
Discounting Rights

Wal-Mart's Violation of US Workers' Right to Freedom of Association

The right of workers to organize is well established under international human rights law. As a member of the International Labour Organization (ILO) and party to several important international instruments, the United States is legally bound to protect this fundamental right. In practice, it falls short.

Under international law, employers cannot mount aggressive and coercive anti-union campaigns that interfere with worker organizing or retaliate against workers for supporting a union. International law requires countries to outlaw such conduct, sanction violators with meaningful and dissuasive penalties, and enforce the prohibitions. US labor laws and practice do not meet international norms. US laws permit myriad employer tactics that interfere with worker organizing and provide penalties so weak that they fail to adequately deter employers from breaking the laws. And Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (Wal-Mart), takes full advantage.

Wal-Mart is a case study in what is wrong with US labor laws. Wal-Mart is the largest company in the world with roughly \$351.14 billion in revenue and \$11.3 billion in profits in the fiscal year ending January 2007. It is the largest private employer in the United States with over 1.3 million US workers and close to 4,000 stores nationwide. None of those workers is in a union. This is no accident. Wal-Mart employs a sophisticated and multifaceted strategy to prevent union activity at its US stores and, when that strategy fails, quashes organizing wherever it starts.

As an influential market leader, Wal-Mart's conduct is especially troubling. By definition, Wal-Mart's treatment of its own workers has a significant impact in the United States and beyond.

Our research shows that Wal-Mart aggressively interferes with workers' right to organize. We believe that this should be cause for concern regardless of one's views on the ongoing debate over whether Wal-Mart is good for local communities and, more generally, for the United States as a whole.

Wal-Mart is not alone among US companies in its efforts to combat union formation following the incentives set out in unbalanced US labor laws that tilt the playing field decidedly in favor of anti-union agitation. It is also not alone in violating weak US labor laws and taking advantage of ineffective labor law enforcement. Wal-Mart stands out, however, for the sheer magnitude and aggressiveness of its anti-union apparatus and actions.

Wal-Mart has devised a comprehensive battery of sophisticated corporate institutions and practices aimed at frustrating union organizing activity. It pursues its anti-union agenda relentlessly, often from the day a new worker is hired. The company employs myriad tactics, including some deemed illegal by US labor law authorities, that chip away at—and sometimes devastate—workers’ right to organize.

Methodology

Many people think of workers' organizing, collective bargaining, and strikes solely as union-versus-management disputes that do not raise human rights concerns. Human Rights Watch approaches workers' choice to use these tools, however, as the exercise of basic rights and the decision of individual, autonomous actors, quite apart from unions' or employers' institutional interests.

In this spirit, between 2004 and early 2007, Human Rights Watch interviewed forty-one current and former Wal-Mart workers and managers, met with labor lawyers and union organizers, analyzed cases against Wal-Mart charging the company with violating US labor and employment laws, and reviewed countless publications addressing working conditions at the company. The forty-one current and former Wal-Mart workers and managers with whom Human Rights Watch spoke were all employed at Wal-Mart facilities during or after union organizing campaigns. Although they constitute only a small fraction of Wal-Mart’s total US workforce, they represent those who have experienced first hand the company’s aggressive strategy to defeat worker organizing. Some supported the union; some were opposed; and others were ambivalent. Each, however, had important insights and perspectives to share regarding working conditions at Wal-Mart stores and the company’s response to workers’ attempts to exercise their right to freedom of association.

Human Rights Watch also contacted Wal-Mart three times in writing to obtain the company’s views on the issues that we examine in this report and to request meetings with the company to hear its perspective directly. Wal-Mart repeatedly refused to meet with us and provided only very limited responses in writing and over the phone.

How Wal-Mart Prevents Union Organizing

Wal-Mart uses a wide range of anti-union tactics to violate its US workers’ right to freedom of association recognized under international law.

Tactics Comporting with US Law

With anti-union tactics that largely comply with US law, Wal-Mart often begins creating a hostile environment for labor organizing from the moment workers and managers are hired. The company uses training sessions, videos, and other means to indoctrinate its employees with the idea that unions are bad for them and bad for the company. Wal-Mart gives managers explicit instructions on how to prevent union formation, many of which are

contained in the company's "Manager's Toolbox," a self-described guide to managers on "how to remain union free in the event union organizers choose your facility as their next target."

