Indeed, during a focus group, Malik, a WFF board member with a felony criminal record, shared that the biggest barrier to successful re-entry for formerly incarcerated people is discrimination when trying to get work or a legal income. He explained,

The biggest thing, as soon as you get out [of prison] you start applying for jobs and trying to get back on your feet. You got that big problem with the interviews and questions on how long you've been locked up, why you've been locked up. It goes right back to that again.

Louis, a UWC member with a felony record, spoke about how after incarceration he had tried getting jobs all over the place, even doing temporary staffing jobs on occasion. Yet he was still not able to get consistent work because, like others, his record always followed him no matter how much time had passed. He lamented that his youngest kid was soon going to college, but he



did not know how he was going to be able to pay for it because he was not able to get a job and stable income.

Likewise, James, a WFF member, explained that having a criminal record makes people unable to provide for their family or be a good role model. He said that before being convicted with a felony, getting a job was fairly easy for him. He had worked at the United Parcel Service (UPS), and done armed security, construction, and various other work. But after being incarcerated, his access to work changed drastically. Below he described a time when he and his brother applied to multiple jobs but employers rejected them due to their records. He complained that

Upon my release especially with that felony in my background it was and still is damn near impossible to find a job. ... True incident too. Me and my brother went down to fill out an application at Walmart and Target. Now Walmart and Target called him back but didn't call me back and I called up there and asked why. They were like, "Because you marked yes on the conviction box." Now he didn't mark yes but once they ran the background check on him and saw that he had a misdemeanor in his background they denied him the job also. So they're cracking down so hard and it's like damn near impossible to find employment.

In James and many other participants' cases, this discrimination made them feel a loss of hope, motivation, and social worth.

Furthermore, while employers are not supposed to look back into a person's criminal record past a certain time period, participants confirmed that this law is often violated. Brandi, a WFF board member, shared her frustration that having a record keeps people from improving their lives after incarceration. She explained

I get mad because one, I see a lot of my....people who go to jail, even if it's a small misdemeanor, that in itself can be a harsh thing on your record for a long time...if someone sees it—even though we got this new law, it's still gonna be difficult...They're gonna say "You had—what? You smoked some weed? I don't know if we want anybody that smoked weed." There's this mark on you, the scarlet letter on you, or '666'. I almost feel like it's having—being shackled and not being able to be free.

In other words, she explained that this mark stays with people forever, and greatly affects how people see them and what opportunities they have in life. Moreover, Patrice, a formerly incarcerated member of WFF, mentioned multiple times that even taking advantage of training opportunities while incarcerated had not helped him get work after his release. During the focus group he said that despite years of experience and certification as a butcher while incarcerated, not even small grocery stores would hire him because of his felony record and being locked up for six years. And despite over a hundred cities, counties, and the state of Illinois recently passing “Ban the Box” legislation, which takes the question regarding criminal convictions off of job applications (Rodriguez and Mehta 2015), participants were not fully relieved. Instead, they were convinced there would be insufficient enforcement of the law and expected that subsequent interviews and background checks would still lead to their exclusion when their criminal marks were “revealed.”

Legal exclusion from certain jobs despite having the necessary qualifications and certifications is something undocumented immigrants also face. Indeed, on most job applications, people are asked to give identification signaling that they are either citizens or legally allowed to work in the U.S., which is something undocumented workers do not have. Given this, degrees from other countries or even those earned here by undocumented immigrants raised in the U.S. are often not enough to access employment due to these rules. This is a reality that the passing of “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals” (DACA) and the fight for the DREAM act and broader immigration reform have made particularly visible, as tens of thousands of undocumented high school and college students graduate yearly but are legally excluded from many forms of work. Thus despite doing what “they are supposed to do” by “improving themselves” and “getting an education,” actions supposedly valued by the broader

society, so many of those who are undocumented but in school, and those who are incarcerated but engaging in school or vocational training, still face exclusion from work.

Furthermore, people with a felony in their background are legally barred from working in or getting certified in numerous industries (see Gomberg-Muñoz 2012; Jackson-Green 2015; Uggen et al. 2006). This is true for many state jobs and other public sector work, including in the fast growing health care sector, as well as numerous private sector, skilled, and service based jobs. Despite evidence to the contrary, the Illinois Correctional Industries (ICI) that is in 19 of the 25 Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) centers (ICI 2016a) touts that they give inmates jobs and skills they can use to get jobs upon their release. The IDOC (Short 2016) reports that the ICI provides

offenders with training and transferable work habits to aid with their successful reentry and securing employment. Approximately 1,351 male and female offenders participated in ICI programs such as garment cutting, dog training, meat and dairy processing, sewing, recycling and other assignments to produce goods and services and improve sustainability for the agency and other government offices. (P. 11)

While some participants said that they appreciated working inside prison to pass the time or stay out of trouble, the pay was extremely low and this so-called training did not seem to help them much upon release. For instance, Howard, a UWC member with a felony record, explained that he used to work for elderly people and really enjoyed it, but following his incarceration for driving without a license and marijuana possession when he was a young man, he could no longer work with home care clients. Likewise, Wade, a UWC board member, who a few years ago was trying to create barbering jobs for formerly incarcerated men in his neighborhood, discovered that having a felony record restricted people from getting their state barber's license at the time. In fact, he had only been able to help one of his apprentices with a felony secure a license, and that was only after taking up his case in court. While this law regarding barbering licenses just recently changed due to lobbying efforts, the barriers to many other jobs are still

significant (see Gowins 2016; Parker 2016; Progress Illinois 2016; Safer Foundation 2016a). In Illinois this includes over one hundred occupations including work as a tattoo artist, mover, athletic trainer (Hasnain 2015; see also Elejalde-Ruiz 2016), and until the beginning of next year, even barbering (Gowins 2016; Progress Illinois 2016; Safer Foundation 2016a). As a result, for some participants, these restrictions meant making the hard decision whether to be honest about their criminal record on job applications. Similar to James and his brother's experience above when applying to retail stores, participants reported from personal and familial experience that if they were forthright, they might not get the job, but if they lied, they would sometimes get found out shortly after starting and get fired anyway.

And even if people with felonies get hired, their legal marginalization creates vulnerability. Madelyn, a WFF board member, said low income African American workers with a record face labor exploitation in ways similar to undocumented immigrant workers, though perhaps to a different degree. She said

*Madelyn:* ...the incarceration issues of brothers on the south and west side affect their status just as much as immigrant issues affect, you know, the status of those types of workers, right?

*Author:* And what do you mean, status?

*Madelyn:* I mean the status that, that if I'm undocumented and I have problems... working, I have problems being exploited as a worker, that I have a problem with my rights as a worker. Well, if I'm an ex-offender, I have those same issues.

It was also noted by participants in both the WFF and UWC that most African Americans with a criminal record are not able to get the kinds of jobs that are more likely to be unionized, and similar to undocumented Latino immigrants, they do not often have a vast knowledge of labor law (Milkman 2011). This leaves them more susceptible to mistreatment and less likely to stand up for their rights at work. In addition, similar to the undocumented Latino immigrants' fear of being reported to ICE if they challenge their employer (Fussell 2011; Gleeson and Gonzales 2012; Gomberg-Muñoz 2010), parolees face the threat of being reported to their parole officer

and again removed from their communities through reincarceration (see Kleis 2010; Opsal 2009; Purser 2012a; Zatz et al. 2016). As I discuss further in the next chapter, Benito, the Latino director of UWC, argued this dynamic is common in the temporary staffing industry (TSI). He explained that parole officers and halfway houses regularly send people to these notoriously exploitative jobs. And since parolees are required to work, if they start complaining about working conditions, the staffing agency or client company managers often threaten to call their parole officer and report them. This is similar to the persistent vulnerability in these and other jobs that undocumented immigrants experience when management threatens to report them to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) because of their legal status. Thus for both groups, challenging their exploitation means they could face being further criminalized and removed from their communities.

Not being able to secure formal employment in most cases unless employers ignore this status, undocumented immigrants face difficult decisions such as using false or expired legal documents, or engaging in street vending or day labor work in public spaces where they are likely to be ticketed or harassed by police (Quiroz-Becerra 2013), doing illegal activities, selling illegal goods, or having to work “in the shadows.” And with each of these options, they again risk further criminalization, detention and deportation. African American participants with felony records sometimes had to make similar choices in order to make money. For instance, some worked “under the table,” or in informal and potentially illegal work that they knew may get them arrested and incarcerated again. Anthony, a UWC member with a felony record, shared that he used to sell CDs on the street when he first got out of prison, just to “get by.” Other participants sold miscellaneous products, cleaned houses, prepared tax forms, and engaged in other service work informally and “off the books.” Because their job options and access to public

benefits were limited, committing more criminal activity or selling goods illegally was frequently the only option they had to make money (Peck and Theodore 2008). Indeed, during the focus group, Malik, a WFF board member with a felony record, explained that he was incarcerated multiple times as a youth and as adult years ago, mostly for drug offenses, and said “I was on probation for an earlier case and I was released without means so I turned back to what I thought would provide me something. I ended up getting caught again less than two weeks out.” Avery, a WFF member with a felony record, admitted to committing crimes after being released from prison because he could not find a job. He commented regularly in WFF meetings that the only reason he was able to eventually get a formal job was due to his family owning a business and giving him a part-time position. Without that, he would say, he would have had to commit more crimes to make a living.

### *Public Resources and Benefits*

Like having an undocumented immigration status, the inaccessibility to or exploitation in work because of a criminal record in turn affected participants’ economic stability more generally, causing even greater need for other resources at a time when they were legally barred from most of them. Indeed, another theme that emerged in my research was the similar exclusion from public resources and benefits for people with a criminal record, particularly if it was a felony, and undocumented immigrants. More specifically, there were similarities in their lack of access to public welfare benefits, educational funding, and public housing. Undocumented immigrants are not eligible for most financial support from the government (Fix and Zimmerman 2001; NILC 2011), particularly with the increased legal restrictions in recent decades (Tumlin and Zimmerman 2003). Yet citizens with certain felonies also face restrictions to accessing benefits such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) (McCarty et al. 2013; NACDL 2014).

Indeed the restriction on access to TANF in Illinois for drug related offenses (IDHS 2013) made it difficult for some of the participants with records or partners with records to make ends meet, particularly due to the labor marginalization they faced. Furthermore, similar to the barriers undocumented immigrants face in affording an education (Clark-Ibáñez 2015), formal citizens with a felony drug conviction do not qualify for Federal Pell Grants for college, or most scholarships. Malik spoke often about how he was only able to go to college because he went to prison before access to Pell Grants was banned for felony drug convictions. This is reminiscent of the ongoing national campaigns for undocumented students, or “Dreamers” to get in-state tuition and financial aid at colleges and universities since their legal undocumented status exempts them from these benefits in many states, even with the implementation of DACA. While the 2003 passage of HB60 in Illinois meant that undocumented students became eligible for in-state tuition at public colleges and universities, and the 2012 Illinois DREAM Act made a state scholarship for these students, they are still not eligible for federal student aid.

Additionally, similar to the housing discrimination and exclusion experienced by undocumented immigrants (NILC 2011; Oliveri 2009), African American participants explained facing discrimination from private landlords and barriers to subsidized housing due to criminal records (Bannon et al. 2010; McCarty et al. 2013; Uggen et al. 2006; Walker 2014). Indeed, Thea, a WFF board member and long-time public housing resident and activist, explained to me that a person with a felony cannot live in Chicago Housing Authority properties. Anthony, a UWC member, explained that these restrictions create chaos and housing insecurity for large numbers of people with records, and by extension affects their families as well. He gave a general example of these situations, saying

Their mom and dad was born and raised on CHA property, then the son go up and go to jail, and he can't come back to the mom house just because he caught a felony. Where they supposed to live? They're keeping them on the street. It's not making them good.

I asked him if he has seen this situation a lot and he responded affirmatively, and said that many people have to leave their families, become homeless, stay with friends, or risk going back to jail and getting their family kicked out of public housing if they stay with them unlawfully.

Similarly, multiple speakers at the “Ban the Box” public forum described at the beginning of this chapter shared personal stories about how traumatizing it was to lose their apartment when a male partner got a record and they were not allowed to stay in public housing, at the same time as dealing with the stress of trying to get income. One couple in particular lamented on how this disruption in housing really upset their family’s living situation and ability to get ahead.

The increased use of house arrest and parole in sentencing exacerbated this insecurity and exclusion from housing. Like Wyatt, a UWC member with a felony record, explained, many landlords will not allow a person to live on their property if they have these legal requirements. And during the focus group, Avery, a WFF member with a felony, shared that this means some people are forced into staying incarcerated longer than required because they have no place to live upon release. He explained,

... in this day and age coming home from the penitentiary, you got to be on house arrest now for a certain amount of time. It's hard for people to even find a spot. Somebody might tell you, “You can stay here for a couple of weeks till you get back on your feet.” Who's to say, man I got to be there for six months? I don't know about that. Some people they can't adjust because nobody wants to deal with them being on house arrest at their house. They got to sit and do a little bit more time before they can just go ahead come home.

In this quote, Avery explains how this extended state surveillance further complicates people’s lives and limits formerly incarcerated people’s ability to get secure housing. This exclusion from basic substantive citizenship rights to public resources puts African Americans with felony records and their communities in particularly precarious situations, similar to that experienced by



undocumented immigrants. And it exacerbates any pre-existing economic and social challenges, and putting them at risk for further criminalization. Indeed this racialized and class based marginalization that many African Americans in Chicago experience is a key factor in the cycles of more incarceration and subsequent loss of citizenship rights, both for individuals, and by extension as family or community members of criminalized people. This is similar for undocumented immigrants, their families and communities, even if they are comprised of mixed formal citizenship statuses.

### *Family Trauma and Separation*

A third theme brought up by participants was the emotional, psychological, legal, and financial trauma on their families resulting from incarceration, criminal records, and the threat of reincarceration and separation (Hairston 2015; Patillo, Weiman, and Western 2004; Roberts 2001; Travis and Waul 2003; Uggen and McElrath 2014; Walker 2014; Western and Wildeman 2009). This “collateral damage” (Roberts 2001) echoed traumas that undocumented and mixed status families experience from the threat and experience of recently ramped up detention and deportation (Arbona et al. 2010; Capps and Karina 2006; Chaudry et al. 2010; Dreby 2012; Hagan, Rodriguez, and Castro 2011; Hawthorne 2007; Pallares 2014, 2010; Wessler 2011). For example, family and friend visits to prison are difficult and often infrequent due to limited contact time and the expense and distance involved. Indeed most of the formerly incarcerated participants were sent far from Chicago, and thus described experiencing considerable strain on their romantic and family relationships. Of course, such separation due to incarceration is not necessarily the same as that due to deportation across a national border that may be thousands of miles away, or the legal restrictions barring reentry. But the stress experienced by individuals

and family members around their treatment and separation during incarceration or detention, and after it, are certainly similar.

Additionally, despite the increasing incarceration, detention, and deportation of women, most people who experience this exclusion are men (Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013; Gomberg-Muñoz 2015; Western and Wildeman 2009). In these instances, similar gender dynamics play out, wherein women tend to bear the brunt of this trauma and the pressure to take care of other family members alone, exacerbated even more if they too are undocumented or have a criminal record. This struggle and extra pressure on women was something Bryan, director of WFF, often brought up in discussions about how criminalization and criminal records extend to people's communities. During the focus group of formerly incarcerated individuals, James, a WFF member, shared that his previous girlfriend even had experienced a miscarriage due to the stress of his incarceration. Likewise, Angela, a WFF member, explained how incarceration and criminalization affects everyone in a family, including children, in substantial ways. She said

When I gave the example of the grandma, the great grandma, the children all left behind when this person goes to prison. All of them are strapped to the same ball and chain. Every one of them. 'Cuz, at the very least, this one person had perhaps the ability to go and turn a dollar over. Grandma's got cancer. She don't have no money saved up because all she did was work for Miss Sally all her life. The kids don't have anything. They don't have any kinda legacies whatsoever. You may as well have thrown the whole family in jail. Kids with incarcerated parents, it's coming on the radar now. Philanthropists and so forth will start to look more at what are we doing to the structure, whatever that family might be. It might not be your typical family, but it is a family structure. What are we doing to the structure when we are so hard on criminals, so to speak?

In this quote, Angela described how incarceration can cause significant hardship for those left behind. She referenced how many grandmothers in particular, often with few resources, are frequently left to care for children when a parent is incarcerated.

Furthermore, like detention and deportation of undocumented immigrants, incarceration and a felony record can sometimes even lead to loss of parental rights (Walker 2014). Scholars and journalists have captured the frequent ripping apart of families, and fostering of children left behind due to detention and deportation, including those resulting from sudden traffic stops and workplace raids (e.g. Dreby 2012). Such realities are also common when parents are incarcerated. For instance, Patrice, a WFF member with a felony record, shared that years ago his child was taken away by the Department of Child and Family Services and that it affected her tremendously. He shared that

[Their] mom got locked up as well. Upon me coming home, trying to hurry to get home to get [them] I was on the train and coming home and that's when [they] got taken, on my way coming home. It affected my [child] bad. That's all [they] talks about to this day.

Indeed, when discussing the relationship between deportation and incarceration tactics, Halima, a WFF board member, explained that in both cases, people are torn from their communities, causing everyone involved immense harm as a result. She said

*Halima:* ...To me, the deportation and mass incarceration feel like the same thing almost. It's just like yanking people from their jobs, and communities, and their families.

*Author:* For what purpose, or what do you think the end result—

*Halima:* The end result is destruction of those communities... Yeah, it's the disruption of those communities, the families, and not just blood families but just all of the things, all of the families that we create as we talked about before, the disruption, the—there's a whole mental health piece that comes along with it, so what emotional state that leaves everyone who's left behind and those who are directly being deported and incarcerated.

Halima argued that these systems similarly fracture families and neighborhoods, creating instability that has a high price for mental and emotional health for both those left behind and those taken. Such trauma, disruption, and separation of families is contrary to what one might expect is owed to those with citizenship rights, reinforcing how marginalized even formal citizens can be due to racialized criminalization.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

My research captures how the growth of criminalization and mass incarceration has exacerbated the marginalization of low income, racialized “second class citizens,” particularly low income African Americans, from full citizenship. I argue that despite still having formal citizenship, the mark left on the millions of low income African Americans with a criminal record, particularly felonies, has led to the reduction of access to multiple parts of their substantive citizenship. And I argue that this reduction is to such a degree that their positionality is rendered similar to that of undocumented immigrants, particularly those from Latin America who are also racialized as non-white. Specifically, participants described experiencing structural marginalization similar to that of undocumented immigrants particularly in the area of work, access to public resources, and their communities. In particular, this reduction in rights has meant they are not eligible for multiple public resources and benefits like welfare, federal loans for school, and housing. It has also curtailed their ability to provide for and be with their families. And finally it has made it difficult for them to find well paying, full time, formal work, which affects these and other areas substantially. Each of these experiences are widely understood to be key areas of exclusion that immigrants marked with an undocumented status experience as well. Thus I pose an extension of theories on nationally based citizenship, particularly regarding barriers to substantive citizenship, by offering an empirical example of the effects of criminalization on racialized, low income formal citizens, and how they are comparable to racialized, low income noncitizens. Although my study focused on low income African Americans involved in two organizations in Chicago, my findings may apply to other groups which are affected by the nexus of criminalization, race, and citizenship.

Certainly, this comparison is not exact, but the castigation as “undeserving” and experience of daily exclusion from income and economic support, and constant threat of

separation and disruption of family life through detention, deportation, and incarceration helps illuminate structural parallels for marginalized groups. In sociological literature we tend to silo discussions on meanings of citizenship to immigrants or to legal citizens, with rare comparisons of people with similar substantive exclusion across legal statuses. I argue that the framing used around undocumented immigrants' rights is useful for contextualizing African American and other people of colors' mitigated access to citizenship when they are criminalized with a felony record because it helps reveal the true cost of mass incarceration in creating more excluded people. Through showing similarities I complicate our understanding of "citizenship" and how criminalization and citizenship shape people's vulnerability. I also make these patterns of similar experiences of structural exclusion more obvious, which might pave the way for more solidarity across race and status. Illuminating these similarities is important for a better understanding of the structural obstacles people face in combatting poverty, improving access to rights, and having a voice in their labor conditions and creating interracial solidarity.

Additionally, my research contributes to arguments that claim the functioning of our economic system relies on some people being excluded from full citizenship rights through racialization and criminalization (see Glenn 2000, 2002; Lebaron 2012; Reiter 2013; Wacquant 2009). This has important implications for community and labor based organizing among low income and racialized communities, as I discuss in the next chapter. In particular, it points to the importance of continued alliance building efforts across races and nationalities to address this marginalization. This is especially important in the workplace, which is the primary place of interaction, competition, and conversations between African Americans and undocumented Latino immigrants. Indeed, when discussing the need for cross racial unity in organizing in the temporary staffing industry (TSI), staff and leaders at the UWC frequently discussed with Latino

members that citizens of color, and African Americans in particular, may have citizenship but still face similar exploitation, incarceration, discrimination, and brutality by law enforcement.

Ramona, a Latina staff person at the UWC, said she explains this comparison to members in the following way,

... “just because you’re a citizen doesn’t mean that you still won’t be exploited, that you still won’t be excluded, that all of these different institutional oppressions will be gone.” This is the exact same example that I would use and bring up. It’s “look at our black brothers and sisters or look at people who have been for one reason or another in the criminal justice system. They are not—they don’t have all of these different rights that we’re supposed to all be having...”

Ramona’s point illustrates how even if immigration reform is finally won and millions of undocumented immigrants gain formal citizenship, the current system of racialized mass criminalization makes it unlikely that they would experience full citizenship. Indeed, while efforts for immigration reform and decriminalization are important and necessary, history tells us that it will not help all groups equally, or even benefit those already marked. As such, my work helps re-center discussions on immigration reform policies, and broader criminalization of people of color, and helps show the ongoing relationship between the increase of criminalization of citizens of color and immigrants of color in a historical context.

My findings also raise questions about the impact of piecemeal criminal justice reform. For instance, while President Obama’s administration has begun taking steps to address mass criminalization, and some states have recently decriminalized marijuana, the implications of such structural changes are not clear for the millions of people, and primarily African American men, whose substantive citizenship has already been reduced due to the prevailing system. After all, as

Hernández (2011) says,

As the case of African Americans makes clear, citizenship can be gained and lost (time and again). Today it is the criminal justice system that renders the substance of citizenship, itself, unpredictable. In other words, a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants in an era of mass incarceration may not be as valuable as it seems if pursued without a challenge to the inequities of mass incarceration. (P. 65-66)

I argue that efforts fighting for racial justice, including in the workplace, would benefit from looking at the systematic relationship between race, criminalization, and citizenship affecting both groups. To really change structural exclusion, such efforts must be paired with addressing neoliberal capitalism and white racial dominance, and a commitment to rights being decoupled from citizenship qualification generally. Not doing so will simply leave the door open for elite and racialized efforts to continue devising new mechanisms of denying access to rights for many, and keeping people divided. This has profound implications for workers, and as I discuss in the next chapter, solidarity between similarly marginalized undocumented immigrants and criminalized African Americans could be an important tool in fighting their exploitation.

