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INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Service workers who are paid in tips instead of hourly wages experience a special type of occupational uncertainty. It stems from the lack of contract securing their wages. When wages are not specified and the intentions of the customer are not known, the outcome of the service exchange is uncertain.

The terms of exchange between service worker and customer are not specified. The service worker must offer service to the customer without a specific promise of payment. The performance of this service may be conceptualized as an act of credit extension since the customer posts no collateral. The outcome of the act of credit extension is uncertain as there is no contract to ensure the claims of the creditor.

The service worker's uncertainty produced by unspecified wages and unknown customer intentions is best described as occupational vulnerability. According to Klatsky and Teitler, the concept of vulnerability refers to a perception of uncertainty that accompanies a trust situation (1973). They describe the perception of
uncertainty as a questioning of the ability and the intentions of another individual to harm or violate one's interests (1973). In this study the concept of vulnerability will be applied to the service work setting. Serving as the dependent variable, it will be conceptualized as the service worker's attitude toward the act of credit extension when the outcome of this service exchange is uncertain.

A Critique of the Variable Relationships

Fourteen different independent variables have been selected for use in the analysis of the vulnerability work attitude. They are generated from two alternative models (specification, structural), which are hypothesized to account for vulnerability variation. Nine of the fourteen independent variables are generated by the specification model. The rationale underlying this model provides that vulnerability is a product of the unspecified terms of exchange attendant between service worker and customer. When the terms of exchange are unspecified the service worker must engage in the act of extending credit to the customer. The specification model predicts that the vulnerability associated with the outcome of this act will vary along several dimensions of time. The time dimension is hypothesized to facilitate the specification of exchange terms. It serves as the model mechanism, since time variation
controls variation in the vulnerability work attitude (Willar, 1967). Nine different variables represent the properties of the time dimension. The amount of time in interaction with the customer, the number of years spent in the service occupation, and the number of hours worked per week are just three of the nine specification variables.

These nine items are further consolidated into three blocks of variables. Each of these blocks measures a dimension of the time mechanism. The interaction block provides an estimate of the length of time in interaction with a certain number of familiar or unfamiliar customers. As each of these items varies so vulnerability is hypothesized to vary.

The second block generated by the specification model is the trade evaluation block. It estimates the effect that the number of hours worked per week has on the vulnerability attitude. A related property of time, the effect of weekday trade, will also be evaluated. The final block in the specification model provides for consideration of the effect of occupational history on the dependent variable. The total number of years in the occupation and the last occupation held each reflect a dimension of the specification process. According to the rationale of the specification model, during the act of credit extension vulnerability, or the uncertainty produced by unspecified exchange outcomes,
will vary according to the length of the exchange episode, the number of years working in the service job, and the number of hours worked per week.

The **structural model** is the alternative explanation for the vulnerability work attitude. It consists of only five variables contained in two blocks. The rationale supporting the structural model provides that vulnerability is a product of the uncertainty that accompanies the unspecified outcomes of a service exchange. It is hypothesized that the employing organization that extends credit to its service worker fosters or encourages a similar orientation in its workers. Thus the structural model predicts that the orientation of the employing organization towards its service employees has a greater effect on vulnerability variation than does the time dimension reflected in the specification model. The mechanism which activates this model is a variant of the reciprocity principle (Levi-Strauss, 1957; Gouldner, 1960; Ekeh, 1974). It contends that those organizations which extend credit to their employees have credit extended to their customers in return, while by contrast, the organization that withholds credit from employees encourages the vulnerability expression.

The two blocks which represent the structural model are the **discipline block** and the **surveillance block**. They contain independent variables which describe rules and
procedures that an employing organization may or may not practice. Organizations that subscribe to these rules and procedures are recognized as extending less credit to their employees than are those that do not implement such policies. The discipline block examines the effect that authorized meals and penalties for work time errors have on vulnerability variation. The surveillance block, by comparison, evaluates the effect that close supervision has upon the dependent variable. In combination, they represent the structural model.

The use of the block procedure permits an analysis of the vulnerability work attitude by combined sets of independent variables. For example, the combined impact of the occupational history variables can be evaluated when the block procedure is used. In addition, this method of analysis permits testing for the effect of combined blocks. In this manner both the specification and structural model can be tested for their effect on the vulnerability work attitude.

The statistic used to interpret the relationship between single blocks and the vulnerability expression is the multiple partial correlation coefficient. It may further be used to test for the relationship between block combinations like the specification model and the dependent variable.
Finally, measurement of the dependent variable, the vulnerability work attitude, will be generated by questions that examine employee response to the act of extending credit to the customer in view of the uncertain exchange outcomes. Guidance in formulating these questions will be provided by exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Fox, 1974; Ekeh, 1974; Heath, 1976). The vulnerability questions will be submitted in a pretest to waitresses employed in three leisure restaurants. Following the pretest, the vulnerability statements will be factor analyzed by the principle component extraction technique and orthogonal rotation. The results of this procedure will be factor scaled according to Armor's method (1973). This vulnerability factor scale along with the operationalized independent variables will then be submitted to waitresses and waiters in eight restaurants. The restaurants will be stratified and purposively sampled on the basis of several criteria variables.

Statement of the Problem

Vulnerability is conceptualized as a work attitude that derives from the uncertain exchange outcomes which follow the act of credit extension in service occupations. This problem will be researched by examining vulnerability in the occupation of waitressing. Two alternative models will allow for testing the effect that nine specification
items and five structural items have on the vulnerability expression. In this manner, it will be possible to see if the vulnerability work attitude may be attributed to considerations of time, proposed by the specification rationale, or to the climate of support sponsored by the employing organization as proposed in the structural model.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to the Model

Two models will be tested for their utility in accounting for the vulnerability work attitude. Willar provides direction in developing study models (1967). He describes the model as:

A conceptualization of a group of phenomena constructed by means of a rationale where the ultimate purpose is to furnish the terms and relations, the propositions of a formal system which if validated becomes theory.

In yet further detail, Willar elaborates, claiming, "The purpose of the model is to generate relationships, and it is therefore encumbered by the definitions, the rationale, and the mechanism" (1967:17).