Store managers are required to call Wal-Mart's Union Hotline when workers ignore the company's warnings and attempt to organize. Through the hotline, managers report the activity to company headquarters and receive guidance from labor relations specialists and lawyers on how to defeat organizing efforts. Each call is summarized and entered into a centralized database commonly called the "Remedy System," which enables Wal-Mart to track union activity at stores across the country.

We found that Wal-Mart generally responds within a few days to worker organizing by dispatching from headquarters members of its Labor Relations Team, a quickly deployable, specialized team that tries to squash the nascent organizing effort. Labor Relations Team members and store managers hold small- and large-group meetings that workers are strongly urged to attend and at which workers are warned of the negative consequences of union formation. Due to Wal-Mart's tactics, union supporters and organizers are denied a meaningful opportunity to address workers' fears. In most cases, workers and managers hear only Wal-Mart's side of the story, made more powerful by the inherent imbalance of the employment relationship.

For example, Wal-Mart has told workers that:

- When employee wages and benefits are subject to collective bargaining, workers could very easily lose a lot;
- Union dues and other union fees are prohibitively expensive;
- With the company's Open Door Policy, workers already have the ability to make their concerns known to the highest levels of management and, therefore, do not need to pay a "third-party" to speak for them; and
- Wal-Mart will permanently replace workers who strike in support of economic demands, such as higher wages and benefits, a practice that is legal in the United States but contravenes international standards.

Videos dramatize the anti-union message by showing an example of a picket line that turns violent, characterizing unions as antiquated organizations, and portraying union organizers as aggressive and harassing people who want revenge against their employers.

The cumulative effect of these tactics is to create a climate of fear and intimidation at Wal-Mart's US stores. We found that many workers fear retaliation, even firing, if they express or even listen to pro-union views when union drives are underway. Largely denied the internationally recognized right to receive messages contrary to Wal-Mart's relentless, well-honed, negative characterization of unions, many workers also fear dire consequences if they vote for union representation.

According to Angela Steinbrecher, a worker and member of the organizing committee at the Greeley, Colorado, Wal-Mart, where the company defeated organizing efforts through tactics comporting with US law, “There is a lot of fear among the associates. . . . [They] fear they will lose their jobs. It’s not said. No one comes out and says if you vote union, you’re going to be fired, but that’s the fear everyone has.”

Tactics Running Afoul of US Law

Wal-Mart also has used an arsenal of tactics that violate US law and workers’ internationally protected right to freedom of association. According to Human Rights Watch research and National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) decisions, the tactics range from restricting the dissemination and discussion of pro-union views to firing key union supporters, in extreme cases.

Even adjusted for its size, Wal-Mart stands out for the number of its US labor law violations. In cases filed between January 2000 and July 2005 with the NLRB, charged with enforcing US labor law, fifteen rulings that Wal-Mart broke the law are still standing and have not been overruled; only four such rulings are still standing against Albertsons, Costco, Kmart, Kroger, Home Depot, Sears, and Target combined. As of early 2006, the total revenue of these seven companies combined was 7 percent greater than Wal-Mart’s and the total workforce roughly 26 percent greater. Although the disparity between Wal-Mart’s record before US labor law authorities in the early 2000s and that of its competitors is attributable in part to the disproportionate efforts of Wal-Mart workers to organize during that period, it is also attributable to Wal-Mart’s aggressive anti-union tactics implemented in response.

Defeating Union Organizing in Aiken, South Carolina

Aiken, South Carolina, Wal-Mart workers told Human Rights Watch that they believe that the 2001 union campaign at their store failed due to the climate of fear and intimidation generated by the company’s hard-hitting response, which an NLRB judge found to include four US labor law violations. “Chris Davis” (a pseudonym), a worker at the store speaking on condition of anonymity, explained:

I think the union failed because a lot of them were scared to come forward, scared for their jobs. That’s exactly the reason I didn’t sign up. . . . I never went to any union meetings. I was scared to. . . . Some of the girls, other associates, would say that if Wal-Mart would get wind of [my involvement with] the union, I’d be fired.