### **III. The Chicago area Temporary Staffing Industry's Use of Racialized "Unfreeness"**

Just before noon on a Friday in November 2014, Corey, a United Worker Center (UWC) staff person, and myself walked into a Quickwork temporary staffing agency lobby. The lobby was a grey concrete sitting area scattered with empty chairs, small windows, and a loudly buzzing soda machine. Two agency staff people sat at their desks behind a glass enclosed counter at the front, and employment information and rules for conduct were posted on the lobby walls. By the time we got there, only a few people were still waiting around from the morning rush for a work assignment. This included two Latino men who left shortly after we walked in, an African American man in his 30s sitting close to the front counter, and two middle aged African American men sitting against the far wall. Corey and I walked up to these last two men. The older of the two, seemingly in his late 50s, said that he had been coming to the agency off and on over the years since 2009. As a Southside Chicago resident, it takes him 2 hours by bus to get to this office on the Westside. The second guy, a few years younger, said he had been coming there for some time as well, and had been sitting there since 5am that day. They told us how they had already seen a lot of Latinos leave for jobs that day. The older man said he had heard about some lawsuit at another agency called Westside Staffing regarding discrimination against African Americans, and that since it was filed, they had been hiring a few more African Americans, though mostly on the second shift rather than the preferred first shift. So, he said, there was still a split between them and Latino workers.

This racial hiring divide in the Chicago metro area temporary staffing industry (TSI) was something I also observed at Westside Staffing and Cardinal Staffing, and heard about broadly from participants. Like other studies have shown (Purser 2012a, 2012b; Elcioglu 2010), TSI job seekers in Chicago usually arrive to an agency office by 4:30 in the morning daily just to get on a



waiting list for the first shift, even if they have been “employed” at the agency for a long time. Unless the worker has social connections with the dispatcher, they usually spend hours waiting, hoping to get an assignment, and to not have to sink more time and money just to make money. Many of those who do not get a job assignment for the first shift stay in the hopes of getting into the second or even third shift, sometimes waiting the whole day. But the hiring is not as simple as “first come, first serve.” Overwhelmingly, I saw and heard that Latino immigrants who were assumed to be undocumented due to language and clothing led the hiring queue because of the assumption that they were less likely to stand up to exploitation because of their presumed immigration status. Indeed, when canvassing outside agencies and factories with organizers, UWC staff and I consistently heard about or saw that Latino workers from Mexico and Central America were the majority of workers hired and sent to client companies. In contrast, there was rarely more than a handful of African American temp workers at these factories, if any, despite many seeking work at the agencies often. Instead, I argue that African Americans were overwhelmingly discriminated against because their phenotype signaled to temp agency staff that they were most likely to be legal citizens, which implied they would be more likely to contest exploitation, unless their “freeness” was limited through being on parole or coming through a halfway house. Notably, I did not see or hear about more than a few white workers applying at agencies or working in these factories.

My research expands the findings by Kathryn M. Kirschenmann and Joleen Neckerman (1991) regarding the prevalence of firm level racial hiring discrimination in Chicago, and Jamie Peck and Nik Theodore’s (1998, 2001, 2008) findings that Chicago area TSI hiring queues are related to the vulnerability in relation to race, criminalization, and immigration status. I provide updated ethnographic data regarding the experiences and perceptions by TSI workers, applicants,

and their advocates in the UWC. I argue that ascribed race is generally used in the TSI as a proxy for the degree of access to full citizenship a worker has, and is utilized for the production of difference and worker control characteristic of historical race management practices (Glenn 2002; Roediger and Esch 2012). Specifically, I argue that while racial discrimination is rampant in TSI hiring, it is primarily used as a proxy for formal citizenship and combined with worker “unfreeness” in determining exploitability and vulnerability. I borrow from Evelyn Nakano Glenn’s (2002) idea of “unfreeness” which she referred to as the local and historical relationships between race, gender, and immigration status in relation to capitalism, specifically referring to state and employer coercion and control over workers. I extend this by specifically pointing to criminalization and legal citizenship status, and thus apply it to include a person’s lack of autonomy and access to rights. In other words, I argue that in seeking to meet client companies’ demands for the most vulnerable and thus exploitable workers, the Chicago area TSI relied on being able to hire the most relatively “unfree” workers available in a given situation, such as undocumented Latino immigrants and African American parolees in this case.

While neither Peck and Theodore (2001, 2008) nor myself described this relationship of discrimination and vulnerability in relation to gender, it was certainly a factor in differential hiring and treatment in the Chicago area TSI and client companies. For instance, Mari described how dispatchers and van drivers would often force themselves onto women or pat women on their butt, and if a women protested such behavior, would face being denied work. And at a UWC rally in February 2013, Latina immigrant workers spoke about how TempLeaders would not hire women over 35 or 40 years old. Sexual harassment and even sometimes assault by male temp agency dispatchers, as well as company supervisors and coworkers was also described by participants as a fairly common occurrence, affecting women’s safety greatly, while they did not

have recourse to address it, and often had to comply with demands in order to keep their jobs. Despite these disturbing accounts, I found gender to be less salient than race and legal status in the processes of the discriminatory hiring queue in the industry and divisions of assignment within the factories. And because most of my data on African American TSI applicants and workers was focused on males or African Americans generally without a gender breakdown, I do not have enough data to make claims about differential gendered treatment or discrimination based on actual or presume criminal records.

In the following sections, I describe the broad theoretical context for this racialized hiring and unfreeness. I then outline my findings on how race affected hiring specifically in the light industrial manufacturing TSI in the Chicago metro area, and how this is complicated by intersections of unfreeness. Next I describe how this sorting is utilized for race and unfreeness management inside the factories, and outline how the TSI fights to protect their ability to discriminate in order to serve client company requests and maintain their business. I also point to how this intersectional discrimination plays into ongoing distrust and divisions between African American and Latino workers, deterring solidarity needed for organizing, much like that described in previous studies (e.g. Waldinger 1996).

These findings contribute to discussions about the implications of the increasing levels of contingent and precarious work, particularly in regards to how nonstandard employment can allow for easier circumvention anti-discrimination regulation. In this instance, the triangulation between the TSI, client company, and worker means client companies are able to get the most vulnerable workers through agencies, separating themselves from liability and avoiding obligations to keep workers long term. Finally, this notion of racialized unfreeness in labor also has implications for citizenship studies, in that workers' marginalization from full citizenship in

combinations of formal and substantive citizenship both makes them preferred workers in this sector, while their marginalization is reinforced.

## RACIALIZATION AND UNFREEDOM AT WORK

Dividing workers has long been a crucial mechanism for controlling them, thwarting organizing efforts, increasing competition between them, and generally facilitating capitalist production and profit (Bonacich et al. 2008; Glenn 2002; Jung 2006; Roediger and Esch 2012). Such division is generally facilitated by the “social production of differences” (Lowe 1996; see also Roediger and Esch 2012) or the development of hierarchies based on intersections of race, gender, national origin, immigration status, and others. Notwithstanding the important intersections with gender, race and citizenship have been a particularly central part of this production of difference for the development of the U.S. economy, even including distinctions between whites and “white ethnics” not considered fully white (see Fox and Guglielmo 2012; Roediger and Esch 2012). Indeed Glenn (2002) explains that the U.S. nation state was founded on a system where white elites had sole governing power and their citizenship was based on their status as “free independent producers” (p. 2). In other words, U.S. citizenship was not only tied to race but also the distinction of free labor (i.e. white) and unfree labor comprised particularly of African Americans, Native Americans, Mexicans and Asians (Glenn 2002:58). As Bonacich et al. (2008) explain, this racialized distinction then provides justification of inferior treatment and exclusion, based on a person’s “lesser” status. They say,

The two most important features of racialized labor are the belief that these workers’ lives are somehow less important—that they are less worthy of decent treatment and that they are denied basic citizenship rights so that they are, in a sense, excluded from the polity and can be exploited without having the political option to protect themselves. (Bonacich et al. 2008:348)

This racialization of workers was institutionalized further through the discipline of management studies. As early as 1830 there were instruction manuals on how to “manage” slaves (Roediger and Esch 2012:10; see also Cooke 2003). Racial and managerial knowledge became more formally intertwined by the time of 19<sup>th</sup> century industrialism, creating “race management” as a system wherein white managers would identify and manipulate differences between workers. Through ranking and sorting groups based on race and nationalities, these management decisions focused on which “coerced labor was most economical, skilled, durable, efficient, and tractable (Roediger and Esch 2012:11).” The production of difference was aided by increased diversity and varying levels of legal citizenship and criminalization following emancipation of African Americans and increased migration from Europe and Mexico. Then in the 1920s and 1930s, as immigration by Europeans decreased and their organizing efforts increased, managers focused most race management on African Americans and Mexicans. But following the 1965 Hart-Celler Act, the increased diversity of immigrants again provided management with “a host of racialized groups to play against each other, groups also separated by citizenship status, religion, legality, and language (Roediger and Esch 2012:206-207).”

This overt racial management was threatened as racial discrimination became less acceptable in the 1960s and early 1970s (Hudson 2007). Nevertheless, race management practices continue, though usually through most discrete or indirect ways. Indeed, numerous studies have shown that “hiring queues” continue to be based on racialized discrimination and employer preference for criminalized and legally marginalized workers who are seen as more easily exploited (Gomberg-Muñoz 2011, 2012; Neckerman and Kirschenman, 1991; Peck and Theodore 2008). This is particularly relevant to Latino immigrants and low income African Americans, as the criminalization of immigrants means that people without documents are not

allowed to work legally in the U.S. and face punishment if they do, and formal citizens with a criminal record are legally able to be discriminated against while also denied many benefits and thus desperate for work. Through this system, both groups are made vulnerable in the labor market and easily exploited through their “differences.”

Furthermore, Peck and Theodore (2001) explain that “Given the marked racial segregation of Chicago’s housing market, the location of an agency was often enough to trigger racial/ethnic signifiers” (p. 488) for client companies to use when requesting workers. Indeed, still today most Chicago area temporary staffing agencies are located in the predominantly Latino neighborhoods on the west side of the city, which are assumed to include many undocumented and thus vulnerable workers. While these locations are generally adjacent to poor African American communities, agencies are almost never located in solely African American neighborhoods since they are generally last in the “recruitment queue” in the Chicago area (Peck and Theodore 2008). Agencies are also densely populated in the inner ring suburbs, arguably in order to avoid the stricter labor laws of the city of Chicago, and to be closer to suburbs where most of the light manufacturing, assembly, and distribution client companies are located.

Of course, knowingly hiring an undocumented immigrant is illegal, as is discriminating by race. But the triangular employment relationship between the worker, client company and temporary staffing industry (Freeman and Gonos 2005; Gonos 1997; Hatton 2014; Vosko 2000; Peck and Theodore 2002) helps buffer and mask legal liability of doing just that, while preying on the workers’ vulnerabilities. Indeed, while some individual managers and dispatchers may make hiring decisions based on personal preferences, I found that like Peck and Theodore (2001) reported, most of the discrimination they carried was due to client preferences and requests. To provide the “just in time” workers sought by client companies, temporary staffing agencies focus

specifically on the recruitment of these “reliably contingent” and controllable workers with few other options for work (Peck and Theodore 2001, 2008). These agencies work hard to match these requests in order to keep their contracts in a climate of extremely high competition in pricing and record of sending “good,” or vulnerable and compliant, workers (Peck and Theodore 2001). Indeed, some companies contracted with or had onsite offices for two or three agencies at a time who were each in competition to deliver vulnerable, compliant workers. In the following sections I describe how this recruitment and hiring are determined not only by race but also unfreeness.

#### “MEXICANS WILL GET JOBS BUT NO BLACKS”

The primary applicants in the Chicago area temporary staffing industry (TSI) during my research were low income African Americans and Latino immigrants. Luke, a white academic, explained that when he collaborated on research and training with the United Worker Center (UWC) he saw the TSI hire based on distinct groups. He said that

One of the reasons employers use the temp agencies is because it's relatively easy to racialize the workforce and play groups off of each other. You know, we've seen, just like other groups have seen uh, you know temp agencies that are specialists in providing you know African-American workers or Latino workers, or you know documented workers or undocumented workers, or women and men, ...

Explaining how this discrimination is made possible, African American board members of Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF), Thea and Sheldon, spoke about hearing codes used to cover up the fact that companies were requesting specific types of workers at the temporary staffing agencies. As a long time temp worker or “permatemp” at a major Chicago newspaper company himself, Sheldon said,

In discrimination, as far as the temp agencies go, they have a code that when a contractor calls and says "I need 15 workers, you know to come here for such and such and I want them to work such and such." They don't have to uh necessarily, the person that's actually taking the contract don't necessarily have to say, "What would you prefer?"

There's a letter, and when they call, if it's white people, the list is the letter W. If it's blacks, it's the letter b, if it's Spanish, oh the, Spanish the letter was C, and if they were Chinese, it was "u."

I asked if this would be written down or said over the phone, and Sheldon explained

No no. When they called, when they emailed or called for the contract you know for "x" amount of people, this particular letter...they were already told, ...if you call for the contract, the specific people that you want, this is the letter that you use. In other words to try to keep anybody.... To try to make it look like "I'm not discriminating" you know, "Well we didn't discriminate, they didn't call and say they wanted 15 white people here, that's not what they said. They said we want 15 people here and we ask you know on what letterhead you want it on and they would say W" and that's it.

Sheldon's description of companies using codes in their "orders" of workers to avoid detection of discrimination was similarly explained by, Travis, white staff person for UWC. Travis told me that according to a former dispatcher he met, when a company wanted Latino immigrant workers they would ask for "bilingual" workers, and when they wanted women or men, it would be "lights" or "heavies" respectively. These were not isolated examples but instead a systematic way of "ordering" workers that organizers and members had seen for years.

Notably though with this system of specific requests, it was Latinos that were most often preferred in the TSI. For instance, one day in July 2013 when I was volunteering at the UWC Chicago office, an African American man in his early 50s came in to ask if we were a hiring agency, and whether we help people with criminal records. He said that he had just seen about twenty African Americans standing outside an agency down the street, trying to get a job but that none of them seemed to be getting one. He said it happened all the time and that "Mexicans will get jobs but no blacks." Madelyn, an African American WFF board member, pointed out that the discrimination was one direction since a preference for African



Americans did not seem to exist at any agencies. She explained

Yeah, so there ... clearly are some temp agencies that if you go to them and you're an African American worker, you're then, you're just not gonna get hired. It is like Spanish-speaking workers only....And I have not heard anything on the other end, like from agencies where they're only, like only hire African American workers. That might be happening. I just haven't heard that.

Likewise, Bryan, the director from WFF, reiterated this pattern saying that many of the WFF member leaders have tried to get temp jobs but do not get hired. Indeed, Amaya, a WFF member, told me that from her experience, Latinos always get jobs before African Americans, and that whites "divide and conquer" these workers. She explained that she often gets called back when she applies to temp agencies, but her African American boyfriend does not. She argued that was because she has a Spanish sounding last name. Similarly, Jimmy, an African American WFF member, recalled that at temp agencies he applied to, Latinos got jobs first. He said,

...a lotta times, it seemed like the Spanish people, I guess, were the regulars, and they got sent out first. Or, they knew where to send them because that was probably a predominantly Hispanic factory or something like that.

While not necessarily making claims on this happening due to discrimination, Jimmy had still noticed imbalanced racialized preferences in hiring.

Benito, the Latino director for UWC, further confirmed this imbalance by explaining how many agencies blatantly prevent African Americans from the chance to even apply for a job. He explained

In MANY of the temp agencies [*African Americans*] are not even given an application, on occasions not even given a pre-application....on occasion not even asked for their numbers, simply told "Come back next week, come back next week, come back next week," and around the back Latino immigrants are getting in the van.

This exclusion even occurred when African Americans called ahead and were told by agency staff to come apply at the office at a certain time, and were given the run around. A couple of times while passing out information flyers in the late morning outside the Westside Staffing

office, Corey, an African American UWC staff person, and myself met African Americans leaving the office angry. They told us that they had specifically been told over the phone to come at certain times, such as 10 or 11 am, to fill out an application for the second shift, but that when they arrived they were told there was no work for them or that they should have come earlier. They were then often told they should just wait to MAYBE get a job on the second shift. In one particular example, one July morning in 2014 we met two young African American women who had just been told they would not get work after having called the agency ahead of time, and walking a long distance to the office. When they had called at 10 am that morning as directed, the dispatcher had told them to come by noon at the latest to apply for the second shift. Accordingly they had arrived around 11:45am but when they spoke to the dispatcher they said there were no jobs so they should not bother putting in an application. The younger woman asked if they could at least put their applications on file for future openings but the dispatcher said they do not do that. Both women were really upset, especially having gone out of their way to do what they were instructed to secure work. Indeed one of the women had just gone to her aunt's funeral the night before, but still made the trip into the agency, trying to get work.

A month later, in July 2014, the UWC hosted a public policy forum regarding these unfair hiring practices. At it, there was a panel that included a sympathetic state senator, multiple TSI workers, and the vice president of Westside Staffing. An African American woman on the panel shared how frustrating it was to sit in the waiting room for hours, being passed up for work and ignored for being African American, while watching Latinos being the majority of people getting job assignments, and even being called by dispatchers over the phone for work. This happened even in neighborhoods where African Americans were the majority of local residents. The Westside Staffing vice president responded to this and other similar stories by

claiming that he did not know about these discrimination problems and would fire the discriminatory dispatchers. He even offered a job to one of the people on the panel.

None of these promises were fulfilled. Instead, after the UWC continued putting pressure on Westside Staffing about this hiring discrimination, the agency tried to appease organizers by holding a “job fair” in September 2014, while promising to hire many people. That morning the agency had set up a small table in the parking lot in front of their office with some balloons to attract passersby, and were handing out promotional t-shirts and pens to applicants. The vice president who had been at the forum was there, but was far less amicable to myself and others with the UWC away from the state senator and news cameras. Earlier that morning, UWC organizers and I even brought members and talked to African American residents in the area to encourage them to apply, to challenge the agency’s claim that African Americans do not get jobs because they do not apply. I later learned that Anthony, a formerly incarcerated African American member of UWC, experienced blatant discrimination when applying that day. He shared with me that during the fair, the Westside Staffing people promised him work and so he waited there for three to four hours, but then they started making excuses preventing him from getting a work assignment that day. He explained,

First, got to the company....they were supposed to be giving out 100 jobs, so I was coming there knowing that I would get a job, first of all. Then when I get that, I was told—I was asked if I could go out that evening. I told the gentleman that I could... go out that day. I had brought another guy with me, and after he got done with his interview, the guy told me to leave and he let him know that he was still waiting on me. He [the dispatcher] was like, "Oh, you all two are together." After that, he just volunteered me to come in for the next day and started going out that night to work...

Excited at the prospect of getting a job, Anthony shared that he was willing to start immediately, and even had his own transportation. But since his friend could not go that night, and for an unexplained reason the dispatcher treated them as a joint unit, they delayed his starting until the

next day when they could “ride together.” Even after this first obstacle, the agency continued to block Anthony from working. He shared that

The next day come, I didn’t get no call from him, so I called them, and they said all the positions were filled....Of course, I was pissed off and angry, mad. I had told people that I was starting another job the next day. I called back again Friday. They still had no work. ....I told my mom and stuff that I was given another job. I was starting it the next day, and that's a disappointment.

He followed up the next two days but dispatchers told him there were still no positions open and never called him again. As someone actively trying to improve his life following incarceration and only having a part time job at the time, Anthony said that having to tell people that he actually did not get the new job after all made him feel really negative.

#### PREFERENCE FOR “UNFREE” WORKERS

For each of these examples, racial divisions were clear in terms of which applicants were given jobs and which were not. Yet as I argue, race was generally used as a proxy for determining formal citizenship, in combination with the level “unfreeness” of a given worker. In other words, beyond these racialized divisions of recruitment, participants explained that agencies specifically hire people with the most limited citizenship, whose freedom is minimized due to legal vulnerability.

For instance, despite being the “preferred” group, even Latino immigrants were not guaranteed to get work. There were some that were hired due to personal connections with dispatchers, or because they had a car that could be used to drive themselves and others to the client company, thus cutting transportation related labor costs. But generally, vulnerability was the lead deciding factor in preferential hiring. For instance, Latinos that were citizens or assumed to be were less likely to get hired. When I went with Carlos, a Latino UWC organizer, to talk with people in a suburb in March 2014, we stopped at a TempLeaders office on the

outskirts of town to test if they would give him a job based on being racialized as Latino. The woman dispatcher inside told him to apply online, which from his experience Carlos assumed was because he spoke English to her. He explained that if you speak English agency staff assume you are a citizen so have you go through the more “legitimate” and drawn out hiring channels. But, he suspected that if he had spoken Spanish she would have had him write down his name on the sign in sheet and wait there for an assignment. This reliance on language and clothing in combination with race to determine someone’s immigration status was brought up often by UWC staff often, and relates to the class and space proxies employers in Kirschenman and Neckerman’s (1991) study used to distinguish and sort applicants.

As Sabrina, a former UWC volunteer explained, citizenship was central to workers’ relationship to the TSI. She said,

I think citizenship is the underpinning of the—why people wind up seeking work through temp agencies... Whether you are a returning citizen and you don't fully have your rights, or whether you're an undocumented person, or whether you are a recent immigrant who hasn't learned the language, these agencies are simply the last resort to seek income to provide for your families.

Like Sabrina said, I found that workers’ degree of marginalization from full citizenship inclusion is what makes them preferred workers. Of course much has been written about employer preference for undocumented workers in many cases as their legal status can be used to control workers for their fear of detention and deportation, and their need for work since there are many places that will not hire them (see De Genova 2002, 2013; Gomberg-Muñoz 2011, 2012). And like Peck and Theodore (2001, 2008), I found this to still be the case in the Chicago area light industrial TSI and their client companies. As Mari, a Latina UWC member and temp worker, explained, most workers she saw alongside her were Latino, and three fourths of them were undocumented. Participants frequently shared that being undocumented made workers more willing to take assignments that were very dangerous or exploitative with minimal

complaint because this is one of the formal jobs they can get into. Latino UWC members and temp workers Ricardo and Gezana spoke about how having “papers” or a documented immigration status made people feel more secure to stand up for their rights, because they were less fearful generally and knew they had other job options, which was not the case for those without documentation.

Many Latino immigrants were also recruited and picked up daily by agency “raiteros.” These are van drivers who go directly to Latino immigrant neighborhoods in Chicago like Little Village or nearby suburbs like Cicero, which are known to have many undocumented Latino immigrants who are seen as a “steady supply” of vulnerable people in search of work. These raiteros serve as “mobile agencies,” wherein the minimal hiring paperwork is handled on the spot and riders are delivered straight to a client company. Indeed many agencies told inquiring workers in these areas to just meet the raitero at a particular location early in the morning rather than coming to the office. Thus these workers rarely even stepped foot in the agency, even if they worked for one for an extended amount of time. For instance, Mari, a Latina UWC member, met a raitero every day for years around 4:30am or 12:30pm depending on the shift she was given. This hiring process added yet another layer of distance from accountability for the employer and even the agencies, and thus workers faced more risk of wage theft and abuse. These workers usually got their paycheck from the raiteros directly, and were even less likely to get a “work slip” confirming their assignment than they would if they had gone to the agency office. And notably, the Illinois Day and Temporary Labor Services Act (IDTLA), passed in 2000 and strengthened in 2005, made it against the law for agencies to charge for rides to client company facilities. Yet participants shared that such charges were regularly taken by raiteros,

who sometimes also stole workers' paychecks or required workers to cash their checks at businesses where they had arrangements with "friends" to get a cut.