The rationale and the mechanism are the primary components of the model. The model rationale . . . "is an explanation of the nature of the included phenomena and leads to the nominal definitions of the concepts of the model" (1967:17). In brief, it is the basic idea, the point of view behind the formation and structure of the concepts of the model (1967).

In comparison, the mechanism of the model is the dynamics or process element that forges the hypothesized relationships. It . . . "determines the structure of
concept relationships"(1967:17). The model mechanism is described according to its function as . . . "the conditions of process"(1967:17).

Model development will guide analysis of the vulnerability work attitude. Taking Willar's lead, two alternative models will generate independent variables that will permit examination of vulnerability expression.

The specification model views vulnerability as a product of unspecified exchange terms between service worker and customer. When the terms of exchange are not specified the waitress must extend credit to the customer. The attitude that forms in response to the uncertain outcome of the act of credit extension is determined by conditions of time. The work attitude is seen to vary as the conditions of work interaction, restaurant trade, and occupational history vary. The time condition represents the process of specification so that as time varies so the specification process varies which in turn accounts for vulnerability variation.

The alternative explanation for the vulnerability work attitude is developed in the structural model. It also identifies the act of credit extension at the base of the vulnerability expression. Vulnerability is hypothesized to vary according to the extent of structural support provided the worker by the employing organization. A derivative of
the reciprocity principle serves as the mechanism or conditions of process for the structural model (Levi-Strauss, 1957; Gouldner, 1950; Ekeh, 1974). It provides that the employing organization that gives support or credit to employees promotes a similar orientation in the waitress-customer exchange. Variation in structural support is represented by the absence or presence of certain discipline and surveillance procedures practiced by employing organizations.

The structural model is made up of the discipline and surveillance blocks, while the specification model consists of the work interaction block, the restaurant trade block, and the occupational history block. The derivation of these blocks and the derivation of the independent variables they contain will be described in a section to follow. Before introducing the specific blocks and variables, a review of the literature accounting for the development of model rationale and mechanism is in order.

The Custom of Tipping

The vulnerability work attitude is a product of the act of credit extension to the customer. The outcome of this act is uncertain, since a tip is not a contracted wage, but rather, a wage regulated by custom. The origins of the tipping custom are poorly documented (Smythe, 1942). It has been suggested that tipping developed from the English
vail system. Smythe cites one theory regarding the origins of tipping as introduced by traveling judges who bestowed a vail or tip upon the servants of one's hosts for the extra trouble they caused during their stay (Smythe, 1942:2). Although several other theories have been proposed regarding the derivation of the practice, the most general idea, according to Smythe, "is that tipping developed as a gift in recognition of special service performed by the tippee for the tipper" (Smythe, 1942:2).

The actual practice of tipping has probably existed considerably longer than the coining of the term tip. According to several sources, the word tip is an anagram that represents the work dictate, to insure prompt service (Smythe, 1942). It is written that a London coffee house posted the anagram on ... "a box beside the door for extra contributions from patrons" (Smythe, 1942:3). We are told that anyone placing an order with an extra contribution was served at once (Smythe, 1942). It is interesting to note that the tip was originally a form of customer insurance presented the worker prior to the service activity. It was not a reward for service per se, but rather, a gratuity for minimizing the time in administration of the task. According to origin, the tipping custom did not serve as the working wage, but rather an incentive for haste. In this capacity, the tip did not provoke vulnerability, since the act of credit extension was not required.
It would appear that the custom of tipping has changed considerably, as both the reason for tipping and the appropriate time for tipping have been displaced through the years. The more recent practice of tipping after completion of the service is responsible for the vulnerability work attitude, since it provides that credit must be extended the customer.

Tipping was not prevalent in the United States until shortly after 1900. During the period of introduction, somewhere around 1900, tips were given only to Black workers. It was considered too demeaning to tip white workers. The element of inferiority attributed to tipping might best be indicated by the European terms for tip. "The German term TRINGELD, the French POUBOIRE and the Spanish PARABEBER all mean drink money" (Smythe, 1942:3). As Smythe points out, "The concept of drink money is suggestive of inferiority on the part of the recipient, since one does not offer drink money to a person of one's own rank" (Smythe, 1942:3).

It is not recorded in the origins of tipping that tips were responsible for two thirds or more of the worker's income, as is the case today (Horn, 1976:12). It has been argued that the expectancy of tips in today's market is a primary factor in arranging the hourly stipend for waitresses and waiters alike (Needleman, 1965). In a recent study of the wage structure in the restaurant industry Gallagher
reports that the majority of waitresses work for approximately one dollar and twenty cents an hour (1977:179).

Each of these comments identifies the importance of the tip for the service worker. In addition, they indicate that the importance of the tip has increased considerably from its original 'drink money' connotation. When two thirds or more of one's working wage is earned through the act of credit extension it is likely that a vulnerability attitude will form in response to the uncertain outcome of this act.

The Uncertainty of the Tip

Many workers in the food and lodging industry depend almost exclusively upon the tip for their income. Yet, as Smythe and others have demonstrated, tips are not contracted wages and their frequency of occurrence and size may vary. She points out that, "Tips are given for uneconomic reasons, such as custom, desire to feel superior, as well as for such economic reasons as payment for service rendered or recognition of special consideration given"(1942:135).

The reasons for giving tips are further detailed in a survey of etiquette manuals. According to Esquire's Guide to Modern Etiquette, there are at least five different reasons to tip. The first reason is gratitude . . . "the tip that thanks for a service performed"(1969:17). A second reason for tipping takes the form of insurance, or according to Esquire, relays the message . . . "please do right
Tips are also given as protection money. "They range from the quarter you give the boys who offer to 'watch your car, mister' to the big bill you give the hotel clerk when you expect him to be discrete" (1969:180). A fourth category of tips is termed as subtle extortion since they are typically given to workers like hat check 'girls' who provide no real service. Finally, a tip may be insulting. The customer that leaves a penny in response to dissatisfaction exercises this reason for tipping. The Esquire Guide does not recommend this final reason for tipping; in fact it is argued that... "when service is performed better than you had a right to expect, you make it a higher tip than the servant has a right to expect." "But the reverse is not true." "If you mean to say, 'thanks for nothing; I'd have been better off without you,' the least you can tip is still minimum" (1969:180).