Discriminatory Limits on Access to Pro-Union Information

Both NLRB rulings and our investigation have found that Wal-Mart has selectively enforced company policies with the effect of limiting access to information about the benefits of union formation. Wal-Mart has banned union representatives from handbilling outside its stores and even called the police to enforce the ban, while allowing representatives of non-

union organizations access. The company has confiscated union literature that found its way into workers' hands or onto break room tables and prohibited employees from distributing union flyers, while permitting non-union information. Wal-Mart managers have prohibited discussions of the union and even talking with co-workers about wages and working conditions, while allowing conversation on non-union issues.

Threats of Dire Consequences If Workers Organize

Wal-Mart has threatened workers with serious consequences if they form a union, including loss of benefits, such as raises.

Illegal Anti-Union Threats in Employee Benefits Books

When Wal-Mart's 2000 and 2001 employee benefits books stated that "[c]ontractually excluded and certain other union represented associates are not eligible for coverage," a US labor law judge found:

What else could this clause have been intended to do, but to threaten employees, who were naturally unsophisticated in the nuances of labor relations, with a loss of benefits for exercising their . . . rights? . . . I am convinced that [Wal-Mart] intentionally selected the specific language it did to ensure, to the extent it could, that its employees were fearful of losing their benefits, and, thus, continued to reject union representation.

Addressing Worker Concerns to Undermine Union Activity

In the midst of organizing drives, Wal-Mart has suddenly addressed complaints that it had previously ignored and made workplace improvements to undermine union drives. While improving conditions is obviously desirable, US law prohibits employers from doing so to send an anti-union message. The danger is that such a response to organizing will carry the implicit message that if a union forms against the employer's wishes, the employer will retaliate by taking away what it has just granted and by making those or similar benefits harder to obtain in the future. Joshua Streckeisen, a former New Castle, Pennsylvania, Wal-Mart worker, commented, "They thought that if we were happy, we'd drop . . . the union. They think they'll make the problems go away."

"Unit Packing" and Worker Transfers to Dilute Union Support

To further stifle union formation at its stores, Wal-Mart has manipulated store staffing to stack proposed bargaining units against the union. In one case we researched, the NLRB found that the company illegally transferred union supporters out and shifted union opponents in, a practice known as "unit packing." The staff changes erect yet another obstacle to union formation by diluting union support, on the one hand, and denying pro-union workers the opportunity to vote in a union election, on the other. US labor law authorities held that at Wal-Mart's New Castle, Pennsylvania, store, a member of the company's Labor Relations Team ordered store managers to identify two workers in their

areas who “stood behind [Wal-Mart] 100 percent and try and persuade those employees to transfer to the TLE [Tire and Lube Express] because [Wal-Mart] did not want the Union there.” The authorities found that the managers illegally did just as they were told.

Surveilling and Spying on Union Activity

Wal-Mart has used illegal techniques to gather information about union activity while pressuring workers to stop organizing. The company has coercively interrogated workers about their and their co-workers’ union sympathies through direct and hostile questioning and sent managers to eavesdrop on discussions among employees in a proposed bargaining unit. Former workers and managers from Wal-Mart’s Kingman, Arizona, store told Human Rights Watch that Wal-Mart has also monitored union activity by focusing security cameras on areas where union organizing is heaviest, though the NLRB never addressed these allegations in the case.

Anti-Union Firing and Disciplining

Wal-Mart has also selectively enforced company policies against pro-union workers, while overlooking policy infractions by anti-union workers. When Wal-Mart has failed to find such policy violations, it has, at times, invented them as a pretext to rid a store of key union sympathizers, as in the case of Brad Jones, a union leader with an excellent performance record at Wal-Mart’s Kingman, Arizona, store. When managers and loss prevention specialists surveilling Jones were unable to find legitimate grounds for his termination, the company fired him on a pretext so unbelievable that labor law authorities ruled that Jones’ firing was illegally based on a “transparent pretext” and could only have been motivated by anti-union animus.

Union Activity Surveillance and Retaliation against Union Supporters

Terry Daly, a former loss prevention worker at the Kingman, Arizona, Wal-Mart, charged with preventing shoplifting, explained to Human Rights Watch that during the organizing drive at his store:

In loss prevention, we were to monitor any activity that we thought might be organized . . . and place cameras in certain areas. I was told with the cameras that we had to make shots more available, reposition them to monitor a better area so we could see any activity going on that might be unusual.