In contrast, there were no "raiteros" going into African Americans communities to hire them. Instead, due to few temp or other job options in their neighborhoods, most African American applicants had to travel significant distances in the very early morning hours by car or public transportation to get to the agency and hope they can get a work assignment. And once there, many found that they were made to wait even longer than Latinos, screened for having a criminal status, and then most often sent away or given particularly undesirable shifts at best. UWC staff and I heard from many African American workers that they were not even given an application at TSI agencies. And often, if they got one, it was some sort of "pre-application" which asked about their criminal record. Like described in the previous chapter, participants shared that if someone answered yes to having a record, it almost certainly meant they would not get work. Participants often said that they were not aware of Spanish speaking workers being given these sorts of applications.

This is in contrast to Purser's (2012a) study of day labor agencies in Baltimore. In that study, Purser (2012a) found that agencies sought to hire the most marginalized workers, overwhelmingly African Americans in that case, without conducting background checks, tests, or interviews. However in Chicago, participants argued that for African Americans, having a criminal record was another tool used by agencies to legally justify not hiring them. Reinforcing Peck and Theodore's (2008) findings, Floyd, an African American UWC staff person and former temp worker, shared with me that he often came across flyers and information from community and re-entry support organizations encouraging people to go to temp agencies to get jobs after their release from prison. But these jobs did not usually pan out. Corey, a UWC staff person,

and I, met with some of the staff at one of these organization in June 2014. They shared that as part of their re-entry support they tried to help formerly incarcerated people get jobs and often sent people to agencies such as Westside Staffing, but they often got demoralized because they hit so many road blocks even in this so-called entry level work.

Furthermore, at a rally at Cardinal Staffing headquarters in May of 2013, Floyd told fellow protesters that he had applied to many temp jobs but was usually asked about his criminal record first while nonblack applicants did not get asked about theirs. He then shared how while organizing he met some young African American men that had gone to StaffingKing to apply and they were forced to do a urine test checking for drugs. While this was not a widely reported practice in the Chicago area, participants and I both heard about such tests only in the context of African American applicants and not Latinos. Similarly, at an event hosted by the WFF, Harold, an African American UWC member, shared with the audience that temp agencies and other workplaces also often used credit checks to discriminate against African Americans.

These kinds of “markers” used to deem someone a criminal or “unworthy” of work were discussed often. In interviews and informal conversations, many participants complained that this dissimilar treatment of Latino applicants insinuated that only African Americans have a criminal background and were thus unfit for the work. But in reality, participants argued that this screening served as a way to legally exclude them from getting hired, while Latino immigrants’ citizenship status was not questioned, and in fact was often ignored or covered up. Thus, I argue this hiring inequality was largely in relationship to not only racism but also assessments regarding levels of a workers’ unfreeness.

Of course, as I argued in the previous chapter, a formal citizen of color with a criminal record faces increased exclusion from full citizenship from those already seen as second class



citizens. But in the case of the Chicago area TSI, this seemed to not qualify them as unfree enough, meaning they were not at the level of vulnerability preferred by client companies. Instead, I found some evidence that African American workers on parole were more likely to get work in the TSI than if they simply had a criminal record. In other words, it seemed that African Americans with criminal records were dismissed or less likely to get work unless they were on parole, and having a record was just used as a convenient way to justify discrimination against them.

As Purser (2012a) described in her Baltimore based study, parole requirements exacerbate the vulnerability and limited the bargaining power of formerly incarcerated workers. This is because they are still controlled by the state and face the threat of reincarceration if they do not hold a job, stop applying for them, or in any way seem as if they are not “rehabilitating” or reentering well into society (see also Kleis 2010; Opsal 2009; Petersilia 2003; Zatz et al. 2016). Similarly, Benito, UWC director, explained how parole officers, or “POs” send their parolees to temp agencies often, and employers use that power dynamic to further control them. For instance, UWC staff persons Benito, Travis, and Carlos each mentioned that if a worker complained about the work or did not perform satisfactorily, supervisors would threaten to tell their PO, similar to how immigrants are threatened with being reported to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). And some UWC staff people had met African Americans living in halfway house over the years that were also funneled into working for temp agencies in a very complicated and controlled dynamic. They had learned that these workers’ transportation to job site, food, and rent all came out of their wages – and they might not even get a check after all that. Travis shared specifically that one member had lived in a halfway house in the suburbs and worked for a couple agencies. That member and others at the house would be picked up by vans

from the agencies rather than going to office, and their food and transportation costs were all taken out of their checks. This was not unlike the dynamics for immigrant workers with *raiteros*. Travis explained that for this member, his choice was to either accept whatever job assignment he was given and not complain about conditions or do the work poorly, or face going back to jail. Arguably this vulnerability then created an incentive for the agencies to hire him and others in his position because it secured his compliance, while at the same time the company assumed minimal financial or social risk associated with hiring “criminals.” Travis said he had heard similar stories from others over the years, though it was hard to get more information on this because people in that position did not want to talk about it. Instead, they just wanted to stay focused so they could get off parole and back to their families.

Carlos explained a similar pattern of workers on parole working for TSI agencies in a suburb not far from Chicago. When I asked him if he had talked with many temp workers that had parole officers, he said that in that suburb,

*Carlos:* ...a lot of workers come cuz they're sent by these halfway houses, like the Safer Foundation and Wayside Cross Ministries. They work to put them in this job development or rehab and they get sent to work in factories through halfway houses from prison and other stuff.

*Author:* Is there a relationship that the agencies have with these organizations?

*Carlos:* Yeah. They say, “Hey, we’ll work with you to give you guys a chance to work.” Some of them do send people to work, but they say that they have a relationship. I’ve never met with Safer, but I’ve met with Wayside Cross and they advocate for their workers and at the same time, they make sure that their workers are doin’ the right things, too.

He explained that while he has heard of some halfway or “sober” houses and parole officers advocating on behalf of workers that are being exploited, that is not a given in every case. And even in supposedly positive relationships between workers and halfway houses, the workers’ freeness was affected by another layer of control from the parole officer, which Carlos said could inhibit their likelihood of challenging exploitation. He said

I think it works different in other places, like Cicero and Chicago.....It doesn't seem like they know what's goin' on because—especially if it's just a PO—because some people will say, “Hey, if I engage in any kind of action, they'll tell my PO.” What does your PO care if you're exercising your rights?.... They're still scared.

This unfreeness through being on parole got even more complicated when community organizations that focused on citizen reentry were involved on both sides of this employment relationship. For instance, the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) has four official Adult Transitional Centers (ATC), two of which are run by Safer Foundation, a re-entry not-for profit organization. Located on Chicago's west side in predominately African American and Latino neighborhoods, their website describes that their programs “allow incarcerated individuals to serve out the last 30 days to 24 months of their sentences in a community-based work-release setting” (Safer Foundation 2016b). Part of this employment program includes their subsidiary temp agency called “Pivotal Staffing, LLC,” which was started in 2005, and supplies workers to manufacturing and light industrial companies (Safer Foundation 2016c) The website says that they provide staff to companies so that they do not have to worry about the “liability” of hiring workers directly, dealing with taxes, or unemployment insurance, and were provided worker transportation, drug screening, and “on-site support” (Safer Foundation 2016 d). While no participants shared that they had gone through this agency or ATCs directly, it is of considerable importance that these state supported entities are directly involved in the business of supplying and surveilling vulnerable, unfree labor into client companies in a triangular temp staffing relationship. Further research is needed to determine the extent of this relationship and pipeline of unfree legal citizens into the TSI directly through parole officers, halfway houses, and community organizations.

“YOU’RE FIRED NOW. I’M GONNA HIRE THESE PEOPLE ‘CAUSE THEY WORK LIKE CRAZY”

This hierarchy of vulnerability based on racialized unfreeness in recruitment and hiring naturally resulted in uneven demographics inside the client companies and fed into pre-existing cultural divisions and racial stereotypes. While I was not able to observe this myself inside factories, I found from participants that this encouraged resentments that kept workers divided and competitive. This is akin to the race management methods conducted by employers in earlier historical eras (Roediger and Esch 2012). For instance, Beatriz, a Latina staff person at the United Worker Center (UWC), said that the stereotypes Latinos had of African Americans were that they were lazy, did not want to do their jobs, and were dangerous. Furthermore, she said African Americans thought that Latinos were “mules and never stand up for themselves” so bosses liked them more. Participants also often described how Latinos felt African Americans had it easier at work in terms of treatment and conditions, and African Americans felt marginalized by language and what they saw as Latino solidarity between workers and supervisors inside the factories.

When discussing pressure on workers by race, Latino UWC members generally reported that black workers were treated better than them, and whites were treated the best if they were on a factory assembly line at all. For instance, Mari said she did see white workers at factories sometimes, but they never got screamed at or pressured to work faster. I asked her why there was such a difference and she said that “They are here in their country and they have more benefits than us.” Similarly, Vicente said that African Americans were required to work hard but bosses tended to require even more from Latinos, and the pace of work was much slower for whites. Samuel said that Mexicans were “treated like garbage and not treated well, at the

bottom. Not seen well.” He also said that blacks and whites were assigned better tasks than Latinos, like only having to sweep or pick up parts. In contrast, he said Latinos got the worst jobs, and are made to work “like a donkey” and do the heavy lifting or using the more intense machines. And while Maite did not think that African Americans had any more rights than other workers, she reported that they were allowed to get away with more insubordination than Latinos. She argued that this was because assembly line leaders often did not speak English and were afraid that if they said anything to African Americans they would complain, threaten to sue, or abandon the job.

Yet most UWC members suggested that citizenship, rather than race, was the key factor determining the differential treatment. Generally this was in reference to formal citizenship, as no one brought up the relationship with criminalization in such conversations. For instance, Ricardo said that when people have immigration authorization, they feel more secure to fight for rights. Similarly, Gezana said that workers with immigration documents were more secure, and had more options for jobs if they wanted to leave their current one. Along these lines, she said that African American workers defended themselves more at work, knew their rights and physical limits, were allowed to use the bathroom more, and did not get in trouble if they challenged supervisor’s demands. Liana said that if you did not have immigration documents you definitely got overworked more than white and black workers, but she also said that Latinos got treated poorly regardless of citizenship. Furthermore, numerous participants described how factory supervisors yelled at workers frequently and threatened them based on their undocumented status, or as I am arguing, unfreeness. For instance, at a member health and safety training in the spring of 2014, Mari spoke about how bosses yelled at them and threatened to fire

or report people to immigration if they complained, which caused most Latino immigrants to work even harder and keep quiet. She emphasized that these were not empty threats.

This pressure and differential treatment of workers facilitated pressure and competition between them. For instance, at the same member health and safety training in the spring of 2014, Gezana said that bosses made workers compete against each other, and so workers ended up pressuring and yelling at one another to go faster. Pointing out that this was problematic, she said "We need to have solidarity between each other." Aracelli went on to say that that when Latinos work too hard, and do the work of two or more people, they jeopardized their health, took away work from others, and encouraged bosses to expect that same fast pace all the time. In this vein, Iris, an Asian UWC volunteer, shared that when she conducted a focus group with UWC members later that year, some Latinos articulated that they saw how differently African Americans and Latinos were treated, and they realized that their compliance with unfair conditions made the situation worse for everyone. She said,

The workers kept saying, "This whole situation - we're adding to the problem, we're adding to the problem." I'm like, "What are you talking about?" They said that when you go to a work place—at a temp agency...Latino workers go crazy. They don't take breaks. They don't take lunch breaks. They just work, work, work, work, so that they can come back. That's the only security is to drive themselves crazy. Black workers go, they know all about the law, so they're like, "Oh," you know what I mean, "within four hours, I'm gonna have to have my 15-minute break. I'm gonna have my hour lunch. I'm gonna go to the bathroom whenever I want to." They know it and they claim it. Whereas, Latino workers don't claim any of it, and they are driving themselves and then driving the whole workforce to a standard that's substandard, right? Then the scumbag employers, who are they gonna hire? Then they go right up to the black people and right up to their face and say, "You're fired now. I'm gonna hire these people, 'cause they work like crazy."...I heard some people wear a diaper so they don't have to go to the bathroom. .... One of the big problems that the workers have identified is that you have a base of people who literally are just filled with fear. How do you organize people who are literally just so fearful that you can't even go to the bathroom? ... Seriously. I mean, that's so hitting you at the core. That's a big problem. How do you really penetrate through that, right? I worry....Yeah, and how they have no rights. If they speak up, then they get fired. Things like that, they [black members] had no idea that that's what the Latino community goes through. Then the Latinos say how black people just don't get hired, don't get—because

of—I think that’s when they feel like Latino workers are creating a problem for black people.... Yeah, they said that[j1] . Yeah. “We’re creating problems for the black people, because there’s no way they’re gonna hire black people if we continue to work like that.

In this example, Iris heard from workers that in their efforts to show they were “good workers” so they could get approval to return to the job the next day they played into managers’ inhumane expectations, and that this made standards worse, and further divided workers.

In addition, companies have historically used the race of a manager to intensify race management (Roediger and Esch 2012). Certainly, in the case of staff or supervisors at both temporary staffing agencies and client companies who were most in contact with workers were often Latino, and this seemed to compound the feelings of division between racial groups. Notably, I never saw or heard about African American supervisors or agency office dispatchers. Ricardo, a male leader at UWC, said that Mexican supervisors are sometimes more hard on fellow Mexicans. Maite said when she started working for Cardinal Staffing, one of her bosses was a white American and they were really nice to her and the workers. In contrast, she said fellow Latino supervisors often treated her and other Latinos the worst. Samuel similarly said that Mexican bosses seemed to push other Mexicans the hardest. He said

In the jobs, if your boss is Mexican, he will squeeze all your energy, push you harder, and even will laugh at you or mock you if working hard. But if a white or black worker is messing around they don’t get in trouble. Other bosses that are white and black treat everyone equal and well, and don’t mock you when you work hard.

On the other hand, African American participants generally felt that Latino managers treated them worse due to being racial outsiders to the majority of workers and supervisors, and not speaking Spanish. For instance, Jimmy, a member from Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) explained that

It was a couple of times where—not necessarily at the temp agency, but when I went on the factory, I felt a bit of discrimination. It was just—it went back to how they speak in a different language around you, and you really don’t know what they saying. I’m working, and I guess, with me getting adjusted, acclimated to the workflow, per se, I

don't know, maybe people mighta had something to say or something like that. I would hear or catch little subtle things. Then, the next thing I know, one of the managers on the floor was coming to relocate me to a different location to do a different type of job.

In this quote Jimmy showed how he felt excluded and targeted by Latino co-workers and management, and that his work would change without notice for reasons he was unaware of. At a UWC member meeting in Cicero, African American member Anthony explained that language differences between him and Latino co-workers also made him feel like an outsider. He said,

...but the big thing I see, too, is that most of them that get work and jobs don't speak English. I think some people don't get hired because they don't speak bilingual. I think they should have to learn how to speak English before they come over here. Yeah, that's a big thing, too. Then by there being more of them at the job, they both talk—they talk Latino or Spanish, then we don't understand it. If they telling us to do something or ask us to do something and they don't speak English, then they probably go back complaining to the boss because the boss speaks the same language they speak. That's how we lose out on jobs, too.

Similarly, Wendy, an African American staff person at UWC, said that Latino workers and supervisors looked out for each other at work. When describing work rotations at the factory she had worked at, she spoke about how Latinos used favoritism for things like breaks and line rotations because they were the majority group. She said,

*Wendy:* Yes, you're supposed to have two hours packing, two hours feedin'. Then, you rotate. The packer and the feeder are on the same aisle. It's teamwork. You're my partner for the day...What I was sayin' about the discrimination and the favoritism was just that the Latinos had the option of picking who they wanted to—to work with, instead of who was available. Then, some were slower feeding. Some were slower packing. They even got the opportunity to say, "I don't feel like packin'. I wanna feed all day."

*Author:* Were all the supervisors Latino?

*Wendy:* Yes...It was—there was only African American on first shift and one African American on second shift.

*Author:* How many are there all together per shift of supervisors or whatever, line—

*Wendy:* There's four. There's four lines.

*Author:* Okay, so three Latino [*cross talk 01:07*] to one Black on each line, okay.

*Wendy:* On each line. The supervisors would give it a go, say, "Okay. You're gonna stay here. When I get some time to move you, Wendy, I'll move you." You look up at the clock, we started at 8:00. Now it's 1:00, and I been packin' all day. Now it's, "Oh, I don't have the time to find anyone that can switch places with you." It was a lot of that stuff goin' on. It's just like wow, with so much favoritism there like I said. They're



usin' the different races against each other. It's working because there's alotta good people, but there's also alotta bad people in the world. ....If you look at it like one person can say, "Okay, well, I see how you're treating me, and I see how you're treating her, and it's not right so I'm gonna say no. I'm gonna switch with her. I'm okay with switching." That's a good person, but it's not a lot of 'em—

*Author:* Not everybody's gonna do that?

*Wendy:* Not everybody's gonna do that.

In this quote, Wendy said that in contrast to reports from Latino workers, it seemed to her that Latino managers gave favoritism to Latino workers, though acknowledged how none of the workers were being treated well. She went on to explain

Yeah, Latinos are the majority. It was rough. A lot of the Latino supervisors would take care of their people. They would cover for em. A lot of 'em can get mouthy. A lot of 'em can have favoritism doing breaks. They allow—oh, this one lady to issue out the breaks. If she's not fair, she's letting all her people go, all of her friends go. They can stay. It's supposed to be 20 minutes, but they can stay 25-30 minutes. Yet, if you're not back within 19 minutes, she's gonna say somethin' to the supervisor cuz now it's a problem. Now it's a big issue of somebody else need to go, and you're takin' up all the time. Yet, you didn't say anything when it was so and so and so and so that was just doin' it. It was just—it was alotta favoritism. That's why I just really hope that they can really get this union in there. Because I mean even them—even the fact that they were puttin' us against each other, they're still treatin' everyone wrong....They're still workin' us to death.

Wendy said that understandably people were all looking out for their self-interest to try to get the best situation possible. She also conceded that these racial divisions were driven by managers. Indeed, as these participants shared with me, the production of difference from intersections of race and unfreeness facilitated divisions and "race management" dynamics within the factories themselves.

#### THE TSI'S FIGHT TO PROTECT THIS SYSTEM: "THEY CAN'T EXIST WITHOUT EXPLOITATION"

I found that this division and management was something that client companies valued significantly, and in order to keep contracts with them, the temporary staffing industry fought to limit any restrictions on their ability to sort workers according to these hierarchies of racialized

unfreeness. Indeed, in numerous public statements and personal conversations, the United Worker Center (UWC) director, Benito, and other staff argued that this discriminatory recruitment in the TSI was intentional. They argued that it was carried out as a means to get the most vulnerable workers and intensify competition between groups of already marginalized, particularly of those that face a threat of deportation or reincarceration. Indeed, Travis, a UWC staff person, said that compared to other issues like wage theft, and health and safety, it was the threat of stopping the TSI's ability to discriminate that the agencies and their representatives such as the Staffing Services Association of Illinois (SSAI) and the Illinois Search and Staffing Association (ISSA) fight the most. In our interview, Travis argued that

The temp industry is set up to enable client companies to avoid regulation. Anything that brings regulation back on to the joint employer kind of defeats the benefit of having temp labor, or one of the benefits of having temp labor.

He said skirting regulation was crucial to their existence, as client companies depended on them to do this discriminatory sorting, and thus any accountability or interracial unity threatened their business. Thus the TSI invested immense amounts of time, money, and energy to preserving this system of discriminatory hiring.

This investment became more obvious to participants and myself as actors in the Chicago area TSI took legal and political steps to stop any efforts that might prevent them from being able to continue discriminating. For instance, in addition to UWC reporting on this discrimination to various media outlets and filing a class action discrimination lawsuit against Westside Staffing on behalf of a group of African Americans, the worker center also organized public actions in front of agencies to highlight their discrimination and other abusive practices. Strategically, the UWC usually focused on the largest or most powerful agencies in the region in the hopes that any changes they agreed to might set the standard for smaller agencies. For instance in May 2013, UWC staff, members and allies rallied outside the main administrative

office of Cardinal Staffing to call for an agreement on working standards that included fairness in hiring and an end to discrimination, which Cardinal Staffing was notorious for. This was significant since it was one of the largest agencies, but also because the top person in the company was also a top person in the SSAI, which effectively drove local TSI standards and influenced national ones. Cardinal Staffing agreed to meet with the UWC to talk about the conditions, but the meetings were essentially fruitless and they continued their status quo operations. UWC staff argued that this was because they knew that to change their policies would mean backlash from the rest of the agencies, and a loss of business from client companies.

The UWC also held public actions in front of a Westside Staffing office like I described above, which the agency responded to with multiple aggressive measures. For instance, the agency called the police on UWC organizers supporters, and myself multiple times, and filed lawsuits against the UWC for defamation and “illegally organizing.” Westside Staffing also tried to intimidate protesters by taking video and close up pictures of UWC members, staff, supporters, and again, myself. These reactions were particularly notable since this was the same agency whose vice president promised at the UWC 2014 policy forum to put an end to any discrimination going on in the agency.

Another approach the UWC took to challenge this system of discriminatory hiring was to push for laws to further regulate the industry, starting with demographic record keeping of applicants. While section 12a of the Illinois Day and Temporary Labor Services Act (IDTLA) requires that agencies maintain records of the race and gender of workers employed and sent to work for a client, this was not widely regulated, and there was no requirement for keeping any record of applicants. Perhaps unsurprisingly then, agencies did not generally keep such records, and this lack of accountability and information made it extremely difficult for worker advocates

to prove these discriminatory hiring experiences in lawsuits and organizing efforts. So in 2014, the UWC began working with a state Senator to draft and lobby for an amendment to the IDTLA which would create more transparency in the hiring process. This new legislation aimed to mandate that agencies keep a list of the race and gender of applicants in order to hold them accountable against discrimination and have records to of proof when it did happen. But the Staffing Services Association of Illinois (SSAI) actively fought against this legislation, keeping up their promise to their fellow SSAI members to “fight to keep our industry free of unnecessary regulations” (SSAI 2015). As part of this effort, the SSAI had a lobbyist in the Illinois state capital working extensively to block the bill and court the State Representative to convince him not to introduce it and to prevent others from supporting it. Travis said the SSAI put enormous amounts of money and energy and “dirty tricks” into stopping their legislation. Myself and UWC staff and members saw this when we drove to the capital in Springfield, Illinois to lobby for its passage. While there, the Senator tried to push both the UWC and the SSAI to meet to “compromise.” In the end, these lobbying efforts by the SSAI were enough to prevent this legislation from passing.

Again and again Benito and Travis’s argument that the TSI fought hardest to maintain the ability to sort workers based on vulnerability was made clear to me. They argued that this was critical to business with client companies who wanted to be able to maintain a management style based on exploitation and hierarchical division. Indeed the reactions by the temporary staffing agencies and entities like the SSAI towards UWC organizing reiterated Corey’s argument that these agencies were only useful as the middlemen to this system, and would be obsolete if the rules changed. He said,

The staffing agencies are literally just middlemen. By forcing the middlemen to do right by people, ultimately they lose their access funding, their money. If you limit their

money, they cease to exist. Forcing them to, by pressure, and by litigation, and by all of these things, sooner or later, they're just gonna hafta fall off. They can't exist without exploitation. If you expose the exploitation, which is what the [UWC] is doing, then they no longer have a need. They'll shift and prob'ly do somethin' different, but *[laughs]* they won't be able to exploit this class or worker anymore.