This position regarding the reasons to tip is challenged by the Social Usage Manual which states, "If the service has been slow, discourteous, inadequate, you need not feel self-conscious about not tipping" (1960:225). Colliers Guide to Quick and Easy Etiquette describes tipping as a personal matter, noting, "If you are a strong individualist who will not tip, you must be courageous enough to bear the consequences" (1963:123).

Finally, Amy Vanderbilt argues, "I believe in reward and punishment." "If you believe the service has been
deliberately bad, and if you have the courage to do so, leave no tip" (1956:146).

This brief survey of tipping etiquette suggests that the reasons for tipping differ, and that tipping, although subject to certain guidelines, is a personal matter that must be interpreted by the customer. The service employee's wage in the form of a tip remains uncertain and fluctuating so long as the individual is permitted the interpretation of a fair exchange. The variation due to individual interpretation provides the context for describing uncertain exchange outcomes. The outcome of the act of credit extension is uncertain and thus vulnerability thrives.

The customer's reasons for tipping are further suggested by observations reported by tipped employees. According to waitress reports, the size and frequency of tips is critically affected by appearance of the waitress, the amount of change left following tab payment, the size of the dining group, and the absence or presence of promotion practiced by the waitress.

When a waitress working in an airport lounge on Long Island, New York changed from a revealing 'bunny' costume to a peasant dress, her tips dropped by fifty percent (Monicon, 1977). This observation suggests that the size of the tip may be a product of personal appearance or apparel.

One of the most significant factors affecting the size of tips earned by workers involves the 'change factor.'
Edwards and Gottula found that the composition of coins and paper money provided the customer following payment for food and beverage had a direct bearing upon the size of the tip (1975). This observation suggests that tips may also be a product of the change returned to the customer.

In yet another study of factors affecting the wages of restaurant workers, Latane reports the group principle of diffusion of responsibility at work. Findings indicate that large groups tip less than small groups do because the responsibility for waitress wage payment is diffused among more customers (1976). According to Latane customers get "cheaper by the bunch" (1976).

It has also been observed that tips earned over a four month period were affected by promotional activities engaged in by the waitress (Butler and Snizek, 1976). In a related occupation, extra special service to cabriders, such as opening doors, carrying packages, etc., failed to significantly affect the size of the cabdriver's tip (Karen, 1972). This finding suggests that extra special service may not increase tips.

As a final indication of the uncertainty associated with tips as wages it is instructive to note a few terms taken from waitress argot. When the waitress fulfills her service obligations and the customer fails in her mind to fulfill his, the waitress is said to get 'stiffed.'

'Stiffing' behavior only occurs when expectations as set by
the waitress are unmet by the customer. Customers engaging in 'stiffing' behavior are labeled 'fleas' by the waitress. The argot of the waitress provides further evidence of the uncertain outcomes that follow the service act.

Each of these observations attest to the uncertainty of wages for those who work for tips. The uncertainty is produced by the wage variance, which assumes no real pattern over time. It has been found to be a product of such diverse factors as worker apparel, size of dining group, composite of customer change, and probably a host of other factors not yet identified. Because there is no contract securing the waitress' wage, the individual customer decides the terms of a fair exchange. According to observations cited, the customer's perception of a fair exchange differs drastically from individual to individual. As a consequence, the outcome of the act of credit extension is never certain.

Smythe points to yet another source of wage uncertainty that tipped workers must confront in earning their income. She contends, "If a tip is considered a wage, it will be seen at once that it is a one sided wage bargain by which those performing equal work do not receive the same amount of tips, and the same person receives varying amounts for the same effort and service" (1942:12). This source of wage variance, again, may be traced to the tipping custom allowance for individual interpretation of a fair exchange. It must be
recalled that tips are often left conspicuously on the table by the customer. Consequently, many workers who earn their living by way of tips generally recognize that fellow workers . . . "in the same establishment may receive widely varying incomes although the work performed may be identical" (Smythe, 1942:12).

The tip as an unspecified wage would seem to be subject to a great deal of variance. This variance is attributed first to an assortment of reasons for tipping and second to the individual's interpretation of a fair exchange. Since there is no way to accurately predict the outcome of the act of credit extension, some sense of vulnerability will accompany all work that is done for tips.

This description of the act which produces vulnerability is not intended to suggest that service workers are unable to make an adequate living wage or that guidelines are not applied to tipping. A recent court case brought by the Internal Revenue Service involved a waitress who did not keep track of her tips and reported 290 dollars, or an average 16 cents of tips an hour. The Internal Revenue Service did not accept this amount and recalculated the tip income for the waitress in question. The restaurant's credit card sales showed the average tip per sale was 13.9% which was pared to 12.5% because the waitress gave a percentage to the busboys. The Internal Revenue Service then computed average sales per
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waitress per hour. This figure $2.04 was multiplied by the 1,833 hours worked by the waitress. After some modifications by the tax court it was decided that taxes must be paid on $2,400 in tips that had not been reported by the audited waitress (1977).

A similar case found fifteen Seattle Space Needle waitresses evading taxes on tips they earned in 1973. The tax court ruled that tip incomes constituted 10% of their total earnings and taxes and penalties were levied on the unreported waitress income. These cases indicate that regardless of the lack of contract between waitress and customer, the tipping custom is subject to guidelines as witnessed by tax court rulings.

Finally, Huebener argues, "The chief fault of the tipping system, is not that under given conditions it does not pay, but that it is uncertain"(1967:12). He continues, by observing that, "A small disproportionate tip or no tip at all must be shrugged off by the waiter; there is no other recourse"(1967:12). In such cases the act of credit extension results in default by the customer. The knowledge of tip variance and the customer's unpredictable interpretation of a fair exchange would seem to promote economic uncertainty in every act of credit extension performed by the waitress.

The act of credit extension is not unique to the waitressing occupation. All work that is done for tips operates on the extension of credit since a service is
performed for a customer without specified promise of payment. That is, credit is extended the customer with no guarantee, contract or otherwise, of a fair exchange. While performing the service or in the process of extending credit the waitress is seen to experience uncertainty with regard to the outcome of the exchange. Vulnerability is therefore defined as the waitress' attitude toward the unspecified outcome of her service performance. This attitude may vary from one of great uncertainty to one approaching predictability. There is no absolute method of accurately predicting the outcome of the act of credit extension, and therefore some sense of vulnerability will accompany all work that is done for tips. The objective of this study is to isolate some of the variables that influence vulnerability variation.