He added that, in particular, they were supposed to focus on union leader Brad Jones. “[We were to] monitor cameras and report back what we saw. We needed to find a reason to fire Brad.” Daly added that, in addition, “My direct boss basically told us if we hear anyone with involvement with union activity, get their names, find out who they are, and get them out of there—anything you can find.”

Refusal to Bargain Collectively

Wal-Mart has been so successful at derailing worker attempts to form unions that Human Rights Watch has only uncovered one case since Wal-Mart's inception in 1962 in which workers at a US store have organized. Meat cutters at the Jacksonville, Texas, Wal-Mart formed a union in February 2000. According to the NLRB, Wal-Mart responded by illegally refusing to engage in collective bargaining with the union and illegally withholding information the union needed to bargain effectively. Wal-Mart subsequently closed the meat cutting department. Although US labor authorities ruled that the closure was legal, it had the effect of dispersing the workers throughout the store and destroying the union.

Norwegian Government Fund Divests from Wal-Mart

In November 2005, the Council on Ethics for the Norwegian Government's multibillion dollar Pension Fund-Global, which includes all state petroleum revenues plus the return on the fund's investments, recommended divestment from Wal-Mart to avoid an "unacceptable risk" of complicity in serious human rights violations. The council noted:

[W]hat makes this case special is the total sum of violations of standards, both in the company's own business operations and in the supply chain. . . . Since Wal-Mart is such a large company, this practice has consequences for a very large number of people.

In June 2006, Norway adopted the council's recommendation, based in part on alleged workers' rights violations in Wal-Mart stores and throughout the company's supply chain, including "measures to actively obstruct unionization" at its US operations.

Weak US Labor Laws

US labor laws do not come close to meeting international standards. They allow a wide range of employer conduct that violates workers' right to organize and fail to include "sufficiently dissuasive sanctions against acts of interference by employers against workers and workers' organizations," as required by international law.

- In violation of international standards, employers can require worker attendance at anti-union captive audience meetings on work time without allowing workers similar access to information supporting organizing efforts. Employers can even bar employees from receiving information from union representatives anywhere on company property, even in publicly accessible areas like parking lots.
- Employers can reject workers' demand for union recognition based on "card check"—union authorization cards signed by the majority of workers in the proposed bargaining unit—and, instead, force an NLRB election. Employers such as Wal-Mart use the period leading up to elections to focus their hard-hitting anti-union campaigns, while disallowing opportunities for opposing views. The result is a workplace climate so acrimonious and coercive that workers are effectively denied the right to freely choose whether to organize.

- In violation of international standards, employers can permanently replace workers on economic strikes and can use this legal tactic offensively during organizing campaigns and worker trainings to intimidate workers into rejecting union formation.
- In violation of international standards, employers that break US labor law face only nominal economic consequences because US law does not provide for fines or punitive sanctions.
- In violation of international standards, which require that “within the context of the application of [US labor law], workers and employers . . . be treated on a fully equal basis,” the NLRB *is required* to petition for an injunction when a case presents evidence of serious illegal union conduct but *is not required* to do so when the evidence concerns serious employer misconduct. And in practice, the agency rarely requests an injunction to stop employer violations.

“Pat Quinn” (a pseudonym), an Aiken, South Carolina, Wal-Mart worker speaking to Human Rights Watch on condition of anonymity, experienced US labor law and practice first hand and expressed frustration:

When we went to court, we felt like we put a lot on the line—our jobs, our reputations, everything on the line—people don’t like that kind of stuff, but all you’re doing is trying to stick up for yourself. And I felt like they [Wal-Mart] just got a slap on the wrist. . . . I feel like the system failed us.

Endemic delays in enforcement further undermine the efficacy of weak US labor laws. According to the fiscal year 2005 NLRB annual report, the median number of days that an unfair labor practice charge is pending before a regional NLRB office issues a complaint is ninety-five, roughly three months; between the filing of the charge and an NLRB administrative law judge decision, 348, almost a year; and between the filing of the charge and a Board decision, 1,232, almost three-and-a-half years. That decision can be appealed to a US circuit court of appeals and, ultimately, the US Supreme Court, causing additional years of delay.