Here Corey noted that by stopping agencies' ability to discriminate and divide workers, they would serve no purpose to client companies interested in getting around regulations. He acknowledged though that companies would try to find another avenue of exploitation if UWC and other supporters' efforts were successful. However, at least it would mean an interruption to this current system.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

My study reaffirms previous findings by Peck and Theodore (1998, 2001, 2008) that racialized hiring queues are central to the TSI in Chicago. I expand this analysis by arguing this is structured more broadly around preference for the most vulnerable workers through hierarchies of citizenship unfreeness, for purposes of control and profit in the tradition of race management (Roediger and Esch 2012; Glenn 2002). I argue that this hiring discrimination and management practices utilized and enhanced racialized and citizenship based stratification, deepening these workers' marginalization. Indeed, Wendy, an African American UWC staff person and former temp worker, reinforced how this discrimination not only greatly affected one's confidence, but also life chances. She said,

Working as a temp worker, I really got the one-on-one experience of how discrimination, how the low pay—the low wages, the harassment, the sexual harassment as well - how it affects the worker and how the employer is basically takin' advantage of the worker.... It's terrible actually because it's definitely, it brings the employee down. It makes you have less confidence in yourself and your work. It's like no matter how great your performance is sometimes it doesn't matter. Things that—as far as the color of your skin could stop you get from gettin' a job, or a promotion, or a pay increase.

This is particularly significant as the TSI is one of the largest formal employment avenues for both undocumented immigrants and formerly incarcerated peoples in Chicago who, for the former are not able to work in many places due to their legal status, and for the latter, are so often discriminated against racially and due to a criminalized status. It also actively leads to the downgrading of workplace conditions for all workers when a group of workers are able to be so actively exploited and their vulnerability reinforced. And due to the breadth of this growing industry, these effects have profound implications for perpetuating racialized inequality throughout the larger labor market through the exacerbated marginalization of racialized and criminalized workers and further fracturing of the workplace (Smith 1998).

Furthermore, my findings that the rampant discrimination and manipulation of racialized and unfree workers through the TSI, and the TSI's fight to preserve this system in order to stay useful to client companies, has significant implications on research on nonstandard, contingent employment relationships. To begin with, this precarious, triangularized employment structure thwarts civil rights gains and gets around legislation supposedly intended to limit unauthorized immigration. It also increases the mistreatment of immigrants, and perpetuates trends of high African American unemployment during a black jobs crisis and mass incarceration; and this is all done in a way that is easy to avoid regulation or accountability for client companies. This dynamic is one that the courts are currently engaged in regarding employer accountability. For instance, the 2015 decision on *Browning vs. Ferris* (Iafolla 2016; NELP 2015) deemed client companies joint employers for purposes of collective bargaining and accountability for working conditions. Yet this decision has since been appealed. It will be important to observe the outcome of this appeal in the coming years, as it will have important implications on client companies' ability to avoid regulation and need for temp agencies.

Finally, this triangular hiring system creates chaos and further divides an already fragmented labor force, making it more difficult to organize. UWC director, Benito, explained that the UWC sees the TSI as a disorganizing entity that labor organizers have to learn how to better respond to. He said that

We believe temp labor...was understood to be something that could disorganize American workers. And we believe it's been really re-invented to disorganize American workers, and also distance the company from responsibility and regulation by saying, "I'm not really the employer, the temp agency is" and the temp agency says "Well I am, but really they should be responsible if there's water on the floor at the company." So it ends up creating more and more chaos in the workforce, and giving the different employers room to move, and we feel like it, that can defeat union organizing, that can defeat sort of community organizing for basic labor rights, and we believe that that is what's happened. .... And so the alienation that already exists naturally between the employer and the employee is just multiplied by many times, and so temp labor is really uh, it's sort of like the wealthy elite learning more and more and more how to keep any kind of organizing at bay.

Similarly, participants pointed out that many workers, particularly Latinos, become “permatemps” where they are in an endless cycle of working at a temp agency rather than getting hired directly by client companies. They pointed out that the precarity of workers having to continuously check if they got a work assignment, and being moved to new clients frequently, makes organizing extremely difficult. This was on top of the challenges in overcoming “black and brown” racial divisions between Latino immigrants and African Americans that exist outside the TSI and is exacerbated by it. And as UWC organizers explain, solidarity and organizing is the only way to challenge the use of unfreeness to facilitate division and racial management in the TSI. Indeed, Roediger and Esch (2012) explain, race management practices will not likely be stopped from the top, but rather will require significant social change from below. At the end of my research, the UWC was still organizing for "equal access to jobs for all" and "fairness in hiring." They did this knowing that preventing the TSI and client companies from taking

advantage of vulnerable workers as much would mean they had to raise their standards, because workers would be more likely to push back. Corey, a UWC staff person, explained that

...Solidarity between working class solidarity around labor issues.... I thought that was extremely important when it came to accessing labor and demanding, I guess, respect in the workplace and equality. I definitely always thought if there wasn't—we repeat history again, if we didn't create that solidarity, the same racial wage that were used after the reconstruction would be used again. It would just create another surplus labor force that was voiceless. I felt like that...If you can get the African-American and Latino community to start having these discussions and see their similarities, oh, my god, it's gonna be some of the scariest work you've ever done in your life. It branches out.

In the following chapter, I describe how the UWC, along with the Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) are addressing this exploitation and chaos facilitated through new employment relationships, and doing this very solidarity building and social change work through operating as “space making” organizations.



#### **IV. Worker Centers as Space Makers**

After news spread about the August 2014 fatal shooting of Mike Brown, an African American teenager in Ferguson, Missouri, by a white police officer named Darren Wilson, fury and devastation erupted nationwide. This emotion spurred protests and the expansion of the “Black Lives Matter” movement and other organizing against the pervasiveness of police brutality and murder against people of color. Recognizing how these events and similar local issues affected their membership and the need for action, staff of five Chicago based organizations organized a caravan to join the ongoing protests in a national convergence in Ferguson that October. Two of these organizations were the WFF and UWC, who felt strongly that solidarity with the racialized and low income community of Ferguson was crucial and tied to the oppression their members experienced in Chicago. As I drove one of the vans to Missouri and back, I heard from WFF and UWC staff and members that this convergence meant a lot to them because they too feared and experienced abuse by cops daily due to being people of color living and working in low income neighborhoods over-policed by the Chicago Police Department. This was something central to their lived experienced as people denied full citizenship, and through their involvement in these worker centers they had a platform and resources to engage in resistance against their shared oppression and exclusion that they might not have had otherwise. Once we got to Ferguson, among the broad swath of civil society that was marching, I noticed there were few labor organizations present in the protests. This illuminated to me how the WFF and UWC, and worker centers more generally, tend to take on a more holistic approach in their organizing for rights than unions, focusing on issues beyond just the job or workplace related rights.

Labor focused, community based organizations like the WFF and UWC are among the growing number of worker centers emerging nationally in support of marginalized workers. While discussions on what it will take to revive the U.S. labor movement in the face of neoliberal labor market restructuring, attacks on labor organizing, and the decline of union density (see Clawson 2003; Fantasia and Voss 2004; Milkman 2014) are still largely union-centric (Sullivan 2010:812), worker centers have begun to gain more attention. Still, most scholarship on them has centered on case study accounts of their structure, function, accomplishments and obstacles such as their small memberships and financial dependency on foundations (Fine 2006; Gordon 2000; Milkman 2014; Theodore 2007), rather than theoretical appraisal of their place in the labor movement or broader civil society. I found that Monisha Das Gupta's (2006) conceptual framework of "place taking" and "space making" politics was a useful way to understand how these worker centers differ from most unions in the current organizational field (see DiMaggio and Powell 1983) of the labor movement. I argue that the contemporary field includes union locals, national unions, union federations and labor councils, constituency groups within and outside the AFL-CIO, organizations like Jobs with Justice and Working America, political action groups, some migrant civil society organizations, and worker centers. Specifically in this chapter, I argue that as institutional actors (Scott et al. 2000) in the contemporary local labor movement, unions tend to operate as "place taking," while worker centers like the WFF and UWC are "space making" organizations. As I explain in this chapter, this space making is generally manifested through their inclusiveness of workers excluded from full citizenship and unions, "whole worker organizing" (McAlevey and Ostertag 2012), and efforts at social and structural transformation.

Both WFF and UWC are focused on making space for marginalized people who are generally excluded in the labor movement and society due to racism, criminalization, or working in nonstandard or unorganized jobs. Indeed, these and most worker centers developed out of activists seeing their communities did not have the support they needed due to a lack of access to most unions and equal rights. And they operate from an acknowledgement that they can only address their members' exploitation at work by also addressing their broader exclusion from access to full citizenship, or the civil, political, and social aspects of inclusion and rights (Somers 2008; Marshall 1964) and addressing the interpersonal and structural causes of this exclusion. I argue this is in contrast to the generally more status quo and exclusionary "place taking politics" of most local and national unions. Despite some exceptions, most unions are primarily focused on the preservation of their current membership and less marginalized workers rather than broader inclusion. They are also generally focused on contracts and workplace based issues rather than the intersectional oppressions faced by workers, or addressing broader structural inequalities (McAlevey and Ostertag 2012). Given this, I expand on Das Gupta's (2006) framework of "space making" and "place taking" politics to offer a theoretical framework for the significance of worker centers as space making organizations among the broader labor movement field and society in general. I also expand her work by using the idea of space making politics not just among immigrant groups but marginalized people more broadly. Below I describe the space making work of the UWC and WFF in contrast to most unions in Chicago, as illustrated by their inclusive, "whole worker," and social and structural transformation focus.

## SPACE MAKING IN THE U.S. LABOR MOVEMENT

The labor movement has been a pivotal part of U.S. civil society, and thus often argued to be a mediating institution necessary for democracy, broad inclusion of a population, and for

challenging dominance by the state or market (Alexander 2006; Cohen and Arato 1992; Gleeson 2009; Somers 2008). Yet as with most of civil society, its influence can be complicated, and some institutional actors or an organizational field as a whole can be used to promote hegemony, and be co-opted by the state or market (Gramsci [1971] 1999; Somers 2008). Indeed, Gramsci ([1971] 1999) argued that civil society is often very intertwined with the state and often used by elites to maintain their power, spread capitalism, and disseminate their hegemonic ideology. In this vein, despite the important work done by unions, most are still not broadly inclusive in substantial ways or challenging hegemonic structures. Some are even co-opted by political or financial influences to promote the status quo.

Yet the labor movement is not monolithic, and Alexander (2006) argued that entities within civil society can be in conflict as well as push each other to change. Indeed, newly emergent unions and independent labor organizations have historically pushed the U.S. labor movement in new directions (Milkman 1990). I use Das Gupta's (2006) framework regarding space making versus place taking politics to illuminate this dynamic. In her research on the field of South Asian organizing in New York, Das Gupta described how organizations with "space making" politics, including a domestic worker and taxi driver worker center, focused on including marginalized South Asian immigrants, embracing their intersectional identities, demanding rights regardless of immigration status, and pushing for broader social and structural transformation. They were in tension with the more elite, exclusionary, assimilationist, and hegemonic ethnic organizations such as the Association of Indian Americans (AIA) and earlier generations of South Asian immigrants whose "place taking" politics controlled the narratives about the community and tried to fit into the pre-existing expectations of citizenship and rights,

rather than challenging them. Building on this idea, I operationalize organizational space making and place taking politics as follows:

- **Place taking politics** – primarily comprised of relatively more hegemonic or privileged people wanting to maintain their hierarchical position, accommodating to or supportive of elite or mainstream politics, and seeking reforms rather than deeper structural change of the state and market.
- **Space making politics** – primarily focused on inclusion of those excluded from full citizenship formally or substantively, while acknowledging the whole person and the intersectional aspects of their exclusion, and pushing for broader social and structural transformation.

Using this framework, I argue that in the organizational field of the Chicago labor movement, the WFF and UWC, like the other workers centers, are generally space making organizations, while most Chicago unions are place taking. These categories are not absolutes and there are certainly exceptions on both sides. But as institutional actors, I argue that that the significance of these and other local worker centers in our current movement is that they challenge and make space for marginalized people and issues in the broader labor movement and society.

Certainly, labor unions have been and continue to be an important to U.S. democracy, and to challenging capital and the nation state. Some have certainly been “space makers” in the labor movement contemporarily as well as historically, such as the early Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) (Milkman 1990). Yet like other organizations, unions follow life cycles, and on both the national and local levels, many unions were founded by or evolved into more “place taking” organizations. This has led to some to support conservative and capitalist political leaders (Beachler 2001; Dark 1999). For instance, locally, there has been a long history of machine politics in Chicago, of which the local labor movement has been an important player. In particular, some trade unions have long supported whatever candidate or cause would guarantee funding for construction projects for their members to get work. And some unions

illustrated place taking politics in their endorsements for the 2014 Chicago mayoral elections, between major candidates incumbent Mayor Rahm Emanuel and Chicago Teacher's Union (CTU) President, Karen Lewis. These polemical candidates were at the heart of labor's conversation as the CTU had become an incredible inspiration to the labor movement locally and nationally for going on strike and winning in 2012 against the so-called "Mayor 1%" Emanuel. Additionally, Emanuel who is known for having helped get the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) passed in the 1990s, as well ongoing business friendly financial decisions, and the historic mass closings of public schools and opening of charter schools. Despite all of this, seventy locals from fifteen unions backed him in the election (Davey 2015). Of these, the building trades were dominant but even some locals from so-called "progressive" unions supported him, specifically SEIU Local 73 and UNITE HERE Local 1 (Carlson 2014; Davey 2015; Hinz 2014; Joravsky 2014; Moberg 2015; UNITE HERE Local 1 2015). Later, when Lewis had to step out of the race due to brain cancer, the CTU endorsed a Latino and pro-union candidate, Cook County Commissioner Jesus "Chuy" Garcia, but the union endorsement divide did not change.

Unions have also generally focused on the middle class or people aspiring to get to it, who are considered more hegemonic and "deserving" of rights, rather than the poor. Such place taking politics was perhaps most obviously displayed again in a statement by AFL-CIO President Trumka regarding the importance of preserving "good jobs" for workers in the very contentious Dakota Access Pipeline project (AFL-CIO 2016c). This project was at the center of historical, peaceful protests and legal suits by the Standing Rock Sioux and other Native Americans, allies, environmental groups, and even some labor groups who were trying to stop the pipeline due to cultural and environmental concerns. While multiple other labor organizations spoke out against

Trumka's statement (e.g. APALA 2016; Communications Workers of America 2016; National Nurses United 2016; New York State Nurses Association 2016) it was still a notable push for more white and middle class jobs at the expense of more disenfranchised people.

In addition, unions often willingly or neglectfully perpetrate white and male supremacy through organizational structures and relationships with the state. While many would argue that unions like SEIU, Workers United, AFSCME, UNITE HERE, and UFCW are diverse and have supported movements for issues like immigration reform (Voss and Sherman 2000) or against police brutality. Yet, both nationally and locally these large unions are still notorious for often simply making statements or engaging in transactional coalition work, thus perpetuating much of the same hegemonic leadership structures and only minimally challenging broader discriminatory and xenophobic attitudes in the larger movement and society (Fletcher and Gapasin 2008; Mantsios 1998).

Furthermore, despite significant changes in the labor market, unions are still rarely organizing low-wage, non-standard and contingent workers (see Fine 2003, 2005; Gordon 2000, 2005; Martin et al. 2007; Milkman 2007; Narro 2005; Ness 2005; Rivchin 2004; Smith 1998; Sullivan 2010) who are disproportionately women, people of color, and immigrants (see Asher and Stephenson 1990; Bronfenbrenner and Warren 2007; Collins 2006; Collomp 1988; Cranford 2007, 2012; Foerster 2004; Göbel 1988; Milkman 2000, 2007; Milkman and Voss 2004; Rivchin 2004; Tait 2005). Thus while unions have become more diverse in recent decades, they still generally focus on organizing people who have access to more standard employment and have relatively more substantive citizenship rights. This was made more visible at the US Social Forum in 2010 when a number of worker centers and alliances came together to form the "Excluded Worker Congress (subsequently changed to "United Workers Congress"). They

united along the axis of worker exclusion from legal labor protection and union organizing, putting a name to their marginalization in a historical and public setting. Unions also generally focus solely on workplace related issues and organizing decisions that are most likely to result in winning contracts rather than longer term, less tangible social justice goals (McAlevey and Ostertag 2012; Sullivan 2010:810-812) like challenging the state on people's access to rights, broader labor market restructuring, or being intentionally inclusive of marginalized, poor, and criminalized people of color.

In contrast, worker centers formed specifically in response to the needs of growing populations of low-wage immigrant and other marginalized workers, the growth of nonstandard and precarious labor, and to the broad ambivalence, disregard, or ineffectiveness of unions and other civil society organizations on these issues (Bada 2006; Fine 2006; Gordon 2005; Rivchin 2004; Sullivan 2010; Tait 2005). Thus they have been compared to organizations such as mutual aid organizations, fraternal organizations, settlement houses that developed during the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to support the waves of marginalized European immigrants (Fine 2006; Milkman 2014). Worker centers are typically comprised of a particular ethnic, racial, or gender group (see Fine 2006; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Louie 2001; Narro 2005; Rivchin 2004; Sullivan 2010; Sullivan and Lee 2008) or a specific community or industry rather than a particular worksite. Despite their typically small scale and breadth of impact, they are among the few resources that low-wage, marginalized workers have for support (Gleeson 2009; Gordon 2005; Fine 2006).

Additionally, Tait (2005) explains that independent labor organizations like worker centers are committed to participatory democracy, community based organizing strategies, and are "Rooted in struggles for racial, ethnic, and gender justice, and existing largely outside the



gates of conventional trade unions (p. 2).” Indeed, she and numerous scholars have documented examples of worker center organizing that is centered on strategies based on intersectionality, community dynamics, and the relationships between work and “non-work” or non-shop floor issues (see Chun, Lipsitz, and Shin 2013a and b; Collins 2006; Louie 1992; Téllez 2013). And in doing that they employ more of what long time union organizer Jane McAlevey (2003; with Ostertag 2012) calls “whole worker organizing.”

Fantasia and Voss (2004) suggest that non-union labor organizations like worker centers are in the “space between unions.” They characterize this as

the development of several new organizational forms that are coming to occupy the space between existing unions, between union and other institutions (communities and their organized representatives, social movements, religious organizations, and so on), and between the labor movement and those stigmatized social groups previously excluded or ignored by it. (Fantasia and Voss 2004:108)

They discuss such organizations as coming out of unions and the broader labor movement, in “tension” with the more hegemonic parts of the movement (Fantasia and Voss 2004:111). While such organizations do connect people to these institutions, I expand and operationalize this idea, arguing that worker centers should not be seen as just organizations “in between” or coming out of unions, but instead generally emerging outside of them as unique institutional actors, and changing the larger labor movement field and broader society. In the following section I outline my findings, showing how the UWC and WFF are space making through including more workers in the labor movement, focusing on their broad structural marginalization through “whole worker organizing” (McAlevey and Ostertag 2012), and working for social and structural transformation.

## WORKER CENTERS AS SPACE MAKERS

*Inclusion: “The Unions Aren’t Helpin’ Us Out.”*

Themes of participant marginalization from society and the mainstream, union based labor movement were common in my research. This marginalization was generally related to racialization, criminalization of citizens of color and non-citizens, and labor market restructuring. On the other hand, I found that both Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) and the United Worker Center (UWC) were actively making space in the labor movement for such groups less often included in the more place taking unions. This is similar to the space making politics of the worker centers in Das Gupta’s (2006) study.

Along these lines, Brianna, a WFF volunteer, and Fernando, an organizer for another worker center, explained that members of worker centers are basically not in the “club” of citizenship. They said this club is generally defined by whiteness and money. Brianna explained

citizenship is essentially like ... who's in a club and who's not. .... You don't hafta be in a union to be in the club, but people who are out of the club are absolutely not in unions—typically not in unions.

Such division is emblematic of place taking politics. Brianna and Fernando also noted that those who are not “in the club,” such as low income, racialized citizens and immigrants, typically have to make their own networks, organizations, or “clubs.” In this case, worker centers are fulfilling that role. Carlos, a UWC staff person, similarly pointed to certain groups of workers having to create their own group since most unions do not organize them. He said,

The unions are generally working with direct hires. The worker centers are dealing with the most delicate working class in the United States. We're working with the post-incarcerated, the undocumented, the folks that don't have the means to access labor anywhere else. This is their last stop. For us is that if they don't—if we don't win, they don't eat.

Likewise, Sarah, a former UWC volunteer, explained part of the reason she and others founded the UWC was because the unions they had worked for were not “meeting the needs of immigrant

workers and black workers.” Indeed, nationally worker centers are overwhelmingly led by and composed of Asian and Latino immigrants, and have thus often been discussed as part of “migrant civil society” (Fox and Bada 2011; Pallares and Flores-González 2010). On the other hand, some of the earliest worker centers were actually started by and for African Americans in the South. And in recent years there has been an increase in the numbers of multiracial and African American worker centers, as organizers have continued to see African Americans underserved by unions (Fine 2006; Pitts 2004; Tait 2005:130). Along these lines, when I asked Madelyn, a volunteer at WFF and union staff person, why worker centers were needed, she pointed to the limits of union inclusion. Here saying “the labor movement” when referring to unions, she said

Well, because the labor movement can’t do it all.....You know? Like ideally, in an ideal world, our labor movement would be, have a visible presence in communities of color, right? And they would be seen as a resource for all workers, not just workers who pay dues, right? But that isn’t happening, and it’s certainly not happening now when the labor movement has been constrained by these attacks by the right wing and have less finances to do the external organizing and the collaborations.

Thus, these have been spaces for excluded people of many backgrounds to take power into their own hands rather than waiting until a union may decide or agree to organize their workplace.

Echoing this lack of access to unions and support generally, Latino immigrant participants at UWC expressed the significance of the center in their lives. Two such members, Gezana and Liana, both Mexican immigrants and mothers of small children, lamented that immigrants here were often desperate for help because they did not have the family, language, or legal tools to fall on when they faced problems like they did back in Mexico. Thus, they expressed that the UWC had been very important for them when they were experiencing emotional abuse, lack of medical attention, threats to their job, and degrading work assignments for confronting their bosses about the severe carpal tunnel injuries they developed at work as

temporary staffing workers. By being involved with UWC, they not only had access to legal support, but general social support and even some donations from volunteers that they would not have had otherwise. More generally, Tania, a staff person from UWC, explained that the UWC supports workers to find and use their own power, including to do things like change detrimental laws. She explained that this was important especially for the members in the suburbs where many where immigrants are even more isolated from resources than in the city.

Similarly, Bryan, director of WFF, shared that he started the center because there are still very few organizations focusing solely on black workers and he felt there needed to be more attention to them both as workers and as job seekers. Indeed, African Americans have had a strained relationship with the labor movement for most of its history (Pitts 2004), and with the exception of public sector jobs, they are underrepresented nationally and locally as union members and leaders despite broad support for organizing. Manzo IV et al. (2016) reports that

The unionization rate for African-American workers is 20.3 percent in Illinois, 20.6 percent in the Chicago MSA, and 13.2 percent in the United States. In comparison, white non-Latino union density is 16.2 percent in the state, 14.2 percent in Illinois' largest metropolitan area, and 11.2 percent across the nation. Respective unionization rates for Latino and Latina workers are currently much lower, at 11.7 percent, 11.8 percent, and 9.4 percent. (P.5)

While these numbers show disproportionate union membership of African Americans, much of this is through the public sector which is constantly threatened at the local and state level, and is largely unavailable to those with criminal records. There is also ongoing discrimination in the labor market that limits African American occupational opportunities into unionized fields, as well as racial discrimination in many unions, making it uncomfortable to be involved, or less likely to be welcomed as an apprentice in a trade union. Malik, a WFF volunteer, talked about this ongoing history of racism within unions, especially in the trades, and how he sees that affect job opportunities for African Americans in his community. And when some of the WFF

members applied for part time canvassing work with a large local union, we all discovered that by law, people with felonies are excluded from working as a union staff person or holding union office for a certain amount of time post-conviction.<sup>6</sup> This exclusion further reinforced a message to WFF members that unions are not available to or concerned about them as this structural limitation keeps criminalized people from meaningful inclusion in unions broadly, despite any inclusionary intentions of individual locals. Relatedly, Brandi, a volunteer at WFF and union staff person, explained how unions do not do enough to help formerly incarcerated workers.