Service Work as an Intermediate Form of Exchange

According to exchange theorists there are two types of exchange (Blau, 1964; Fox, 1974; Ekeh, 1974). Economic exchange is characterized by terms that have been specified, while social exchange entails unspecified obligations (1964: 93). Work that is done for tips operates as an intermediate exchange type.

On the surface the waitress-customer exchange, an occupational relationship, appears to be an economic exchange. From a Marxian perspective waitressing is conceptualized as a money relation. Specifically Marx argues that, "All
personal services take on a monetary nature" (1967:267). There is, according to Marx, a transformation of the social relation into money relations (1967).

The position held by the waitress can be compared with a sales job. According to Deitz, the good waitress must engage in the art of selling (1952). In addition, she reminds the waitress that . . . "suggestive selling, if properly applied, not only produces greater customer satisfaction and good will but will invariably increase your tips as well" (Dietz, 1952:33).

The description of suggestive selling provided by Dietz is reminiscent of Mills' classic discussion of salesmanship. "The bargaining manner, the huckstering animus, the memorized theology of pep, the commercialized evaluation of personal traits--they are all around us; in public in private there is the tang and feel of salesmanship" (Mills, 1951:61).

Gallagher further describes the economics of waitressing. "In a sense, to be a waitress is to be an independent contractor selling services to restaurant customers" (1977:179). "The only thing with which a restaurant owner provides his waitresses, besides the $1.20 an hour, is a place in which they can sell their services" (1977:179).

While serving as the salesperson or independent contractor the terms of the management-customer exchange are specified. Menus publish the terms of exchange assigned by management. The waitress and restaurant management work as a
team to ensure that these terms are honored. However, the waitress acts as an individual agent in her efforts to ensure that she receive a fair payment for her services. Her position is unsupported, that is, she stands alone, without the protection of contract, when the terms of exchange for her service are determined by the individual customer. In the case of tipping, neither management, law, or union protect the waitress.

Although the restaurant workers organized soon after the American Federation of Labor (1891), the hotel and restaurant workers union assisted in regulating the terms of exchange between worker and management exclusively. That is, the organized labor movement had no control over the terms of exchange between waitress and customer. The absence of control remains as it was in the 1890's. Hourly wages, weekly work schedules and seniority privileges are some of the specific issues negotiated by the union (Horowitz, 1960).

The union claims a limited control over waitress wages, since two-thirds or more of wages in this occupation are determined by tips (Horn, 1976). In addition, the restaurant workers union has met with little success in organizing waitresses. Havelick, a labor lawyer, explains why. "Waitresses, unlike a lot of other workers, don't see themselves as having collective interests"(1977:182). The lack of identification with their jobs is cited as the primary reason for not joining the union. In the words of one
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waitress, "If I were going to be here forever, then I would want a union, but I'm not going to be here forever" (Gal-lagher, 1977:182).

Waitressing is described as an intermediate form of exchange, assuming certain attributes of a money relation (economic exchange) while simultaneously assuming attributes of a personal relation or social exchange. Although Marx argues that . . . "all personal services take on a monetary nature" (1967:267). This emphasis on the economics of waitressing tends to ignore the social exchange model from which the waitress-customer relationship is derived. The exchange between waitress and customer may be regarded as a modern descendant of the master-servant relationship.

Deitz identifies the servant demeanor by advising the waitress to emphasize one action, that of 'gracious service.' In addition, she warns the waitress to never work with dollar signs before her eyes (1952:33). In other words, the threat of a money relation, described by Marx, is recognized and identified as improper. A most obvious example of the servant demeanor is expressed through the titles employed by the waitress and customer during the service exchange. The waitress generally refers to the customer as "Ma'am" or "Sir," while the customers often refer to the waitress as "Girl," regardless of the waitress' age.

Smythe argues that all tipping occupations consist of a
personal relationship tinged with servitude (1942:17). The tinge identified by Smythe is a vestige which survives the master-servant relationship of the preindustrial society. This relationship served as the law of employment prior to the industrial revolution. "Master and servant law looked to the household as a model" (Fox, 1974:184). "The household model was most appropriate not only to the predominant agricultural family unit in which hired labor supplemented the work of the family members, but also to the pattern for work and training among skilled artisans" (1974:185).

The bond supporting the master-servant relationship has been described as diffuse and paternalistic (Fox, 1974). The diffusion adjective refers to the broad scope of mutual rights and obligations accepted by all who entered into the master-servant relationship. The paternal attribute refers to the personal bond securing the relationship.

Selznick supports this depiction, claiming that obligations of the servant were broad and diffuse in nature (1969). In addition . . . "the servant was seen as contributing personal service, conceived not as specific labor duties but as a general contribution to the needs of the household" (1969:124). Comments by Fox and Selznick suggest that the master-servant relationship was not so much an economic relationship as one more closely approximating familial bonds. In the tradition of the master-servant
relationship the waitress is expected to 'wait the table' and graciously accept the customer's judgment of a fair exchange for her service. The waitress, like the servant of pre-industrial society, must contribute personal service in the role she performs as hospitality agent in the restaurant industry. Unlike the servant that waits on the master, the waitress generally waits on a stranger. As a consequence, there is no personal bond to ensure their exchange. This difference may in part account for the uncertainty of the credit extension act performed by the contemporary cousin of the servant.

Terms of Exchange

Waitressing, and similar types of service work, would seem to be a composite of both work of the servant and of the salesperson. Because the two represent divergent exchange models, it becomes necessary to further examine the terms of exchange implied by each model. Fox distinguishes economic exchange from that of social exchange in the following manner. "In economic exchange reciprocation lies in honoring terms which have been specifically defined" (1974:82). "By definition no exercise of (individual) discretion is called for, since the specificity of the terms excludes choice" (1974:82). As a consequence, Fox notes the economic exchange work context places the . . . "emphasis on conformity to the
prescribed elements which make up the greater part of the role" (1974:82).