Under these conditions, in which employers face minimal consequences for violating US labor law; in which workers hear almost exclusively anti-union views, underscored by the inherent power imbalance of the employment relationship; and in which fears of permanent replacement if workers exercise their right to strike are real and overwhelming, union elections are not free and fair. Workers do not have the right to decide for themselves, without coercion, whether to organize.

An important step forward is the Employee Free Choice Act, passed by the US House of Representatives on March 1, 2007, and pending in the US Senate. If enacted, it would increase penalties for US labor law violation and go a long way towards remedying other legal shortcomings that facilitate violation of US workers’ right to freedom of association.

Working Conditions at Wal-Mart

Denied the right to freedom of association, Wal-Mart workers are deprived of a tool that international law recognizes as an important means for addressing their multitude of workplace concerns.

In civil lawsuits across the country, Wal-Mart workers have charged the company with violating US wage and hour and employment discrimination laws. Wal-Mart denies any unlawful activity.

- **Wage and Hour Violations:** Fifty-seven class action lawsuits filed since 2000 complain that Wal-Mart broke wage and hour laws by forcing workers to work “off the clock,” failing to pay them overtime, and denying them meals and rest breaks. In the three cases that have gone to jury trials since 2000, juries have ruled against the company.
- **Sex Discrimination:** The largest class action employment discrimination lawsuit in US history, with a class of roughly 1.5 million women, claims the company intentionally discriminated against its female workers in promotions, pay, job assignments, and training. The US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit upheld class certification. Wal-Mart plans to appeal.
- **Disability Discrimination:** By the end of June 2001, the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission had filed sixteen suits against Wal-Mart for discriminating against disabled workers and job applicants, the most against any company since US anti-disability discrimination laws went into effect in 1992. By September 2005, the number had risen to nineteen. Three of the cases ended with verdicts against the company; one case was dismissed; fourteen were resolved through court-sanctioned consent decrees; and one is still pending.

Wal-Mart workers also described to Human Rights Watch their personal frustrations with their working conditions, including perceived job insecurity for long-term workers, low wages, and high healthcare costs.

- **Eliminating Long-Term Workers:** Evidence from several sources suggests that Wal-Mart may have adopted a strategy of eliminating long-time employees, both young and old, whose wages are higher than recently hired workers, in order to reduce payroll costs. A fall 2005 internal memo to the company’s board of directors states that “[g]rowth in benefits costs is unacceptable . . . and driven by fundamental and persistent root causes (e.g., aging workforce, increasing average tenure).” The memo notes, “Given the impact of tenure on wages and benefits, the cost of an Associate with 7 years of tenure is almost 55 percent more than the cost of an Associate with 1 year of tenure, yet there is no difference in his or her productivity.” Wal-Mart denies targeting long-term workers for elimination.

- **Low Wages:** Current and former Wal-Mart workers recounted to Human Rights Watch the difficulties of living on their Wal-Mart earnings. Specific, reliable, and comprehensive information on Wal-Mart workers' wages is unavailable, however. According to the company, as of early 2007, the "average, full-time hourly wage is \$10.51." But this average includes the comparatively higher wages of hourly managers and excludes the comparatively lower wages of part-time workers, who constitute roughly 25 percent of Wal-Mart's hourly workforce. As a result, the average hourly wage for Wal-Mart's non-managerial workers is likely well below \$10.51. It is also likely well below industry-wide averages, according to US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) figures, which *include* part-time workers' and *exclude* supervisors' wages. Even though comparison between Wal-Mart's published average wage and BLS data is likely skewed in favor of Wal-Mart, the company's average, full-time hourly wage still appears slightly below industry-wide averages. Comparing BLS data through October 2006—the most recent relevant BLS figures publicly available—with Wal-Mart's 2006 reported average hourly wage of \$10.11 reveals that Wal-Mart's average was less than the \$10.24 average at discount department stores, the \$10.55 average at warehouse clubs and supercenters, and the \$11.12 average at supermarkets and other grocery stores nationwide.
- **High Employee Healthcare Costs:** Workers complained to Human Rights Watch that they are unable to afford company-sponsored healthcare, though Wal-Mart claims to offer "affordable health benefits." Because the company's plans focus on catastrophic coverage, insured workers are still required to shoulder a significant portion of their every-day preventive care costs. As of the fall of 2006, roughly 62 percent of eligible workers chose to sign up, a "take-up rate" well below the national retail industry average of 75 percent. Wal-Mart's healthcare spending also falls far below industry-wide averages. In 2005, Wal-Mart paid roughly 64 percent of employees' premiums and spent an average of, at most, \$3,620 per covered worker for all company benefits plans combined, including health, dental, and life insurance and long-term disability, temporary disability, and death benefits. In contrast, in 2002, US retailers spent an average of \$4,834 per covered employee on health benefits alone and in 2005, paid an average of 77 percent of healthcare premiums for single health coverage and 70 percent for family coverage.