Referring to the WFF, she said,

It's pertinent to have more black organizations like this. The unions aren't helpin' us out. We need to start figuring out a way to help out people. ... but what are unions doing to help people who have been incarcerated? People with colored skin, cuz they're sayin', "We can't get enough black people." Then, help us because a lot of us, our black men are going into jail. Figure out a way to be a part of some love.

For those few participants that had been involved in unions described feeling unwelcome or not having their needs truly considered. For instance, Tania, a staff person from UWC, spoke often about how she saw Latinos getting their money taken through union dues but received minimal support in return, including rarely getting important information translated into Spanish. Bernadine, a volunteer of WFF, similarly pointed to negative and ineffective treatment that is common for workers of color in unions, focusing on immigrants in particular. She said,

The reality is that labor unions are dying because of their own sexist, racist construct, right...So they are busy building power for themselves to the exclusion of people of color and women. ... there's no love lost between me and labor unions. I understand the importance of labor, but until unions sort of take ownership for the fact that they created this mess.... I mean, it's always fascinating to talk to workers, and Latino workers in particular who are knee deep in these unions and paying union dues and they're getting screwed over by union reps.

---

<sup>6</sup> See [http://www.ehow.com/list\\_7495288\\_federal-laws-felony-employment.html](http://www.ehow.com/list_7495288_federal-laws-felony-employment.html) "29 U.S.C. §§ 504 -- Union Officials -United States Code title 29, section 504.

On the other hand, some participants felt that when unions did help people of color, it was usually in support of Latinos over African Americans, especially since the annual pro-immigrant rights marches that began in 2006. Along these lines, Madelyn, a volunteer at WFF and union staff person, said that unions have improved their stance a lot on immigration issues, but not enough on African American and other black workers' issues. She said that there is not a "black agenda," even at the union she works for that has many African American members. Madelyn described how anything close to such an agenda really had only come about since the growth of the national "Black Lives Matter" movement rather than from within the labor movement.

Participants also discussed the lack of accountability and reflection by unions on such exclusion. Tamara, a staff person of WFF, said that labor movement overall lacks a racial analysis, or understanding about the centrality of racial inequality and identity in worker's lives. And Bryan, director of WFF, said that even well intentioned unions are sometimes colorblind in their analysis and organizing tactics. Brianna, a WFF volunteer, and Fernando, an organizer for another worker center, explained too that unions are generally a "white structure" so do not necessarily focus their energy on identity-based organizing. And this extends into the very structure of unions. For instance, Bryan and Bernadine, a WFF volunteer, both expressed seeing very few people of color in top leadership positions in unions. On the other hand, when I asked Jayden, member of WFF, what he saw as the difference between the WFF and other labor focused organizations, he said that a key difference was that the WFF is run by people who are affected directly by the issues they work on, and not by more privileged outsiders. This mattered to him because they are the most informed and have the most to gain or lose from their efforts, so

he felt they should be the ones leading the work. He said

Like, the majority of all of us, we are all ex-felons, so it's not like you got a group of people who stay all in the suburbs and be, like, "Yeah. Let's try and help some black people out." No. We're still struggling, and we are part of the struggle—like, everyday struggle, and we want to change the current situation of everyone. That's the difference between us and other organizations. Other organizations have people who are well off.

When I asked him to clarify which organizations he meant and if he was comparing WFF to unions, he said

Yes. They hire people who are more well-off versus people who would actually move for the change because they're goin' through it every day. Okay. You got people in our organization who probably have no lights or gas, or gotta get a babysitter, or are an ex-felon and could not get a job, or definitely need a raise in minimum wage, versus a person who makes \$30 an hour, stays in South Holland, has about three cars. One of your kids is already in college. You hang nowhere near the 'hood. Why would you put a person like that somewhere where they don't understand?

Jayden described how by rarely hiring community members, unions too often have staff that are unfamiliar with, have less connection to, and are less committed to the issues in a community than local residents, which limits the significance and effectiveness of their work.

In addition to exclusion stemming from citizenship status and racial discrimination, the restructuring of the labor market towards more low-wage, non-standard, precarious and service based work has contributed to the further marginalization of people of color and immigrants who disproportionately work in these jobs. Furthermore, these jobs are still largely unorganized by unions due to “employee” misclassifications and a lack of time, commitment, and resources necessary to devote to organizing a fragmented labor force. In reference to this, Carlos, a staff person at UWC, said that unions have been having a difficult enough time organizing full time and direct hire workers in the current anti-union political climate, so they cannot afford to focus on other groups that are more difficult to organize. He said,

It's not that they exclude them; it's that there's not a movement within the traditional labor movement to reach out to those folks because they're all just trying to survive with people who are directly hired and who are non-contingent.

On the other hand, these contingent, non-standard jobs are the very industries that worker centers organize, subsequently making space for these otherwise excluded workers. As Corey, a staff person for UWC, said, “it looks like worker centers sprung up where unions weren’t really doing much or in the spaces that unions couldn’t go.” Indeed, unions have some legal restrictions on who they can organize, and generally represent people that are relatively higher up already in terms of work, class, and structural position than people that worker centers generally represent.

Notwithstanding the local Fight for 15 and a handful of other union campaigns, worker centers are the entities most often organizing informal or nonstandard workers that have never been widely organized by unions, such as domestic workers, street vendors, restaurant workers, and street corner day laborers, or in industries that have been deunionized, such as warehouse work and manufacturing. For instance, the UWC, organizes workers in the Chicago area light industrial sector, which was largely unionized in the past. Starting in the 1970s, with outsourcing, restructuring, and the growth of the temporary staffing industry, unions have lost ground in the industry, and are not actively organizing the temp workers that are increasingly present. Carlos, a staff person for the UWC, said that unions and their members have generally looked down on temp workers because they have been used to break up strikes or bargaining units. But, the UWC saw these workers differently. He argued that,

UWC, instead of looking at temp workers like that, decided, “No. How ‘bout reachin’ out to these workers and tryin’ to walk with them and organize together to address their exploitation and discrimination and helping to see other organized groups like unions that, “Hey, these workers are just like you and everybody else.” The people who are using them are the ones that ought to be held accountable, not people tryin’ to make ends meet or make a living or eat.

Some participants argued that unions tend to want to protect their members’ relatively higher position regardless of the costs, a characteristic of place taking politics. For instance, Brandi, a volunteer at WFF, shared how while working as a “salt,” or undercover union



organizer, at a local newspaper, she saw a complete disparity between the union members' working conditions compared to the temp workers who were required to do the "shit work." She also noticed that this division was racialized since the temps were predominately Latino and African American, and the full time union workers were white. Brandi said it felt like an example of unions not caring about broader issues and not supporting those who are not already organized. She explained that,

We wanted to talk with the [union] to figure out how we can work together . They are all about, "It's not hurting us." I remember that. It's like, "This is not bothering us." We want them to be on board to say, "Your folks are getting fucked." They're like, "No, we're not gonna do it." They had so much power. It's like, "It's not an issue for us."

Thus, the UWC and WFF engage in space making through bringing in people that are the least likely to be engaged included in the broader labor movement or the society that they are legally, socially, politically, and economically marginalized from.

*Whole Worker Organizing: "'Cause They Don't Only Care About You as a Worker; They Care About Your Whole Life"*

In addition to issues of exclusion from unions, participants often echoed Pitts' (2004) argument that unions are often narrow in their focus, and neglect "non-work" or non-workplace concerns of members. Attention to individual worker needs is rare in most unions outside of grievance filing, and community issues are generally treated as tangential, if considered at all (see also McAlevey and Ostertag 2012). In contrast, I found Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) and the United Worker Center (UWC) to be employing a more "whole worker organizing" model, addressing oppressions and access to rights for members outside of the workplace, both at the individual and community level. Certainly, like most worker centers (Fine 2006), both the UWC and WFF ran "know your rights" and health and safety trainings, helped people with wage theft or other problems related to a particular job, and even aided

workers in trying to get work. They were thus concerned with workplace issues, but not only those issues.

Indeed, Bryan, director of the WFF, said that worker centers are different than unions because they focus on the whole person, the “totality of issues,” and on real community organizing and coalition building within the community and between themselves. And Benito, director of UWC, said the dichotomy between labor and community organizing comes from the outside, and is not how “poor folks” experience the blurry and often overlapping boundaries. In other words, all issues are “labor” issues, even if they are not simply something related to a particular workplace. Similarly, Brianna, a volunteer for WFF, and Travis, a staff person for UWC, each explained that for most unions, if something is not covered by the contract as something that is grievable, they tend to not want to organize around it. Brandi, a volunteer at WFF and union staff person, echoed a similar sentiment that the WFF is focused more on community and non-workplace issues than unions are. Furthermore, Sarah, a UWC volunteer, explained that generally worker centers focus on all parts of members’ lives. She said,

I think workers centers take a much more holistic approach to organizing ‘cause they don’t only care about you as a worker. They care about your whole life, everything about you and your family. It’s more of a community approach even though they focus on worker issues.

I observed this whole worker focus on the individual level when the UWC publicly fought for the release of a former staff person’s family member from detention in the summer of 2015. Similarly, UWC staff supported two women experiencing domestic violence by connecting them with resources and support. Likewise, staff, members, and volunteers at both organizations supported each other during hard financial times. For instance Corey, a staff person with WFF, helped organize moral and financial support for a member who was shot at his home in the summer of 2016. And UWC staff members gathered up emergency funds for two

undocumented members that had been severely injured and then fired from a factory around the holidays since they were not eligible for government support given their legal status. Thus, part of the whole worker focus I observed was when these centers helped members get through trauma or obstacles so they could move on and keep fighting, rather than get left behind.

Whole worker support was also part of the organizational level work at WFF and UWC. For instance, feeling the effects of Chicago Public School closures by Mayor Emanuel in 2013 and ongoing violence in the city, WFF members talked about finding ways to address these “non-work” issues. In support of such projects and recognizing their connection to peoples working lives, Bryan said,

...just because we're a black worker center, we may not necessarily work on quote-unquote worker issues at all times. The folks here decided they wanted to figure out a way that we can work, weigh in on what's happening with schools in Chicago. They wanted to work around violence and trauma and stuff like that so, all of that is deeply tied to jobs and employment, and so we need to figure out ways on how we can you know, work on those as well.

Here Bryan explained that issues of violence and school closures were inherently linked to people's labor concerns, and thus were important issues for them to work on even if they were not related to a particular job. Similarly, the UWC actively helped immigrant members get resources to minimize obstacles they faced related to their immigration status. As an example, the UWC hosted two workshops in the spring of 2013 to inform members about the new Illinois Temporary Visitor Driver's License (TVDL) law, which allowed people without immigration authorization access to a license. During the workshops, staff explained the requirements and risks to members. Then in the weeks following Beatriz, a staff person at UWC, helped workers gather their documents and get appointments to take their driving tests. Similarly, in an effort to address the effects of racialized criminalization, over-policing, and mass incarceration among their members and in their communities, both centers held criminal record expungement

workshops with information and access to legal counsel. This is because they recognized that these records affect members' access to jobs and rights more broadly. Such events are not commonly hosted by unions.

In addition, both organizations used community organizing strategies in their membership building efforts. For instance, in addition to recruiting disgruntled workers outside of temporary staffing agencies, on numerous occasions UWC staff members Gabriela and Corey, and myself, canvassed in the neighborhood to raise awareness of the organization. Likewise, in the summer of 2014, I went with members from WFF to survey African Americans in Southside commercial areas and transportation hubs about their work experience, wages, working conditions, and whether they had experienced racial or gender discrimination. While doing this, we talked to people about the organization and welcomed them to get involved or come to an upcoming event. Both organizations also hosted public events to bring in, educate, and provide a platform for local people to give voice to pressing issues. For instance, during the summer of 2014, the UWC hosted a forum on exploitation and racial discrimination in the temporary staffing industry in which community members had the opportunity to learn about press on a state legislator and temp agency manager for answers and action. And on multiple occasions in 2013 the WFF hosted public documentary showings with food, welcoming members, local residents, and volunteers to learn about the organization, have educational discussions on issues related to structural racism, and encourage new attendees to get involved. These efforts brought in numerous new members and volunteers, extending the inclusion into various spaces and making sure these organizations were rooted in their communities. With this in mind, Carlos explained that being in the community helps build trust and should be done with the goal of supporting justice in all areas. He said,

Why only defend human dignity at work and not care that that worker may be getting discriminated against at home or in their society? ...Why care that sexual harassment is happening at work, but not at home or not in the street or not—” Oh, well, that’s not my problem cuz it’s not something related to work”?”... If you have a comité that’s working on sexual harassment, on sexual assault issues in their workspaces, why wouldn’t they also be concerned about that in their neighborhood and in their homes?

Similar to the participants in Das Gupta’s (2006) study, such whole worker efforts made space for people to stay involved and get help in the many areas of their life that they may not have had support in otherwise.

*Social and Structural Transformation: “Let’s break down the structures of why this is happening.”*

Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) and United Worker Center (UWC) also actively challenged hegemonic, exclusionary and oppressive structures, similar to those in Das Gupta’s (2006) study. This was in contrast with organizations with place taking politics such as most Chicago unions, who at best tend to address these structures in surface ways to avoid “upsetting” their relationships or reputation. To begin with, unlike most local unions, the WFF and UWC actively spoke about and challenged racial discrimination and inequality on a structural and interpersonal level. For instance, the WFF spoke frankly about anti-black racism in meetings and in their communications with the media, coalition partners, and legislators. Bryan, the director of WFF, also actively educated people on the historical connection between African Americans’ labor exploitation and criminalization, and as well as how implicit bias and stereotypes of black workers perpetuate their exclusion from good jobs and rights. Brianna, a WFF volunteer, spoke about how important a focus on these issues was. She said

I think this is a moment—..... more or less, people don’t really give a shit about Black workers. [Bryan] is out havin' conversations that I don't know if other folks are having....About re-imagining black workers, about knowing your rights on the job.

Similarly, in media pieces and member meetings, UWC staff actively explained how organizing against exploitation in the temporary staffing industry required fighting racial discrimination by employers and fellow workers. In the summer of 2014 the UWC even hosted a “racial unity dialogue” for Latino and African American members to talk, learn about shared struggles, and work through some of their divisions so they could move forward in building stronger interracial solidarity. Travis, a staff person at UWC, told me he noticed that when Mexican members started feeling heard and accepted by African Americans, they tended to feel more of a sense of belonging in the U.S. generally. He explained that,

Coming together with the African Americans broadens their sense of citizenship, their sense of belonging, their sense of not being a segregated minority that’s easily exploited and marginalized.

Travis said he noticed a similar change of heart often happened for African Americans members when getting to know Latino members. He said they generally moved from thinking of Latino immigrants as people who allow themselves to be exploited to understanding the vulnerabilities they face and that indeed many were standing up with them. Indeed, Sofia and Raul, members of UWC, admitted to me that being involved in the UWC and meeting more African Americans through organizing and actions had changed a lot of their prejudice against African American people. And a UWC member named Anthony shared with me that he had not realized how Latino immigrants were so mistreated at the temp agencies until after he met some at a membership meeting. Before he just thought about how they “took jobs” from citizens, but hearing how they were treated gave him a different outlook, helping him see that everyone was just trying to get decent work and pay.

In addition, the UWC and WFF were trying to address oppression and exclusion in the labor market more generally. Benito, director of the UWC, explained how the UWC was

challenging the very existence of the temporary staffing industry. He said

what we're promoting in temp labor is the raising of those standards, and promoting a social movement, much like child labor, where it would be, "this is not the country we want to be, this is not the best that we can do - we don't want to have 10 or 15 different people between myself and my employer...

They pushed for these goals through multiple avenues, including organizing workers into committees in various client companies and agencies, direct actions, pressuring the industry through individual and class action lawsuits, media coverage, as well as health and safety and wage theft claims. They also worked toward this goal through lobbying in the state capital for stronger worker protections. For instance, during my research, the UWC was pushing state legislators to pass a law requiring agencies to keep track of applicant demographics in an effort to halt the rampant discrimination towards African American job seekers. It became a significant political battle that has yet to be won. But thanks to this pressure, Gabriela, a volunteer at UWC, claimed that some client companies and agencies have been working to appear less discriminatory and exploitative, at least for short periods. Gabriela said

I think that temp agencies are realizing that there is someone supporting temp workers. I think sometimes they are—they're trying to—or behave well. [Laughter] Being a little bit more careful.

This anti-discrimination work was an example of both centers' efforts to also address the so-called "black jobs crisis" of significant African American unemployment or employment in bad jobs. Along these lines, Bryan, director of WFF, explained to me that the emergence of black worker centers like his came from people seeing that black unemployment was not improving even with President Obama in office and with the "recovery" post-recession, and thus people need to push for structural changes to make more and better jobs available to African Americans. Among their multiple efforts on this issue, the WFF lobbied state legislators and called 10,000 Illinois voters to push for "Ban the Box" legislation in the state. This kind of law

takes the question about one's criminal convictions off of job applications in an effort to limit discrimination against formerly incarcerated job seekers. Arguably this contributes to increased substantive rights, and hopefully influences public opinion of who is 'deserving of work' or realigning their social validation. In 2013 WFF and their allies were successful in getting an administrative order passed that took the criminal convictions question off state job applications. And in 2014 they successfully won legislation taking the question off of all applications in the state. Brandi, a volunteer at WFF and union staff person, emphasized the importance the WFF's efforts at addressing such discrimination against African Americans, and how it was challenging the broader labor movement to also pay attention. She said

There's workers that are supporting, and kinda changing some people's perspective of what it means to be a person who's been incarcerated. Just about race, and how there's—it's not just being, of course being in jail, but why are they getting this? Let's break down the systems, right? Let's break down the structures of why this is happening. I like that he has—not he, but the organization talks about that. How it starts off when we're kids and the pipe. People talk about the pipeline. Some people think there's a pipeline from the cradle to the jailhouse. That's what that is. I do admire that. I think there's a way of how he's challenging, or how we're challenging other unions; foraging these relationships to say, "We need you to be a partnership in this."

Addressing structural violence by the state was also a concern for both organizations. For instance, in addition to the trip to Ferguson I described at the beginning of this chapter, both groups engaged in meetings and actions with other local organizations to challenge police brutality and racial discrimination in the criminal justice system. For instance, in December 2014, the WFF joined other racial justice groups at the Cook County Jail to demand an end to mass incarceration of residents of color and to pressure then States Attorney Anita Alvarez to end her legacy of discriminatory sentencing by changing laws and resigning from her office. Despite the growing popularity of "Black Lives Matter" and growing debates about our law enforcement and criminal justice systems, questioning the legitimacy of these arms of the state



even two years ago was a fairly unpopular and radical act. But these were issues that directly impacted people involved with these organizations, and they did not cower from them. Instead, they made space by challenging them, rather than asking for them to simply be reformed or ignored. The same cannot be said of local unions generally, whose leadership was rarely present at any such actions, with the occasional exception of the Chicago Teachers Union.

## CHALLENGES TO SPACE MAKING EFFORTS

Like all organizations, the Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF) and United Worker Center (UWC) were not without limitations. To begin with, their inclusive efforts were sometimes interrupted by internal power inequalities in regards to gender, interracial communication, language, and class differences. For example, despite the centers being more inclusive of marginalized people at all organizational levels compared to most unions, staff at both organizations were still generally more privileged than the members. The top staff were disproportionately more highly educated and male, and less likely to be immigrants or to have a criminal record than members or lower level staff. In addition, leadership at both organizations tended to rely more on more “professional” and women board members and volunteers like myself for logistical and organizing work than trusting or training members to do it themselves, or calling on men to take on similar responsibility. Furthermore, due to precarious life circumstances, schedules, and sometimes lack of interest, not all members were equally engaged, aware of, or even knowledgeable about the work that was being done by their respective organization. Moreover, women members and staff sometimes implied or stated that male staff and members too often dominated conversations or decisions.

Racism and language differences also presented some limits to inclusiveness and solidarity. At the UWC, despite efforts to create interracial unity between Latinos and African

Americans, stereotypes and feelings of racial marginalization still sometimes lingered among members and staff. Similarly, not all members of the WFF were in support of or conscious of the struggles that low income immigrants experienced and sometimes expressed xenophobic attitudes. And despite efforts at translating during UWC meetings, Spanish speaking staff and members often missed out on details or were marginalized in English dominated discussions. And when staffing changes occurred there were sometimes not enough Spanish speaking staff at UWC to serve the members' needs. Of course, none of these issues were unique to these worker centers but rather are ongoing issues in many organizations. Nevertheless, given their efforts at inclusion and social transformation, it is important to note areas in which both organization could have lived up to such commitments more fully.

Furthermore, in contrast to most unions, these organizations were still relatively young, small, less bureaucratic, and faced less legal restrictions in their work. This made them more nimble and open in their organizing, although that could change over time for both the WFF and UWC, and worker centers more broadly, if they get more institutionalized (Michels (1915[1962]); Milkman 1990). Additionally, in contrast to unions, these and most worker centers do not operate through elected leadership. Thus they are effectively less formally member controlled unless all parties commit to engaging in that manor (Eade and Leather 2005). Indeed, Travis, staff person at UWC, noted in our interview, currently under the tax law 501c3 status of most worker centers, leadership is not an elected governing body, but rather some configuration of a board of directors and a hired director. This meant that salaries, hiring, and budget decisions were not democratically determined at either organization, and this sometimes causes disagreements and feelings of powerlessness when staffing decisions were made. Thus it could be argued that unions are at least theoretically more accountable to members since there

are voting structures for representation and decision making in place, though this is not often without power dynamics.

Finally, the critiques that worker centers are often beholden to funding from large foundations are important (see Fine 2006). While both the UWC and WFF had thus far been able to get funding that had minimal impact on their programming and overwhelmingly focused on operating costs rather than specific projects and metrics, they were sometimes forced to reckon with local politics on some funding, including from the Catholic Church. These dynamics could pose challenges to their space making efforts in the future.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Based on my findings, I argue that the key contributions of the United Worker Center (UWC) and Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF), has been to be space makers in creating more inclusion, whole worker focused organizing, and social and structural transformation in the broader local and national labor movement, and by extension, U.S. society. From my observation, the same could be said for most other local worker centers. As civil society organizations, the WFF and UWC challenged market fundamentalism and state exclusion more broadly, both by changing narratives of people and issues, and explicitly involving people to take rights and to be part of civil society rather than outside of it. Through this space making these centers' members and their communities have access to and become included in civil society in ways these groups rarely are, by making their own "club" like WFF volunteer Brianna described above. This has crucial implications for marginalized people to claim rights associated with citizenship. Somers (2008) explains that

Social inclusion in a robust civil society is also a precondition of the first right to membership and belonging. Absent that civil membership, so too will be recognition by others as a fellow human of equal worth and value. (P. 26)

Indeed, by being involved in these worker centers, people otherwise mostly excluded from civil society are brought into a body, belong, and have more support to access their rights. This echoes Das Gupta's (2006) statement that that worker centers she studied

reinvented immigrant workers – both undocumented and documented – into subjects who demand rights that they are routinely denied....The two organizations have reformulated workers' rights so that they can apply to immigrants regardless of their immigration status. (P. 251)

This was the case for the UWC and WFF as well. Angela, a WFF member, explained that in the bigger picture, the WFF has created a space to humanize, include, and empower marginalized people such as formerly incarcerated African American men who are otherwise treated as morally and socially unworthy of full inclusion in society. She said,

What Bryan has done, in my mind, is give hope back to the people. He has empowered, through his organizing principles, them to believe in themselves and in their inherent value as human beings. When you can see four or five young black males who have been to prison and are back buy in to the concept that more brothers are out there just like me, and we all need some help- you can see that buy-in cuz it just doesn't happen overnight. This is relationship building that makes this happen...This is having enough to lure you into a place where you can begin to see yourself for who you are, and not in a negative light. That, to me, is as valuable as getting the legislators to agree to Ban the Box, when we all know that it's somewhat perfunctory. Cuz employers are gonna find a way [to discriminate], they're a business. When folks can be organized around a common need, and you can hold that intention, you've got something as valuable as those big bucks that big corporations have.