The waitress salesperson appears to take part in an economic exchange with the customer. The sales activity of the waitress is defined by management's prearranged terms. The terms of the sale are specified by the menu; however, the terms for the service are not. Instead, the customer, occupying the master status, is given exclusive control of payment for service. As a consequence, the waitress-customer relationship resembles social exchange, since "obligations are diffuse, left to the interpretation of the role occupant in light of his or her judgment, knowledge, and capacity to evaluate consequences" (1974:83).

According to Blau, "The basic most crucial distinction between social and economic exchange is that social exchange entails unspecified obligations" (1964:93). In addition, he notes that, "transactions that involve services generally are somewhat closer to social exchange than the pure type of economic exchange of commodities or products of services" (1964:93). The resemblance between waitressing and social exchange is further illustrated by Blau. He describes social exchange as involving the principle that "one person does another a favor, and while there is a general expectation of some future return, its exact nature is definitely not stipulated in advance" (1964:93).
The terms of exchange appropriate to an economic relationship are specified in advance. By way of comparison, the terms of social exchange are not. The terms of social exchange may be specifically defined or at least recognized on the basis of previous interaction, as in the case of a friendship exchange. However, the terms of social exchange may be diffuse and subject to creation or at least improvisation, as in the case of a new acquaintance. Over time, as social interaction continues the terms of exchange will become explicate to the participants. It is this process of specification through interaction over time that serves as the dynamic (mechanism) of the specification model. The vulnerability work attitude is predicted to vary as the specification process varies. One of Blau's exchange principles summarizes this process: "The more exchange relations have been established, the more likely they are to be governed by norms of fair exchange" (Turner, 1973:236). As shall be seen in a section to follow, the specification process is represented by a number of work interaction, occupational history, and restaurant trade items.

When exchange occurs within the boundaries of a goal seeking economic organization, the terms of exchange, for reasons of expediency, are generally defined in advance of interaction. Such definition of exchange terms inhibits the expression of vulnerability since the outcome of the credit extension act is certain. By implication then, the
restaurant that guarantees 15 percent of the tab to the waitress, specifies the terms of exchange by defining an economic relationship, which in turn eliminates the expression of vulnerability because the outcome of the service performance is guaranteed. In the case of social exchange such insurance is absent, for the terms of exchange are not determined until repeated interaction assumes a pattern. The terms of social exchange are ensured by a personal bond. While by contrast, the terms of economic exchange are ensured by the legal claims of the encompassing economic organization. Neither personal bond nor the legal claims of the economic organization guarantee fair exchange terms for the waitress.

Finally, it should be noted that the media of respective exchange types differs. Utilitarian items are generally exchanged in an economic relationship, money for service or product. By comparison, symbolic items are the tender of social exchange. Service is exchanged for money in the waitress-customer relationship. Yet, as has already been mentioned, there is no third party arbitrating the exchange. As a result, the waitress may perform a service by extending credit to the customer, only to find that the monetary outcome is inadequate or absent.

The Act of Credit Extension

The act of credit extension must be performed by all who work for tips. Without the benefit of contract to specify
the outcome of a service, the waitress must extend credit to each new customer. Credit extension is an act of social exchange, since the act is based upon trust and reciprocity, not contract and law. The service provided by the waitress to the customer can be viewed as an entrusting act. According to Klatzky and Teitler, there are two roles that designate the entrusting act: the entrustor and trustee. The former has relinquished or intends to relinquish control over something which they value; while the latter is the recipient of the valued interest (1973). The entrusting act is not a sufficient condition for trust or distrust to be relevant (Klatzky, 1973). Instead, a perception of either uncertainty or vulnerability on the part of the entrustor must accompany the act (Klatzky, 1973).

This description of the entrusting act closely resembles the act of credit extension performed by the waitress. The waitress is never certain of the outcome following the service act, since the terms of exchange are not specified. Ultimately, the waitress must trust the customer to abide by principles of fair exchange.

The concept of trust has been described from two different perspectives in the literature. Durkheim and Mauss argue that there is a climate of trust that prevails and informs all social exchange (Ekeh, 1974). This 'morality of social exchange' provides a moral code of behavior,
... "which acquires an independent existence outside the social exchange situation and which informs all social, economic, and political interpersonal relationships in society" (1974:58). In this manner, the customer's relationship with the waitress is regulated by the morality of social exchange. A breakdown of morality or "exploitation of the social exchange for power and status differentiation is anomic and ultimately leads to the abortion of social exchange relationships" (Ekeh, 1974:57). This prediction of the termination of the exchange relationship may not be accurate within the restaurant context. The waitress may be exploited by a customer, yet continue to serve in view of limited job alternatives. Regardless of such predictions, it should be recognized that trust depicted as a climate or prerequisite to exchange, coincides with the structural model. The climate of trust sponsored by restaurant management is hypothesized as providing an orientation to the customer trust relationship.

A second perspective that describes the waitress-customer trust relation is provided by Blau (1964). He proposes that trust is a process that is subject to formation. This depiction of trust contradicts the one that views trust as a climate. It is argued by the formative trust theorists that, "Social exchange requires trusting others to reciprocate," therefore, "the initial problem is to prove oneself trustworthy" (Blau, 1964:98). Trust is developed ... "as
individuals regularly discharge their obligations, for they prove themselves trustworthy of further credit" (1964:98).

The major determinant of trust, according to Webster, who agrees with Blau, . . . "seems to be an actor's perceived ability to reward or punish the potential trusted actor in the future" (1975:254). In addition he notes, "If interaction between actors will continue for some time as, for example, it usually will between friends or members of the same family or social group—then trust is relatively more likely than if interaction will not persist" (1975:254). The depiction of trust provided by Blau (1964) and Webster (1975) will serve as the rationale of the specification model.

Finally Marx argues that relationships built on trust are not possible in the capitalist era since, . . . "there is no other nexus between man and man than naked self interest and callous cash payment" (1967:82).

Each of the descriptions of trust differs. Durkheim and Mauss argue that trust regulates all social exchange relationships, while Blau and Webster claim that trust develops over time, as one proves oneself trustworthy. Finally, Marx suggests that there is no base for trust in a money relation. The waitress is likely to adopt one of these three positions in her exchange with the customer. In other words, the outcome of the credit extension act may be identified as always uncertain and subject to exploitability (Marx, 1967), or outcomes may be viewed with increasing
certainty as trust develops (Blau, 1964; Webster, 1975), or finally service outcomes may be viewed with increasing certainty according to the climate of trust that is sponsored by the employing organization.