A Worker's Struggle with Low Wages and High Healthcare Costs

"Rebecca Stewart" (a pseudonym), a full-time worker in her twenties at the Aiken, South Carolina, Wal-Mart speaking to Human Rights Watch on condition of anonymity, explained, "It's just hard to get by, I tell you." Stewart has two children and works two jobs because, she says, "I barely bring home \$425 for two weeks at Wal-Mart." In June 2005, Stewart told Human Rights Watch that she made \$7.67 an hour. She listed her monthly expenses for Human Rights Watch, excluding food, other groceries, clothing, and incidentals, and they totaled \$1,160—over \$300 more than her monthly Wal-Mart salary. Stewart added that although she has Wal-Mart's health insurance, her partner is uninsured and her children are on Medicaid. She explained, "Right now, with the amount I make, I really couldn't afford to have much more taken out."

Recommendations

Wal-Mart asserts that “respect for the individual is one of the core values that have made us into the company we are today.” Wal-Mart’s violation of workers’ right to organize flies in the face of this professed core value. Wal-Mart should dramatically alter its approach to freedom of association and make respect for this fundamental right a component of its recently launched “transformation”—called “Wal-Mart Out in Front”—one of the five pillars of which is “Becoming an Even Better Place to Work.” Weak US labor laws must also be reformed to remove the shortcomings that, in part, account for Wal-Mart’s coercive anti-union behavior and to deter other employers from emulating Wal-Mart’s approach to workers’ right to organize.

To the US Government

- Ratify ILO Convention 87 concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise and ILO Convention 98 concerning the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining.

To the US Congress

- Pass the Employee Free Choice Act to:
 - Help restore the democratic union selection process by requiring employers to recognize unions based on card check, with adequate safeguards to ensure the cards were freely signed;
 - Increase penalties for violating US labor laws; and
 - *Require* the NLRB to seek a federal court injunction against an employer charged with illegal anti-union activity that “significantly interferes with, restrains, or coerces employees” in exercising their right to organize.
- Ban employers from hiring permanent replacements during all labor strikes.
- Guarantee workers the right to hear and receive information about the benefits, not just the risks, of union formation by requiring employers to:
 - Apply a principle of proportional access when they hold anti-union captive audience meetings by allowing workers to hear information from union representatives under similar conditions;
 - Allow union organizers and advocates to meet with and provide information to workers in non-work areas during non-work time.

To the National Labor Relations Board

- Seek federal court injunctions more frequently in response to serious allegations of illegal employer conduct, particularly with repeat offenders such as Wal-Mart that systematically try to keep unions out of their US stores and undermine workers’ right to organize.

- Establish a national task force on Wal-Mart to address the company's pattern of behavior nationwide.

To Wal-Mart

- Immediately cease all tactics, whether allowed under US law or not, that undercut workers' freedom of association.
- Go beyond US and international law requirements to become an industry leader on workers' rights by pledging neutrality on union formation. If Wal-Mart truly wants to be "out in front" and become a better place to work, as its public relations materials proclaim, it should respect individual workers' rights by dropping hard-hitting tactics against worker organizing.
- Accept worker demands for union recognition based on card check upon a showing that the majority of workers in an appropriate bargaining unit signed cards freely.
- Grant outside union organizers access to stores' non-work areas to present their views to workers during specified hours during non-work time.
- Commit to using only temporary replacement workers to continue operations during an economic strike and convey that commitment to workers through company-wide communications channels.

To download free of charge the full text of *Discounting Rights: Wal-Mart's Violation of US Workers' Right to Freedom of Association*, please visit Human Rights Watch's website at:

<http://hrw.org/reports/2007/us0507/>.

On the website, you can also view additional materials on this issue, including photos and audio clips of former Wal-Mart workers.