While primarily noting the director Bryan's vision in this quote, it was the effects of the commitment and efforts of all those in WFF that Angela and others recognized as space making. Similarly, when asking him how UWC and worker centers more generally connect to the issue of citizenship, Travis explained that

Because it helps define interests of a certain class of people not based on immigration status and not based on race, but based on their common interest as working class people who have a set of goals which cut across race, class, and gender..... To be treated equally, to be respected, to have a voice in their workplace, to have a voice in their organization, to have a voice in the outside world, to have a political voice that reflects their interests as workers or as low income people, as immigrants, as people that are marginalized by the greater society to find the power to have an equal voice with the rest

of the folks whether they be immigrants or African Americans. Those are our two basic constituencies.

This, I argue, means otherwise marginalized people have access to being recognized as part of our society, and our labor movement – as whole people worthy of the same rights as others despite the state, market, and even the larger labor movement, trying to keep them out of the “club.” As such, I argue that despite the sometimes small scale victories or campaigns and organizational limitations of worker centers, the importance of the UWC, WFF, and arguably worker centers generally, are that they are space making on multiple levels. They are changing the labor movement by not only including excluded people and issues, and challenging otherwise hegemonic entities, but also pushing the larger labor movement and society to change. And this space making, like the organizations in Das Gupta’s (2006) work, means more access to rights and inclusion for those often deemed “unworthy” of full citizenship.

## V. Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have problematized how we look at citizenship, theorized examples of neoliberal projects further diminishing the rights of already marginalized people, and conceptualized how worker centers are addressing this exclusion from full citizenship. In particular, I complicated notions of access to citizenship by comparing undocumented Latino immigrants and low income African Americans with criminal records. While these groups have different formal citizenship statuses, I address how their substantive access to rights are more similar than typically discussed in most immigration and racial inequality related literature. I also found that racialized criminalization and labor market restructuring towards more nonstandard and flexible work has further excluded these groups from access to rights, and that these projects intersect and reinforce each other.

Finally, I also found that the efforts of the Unity Worker Center (UWC) and Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF), and worker centers more broadly, are serving to challenge these neoliberal projects and outcomes in ways different than most unions. In doing this they change the labor movement and push for broader access to full citizenship rights for people excluded from them. The history and structure of worker centers, and their focus on immigrants and nonstandard work, has been something broadly documented but undertheorized. When I started this project, I sought to contribute such insight and capture why these centers organized around rights beyond those in the workplace, despite being primarily labor focused organizations. I found that both organizations operated from an understanding that they could only address their members' exploitation and marginalization as workers by also addressing the citizenship exclusion enhanced by this nexus of racialized criminalization and labor market restructuring. Indeed, I argue that the United Worker Center (UWC) and Workers Fighting for Fairness (WFF)

operated from the premise that their struggles for justice had to go beyond claims on employers to also include the state and broad market entities that perpetuate members' exclusion from the social, civil, economic, and political rights associated with full citizenship inclusion. As such they, and I would argue most worker centers, go beyond the work of most unions, who concentrate primarily on rights connected to a particular workplace or industry, and only minimally on aspects of this nexus of exclusion.

That the racialized criminalization of African Americans facilitates significant citizenship rights exclusion similar to that of undocumented Latino immigrants in Chicago has profound implications for worker advocacy efforts, and people's ability to get employment and stand up for their rights. Furthermore, the increase in precarious nonstandard work in the form of triangularized employment facilitated by the temporary staffing industry (TSI) takes advantage of and perpetuates the racialized unfreeness of these two groups. This is done in an effort to supply the most vulnerable workers to client companies who use workers' differential and vulnerable statuses to maximize division and exploitation, and create a chaotic employment situation thwarting accountability and organizing. I found that this racialized criminalization and the manipulation through labor market restructuring perpetuated the racialized and status based exclusion most of these workers experienced in the mainstream labor movement. By undocumented Latino immigrants and formerly incarcerated African American workers being included in and helping lead these organizations, the UWC and WFF were facilitating increased inclusion. Through this inclusion, doing "whole worker" organizing, and focusing on structural transformation, they were utilizing Das Gupta's (2006) concept of "space making" politics. This means these organizations were facilitating space "at the table" so to speak for overwhelmingly

excluded workers in the local labor movement, and society, and fighting for more access for their full citizenship rights.

These findings are theoretically important in understanding the effects of racialized criminalization and labor market flexibilization in the context of labor organizing. To begin with, because labor movement, citizenship, and political incorporation literature is often limited in its analysis of intersections of race, gender, and nativity, I contribute insight on these areas. In particular, contributing to understandings of what “full citizenship” means for people, and how the distinctions between formal and substantive citizenship matter in people’s daily lives, provides a lens of intersectionality, marginalization, and oppression not often nuanced in labor market or movement literature. In addition, by outlining how economic restructuring and the increase of low-wage, non-standard work such as the TSI utilizes as well as contributes to systems of exclusion of citizenship marginalization helps give tangible insight on the effects of neoliberalism and how to fight it. Finally, by applying Das Gupta’s (2006) framework to labor movement theory, I contribute to discussions around the usefulness of intersecting organizational and social movement theory (see McAdams and Scott 2005). This helps give context to the movement, to see where there are gaps and limitations to our understanding and connecting it to patterns in movements and organizations more broadly and historically.

Of course, there are multiple ways I would like to expand this research in the future. To begin with, my research questions did not engage with issues around gender much at the start, and neither has my analysis. This was partially due to the interview schedule I used, but arguably also due to the fact that participants and the data I gathered was generally less focused on the effects of gender dynamics than race and immigration status as the most influential aspects of their marginalization. In regards to issues of racialized criminalization, my analysis in



chapter two was centered on African American men since the participants with felonies were all men. Even in the focus group Bryan organized for people with records, all participants were men. Additionally, despite increasing numbers of women being criminalized and marked with a criminal record, locally and nationally men are still overwhelmingly the ones incarcerated and given felonies. Thus, in my study, participants' experience of being marked with a criminal record reflected the majority, or African American male experience. Meanwhile, most African American women participant's experiences or perceptions of criminalization were based on family member or community member experiences. I did not complicate the meanings of these differences in depth but that is something that I hope to do more in future research. In addition, it so happened that a majority African American participants at the UWC during my fieldwork were men. Thus again, my discussions and comparisons for women and non-male identified workers was minimal. It has been my observation in more recent communications with the UWC that more African American women temp workers are currently involved in the organization, so I hope to hear their insights in the future. On the other hand, Latino immigrant participants and staff members involved at the UWC were much more equal in number across gender, but my limited Spanish skills and access to translators meant my conversations and data on some issues were not as nuanced as I hoped, including on issues of gender.

Finally, as discussed briefly in chapter four, I cannot dismiss the fact that both organizations were primarily led by men and that likely had an effect on organizational statements, strategy, and focus. Arguably, being of the dominant gender meant that they were less inclined to see or focus on gender inequality or have as strong of a gender analysis as they might if they were women. Still, gender differences and power dynamics were discussed by all participants, including these directors and other leaders of both centers, and sometimes even

addressed in programming. And certainly some members and lower level staff at both organizations, sometimes commented on gender imbalance in leadership and decision making at both the UWC and WFF, as well as how gender affected their experiences as workers. Nevertheless, I found that men and even women still tended to refer to race and legal status as most central in their analysis of issues they faced and were organizing around. Still, as citizenship has always been structured around gender as well as race and immigration status (Glenn 2002), I plan to include a lens that looks more fully at gender regarding citizenship exclusion in future research.

I must also note that sexual orientation or identity was something that did not come up regularly at either organization, nor did I ask about it much. Throughout my research, it was treated by participants as an assumption that members and staff at both organizations were “straight” and generally anytime LGBTQ issues were brought up, they were about “other people.” Generally when topics around sexual orientation and identity did come up it was in the context of jokes, particularly among men, regarding whether they were straight or challenging each other’s masculinity. And although one WFF member started sharing that they were bisexual later in my fieldwork, this was not discussed often. Thus generally, I did not notice enough variety in sexual orientation and identity to base a comparative analysis on.

In regards to other future research, there were a number of new questions that emerged during my fieldwork that I hope to investigate further. Namely, I argue more research is needed on the relationship between parole officers, halfway houses, and re-entry support organizations with temporary staffing agencies, particularly those that are affiliated with or funneling people into other agencies. Unlike *raiteros*, which directly siphon local Latino residents from public places in their neighborhoods into these employment relationships, parole officers and halfway

houses are not especially visible to the public, nor are their relationships with these re-entry support organizations. There also needs to be more research on those social service and re-entry organizations like the Safer Foundation that not only encourage people to apply to agencies but also have their own temp agencies. This is particularly important given that some of these, like the Adult Transitional Centers, are branches of the state, meaning the state is involved in perpetuating unfreeness in this triangulated employment relationship. As civil society entities, their involvement in intentionally or unintentionally perpetuating this triangular and discriminatory industry is notable, particularly as the temp industry becomes more and more normalized as the primary entry point for low-wage work, particularly for those with a criminal record. This of course says nothing of the unfreeness of workers that are currently incarcerated and exploited, which is also an area in need of urgent research regarding workers' rights, citizenship, and labor markets.

Additionally, future research should confirm if the Illinois and Chicago "Ban the Box" laws prohibiting employers to ask about criminal convictions on application has had any positive effects on labor market inclusivity and discrimination in the Chicago area. This will be particularly interesting in the TSI given that criminal records are used so frequently to sort applicants, and it is yet to be seen what might be used to justify discrimination instead. My hypothesis is that the "Ban the Box" law will not likely have any significant effect on access to employment in Illinois if there is not substantial enforcement of it. This connects to discussions spurred by a few studies that argue these laws are not making a differences since employers end up stereotyping based on demographics and criminality anyway, meaning young African American men of color in particularly lose out on opportunities (see Semuels 2016). On the other hand, Emsellem and Avery (2016) say that these studies are irresponsible because the laws are

actually helping, and that the discrimination that continues is actually due to ongoing discrimination anyway and criminalizing stereotypes and structural racism rather than effects of the actual policy. They also point out that these laws are accomplishing important awareness raising and are changing public opinions about people with criminal records and their worthiness of access to work.

Finally, as the labor movement evolves, it will be important to see how this cohort of “space making” organizations evolve and their structures and networks mature. In particular, like previous generations of more inclusive or radical labor organizations (Milkman 1990) it will be important to see if they develop more “place taking” politics, turn more bureaucratic (Michels (1915[1962])), get co-opted by hegemonic entities, and whether the gap between leadership and members grows larger. On the other hand, it will be important to measure if they are able to make the broader labor movement more inclusive and transformational.

Of course, continued research generally on the TSI, labor market structures, and racialized criminalization is necessary until there substantial change, so as to help inform strategies and policies to contribute to such change. In the meantime, I offer my findings as an encouragement for policy makers, civil society, and particularly those involved in the labor movement to think about exclusion, exploitation, and citizenship more systematically. To begin with, we must actively work to address the non-shop floor concerns that members and people in the community experience. In particular, for entities organizing or supporting labor organizing efforts, it is not enough to verbalize support or make resolutions in support of reforms but instead to actively work to abolish structures that perpetuate workers exclusion from full citizenship. This is particularly the case for the state and market facilitated structures that criminalize immigrants and people of color, making them legally and socially excluded from full substantive

and formal citizenship rights. And as employment relationships become less standard, similar to earlier eras, it is critical to re-evaluate organizing priorities. Without doing so, labor related organizing will have a limited impact and perpetuate scattered, individual workplace based strategies without systematic change and solidarity building.

I encourage those involved in labor research and organizing to have harder conversations about full inclusion inside our movement and communities, and transforming these spaces by challenging racialized criminalization and labor precarity for workers. The broader labor movement should also increase their support of those already doing this work, and encourage reflection on how to avoid replicating the injustices we seek to address within our own organizations. Otherwise, the labor movement and relevant research will continue to leave out millions of workers and allow the state and market entities to keep groups divided, differentially vulnerable, and keep standards low for all workers. And we cannot build a society with labor justice without working to ensure people's broader access to full citizenship rights.

## CITED LITERATURE

- AFL-CIO. 2016a. "About." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.aflcio.org/About>).
- AFL-CIO. 2016b. "Constituency Groups." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.aflcio.org/About/Allied-Organizations/Constituency-Groups>).
- AFL-CIO. 2016c. "Dakota Access Pipeline Provides High-Quality Jobs." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.aflcio.org/Press-Room/Press-Releases/Dakota-Access-Pipeline-Provides-High-Quality-Jobs>).
- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2006. *The Civil Sphere*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alexander, Michelle. 2010. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. NY: The New Press.
- Anderson, Carol. 2003. *Eyes Off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Appelbaum, Lauren D. and Lola Smallwood Cuevas. 2011. "Los Angeles Black Worker Center- A New Sense of Power of the People: Fighting for Equity, Transparency, Accountability and Justice in the 21st Century Labor Market." *Research and Policy Brief 7*, UCLA Institute for Research on Labor and Employment.
- Aranda, Elizabeth and Elizabeth Vaquera. 2015. "Racism, the Immigration Enforcement Regime, and the Implications for Racial Inequality in the Lives of Undocumented Young Adults." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(1):88–104.

- Arbona, Consuelo, Norma Olvera, Nestor Rodriguez, Jacqueline Hagan, Adriana Linares, and Margit Wiesner. 2010. "Acculturative Stress Among Documented and Undocumented Latino Immigrants in the United States." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 32:362-384.
- Armenta, Amada. 2016. "Racializing Crimmigration: Structural Racism, Colorblindness, and the Institutional Production of Immigrant Criminality." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1-14.
- Asher, Robert and Charles Stephenson. 1990. "Chapter 1: American Capitalism, Labor Organization, and the Racial/Ethnic Factor: An Exploration." Pp. 3-27 in *Labor divided: race and ethnicity in United States labor struggles, 1835-1960*, edited by R. Asher and C. Stephenson. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA). Sept. 19, 2016. "AFL-CIO Constituency Groups Stand with Native Americans to Stop the Dakota Access Pipeline." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.apalanet.org/press-releases/afl-cio-constituency-groups-stand-with-native-americans-to-stop-the-dakota-access-pipeline>).
- Bada, Xóchitl. 2006. "New Trends and Patterns in Mexican Migrant Labor Organization." Pp. 15-21 in *Invisible No More: Mexican Migrant Civic Participation in the United States*, edited by X. Bada, J. Fox, and A. Selee. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Bada, Xóchitl, Jonathan Fox, and Andrew Selee. 2006. *Invisible No More: Mexican Migrant Civic Participation in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Bakan, Abigail B. and Daiva K. Stasiulis. 1995. "Making the Match: Domestic Placement Agencies and the Racialization of Women's Household Work." *Signs* 303-335.

- Balakrishnan, Radhika. 2002. *The hidden assembly line: gender dynamics of subcontracted work in a global economy*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc.
- Bannon, Alicia, Mitali Nagrecha, and Rebekah Diller. 2010. "Criminal Justice Debt: A Barrier To Reentry." Publication of the *Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law*.
- Bartley, Tim. 2007. "How Foundations Shape Social Movements: the Construction of an Organizational Field and the Rise of Forest Certification." *Social Problems* 54(3):229-255.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Beachler, Donald W. 2001. "Labor's Triumphs and Frustrations: New Labor and Electoral Politics in the 2000 Election." *Working USA* 5(1):103-123.
- Beale, Sara Sun. 2003. "Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Restorative Justice: Still Tough on Crime? Prospects for Restorative Justice in the United States." *Utah Law Review* 2003(1):413-437.
- Belous, Richard S. 1989. "The Contingent Economy: The Growth of the Temporary, Part-Time and Subcontracted Workforce." *NPA Report 239*. Washington, DC: National Planning Association.
- Bernhardt, Annette. November 1, 2011. "The Economic Future Looks Dark as the Faux Economic Recovery is Primarily Low-Paying Jobs." *Alternet*. Retrieved November 28, 2012 ([http://www.alternet.org/story/152929/the\\_economic\\_future\\_looks\\_dark\\_as\\_the\\_faux\\_economic\\_recovery\\_is\\_primarily\\_low-paying\\_jobs](http://www.alternet.org/story/152929/the_economic_future_looks_dark_as_the_faux_economic_recovery_is_primarily_low-paying_jobs)).



- Bernhardt, Annette. 2012. "The Role of Labor Market Regulation in Rebuilding Economic Opportunity in the United States." *Work and Occupations* 39(4):354-375.
- Bernhardt, Annette, James DeFilippis, Nina Martin, and Siobhán McGrath. 2005. "Unregulated Work and New Business Strategies in American cities." Pp. 188-196 in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Labor and Employment Relations Association*.
- Bernhardt, Annette, Heather Boushey, Laura Dresser, and Chris Tilly, eds. 2008. *The Gloves Off Economy: Workplace Standards at the Bottom of America's Labor Market*. Champaign, IL: Labor and Employment Relations Association (LERA).
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bonacich, Edna, Sabrina Alimahomed, and Jake Wilson. 2008. "The Racialization of Global Labor." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52(3):342-355.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62(3):465-480.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2004. "From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a New System of Racial Stratification in the USA." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(6): 931-950.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2013. *Racism without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2015. "More than Prejudice: Restatement, Reflections, and New Directions in Critical Race Theory." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(1):73-87.
- Bookman, Ann. 1995. "Flexibility at What Price? The Costs of Part-Time Work for Women Workers." *Washington & Lee Law Review* 52(3):799-814.

- Bosniak, Linda. 2006. *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bosniak, Linda. 2012. "Birthright Citizenship, Undocumented Immigrants and the Slavery Analogy." Retrieved September 21, 2016 at Social Science Research Network (SSRN) <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2194874> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2194874>.
- Bronfenbrenner, Kate and Dorian T. Warren. 2007. "Race, Gender, and the Rebirth of Trade Unionism." *New Labor Forum* 16(3):142-148.
- Brubaker, W. Rogers. 1990. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. PhD Dissertation, Columbia University. Retrieved September 21, 2016 ([http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/brubaker/Publications/Brubaker\\_Dissertation.pdf](http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/brubaker/Publications/Brubaker_Dissertation.pdf)).
- Bruno, Robert. 2003. *Reforming the Chicago Teamsters: The Story of Local 705*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Capps, Randolph and Fortuny Karina. 2006. "Immigration and Child and Family Policy." Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Carbado, Devon W. 2005. "Racial Naturalization." *American Quarterly* 57(3):633-658.
- Carlson, Erin. July 21, 2014. "Seeking Re-Election, Emanuel Gets More Love From Labor Unions." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.nbcchicago.com/blogs/ward-room/Rahm-Emanuel-chicago-mayor-labor-unions-campaign-contributions-267992271.html>).
- Carré, Francoise, Marianne A. Ferber, Lonnie Golden, and Stephen A. Herzenberg, eds. 2000. *Nonstandard Work: The Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements*. Champaign, IL: Industrial Relations Research Association.

- Chaudry, Ajay, Randolph Capps, Juan Pedroza, Rosa Maria Castañeda, Robert Santos, and Molly M. Scott. 2010. "Facing Our Future: Children in the Aftermath of Immigration Enforcement." Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Chauvin, Sebastien and Blanca Garces-Mascarenas. 2012. "Beyond Informal Citizenship: The New Moral Economy of Migrant Illegality." *International Political Sociology* 6:241-259.
- Chavez, Leo R. 2008. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Chun, Jennifer Jihye, George Lipsitz, and Young Shin. 2013a. "Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates." *Signs* 38(4):917-940.
- Chun, Jennifer Jihye, George Lipsitz, and Young Shin. 2013b. "Immigrant Women Workers at the Center of Social Change: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates." Pp. 207-231 in *Immigrant Women Workers in the Neoliberal Age*, edited by N. Flores-González, A. Romina Guevarra, M. Toro-Morn, and G. Chang. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Clark-Ibáñez, Marisol. 2015. *Undocumented Latino Youth: Navigating Their Worlds*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Clawson, Dan. 2003. *The Next Upsurge: Labor and the New Social Movements*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. and Guthrie, Doug. 2011. *Politics and Partnerships. The Role of Voluntary Associations in America's Political Past and Present*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cobble, Dorothy Sue. 1991. "Organizing the Postindustrial Work Force: Lessons from the History of Waitress Unionism." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 44(3):419-436.
- Cobble, Dorothy Sue. 1997. "Lost Ways of Organizing: Reviving the AFL's Direct Affiliate

- Strategy.” *Industrial Relations* 36(3):278-301.
- Cobble, Dorothy Sue, ed. 2007. *The Sex of Class: Women Transforming American Labor*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Cobble, Dorothy Sue and Leah F. Vosko. 2000. “Historical Perspectives on Representing Nonstandard Workers.” Pp. 291-312 in *Nonstandard Work: The Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements*, edited by F. Carre, M. Ferber, L. Golden, and S. A. Herzenberg. Champaign, IL: Industrial Relations Research Association.
- Cohen, Jean L. and Andrew Arato. 1992. *Civil Society and political theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Collins, Jane. 2006. “Redefining the Boundaries of Work: Apparel Workers and Community Unionism in the Global Economy.” *Identities* 13(1):9-31.
- Collomp, Catherine. 1988. “Unions, Civics, and National identity: Organized Labor's Reaction to immigration, 1881-1897.” *Labor History* 29:450-474.
- Communications Workers of America. Sept. 9, 2016. “Press Release: Statement by the CWA Committee on Human Rights in Support of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.” Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.cwa-union.org/news/releases/statement-cwa-committee-on-human-rights-in-support-of-standing-rock-sioux-tribe>).
- Cooke, B. 2003. “The Denial of Slavery in Management Studies.” *Journal of Management Studies* 40(8):1895-1918.
- Cordero-Guzmán, Héctor R. 2015. “Worker Centers, Worker Center Networks, and the Promise of Protections for Low-Wage Workers.” *WorkingUSA* 18(1):31-57.
- Cordero-Guzmán, Héctor, Nina Martin, Victoria Quiroz-Becerra, and Nik Theodore. 2008. “Voting with their Feet; Nonprofit Organizations and Immigrant Mobilization.”