Two alternative models are suggested by the competing conceptualizations of trust. The specification model, based upon the principles of trust formation espoused by Blau and Webster, accounts for vulnerability variation in terms of trust development over time. While by contrast, the structural model, which approximates the Durkheimian-Mauss position, accounts for vulnerability variation according to the climate of trust which prevails in the restaurant organization. In short, one's evaluation of the uncertain outcomes of the act of credit extension is a product of one's view of trust. The vulnerability expression is hypothesized to vary according to two alternative depictions of trust. One depiction conceptualizes trust as a product of exchange, while a second conceptualizes trust as a climate or a structure upon which the exchange is built. A closer examination of the concepts and variables representing the respective models is in order.

**Specification Model**

According to Blau (1964) and Webster (1975), trust, the act of credit extension, can be described as a product of exchange. This rendering of trust suggests that vulnerability,
the uncertainty over exchange outcomes, will vary according to the process of trust development. The mechanism for the specification model operates so that credit or trust is a product of time. Consequently, variables that reflect this time dimension should explain variation in the vulnerability expression. If vulnerability is a product of trust/distrust, and if trust is a product of time factors then as time factors vary so should the expression of vulnerability.

The factors chosen to represent the time dimension are grouped into three sets. First, a set of three work interaction factors will be examined to ascertain their effect upon vulnerability variation. The length of the restaurant interaction episode should promote the trust development process and secure the exchange outcome. In addition to this factor, the number of people who typically demand this interaction or the number of customers per shift, should similarly affect the trust formation process. Small group research conducted by Hare (1964) has suggested that as size of group increases the cohesion between members decreases (Cartwright and Zander, 1968). This principle would seem to indicate that the vulnerability work attitude may be a by-product of the number of customers that must be attended to by the waitress. The final factor representing this work interaction block is the regular customer indicator. The intentions of the regular customer are more readily known and the
outcome of the waitress work exchange more predictable. In sum, the interaction attributes are arranged so that variation on the length of interaction episode, the number of customers served per shift, and the percentage of repeat customers should influence variation in the vulnerability expression. Therefore, it is hypothesized as the interaction attributes vary so the vulnerability work attitude should vary.

The second grouping of attributes were selected as a control measure. Vulnerability has been depicted as a response to uncertain outcomes of an exchange relationship. The uncertainty of restaurant trade might possibly influence the expression of vulnerability measured by questions concerning the uncertainty of exchange outcomes. Therefore, it was necessary to control for the number of hours worked per week, the weekday trade estimate, and the average tab for two, which might contaminate the vulnerability expression.

Beyond serving as a control, this block of items is indicative of a stable work pattern. Waitresses that work consistent hours, within the restaurant enjoying a healthy trade, should experience stable work activity which in turn should lend itself to the confirmation of exchange terms. A stable work pattern inhibits the formation of the vulnerability work attitude. Therefore, as work patterns vary so the vulnerability work attitude should vary.

The final grouping of specification items are occupational history attributes. Along this dimension,
vulnerability is predicted to vary according to the number of years spent in the occupation, the length of time at present employment and the wage arrangement (tips or contract) of previous work. It is proposed that those who are new to waitressing with minimal exposure to tips as wages will express greater vulnerability than those experienced with the uncertain outcomes which typify waitress work. There is some evidence that length of time spent in a service occupation promotes a kind of specialization which facilitates the process of specifying the terms of exchange and thereby ensures exchange outcomes.

This brand of specialization is exemplified by Davis in his description of the cab driver (1959). According to Davis a typology of cabusers developed by the 'cabbie' permits the application of certain strategies which anticipate clientele needs. Davis discusses clientele stereotypes (the sport, businessman, etc.) and appropriate strategies useful in specifying the occupational exchange between Cabbie and customer. The strategies are not a solution to the vulnerability problem, but rather a means of coping with the uncertain outcomes that accompany work that is done for tips.

The rationale supporting the specification model is derived from exchange theory. It provides that the vulnerability expression can be explained according to principles
of social exchange and trust formation (Blau, 1964; Webster, 1975). Trust, the inhibitor of the vulnerability work attitude, is conceptualized as a formative process that develops over time. The specification model is activated by a mechanism that represents this developmental depiction of trust. The three blocks of variables which constitute the specification model each represent some aspect of the developmental process. Finally, testing the specification model by comparing the interaction, occupational history, and restaurant trade variables with the vulnerability expression reported by the waitress will permit a theoretical evaluation of the rationale and mechanism which support the model. In addition, the test will allow an isolation of factors promoting the vulnerability work attitude.

**Structural Model**

The structural model views trust as a prerequisite to social exchange. Its rationale is derived from theory proposed by Durkheim and Mauss (1954). According to these theorists trust is a climate that informs all social exchange. In addition, trust is depicted as a platform that supports the exchange relationship. In contrast to the specification model with its depiction of trust formation, the structural model views trust as a prerequisite to exchange. Converting this conceptualization to the study of waitress vulnerability suggests that trust or distrust in the waitress-customer
exchange is a product of the trust/distrust waitress-management exchange. In other words, the climate of trust that informs or prevails upon the waitress-customer exchange is a product of the trust derived from the waitress' relationship with the employing organization. The waitress' attitude toward the uncertain outcomes of her work exchange is hypothesized to vary according to the climate of trust sponsored by the employing organization. Therefore, the five variables which represent the structural model may each account in part for the climate of trust that is sponsored by the restaurant management.

The mechanism activating this model is a variant of the reciprocity principle (Levi-Strauss, 1949; Gouldner, 1960; Ekeh, 1974). It provides that the restaurant organization that sponsors a climate of trust in relations with its employees promotes a similar orientation for the waitress-customer exchange. Briefly then, it is proposed that a positive trust orientation toward the employees is reciprocated by a positive trust orientation toward the customer. While by comparison, a negative trust orientation toward the employees is seen to promote vulnerability or uncertainty regarding the outcome of the service act.

