

Click to prove
you're human



I am writing a research paper on how the amount of hours put in by an architect affects the customer's perceived quality of service. Would "manpower input" be the correct term to describe the amount of hours spent on a project or "human resource allocation" or "manpower allocation"? Most of the literature I've come across so far uses "manpower allocation," but I had thought that "manpower" would no longer be politically correct to use. If anyone has a good suggestion for a term to use, I'd really appreciate it. Thanks, Flute Canada's largest staffing company is called Manpower Canada, so obviously they don't think it's bad for business. Never forget that somewhere out there, there is a complete nutter who is waiting to be offended by something, anything. This nut-job is only happy when pointing out the PC faults of others. Thanks for your reply. Yes, I see "manpower" used quite often but I was just not sure if what used to be okay to use but may have changed recently. I think manpower allocation or manpower input is acceptable..... although it makes me think the entire firm or more than one person is working on the job. For a single architect working alone on the job.....?? I agree with Brioche. The word is neutral, yet there are those who will take offense at almost anything. Here is another, somewhat unrelated thought. I once worked for a management consulting firm. Our invoices to clients used the term billable hours, or professional staff time for the consultants' manhours. Other administrative time was billed as support staff time. That is less direct, less clear, and less precise than man hours or manpower, but it might give the PC police less to gripe about. Sorry to revive this old thread. It's been quite a long time, so maybe things have changed. At my company we were doing an engineering schedule. Each task/document had a number of hours (manpower) required, and resources (people) allocated to it. When the schedule was distributed one comment (from a Spaniard) was: 'Shouldn't we change the word 'manpower' to 'personpower'? Since we are issuing documents in English for foreign parties (we are a Spanish company) it is quite important to be politically correct. However, the proposed 'person power' sounds to me like a word invented by a non English speaking person. So I basically have two questions: - Is 'person power' (or personpower) acceptable? (I would say no, there are no hits in WR) - If not, is 'manpower' still acceptable, or do we have to look for a roundabout, such as the proposed 'professional staff time'? - Is 'person power' (or personpower) acceptable? (I would say no, there are no hits in WR) - If not, is 'manpower' still acceptable, or do we have to look for a roundabout, such as the proposed 'professional staff time'? It is fine in every context I can imagine. However, I would be wary of using "man-hours" as a unit of measure. Where I work, the people in question are operators, so I tend to use operator-hours (or operator-minutes, since minutes are what our jobs are timed in), but "person-hours" is fine. I only mention this here as it was mentioned in post #5. This phrase is said to describe 60's poet, political activist, manager... John Sinclair. Any idea of what "power poetry" means and how it could be translated? Is it a specific type of poetry? "He was a magnificent specimen of power poetry." "Era un magnifico espécimen de xxx". Thanks in advance This phrase is said to describe 60's poet, political activist, manager... John Sinclair. Any idea of what "power poetry" means and how it could be translated? Is it a specific type of poetry? "He was a magnificent specimen of power poetry." "Era un magnifico espécimen de xxx". Thanks in advance Where does your sentence come from? Do you have the source? "He was a magnificent specimen of power poetry"? He may have been a poet about themes of power or a powerful poet but he, in and of himself, is not a "specimen of poetry" in any usual sense. If you are certain that the words are accurate, then the translation should be literal so it can sound just as bizarre in Spanish as it does in English. There is no genre of poetry called power poetry. "He was a magnificent specimen of power poetry"? He may have been a poet about themes of power or a powerful poet but he, in and of himself, is not a "specimen of poetry" in any usual sense. If you are certain that the words are accurate, then the translation should be literal so it can sound just as bizarre in Spanish as it does in English. There is no genre of poetry called power poetry. Thanks, that makes sense. Yes, it's quite an unusual expression. If I refer to the authorization a person gives to his lawyer to begin a civil case, I must use proxy or power of attorney? thank you I'm not sure that either of these terms is appropriate, but more importantly, the correct choice will depend on the jurisdiction (you have in mind). It's an Italian jurisdiction, a common tribunal. It's a normal procuration to a lawyer for a suit. I think you usually simply instruct your lawyer to begin a case. If you give the lawyer (or anyone else) power to sign documents on your behalf, that is a power of attorney. A proxy is authorisation only to vote. The same word 'proxy' is used for the relationship (you have in mind). It's an Italian jurisdiction, a common tribunal. It's a normal procuration to a lawyer for a suit. I think you usually simply instruct your lawyer to begin a case. If you give the lawyer (or anyone else) power to sign documents on your behalf, that is a power of attorney. A proxy is authorisation only agency (agency tends to be more permanent than a PoA). The advice that a client instructs counsel is correct, but overlooks the fact that a lawyer who says he is representing a party is not sufficient in the eyes of many judicial authorities, who require to have proof of the appointment before they will "grant counsel hearing". Otherwise, failing due documentation being produced, the court will decline to enter appearance for the party and - sometimes confusingly for the slow of wit, who will then repeat what they just said, but louder - the court will declare that it is "unable to hear counsel". It's an Italian jurisdiction, a common tribunal. It's a normal procuration to a lawyer for a suit. It's an Italian forum. A forum is any body appointed to adjudicate disputes. It could be a court, or a tribunal. Forum is a catch-all, which includes under a single term ordinary courts, special purpose courts, courts of appeal and cassation, arbitral tribunals as well as employment, social security and tax tribunals, the ICC and Special Courts, say, like that which was set up for the war in Yugoslavia or the Rwandan Genocide, or Nuremberg after WWII. Tribunale, in Italian, would generally translate as court. The "common" courts are usually referred to as "ordinary courts". Jurisdiction is the remit that falls to a particular court or tribunal: it may be geographical or subject-matter based, or both. Both are generally called jurisdiction in English. Care should be exercised in using the word "competence". A forum may have jurisdiction (it would be useless if it didn't) but only if the case brought before it meets the criteria for consideration by that forum is it competent to hear the cause. A court's competence therefore is dependent on the particular facts of a given case; its jurisdiction is a matter of its constitution.