- American Behavioral Scientist* 52(4):598-617.
- Cranford, Cynthia. 2007. "It's time to leave machismo behind': challenging gender inequality in an immigrant union." *Gender & Society* 21(3):409-438.
- Cranford, Cynthia. 2012. "Gendered Projects of Solidarity: Workplace Organizing among Immigrant Women and Men." *Gender, Work and Organization* 19(2):142-164.
- Cranford, Cynthia J. and Deena Ladd. 2003. "Community Unionism: Organising For Fair Employment in Canada." *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society* 3:46-59.
- Cranford, Cynthia, Mary Gellately, Deena Ladd and Leah F. Vosko. 2005. "Community Unionism and Labour Movement Renewal: Organizing for Fair Employment." Pp. 237-249 in *Paths to Union Renewal*, edited by P. Kumar and C. Schenk. Toronto and Ottawa, Canada: Garamond Press and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Cranford, Cynthia, Tania Das Gupta, Deena Ladd and Leah F. Vosko. 2006. "Thinking Through Community Unionism." Pp. 353-378 in *Precarious Employment: Understanding Labour Market Insecurity*, edited by L. F. Vosko. Montreal and Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Dark, Taylor E. 1999. *The Unions and the Democrats: An Enduring Alliance*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Das Gupta, Monisha. 2006. *Unruly Immigrants: Rights, Activism and Transnational South Asian Politics in the United States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Davey, Monica. April 5, 2015. "In Chicago's Reshaped Politics, Unions Are Divided Over Mayoral Race. Retrieved September 21, 2016 ([http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/06/us/in-chicagos-reshaped-politics-unions-are-divided-over-mayoral-race.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/06/us/in-chicagos-reshaped-politics-unions-are-divided-over-mayoral-race.html?_r=0)).

- Davis, Stephen P., Juan R. Martinez, and R. Stephen Warner. 2010. "The Role of the Catholic Church in the Chicago Immigrant Mobilization." Pp. 79-96 in *Marcha: Latino Chicago and the Immigrant Rights Movement*, edited by A. Pallares, and N. Flores-González. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2002. "Migrant "Illegality" And Deportability in Everyday Life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:419-447.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2005. *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2013. "Spectacles of migrant 'illegality': the scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(7):1180-1198.
- Detention Watch Network (DWN). 2015. "Banking on Detention: Local Lockup Quotas and the Immigrant Dragnet." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.detentionwatchnetwork.org/sites/default/files/reports/DWN%20CCR%20Banking%20on%20Detention%20Report.pdf>).
- Detention Watch Network (DWN). 2016. "Immigration Detention 101." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<https://www.detentionwatchnetwork.org/issues/detention-101>).
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48:147-160.
- Doussard, Marc, Jamie Peck, and Nik Theodore. 2009. "After Deindustrialization: Uneven Growth and Economic Inequality in "Postindustrial" Chicago." *Economic Geography* 85(2):183-207.
- Dreby, Joanna. 2012. "How Today's Immigration Enforcement Policies Impact Children,

- Families, and Communities: A View From the Ground.” Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress. Retrieved December 1, 2015 (<https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/DrebyImmigrationFamiliesFINAL.pdf>).
- Eade, Deborah and Alan Leather, eds. 2005. *Development NGOs and Labor Unions: Terms of Engagement*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Eidelson, Josh. January 29, 2013. “Alt-Labor.” *The American Prospect*. Retrieved September 1, 2016 (<http://prospect.org/article/alt-labor>).
- Elcioglu, Emine Fidan. 2010. "Producing Precarity: The Temporary Staffing Agency in the Labor Market." *Qualitative Sociology* 33(2):117-136.
- Elejalde-Ruiz, Alexia. April 26, 2016. “Illinois’ hiring protections ‘minimal’ for those with criminal records.” *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved September 26, 2016 (<http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-criminal-background-occupational-licensing-0427-biz-20160426-story.html>).
- Emsellem, Maurice and Beth Avery. August 11, 2016. “Racial Profiling In Hiring: A Critique of New “Ban the Box” Studies.” *National Employment Law Project Policy Brief*. Retrieved September 28, 2016 (<http://www.nelp.org/publication/racial-profiling-in-hiring-a-critique-of-new-ban-the-box-studies/>).
- Essed, Philomena. 1991. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Esters, Stephanie. November 16, 2015. “State’s prison industries generate \$52.6 million worth of business.” *The Southern Illinoisan*. Retrieved September 21, 2016 ([http://thesouthern.com/news/local/communities/state-s-prison-industries-generate-million-worth-of-business/article\\_8d47617d-7254-523c-9748-76d7f19d0b3d.html](http://thesouthern.com/news/local/communities/state-s-prison-industries-generate-million-worth-of-business/article_8d47617d-7254-523c-9748-76d7f19d0b3d.html)).

Fantasia, Rick and Kim Voss. 2004. *Hard Work: Remaking the American Labor Movement*.

Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Fletcher, Bill, Jr., and Fernando Gapasin. 2008. *Solidarity Divided: The Crisis in Organized*

*Labor and a New Path Toward Social Justice*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Fine, Janice. August 1, 2003. "Non-union, Low-wage Workers are Finding Voice as Immigrant

Workers Centers Grow." *Labor Notes*.

Fine, Janice. 2005. "Community Unions and the Revival of the American Labor Movement."

*Politics & Society* 33(1):153-199.

Fine, Janice. 2006. *Worker Centers: Organizing Communities at the Edge of the Dream*. Ithaca,

NY: ILR Press, an imprint of Cornell University Press.

Fine, Janice. 2007. "A Marriage Made in Heaven? Mismatches and Misunderstandings between

Worker Centres and Unions." *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45(2):337-64.

Fine, Janice. 2011. "New Forms to Settle Old Scores: Updating the Worker Centre Story in the

United States." *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations* 66(4):604-630.

Fine, Janice, Jeff Grabelsky, and Victor Narrow. 2008. "Building a Future Together: Worker

Centers and Construction Unions." *Labor Studies Journal* 33(1): 27-47.

Fink, Leon. 2010. "Labor Joins la Marcha: How New Immigrant Activists Restored the

Meaning of May Day." Pp. 109-119 in *Marcha: Latino Chicago and the Immigrant*

*Rights Movement*, edited by A. Pallares, and N. Flores-González. Chicago: University of

Illinois Press.

Fix, Michael and Wendy Zimmermann. 2001. "All Under One Roof: Mixed-Status Families in

an Era of Reform." *International Migration Review* 35(2):397-419.

Flores, William V. and Rina Benmayor, eds. 2000 *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming*



- Identity, Space, and Rights*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Foerster, Amy. 2004. "Race, Identity, and Belonging: "Blackness" and the Struggle for Solidarity in a Multiethnic Labor Union." *Social Problems* 51(3):386-409.
- Fox, Cybelle. 2012. *Three Worlds of Relief: Race, Immigration, and the American Welfare State from the Progressive Era to the New Deal*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fox, Cybelle and Thomas A. Guglielmo. 2012. "Defining America's Racial Boundaries: Blacks, Mexicans, and European Immigrants, 1890–1945." *American Journal of Sociology* 118(2):327-379.
- Fox, Jonathan and Xóchitl Bada. 2011. "Migrant Civic Engagement." Pp.142-160 in *Rallying for Immigrant Rights: The Fight for Inclusion in 21<sup>st</sup> Century America*, edited by I. Bloemraad and K. Voss. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fox, Jonathan and Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, eds. 2004. *Indigenous Mexican Migrants in the United States*. La Jolla, CA: University of California, San Diego, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies and Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.
- Freeman, Harris and George Gonos. 2005. "Regulating the Employment Sharks: Reconceptualizing the Legal Status of the Commercial Temp Industry." *WorkingUSA* 8(3):293-314.
- Fudge, Judy and Kendra Strauss, eds. 2014. *Temporary Work, Agencies and Unfree Labour: Insecurity in the New World of Work*. NY: Routledge.
- Fussell, Elizabeth. 2011. "The Deportation Threat Dynamic and Victimization of Latino Migrants: Wage Theft and Robbery." *The Sociological Quarterly* 52(4):593–615.
- Glaze, Lauren E. and Danielle Kaebler. 2014. "Correctional Population In The United States,

- 2013.” *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Retrieved December 1, 2015  
(<http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5177>).
- Gleason, Sandra E., ed. 2006. *The Shadow Workforce: Perspectives on Contingent Work in the United States, Japan, and Europe*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Gleeson, Shannon. 2009. “From Rights to Claims: The Role of Civil Society in Making Rights Real for Vulnerable Workers.” *Law & Society Review* 43(3):669-700.
- Gleeson, Shannon. 2012. *Conflicting Commitments: The Politics of Enforcing Immigrant Worker Rights in San Jose and Houston*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Gleeson, Shannon and Roberto G. Gonzales. 2012. “When Do Papers Matter? An Institutional Analysis of Undocumented Life in the United States.” *International Migration* 50(4):1–19.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2000. “Citizenship and Inequality: Historical and Global Perspectives.” *Social Problems* 47(1):1-20.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2002. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Göbel, Thomas. 1988. “Becoming American: Ethnic Workers and the Rise of the CIO.” *Labor History* 29:173–98.
- Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2009. “The Immigration Industrial Complex: Why We Enforce Immigration Policies Destined to Fail.” *Sociology Compass* 3(2):295–309.
- Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2012. *Immigration Nation: Raids, Detentions and Deportations in Post-9/11 America*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Golash-Boza, Tanya and Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo. 2013. “Latino Immigrant Men and the

- Deportation Crisis: A Gendered Racial Removal Program.” *Latino Studies* 11: 271–292.
- Gomberg-Muñoz, Ruth. 2010. “Willing to Work: Agency and Vulnerability in an Undocumented Immigrant Network.” *American Anthropologist* 112(2): 295–307.
- Gomberg-Muñoz, Ruth. 2011. *Labor and Legality: An Ethnography of a Mexican Immigrant Network*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gomberg-Muñoz, Ruth. 2012. “Inequality in a ‘Postracial’ era: Race, Immigration, and Criminalization of Low-Wage Labor.” *Du Bois Review* 9(2):339-353.
- Gomberg-Muñoz, Ruth. 2015. “The Punishment/El Castigo: Undocumented Latinos and US Immigration Processing.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(14):2235-2252.
- Gomberg-Muñoz, Ruth and Laura Nussbaum-Barberena. 2011. "Is Immigration Policy Labor Policy? Immigration Enforcement, Undocumented Workers, and the State." *Human Organization* 70(4):366-375.
- Gomberg-Muñoz, Ruth and Laura Nussbaum-Barberena. 2014. “Guest Editors’ Note: Everyday Enforcement: Heightened Immigration Enforcement and Community Responses in the United States.” *City & Society* 26(1):3–9.
- Gonos, George. 1997. "The Contest over 'Employer' Status in the Postwar United States: The Case of Temporary Help Firms." *Law and Society Review* 31:81-110.
- Gordon, Jennifer. January 3, 2000. “Immigrants Fight the Power- Worker Centers are One Path to Labor Organizing and Political Participation.” *The Nation* 270(1):16-20. Retrieved January 4, 2011  
<http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy.cc.uic.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=b8592f43-fab8-419c-ba44-20b59752ece0%40sessionmgr111&vid=2&hid=127>).
- Gordon, Jennifer. 2005. *Suburban Sweatshops: The Fight for Immigrant Rights*. Cambridge,

- MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Gottheil, Thomas. 2014. "Not Part of the Bargain: Worker Centers and Labor Law in Sociohistorical Context." *NYU Law Review* 89:2228-2264.
- Gowins, Hilary. May 27, 2016. "Removing Barriers for Ex-Offenders: Occupational-Licensing Expansion Bill Passes." *Illinois Policy*. Retrieved September 26, 2016 (<https://www.illinoispolicy.org/removing-barriers-for-ex-offenders-occupational-licensing-expansion-bill-passes-illinois-senate/>).
- Grabell, Michael. June 27, 2013. "The Expendables: How the Temps Who Power Corporate Giants Are Getting Crushed." *Propublica*. Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<https://www.propublica.org/article/the-expendables-how-the-temps-who-power-corporate-giants-are-getting-crushed>).
- Hoare, Quintin and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, eds. [1971] 1999. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: ElecBook.
- Greene, Judith. 2002. "Getting Tough on Crime: The History and Political Context of Sentencing Reform Developments Leading to The Passage of the 1994 Crime Act." Pp. 43-64 in *Sentencing and Society: International Perspectives*, edited by C. Tata and N. Hutton. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Grossman, James R. 1989. *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guevarra, Anna Romina. 2010. *Marketing Dreams, Manufacturing Heroes: The Transnational Labor Brokering of Filipino Workers*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gutiérrez, Ramón A. 2004. "Internal Colonialism: An American Theory of Race." *Du Bois Review* 1(2):281-295.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hagan, Jacqueline Maria, Nestor Rodriguez, and Brianna Castro. 2011. "Social effects of mass deportations by the United States government, 2000–10." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(8):1374-1391.

Hairston, Creasie Finney. 2015. "Family Ties During Imprisonment: Important to Whom and For What?" *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 18(1):87-104.

Harvey, David. [1982] 1999. *The Limits to Capital*. NY: Verso.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Hasnain, Subuk. January 27, 2015. "12 Jobs you can't get with a felony." *The Chicago Reporter*. Retrieved September 26, 2016 (<http://chicagoreporter.com/12-jobs-you-cant-get-with-a-felony/>).

Hatton, Erin. 2011. *The Temp Economy: From Kelly Girls to Permatemps in Postwar America*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Hatton, Erin. 2014. "Temporary Weapons: Employers' Use of Temps against Organized Labor." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 67(1):86-110.

Hawthorne, Monique Lee. 2007. "Family Unity in Immigration Law: Broadening the Scope of Family." *Lewis and Clark Law Review* 11:809-833.

Hinz, Greg. June 3, 2014. "Think labor is uniformly against Emanuel's re-election? Think Again." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.chicagobusiness.com/article/20140603/BLOGS02/140609949/think-labor-is-uniformly-against-emanuels-re-election-think-again>).

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2001. *Doméstica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in*

*the Shadows of Affluence*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hudson, Kenneth. 2007. "The New Labor Market Segmentation: Labor Market Dualism in the New Economy." *Social Science Research* 36:286–312.

Iafolla, Robert. January 22, 2016. "Browning-Ferris appeals U.S. ruling on 'joint employment.'" *Reuters*. Retrieved August 31, 2016 (<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-republic-servs-browningferris-appeal-idUSKCN0V02OY>).

Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (ICIRR). 2011. "US and Illinois Immigrants by the Numbers." Retrieved August 3, 2016 (<http://icirr.org/sites/default/files/fact%20sheet-demography%202011.pdf>).

Illinois Correctional Industries (ICI). 2016a. "Homepage." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.icicatalog.illinois.gov/>).

Illinois Correctional Industries (ICI). 2016b. "Frequently Asked Questions." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.icicatalog.illinois.gov/Documents/FAQ.pdf>).

Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS). 2013. "Plan for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families." Retrieved December 1, 2015 ([http://www.dhs.state.il.us/page.aspx?item=69797#a\\_toc10](http://www.dhs.state.il.us/page.aspx?item=69797#a_toc10)).

Illinois Department of Labor (IDOL). 2015. "Registered Day and Temporary Labor Agencies." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<https://data.illinois.gov/Labor/IDOL-2015-Registered-Day-and-Temporary-Labor-Agenc/akfg-wxhq>).

Jackson-Green, Bryant. 2015. "Illinois' Occupational Licensing Laws Undermine Ex-Offender Rehabilitation." *Illinois Policy*. Retrieved October 1, 2015 (<https://www.illinoispolicy.org/illinois-occupational-licensing-laws-undermine-ex-offender-rehabilitation/>).

- Joravsky, Ben. June 4, 2014. "SEIU Local 73 gives Mayor Rahm \$25,000. Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.chicagoreader.com/Bleader/archives/2014/06/04/seiu-local-73-gives-mayor-rahm-25000>).
- Jayaraman, Saru. 2005a. "La Alianza Para La Justicia: A Team Approach to Immigrant Worker Organizing." Pp. 85-194 in *The New Urban Immigrant Workforce: Innovative Models for Labor Organizing*, edited by S. Jayaraman and I. Ness. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Jayaraman, Saru and Immanuel Ness. 2005. "Models of Worker Organizing." Pp. 71-84 in *The New Urban Immigrant Workforce: Innovative Models for Labor Organizing*, edited by S. Jayaraman and I. Ness. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Jung, Moon-Kie. 2006. *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Kalleberg, Arne L. 2011. *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarize and Precarious Employment Systems in the United States, 1970s-2000s*. NY: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Kalleberg, Arne L., Edith Rasell, Naomi Cassirer, Barbara F. Reskin, Ken Hudson, David Webster, Eileen Appelbaum, and Roberta M. Spalter-Roth. 1997. *Nonstandard Work, Substandard Jobs: Flexible Work Arrangements in the U.S.* Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Kalleberg, Arne L., Barbara F. Reskin, and Ken Hudson. 2000. "Bad jobs in America: Standard and nonstandard employment relations and job quality in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 65(2):256-278.
- Kirschenman, Joleen and Kathryn Neckerman. 1991. "'We'd Love to Hire them, But...': The Meaning of Race for Employers." Pp. 203-234 in *The Urban Underclass*, edited by C. Jencks and P. E. Peterson. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

- Kisivo, Peter and Thomas Faist. 2009. *Beyond a Border: The Causes and Consequences of Contemporary Immigration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Kleis, Kathryn M. 2010. "Facilitating Failure: Parole, Reentry, and Obstacles to Success." *Dialectical Anthropology* 34(4):525–531.
- Kullgren, Jeffrey T. 2003. "Restrictions on Undocumented Immigrants' Access to Health Services: The Public Health Implications of Welfare Reform." *American Journal of Public Health* 93(10):1630-1633.
- Laine, Jussi. 2014. "Debating Civil Society: Contested Conceptualizations and Development Trajectories." *International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law* 16(1):59-77.
- LeBaron, Genevieve. 2012. "Rethinking Prison Labor: Social Discipline and the State in Historical Perspective." *WorkingUSA* 15:327–351.
- Levitt, Peggy. 2001. *The Transnational Villagers*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Levitt, Peggy and Nina Glick Schiller. 2004. "Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society." *International Migration Review* 38(3):1002-1039.
- Lister, Michael. 2005. "'Marshall-ing' Social and Political Citizenship: Towards a Unified Conception of Citizenship." *Government and Opposition* 40(4):471-491.
- Louie, Miriam Ching. 1992. "Immigrant Asian Women in Bay Area Garment Sweatshops: 'After Sewing, Laundry, Cleaning and Cooking, I Have No Breath Left to Sing.'"  
*Amerasia Journal* 18(1):1-26.
- Louie, Miriam Ching Yoon. 2001. *Sweatshop Warriors: Immigrant Women Workers Take On the Global Factory*. Cambridge, MA: Sound End Press.
- Lowe, Lisa. 1996. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.



- Luo, Tian, Amar Mann, and Richard Holden. 2010. "The Expanding Role of Temporary Help Services from 1990 to 2008." *Monthly Labor Review*, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 1-16.
- Lyons, Christopher J. and Becky Pettit. 2011. "Compounded Disadvantage: Race, Incarceration, and Wage Growth." *Social Problems* 58(2):257–280.
- Lytle Hernández, Kelly. 2011. "Amnesty or Abolition: Felonies, Illegals and the Case for a New Abolition Movement." *Boom: A Journal of California* 1(4):54-68.
- Mantsios, Gregory, ed. 1998. *A New Labor Movement for the New Century*. NY: Routledge.
- Manzo IV, Frank, Robert Bruno, and Virginia Parks. 2016. *The State of the Union 2016: A Profile of Unionization in Chicago, in Illinois, and in America*. Retrieved September 28, 2016 (<https://ler.illinois.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/State-of-the-Unions-2016-FINAL.pdf>).
- Marshall, T. H. [1950] 1990. "Citizenship and Social Class." Pp. 3-51 in *Citizenship and Social Class*, by T.H. Marshall and T. Bottomore. London: Pluto Perspectives.
- Marshall, T. H. 1964. *Class, Citizenship, and Social Development*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company.
- Macías-Rojas, Patrisia. 2016. *From Deportation to Prison" The Politics of Immigration Enforcement in Post-Civil Rights America*. NY: NYU Press.
- Mauer, Marc. 2006. *Race to Incarcerate*. NY: The New Press.
- Mauer, Marc. 2013. *The Changing Racial Dynamics of Women's Incarceration*. Washington, D.C.: The Sentencing Project.
- Martin, Nina, Sandra Morales, and Nik Theodore. 2007. "Migrant worker centers: contending with downgrading in the low-wage labor market." *GeoJournal* 68:155-165.

- McAdam, Doug and W. Richard Scott. 2005. "Organizations and Movements." Pp. 4-40 in *Social Movements and Organization Theory*, edited by G. F. Davis, D. McAdam, W. R. Scott, and M. N. Zald. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McAlevey, Jane. 2003. "It Takes a Community: Building Unions from the Outside In." *New Labor Forum* 12(1):23-32.
- McAlevey, Jane and Bob Ostertag. 2012. *Raising Expectations (And Raising Hell): My Decade Fighting for the Labor Movement*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
- McCarty, Maggie, Randy Alison Aussenberg, Gene Falk, and David H. Carpenter. 2013. "Drug Testing and Crime-Related Restrictions in TANF, SNAP, and Housing Assistance." *Congressional Research Service*. Retrieved December 1, 2015 (<http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/crs/R42394.pdf>).
- Mehta, Chirag, Nik Theodore, Iliana Mora, and Jennifer Wade. 2002. "Chicago's Undocumented Immigrants: An Analysis of Wages, Working Conditions, and Economic Contributions." UIC Center for Urban Economic Development.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2006. "Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants' Lives in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(4):999-1037.
- Menjívar, Cecilia and Daniel Kanstroom, eds. 2014. *Constructing Immigrant "Illegality": Critiques, Experiences, and Responses*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, John. 2010. "World Society, Institutional Theories and the Actor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 1-20.
- Michels, Roberto. [1915]1981. "Oligarchy." Pp.37-54 in *The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*, edited by O. Grusky and G. A. Miller. NY: Free Press.
- Migration Policy Institute. 2016. *Illinois: Demographics and Social*. Retrieved October 12, 2016

(<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/demographics/IL>).