Waitress service is depicted as a series of acts of credit extension. Vulnerability is a response to the uncertainty of extending credit in a work exchange. The
outcome of the act of credit extension is always uncertain unless the customer is part of 'regular trade.' According to predictions derived from the structural model, the waitress' orientation toward the outcome of the credit extension act is a product of trust relations with the employing organization. Vulnerability is therefore predicted to vary as trust relations vary.

Two sets of variables represent the rationale of the structural model. The discipline block consists of three items which reflect the employing organization's position with regard to work errors. Specifically, penalties for check errors, and breakage along with an authorized meal time are each indicative of rule rigidity and low trust relations (Gouldner, 1957). These variables reflect the 'credit mentality' shown the waitress by restaurant management. According to Ekeh 'credit mentality' refers to, "the belief that individuals are credit worthy and can be trusted to pay back what they owe" (1974:59). Rigid rules, by contrast, would seem to indicate that individuals are not trustworthy and must be constrained during work. Gouldner argues that the "extreme elaboration of bureaucratic rules is prompted by an abiding distrust of people and of their intentions" (1955:163). Restaurants in which penalties are levied on work errors and in which meal time is authorized, sponsor structural rigidity which is indicative of low trust relations and is seen to promote the vulnerability work
attitude. Therefore, as organizational discipline varies so the vulnerability work attitude should vary.

The second grouping of structural attributes consists of two surveillance items. These variables, like the discipline, are structural characteristics that describe management practices exterior to the individual worker, which if practiced, place constraints upon the individual's activity. For example, station inspection is a management practice where the supplies, cleanliness and positioning of restaurant equipment in the waitress' station is checked several times during the day. This practice, like the enforcement of the discipline items, indicates low trust relations.

Inventory control, the second surveillance practice, refers to the procedure followed for checking the worker's requests for customer food and beverage. Checking these requests is a matter of matching the waitress' numbered and carbon copied requests which have been turned into the kitchen and bar with the final tab paid by the customer. Restaurants that match duplicates and checks every night or after every transaction display low trust relations. By comparison, restaurants that sporadically check food and beverage requests demonstrate less surveillance and more trust for their employees. Inventory control is one means of discovering theft. It also is a method of 'catching' errors, especially at the bar. Requests that are made at the bar and forgotten on the tab are identified by this method.
Both of these practices measure the extent of management observation of the waitress. Their presence in a restaurant organization is seen to promote an atmosphere of distrust which may produce a 'vulnerable' climate for the operation of exchange with customers. Therefore, as organizational surveillance varies so the vulnerability work attitude should vary.

**Summary**

Vulnerability is a work attitude that stems from the uncertain outcomes of work exchange. The attitude is hypothesized to vary according to principles of trust. In other words, certainty/uncertainty over exchange outcomes is considered to be a product of trust dynamics. Using the exchange principles of Blau and Webster to form the rationale of the specification model it is hypothesized that variation in the vulnerability work attitude can be explained by the work interaction, restaurant trade, and occupational history block. Each of these groupings of variables is seen to reflect certain aspects of the trust formation process. They provide that as patterns are established along these dimensions, trust in process forms, and the variation in the vulnerability expression is accounted for. If variation in the vulnerability expression is explained by the specification factors then it may be concluded that uncertain outcomes of work exchange are influenced by time and pattern formation.
In addition, explanatory power of the specification model would confirm the depiction of trust formation found in the work of Blau (1964) and Webster (1975). These theorists contend that trust is a product of exchange. It is formed, they argue, through exchange.

The structural model, by comparison, claims that vulnerability variation is accounted for by the nature or climate of trust sponsored by the employing organization. Discipline and surveillance factors practiced by restaurant management permit a measure of trust climate. This model views trust as a prerequisite to exchange, not as a product of exchange. Therefore, the waitress' attitude toward uncertain outcomes of exchange with the customer is a product of the trust climate sponsored by employing organizations.

Testing the two models will allow an identification of variables that influence the attitude toward uncertain exchange outcomes. In addition, model testing will provide further understanding of the concept of trust.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The Sample and Research Setting

The restaurant will serve as the unit of sample selection in analysis of the vulnerability work attitude. Each of the restaurants sampled is located in or adjacent to a city situated in the Middle Atlantic Region of the United States. This City does not currently claim a national reputation for its restaurants. However, the City sponsors a healthy restaurant trade as indicated by increasing numbers of new restaurants.

Eight leisure dining restaurants within the City and surrounding suburbs have been selected for the study sample. The leisure dining restaurant is often distinguished within the restaurant spectrum as a "fancy restaurant" (Whyte, 1949). It differs from the 'counter-top' or 'fast-food' restaurant in three ways. Menu options, length of dining episode, and presence of live entertainment each serve to distinguish leisure dining from "fast food" restaurants. Liquor, appetizers, soup, salad and main entree are all available to those frequenting the leisure dining establishment. The customer's length of stay in the leisure dining restaurant assumes a range of from one to four hours, while the period
of visitation in fast food restaurants generally does not exceed one half hour. A final mark of distinction claimed by the leisure dining restaurant is the presence of live entertainment. Although the menu options and length of dining episode characterize each of the restaurants sampled, only five of the eight provide some form of entertainment.

Eight restaurants were sampled, primarily for reasons of manageability. This number was large enough for representation, yet small enough to enable the investigator to become familiar with the restaurant staff and operations.

The research design, consisting of two alternative models, focuses upon both structural and interactional attributes of the restaurant work setting. With these constraints in mind, a stratified purposive sample design was seen to be most useful. According to Selltiz, "The basic assumption behind purposive sampling is that with good judgment and appropriate strategy one can hand pick the cases to be included in the sample, and thus develop samples that are satisfactory in relation to one's needs" (1959:521). The research design calls for the testing of two models and the variables they include. Because it is necessary to ensure variation on the independent variables, restaurants have been selected on the basis of three attributes: corporate affiliation, presence of lodging facilities, and interaction factors.
Four restaurants have been selected from a corporate affiliation category. This attribute is seen to influence the structural factors derived from the structural model. It is hypothesized that standard corporate policy may provide a more structured work setting with greater discipline and surveillance procedures, while the noncorporate restaurant may provide a less structured work setting.