- Milkman, Ruth. 1990. "Gender and trade unionism in historical perspective." Pp. 87-107 in *Women, Politics, and Change*, edited by L. A. Tilly and P. Gurin. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Milkman, Ruth. 2000. "Introduction." Pp. 1-24 in *Organizing Immigrants: The Challenge for Unions in Contemporary California*, edited by R. Milkman. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Milkman, Ruth. 2006. *L.A. Story: Immigrant Workers and the Future of the U.S. Labor Movement*. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Milkman, Ruth. 2007. "Labor Organizing Among Mexican-born workers in the U.S.: Recent Trends and Future Prospects." *Labor Studies Journal* 32(1):96-112.
- Milkman, Ruth. 2011. "Immigrant Workers, Precarious work, and the US Labor Movement." *Globalizations* 8(3):361-372.
- Milkman, Ruth. 2014. "Introduction: Toward a New Labor Movement? Organizing New York City's Precariat." Pp. 1-22 in *New Labor in New York: Precarious Workers and the Future of the Labor Movement*, edited by R. Milkman and E. Ott. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Milkman, Ruth, Joshua Bloom, and Victor Narro, eds. 2010. *Working for Justice: The L.A. Model of Organizing and Advocacy*. Cornell, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Milkman, Ruth and Kim Voss, eds. 2004. *Rebuilding Labor: Organizing and Organizers in the New Union Movement*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mills, Mary Beth. 2003. "Gender and Inequality in the Global Labor Force." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32:41-62.
- Moberg, David. January 28, 2015. "Rahm Emmanuel Is a Union-Buster. So Why Are Chicago

- Unions Backing Him?” *In These Times*. Retrieved September 21, 2016  
([http://inthesetimes.com/article/17548/rahm\\_emanuel\\_unions](http://inthesetimes.com/article/17548/rahm_emanuel_unions)).
- Moore, Mack A. 1965. “The Temporary Help Service Industry: Historical Development, Operation, and Scope.” *ILR Review* 18(4):554-569.
- Moreno, Paul. 2006. *Black Americans And Organized Labor*. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press.
- Muhammad, Khalil Gibran. 2010. *The Condemnation of Blackness: Race, Crime, and the Making of Modern Urban America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Narro, Victor. 2005. “Impacting Next Wave Organizing: Creative Campaign Strategies of the Los Angeles Worker Centers.” *New York Law School Law Review* 50(2):465-513.
- National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL). 2014. “Collateral Damage, America’s Failure to Forgive or Forget in the War on Crime: A Roadmap to Restore Rights and Status After Arrest or Conviction.” Retrieved October 1, 2015  
(<http://www.nacdl.org/restoration/roadmapreport/>).
- National Employment Law Program. 2015. “Fact Sheet: The NLRB’s Browning-Ferris Decision Explained: Myths and Realities for Workers and Small Business Owners.” Retrieved August 31, 2016 (<http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/NLRB-Browning-Ferris-Decision-Explained.pdf>).
- National Immigration Law Center (NILC). 2011. “Table 1: Overview of Immigrant Eligibility for Federal Programs.” Retrieved December 1, 2015  
([http://www.nilc.org/table\\_ovrw\\_fedprogs.html](http://www.nilc.org/table_ovrw_fedprogs.html)).
- National Nurses United. September 9, 2016. “Press Release: Nurses Applaud Federal Move to

- Halt Dakota Pipeline, Call for Permanent End to Project.” Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.nationalnursesunited.org/press/entry/nurses-applaud-federal-move-to-halt-dakota-pipeline-call-for-permanent-end/>).
- Natividad Rodriguez, Michelle and Beth Avery. 2016. "Ban the Box: U.S. Cities, Counties, and States Adopt Fair-Chance Policies to Advance Employment Opportunities for People with Past Convictions." NY: National Employment Law Center. Retrieved August 27, 2016 (<http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/Ban-the-Box-Fair-Chance-State-and-Local-Guide.pdf>).
- Neckerman, Kathryn and Joleen Kirschenman. 1991. “Hiring strategies, racial bias, and inner-city workers.” *Social Problems* 38(4):433–447.
- Nelson, Bruce. 2001. *Divided We Stand: American Workers and the Struggle for Black Equality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ness, Immanuel. 2005. “Francophone West African Supermarket Delivery Workers Autonomous Union Organizing Outside of a Union” Pp. 96-129 in *Immigrants, Unions, and the New U.S. Labor Market*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- New York State Nurses Association. September 1, 2016. “Blog: We Stand With the Standing Rock Sioux.” Retrieved September 21, 2016 ([http://www.nysna.org/blog/2016/09/01/we-stand-standing-rock-sioux#.V-Qv8\\_ArK01](http://www.nysna.org/blog/2016/09/01/we-stand-standing-rock-sioux#.V-Qv8_ArK01)).
- Ngai, Mae. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Obeidat, Sara. October 21, 2015. “America’s Immigration Battle By the Numbers.” *Frontline*. Retrieved October 6, 2016 (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/immigration-2/immigration-battle/americas-immigration-battle-by-the-numbers/>).

- Oboler, Suzanne. 2008. "Out of the Shadows..." *Latino Studies* 6(3):249-251.
- Oliveri, Rigel C. 2009. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Landlords, Latinos, Anti-Illegal Immigrant Ordinances, and Housing Discrimination." *Vanderbilt Law Review* 62(1):53-125.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960's to the 1990's*. NY: Routledge.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 2015. *Racial Formation in the United States, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition*. NY: Routledge.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2003. *Buddha is Hiding: Refugees, Citizenship, the New America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Opsal, Tara D. 2009. "Women on Parole: Understanding the Impact of Surveillance." *Women & Criminal Justice* 19(4):306–328.
- Pager, Devah. 2003. "The mark of a criminal record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108(5): 937–975.
- Pallares, Amalia. 2010. "Representing La Familia: Family Separation and Immigrant Activism." Pp. 215-236 in *Marcha: Latino Chicago and the Immigrant Rights Movement*, edited by A. Pallares and N. Flores-González. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Pallares, Amalia. 2014. *Family Activism: Immigrant Struggles and the Politics of Noncitizenship*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Pallares, Amalia and Nilda Flores-González. 2010. *Marcha: Latino Chicago and the Immigrant Rights Movement*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

- Parker, Molly. Oct. 5, 2016. "Licensed to Work: Former inmate granted cosmetology license as he exits Vienna prison doors." *The Southern Illinoisan*. Retrieved October 5, 2016 ([http://thesouthern.com/news/local/licensed-to-work-former-inmate-granted-cosmetology-license-as-he/article\\_91df1956-e278-5a8c-aadf-c9676de39ce5.html](http://thesouthern.com/news/local/licensed-to-work-former-inmate-granted-cosmetology-license-as-he/article_91df1956-e278-5a8c-aadf-c9676de39ce5.html)).
- Patillo, Mary, David Weiman, and Bruce Western, eds. 2004. *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Peck, Jamie and Nikolas Theodore. 1998. "The business of contingent work: growth and restructuring in Chicago's temporary employment industry." *Work, Employment, and Society* 12:655-674.
- Peck, Jamie and Nik Theodore. 2001. "Contingent Chicago: Restructuring the spaces of temporary labor." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25(3):471-496.
- Peck, Jamie and Nik Theodore. 2002. "Temped out? Industry Rhetoric, Labor Regulation, and Economic Restructuring in the Temporary Staffing Business." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 23(2):143- 175.
- Peck, Jamie and Nik Theodore. 2008. "Carceral Chicago: Making the Ex-Offender Employability Crisis." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(2):251-281.
- Peck, Jamie and Nik Theodore. 2012. "Politicizing Contingent Work: Countering Neoliberal Labor Market Regulation...From the Bottom Up?" *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 111(4):741-761.
- Peck, Jamie, and Adam Tickell. 2002. "Neoliberalizing Space." *Antipode* 34 (3):380-404.
- Petersilia, Joan. 2003. *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. NY: Oxford University Press.

- Phillips, Julie A. and Douglas S. Massey. 1999. "The New Labor Market: Immigrants and Wages after IRCA." *Demography* 36 (2): 233–46.
- Pierce, Chester M., Jean V. Carew, Diane Pierce-Gonzalez, and Deborah Willis. 1978. "An experiment in racism: TV commercials." Pp. 62-88 in *Television and education*, edited by C. Pierce. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pitts, Steven. 2004. "Organize...to Improve the Quality of Jobs in the Black Community." University of California Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education.
- Progress Illinois. August 22, 2016. *Rauner Signs Criminal Justice Reforms*. Retrieved September 26, 2016 (<http://progressillinois.com/news/content/2016/08/22/Rauner-signs-criminal-justice-reforms>).
- Purser, Gretchen. 2012a. "Still Doin' Time:" Clamoring for Work in the Day Labor Industry." *WorkingUSA* 15(3):397-415.
- Purser, Gretchen. 2012b. "The Labour of Liminality." *Labour, Capital & Society* 45 (1):10-35.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Quiroz-Becerra, M. Victoria. 2013. "Street Vendors Claiming Respect and Dignity in the Neoliberal City." Pp. 19-37 in *Immigrant Women Workers in the Neoliberal Age*, edited by N. Flores-González, A. Guevarra, M. Toro-Morn, and G. Chang. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Reiter, Bernd. 2013. *The Dialectics of Citizenship: Exploring Privilege, Exclusion, and Racialization*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Ridgley, Jennifer. 2008. "Cities of Refuge: Immigration Enforcement, Police, and the Insurgent Genealogies of Citizenship in U.S. Sanctuary Cities." *Urban Geography* 29(1):53-77.



- Rivchin, Julie Yates. 2004. "Building Power Among Low-Wage Immigrant Workers: Some Legal Considerations for Organizing Structures and Strategies." *N.Y.U. Review Law and Social Change* 397, 2003-2004.
- Roberts, Dorothy E. 2001. "Criminal Justice and Black Families: The Collateral Damage of Over-Enforcement." *Faculty Scholarship* 34:1005-1028.
- Rodriguez, Michelle Natividad and Maurice Emsellem. 2011. "65 Million 'Need Not Apply': The Case for Reforming Criminal Background Checks for Employment." *National Employment Law Project*. Retrieved December 1, 2015 ([http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/2015/03/65\\_Million\\_Need\\_Not\\_Apply.pdf](http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/2015/03/65_Million_Need_Not_Apply.pdf)).
- Rodriguez, Michelle Natividad and Nayantara Mehta. 2015. "Ban the Box U.S. Cities, Counties, and States Adopt Fair Hiring Policies to Reduce Barriers to Employment of People with Conviction Records." *National Employment Law Project*. Retrieved December 14, 2015 (<http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/Ban-the-Box-Fair-Chance-State-and-Local-Guide.pdf>).
- Roediger, David R. and Elizabeth D. Esch. 2012. *The Production of Difference: Race and the Management of Labor in U.S. History*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Safer Foundation. 2016a. "HB 5973 Passes Illinois House; Remove Barriers to Licensing in 3 Occupations." Retrieved September 26, 2016 (<http://www.saferfoundation.org/news-views/hb-5973-passes-illinois-house>).
- Safer Foundation. 2016b. "Adult Transition Centers." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.saferfoundation.org/services-programs/adult-transition-center>).

- Safer Foundation. 2016c. "Transitional Employment Program." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.saferfoundation.org/services-programs/transitional-employment-program>).
- Safer Foundation. 2016d. "Pivotal Staffing." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.saferfoundation.org/support-safer/pivotal-staffing>).
- Sassen, Saskia. 1996. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. NY: New Press.
- Schneider, Dorothee. 2011. *Crossing Borders: Migration and Citizenship in the Twentieth-Century United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, W. Richard, Martin Ruef, Peter J. Mendel, and Carol A. Caronna. 2000. *Institutional Change and Healthcare Organization: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Segal, Lewis M. and Daniel G. Sullivan. 1997. "The Growth of Temporary Services Work." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11(2):117-136.
- Samuels, Alana. August 4, 2016. "When Banning One Kind of Discrimination Results in Another." *The Atlantic*. Retrieved September 28, 2016 (<http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/08/consequences-of-ban-the-box/494435/>).
- Short, Dede, ed. 2016. *The Illinois Department of Corrections: Fiscal Year 2015 Annual Report*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Corrections Office of Constituent Services. Retrieved September 28, 2016 (<https://www.illinois.gov/idoc/reportsandstatistics/Documents/FY2015%20Annual%20Report.pdf>).

- Sklair, Leslie. 2001. *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Smith, Michael and Matt Bakker. 2008. *Citizenship Across Borders: The Political Transnationalism of El Migrante*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Smith, Rebecca and Claire McKenna. 2014. "Temped Out: How the Domestic Outsourcing of Blue-Collar Jobs Harms America's Workers." *National Employment Law Project*.
- Smith, Vicki. 1998. "The Fractured World of the Temporary Worker: Power, Participation, and Fragmentation in the Contemporary Workplace." *Social Problems* 45(4):411-430.
- Somers, Margaret. 2008. *Genealogies of Citizenship: Markets, Statelessness, and the Right to Have Rights*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Somers, Margaret and Christopher N.J. Roberts. 2008. "Toward a New Sociology of Rights: A Genealogy of 'Buried Bodies' of Citizenship and Human Rights." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 4:385-425.
- Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoglu. 1995. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Staffing Services Association of Illinois (SSAI). 2015. "Home." Retrieved May 7, 2015 (<http://www.ilssa.net/>).
- Stephen, Lynn. 2007. *Transborder Lives: Indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California and Oregon*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Stumpf, Juliet. 2006. "The 'Crimmigration Crisis': Immigrants, Crime and Sovereign Power." *American University Law Review* 56(2):367-419.
- Sullivan, Richard. 2010. "Organizing Workers in the Space between Unions: Union-Centric Labor Revitalization and the Role of Community-Based Organizations." *Critical Sociology* 36(6):793-819.

- Sullivan, Richard and Kimi Lee. 2008. "Organizing Immigrant Women in America's Sweatshops: Lessons from the Los Angeles Garment Worker Center." *Signs* 33(3):527-532.
- Tait, Vanessa. 2005. *Poor Workers' Unions: Rebuilding Labor from Below*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Téllez, Michelle. 2013. "Transfronteriza: Gender Rights at the Border and La Colectiva Feminista Binacional." Pp. 232-246 in *Immigrant Women Workers in the Neoliberal Age*, edited by N. Flores-González, A. Romina Guevarra, M. Toro-Morn, and G. Chang. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Theodore, Nik, Virginia Carlson, and Sean Fahey. 1995. *When the Job Doesn't Pay: Contingent Workers in the Chicago Metropolitan Area*. Chicago: Working Poor Project.
- Theodore, Nik and Nina Martin. 2007. "Migrant Civil Society: New Voices in the Struggle Over Community Development." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29(3):269-287.
- Theodore, Nik and Jamie Peck. 2002. "The Temporary Staffing Industry: Growth Imperatives and Limits to Contingency." *Economic Geography* 78(4):463-493.
- Theodore, Nik and Jamie Peck. 2014. "Selling Flexibility: Temporary Staffing in a Volatile Economy." Pp. 26-47 in *Temporary Work, Agencies and Unfree Labour: Insecurity in the New World of Work*, edited by J. Fudge and K. Strauss. NY: Routledge.
- Theodore, Nik, Abel Valenzuela Jr., and Edwin Meléndez. 2009. "Worker Centers: Defending Labor Standards for Migrant Worker Centers in the Informal Economy." *International Journal of Manpower* 30(5):422-436.
- Thomas-Breitfeld, Sean, Linda Burnham, Steven Pitts, Marc Bayard, and Algernon Austin. 2015.

- “#BlackWorkersMatter.” *Joint report from the Discount Foundation and the Neighborhood Funders Group*. Retrieved September 21, 2016  
([http://www.discountfoundation.org/sites/all/files/black\\_workers\\_matter.pdf](http://www.discountfoundation.org/sites/all/files/black_workers_matter.pdf)).
- Travis, Jeremy and Michelle Waul, eds. 2003. *Prisoners Once Removed: The Impact of Incarceration and Reentry on Children, Families, and Communities*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Tumlin, Karen C. and Wendy Zimmermann. 2003. “Immigrants and TANF: A Look at Immigrant Welfare Recipients in Three Cities.” Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Turner, Lowell and Richard W Hurd. 2001. “Building Social Movement Unionism: The Transformation of the American Labor Movement.” Pp. 9-26 in *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by L. Turner, H.C. Katz, and R. W. Hurd. Cornell, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Uetrict, Micah and Jasson Perez. November 30, 2012. “Democratic to the CORE: The Chicago Teachers Union’s secret to Success? The rank and file are in control.” *In these Times*. Retrieved September 21, 2016  
([http://inthesetimes.com/article/14207/democratic\\_to\\_the\\_core](http://inthesetimes.com/article/14207/democratic_to_the_core)).
- Uggen, Christopher, Jeff Manza, and Melissa Thompson. 2006. “Citizenship, Democracy, and the Civic Reintegration of Criminal Offenders.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 605:281-310.
- Uggen, Christopher and Suzy McElrath. 2014. “Parental Incarceration: What We Know and Where We Need to Go.” *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 104(3):597-604.
- U.S. Census Bureau. “2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.” Retrieved

September 21, 2016

(<http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF>).

United Worker Congress. 2014. "The Rise of Worker Centers and the Fight for a Fair Economy: How Dynamic New Worker Organizations Are Overcoming Corporate Attacks to Advance Wages for All." Briefing Paper #1. Retrieved October 1, 2015 ([http://www.unitedworkerscongress.org/uploads/2/4/6/6/24662736/uwc\\_rise\\_of\\_worker\\_centers-\\_sm.pdf](http://www.unitedworkerscongress.org/uploads/2/4/6/6/24662736/uwc_rise_of_worker_centers-_sm.pdf)).

UNITE HERE Local 1. March 16, 2015. "We're winning with Rahm!" Retrieved September 21, 2016 (<http://www.unitehere1.org/2015/03/why-is-rahm-emanuel-the-best-choice-for-our-union/>).

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. December 19, 2014. "ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations Report: Fiscal Year 2014." Retrieved June 25, 2015 (<https://www.ice.gov/doclib/about/offices/ero/pdf/2014-ice-immigration-removals.pdf>).

Vargas, Zaragosa. 2005. *Labor Rights are Civil Rights: Mexican American Workers in Twentieth-Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Von Bergen, C.W., & Bressler, Martin S. 2016. "'Ban the box' gives ex-offenders a fresh start in securing employment." *Labor Law Journal* 67(2):383-395.

Vosko, Leah F. 2000. *Temporary Work: The Gendered Rise of a Precarious Employment Relationship*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Vosko, Leah F. 2010. *Managing the margins: gender, citizenship and the international regulation of precarious employment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Voss, Kim and Rachel Sherman. 2000. "'Organize or Die': Labor's New Tactics and Immigrant Workers." Pp. 81-108 in *Organizing Immigrants: The Challenge for Unions in*

- Contemporary California*, edited by R. Milkman. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2001. "From Slavery to Mass Incarceration." *New Left Review* 13:41–60.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Waldinger, Roger. 1996. *Still the Promised City? New Immigrants and African-Americans in Post-Industrial New York*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, Hannah L. 2014. "Extending the Effects of the Carceral State: Proximal Contact, Political Participation, and Race." *Political Research Quarterly* 67(4):809–822.
- Waterman, Peter. 1993. "Social-Movement Unionism: A New Union Model for a New World Order?" *Review* 16(3):245–278.
- Wessler, Seth F. 2011. *Shattered Families: The Perilous Intersection of Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System*. Washington, D.C.: Applied Research Center.
- Western, Bruce. 2006. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. NY: Russell Sage.
- Western, Bruce. 2007. "The Prison Boom and the Decline of American Citizenship." *Society* 44(5):30–36.
- Western, Bruce and Christopher Wildeman. 2009. "The Black Family and Mass Incarceration." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 621:221–242.
- Zatz, Noah, Tia Koonse, Theresa Zhen, Lucero Herrera, Han Lu, Steven Shafer, and Blake Valenta. 2016. *Get to Work or Go to Jail: Workplace Rights Under Threat*. UCLA

Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, UCLA Labor Center, and A New Way of Life Reentry Project. Retrieved September 21, 2016

(<http://www.labor.ucla.edu/publication/get-to-work-or-go-to-jail/>).



## VITA

NAME: Jessica Dianne Cook

### EDUCATION:

2005 Junior Summer Institute - Public Policy and International Affairs (PPIA)  
Fellow, Princeton University

2006 B.A., Sociology, African Studies, Economics (minor), University of  
Kansas

2011 M.A., Sociology, University of Illinois at Chicago

2016 Ph.D., Sociology, University of Illinois at Chicago

### AWARDS:

2013, 2014 Chancellor's Graduate Research Fellowship, University of Illinois at  
Chicago

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE:

2016 - Present Director, DePaul University Labor Education Center, Chicago, IL

### RESEARCH EXPERIENCE:

March – Aug 2015 Graduate Research Assistant II (GRA), NORC at the University of  
Chicago

May 2013 – Jan 2015 Ethnographic and Interview Dissertation Research, University of Illinois  
at Chicago

Aug – Oct 2014 Invited research and writing collaborator, "Latina Portrait: Latinas and  
Economic Security," with Mujeres Latinas en Accion, Chicago, IL

Summers 2010, 2011 Research Assistant and Coordinator, Chicago Area Study, Department of  
Sociology, University of Illinois at Chicago

### TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

DePaul University Labor Education Center, Chicago, IL

#### *Instructor*

Fall 2016 Advanced Labor Leadership I – Collective Bargaining

Summer 2016 Regina V. Polk High School Summer Internship Program (Coordinator)

Spring 2016 Advanced Labor Leadership I – Skills for Organizing

National Louis University, Chicago, IL

#### *Adjunct Instructor*

Summer 2015 PPA 570 Methods 2: Qualitative Research Design and Methodology

University of Illinois at Chicago, Department of Sociology, Chicago, IL

#### *Graduate Student Instructor*

Fall 2015, Spr 2016 SOC 385: Introduction to Sociological Theory, writing instruction

Fall 2014, Spr 2015 SOC 244: Sociology of Work

Sum 2013, Fall 2013, Spr 2014, Sum 2014 SOC 385: Introduction to Sociological Theory

*Fall 2012, Spr 2013* SOC 105: Social Problems

*Teaching Assistant*

*Spr 2010, Sum 2012* SOC/LALS/AAST 225: Race and Ethnicity in the United States  
*Spr 2012* SOC 300: Introduction to Sociological Research Methods  
*Fall 2011* SOC 100: Introduction to Sociology (Head TA)  
*Spr 2011* SOC 501: Sociological Research Methods II (Graduate course)  
*Fall 2010* SOC 100: Introduction to Sociology (TA for three discussion sections)  
*Fall 2009* SOC/GWS 224: Gender and Society

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico (UNAM-USA), Extension School, Chicago, IL  
*English Department Instructor*

*Summer 2013* Advanced Level Writing and Grammar  
*Summer 2012* Intermediate Level Reading

Latino Union, Chicago, IL

*Instructor*

*Feb 2009 – Apr 2009* English as a Second Language (ESL)

Mexico Solidarity Network, Chicago, IL

*Instructor*

*Jan 2009 – Apr 2009* English as a Second Language (ESL)

ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS:

International Journal of Comparative Sociology (IJCS) 54(1):76-77.

*Spr 2013* Book Reviewer for: Schneider, Dorothee. 2011. *Crossing Borders: Migration and Citizenship in the Twentieth-Century United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ACADEMIC RELATED SERVICE AND MEMBERSHIP:

Labor Research and Action Network (LRAN)

*Fall 2015-June 2016* Co-Organizer of June 2016 national conference in Chicago  
*Sept 2014 - present* Academic Representative (elected), LRAN Advisory Committee  
*Apr 2013 – present* Co-Founder and organizer of LRAN Chicago chapter  
*2013 –2016* Graduate Student Member, LRAN Conference Planning Committee  
*2012 –2014* Graduate Student Member, LRAN New Scholars Working Group

United Association for Labor Education (UALE)

*Aug 2016- present* Member on behalf of the DePaul Labor Education Center  
*Feb – July 2015* Planning and Curriculum Committee for the Midwest School for Women Workers (MSWW)

Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP)

*Aug 2015 - present* Member and session organizer for the Labor Studies Division  
*Jan 2014-present* Graduate Student Member  
*Jan 2014-Dec 2015* Member of Student Advisory Board for *Social Problems* journal

- 2012 - Present* Graduate Student member, American Sociological Association (ASA)
- Fall 2012-Sum 2016* Undergraduate Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois at Chicago
- 2011 – 2013* Graduate Student Member, Midwest Sociological Society (MSS)
- Fall 2011- Spr 2012* Planning Committee Member and Head of the Speaker and Discussant Committee for the 14<sup>th</sup> Chicago Ethnography Conference, Apr 14, 2012

#### LABOR ORGANIZING EXPERIENCE:

UIC Graduate Employees Organization (GEO), IFT-AFT Local 6297, Chicago, IL

- 2009 –2016* Member Activist and Sociology Department Steward
- 2015 –2016* Outreach Committee Member
- 2012- 2015* Outreach Chair on Steering Committee
- 2009 –2011* Organizing Chair on Steering Committee

UNITE HERE, Nationwide and based out of NY, NY

- 2006 – 2009* Union Organizer