The lodging facility attribute, shared by four restaurants, ensures customer anonymity which provides variation on the repeat customer variable. In addition, variation is sought on the work interaction variables, especially the length of interaction episode item derived from the specification model. Information on this attribute is provided by a City Restaurant Guide (Reed, 1977).

Four sources assisted in providing information relating to the preceding characteristics. A first source was the City and County phone books. Restaurant yellow pages provided a listing of all restaurants within the confines of the City. A second source is a listing of restaurants and managers participating as members in the City Food Managers Association. A third source is a restaurant guide for the City and surrounding Suburbs. "It was compiled by a local restaurant critic and provides the following information: cost range, specialty, entertainment, hours of operation, dining attire, length of dining episode and seating capacity" (Reed, 1977).
A final source of information was the judgment of a knowledgeable guide familiar with both City and County restaurants. Considering all available information, and in view of the variation requirements, eight restaurants have been chosen. Two alternatives served as replacements in the event that any of the original restaurants were not accessible. Fortunately, the replacements were not required.

Techniques of Data Collection

Once the sample had been selected, the next step was to gain permission for entrance to the restaurants. With the assistance of a cover letter and supplemental information concerning the University food and lodging management program, all restaurant managers were approached in person by the investigator. Each of the eight managers granted permission to take part in the study. All managers, waitresses and waiters were briefed on the purpose of the study and were assured of their anonymity throughout the study and its presentation.

Once permission was granted, the management interview and distribution of questionnaires to waitresses and waiters was arranged. The questionnaire was presented to the restaurant workers as a group at the beginning of the meal shift. There were two restaurants where managers asked to distribute the questionnaire. Attached to each questionnaire was a note requesting cooperation and identifying the
investigator and the subject of investigation. Each of the questionnaires was contained within a large envelope that could be sealed if the worker wished to conceal her response.

Table 1 reports the rate of questionnaire return by sex. Seventy-seven percent of the waiters (70% = 7) and waitresses (78% = 54), returned the questionnaire. After initial collection of questionnaires, two additional visits and reminder phone calls were used as follow up techniques. No waitress or waiter refused to take part in the study. However, once the questionnaire was taken home, the return rate was adversely affected.

[Table 1 About Here]

Restaurant Worker Profile

The restaurant work force sampled can be described according to several attributes. Sex differentiation is limited within the sample. Only 10 percent of the workers questioned were waiters. Five of the restaurants were staffed exclusively by waitresses. The remaining three restaurants consisted of mixed staffs although as the numbers indicate (Table 1) waiters were in a minority. It is interesting to note that the Department of Labor reports that 90.7 percent of those persons waiting on tables are women (Gallagher, 1977: 104). The study sample coincides with the Department of Labor statistics. Waitresses accounted for eighty-nine percent of the study respondents. When restaurant managers
TABLE 1

RATE OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant #</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(70%) (78%)
were asked about hiring preferences, given a choice, an all male staff was preferred. However, they claimed it was next to impossible to recruit male restaurant workers. Two restaurant owners explained the absence of waiters as due to the City's recent venture into leisure dining. They argued that there was no tradition in the City for men to assume jobs in the restaurant dining room.

In describing the marital status of those questioned, nearly 40 percent of the workers are married. Those reporting separation (11 percent) or divorce (15 percent) accounted for 26 percent of workers surveyed. Finally, single workers represented 34 percent of those questioned.

Approximately one third of the workers (31 percent) did not graduate from high school. Those with high school diplomas accounted for 26 percent of the sample, while 42 percent claimed more than twelve years of formal education. It is interesting to note that 13 percent of the workers have completed more than fourteen years of formal education.

When asked how many children they had the surveyed restaurant workers reported the following: better than half (54 percent) reported no children. Twenty-three percent reported one child and 16 percent reported two or three children.

The age question produced some annoyance and lack of cooperation in the pretest. In light of the controversy, and given the fact that age was not a critical variable, a group
age was assigned restaurants. The restaurant work force was
classified as young (18-34) and middle age (35+). Five of
the restaurants were staffed by a young work force, while
three restaurants employed a middle aged work force.

**The Dependent Variable**

The methodological decisions which lead to development
of the vulnerability factor scales will provide the context
for the presentation of the dependent variable. The first
step in development of the vulnerability measure was to
acquire theoretical guidance from exchange theory. Ac-
cording to the exchange paradigm the waitress-customer ex-
change relationship is based upon trust since no contract
defines the terms of exchange. With exchange theory serving
as a guide, a variety of existing scales that measure job
attitudes were reviewed (Robinson, 1969). Several ideas
were gleaned from existing resources. Rosenberg's 'Trust in
People Scale' (1956) and Wrightman's 'Philosophy of Human
Nature Scale' (1964) provided some direction in developing
the vulnerability measure. However, no existing measure
focused on the problem of uncertain outcomes and the situation
of trust that accompanies unspecified terms of exchange.

It soon became apparent that an original measure would
be required. Development of an original measure requires a
pretest. With both exchange theory and existing scales in
mind, the first exhaustive list of statements concerning
uncertain exchange outcomes was compiled and evaluated by several judges. By the time the final pretest questionnaire was printed the vulnerability statements had been revised three times. Although twenty statements were used in the pretest, it was expected that approximately ten would emerge as significant scale items.

All statements have been cast in a Likert type format. A neutral category was included in the response possibilities, in order that no respondent will feel forced to agree or disagree with the twenty statements. The five response categories were scrambled on the questionnaire, thus serving as a safeguard against a selective tendency by the respondent.

**Dependent Variable Pretest**

A pretest of the questionnaire was administered in three local leisure dining restaurants. These restaurants were similar in many respects to the corporate affiliated restaurants selected for the study sample. A section of the questionnaire used in the pretest asked for comments and criticisms about the questions. In each restaurant following questionnaire completion, the investigator spent at least two sessions with several of the waitresses discussing work, tips, customers and the questionnaire.

Once the questionnaire had been collected, the pretest items were subjected to factor analysis. Factor analysis isolated the patterns imposed on the pretest items by the
waitress. In addition, factor analysis permitted a revision of the original questionnaire. While taking into consideration both written and verbal comments made by the restaurant workers and in view of the factor analysis, items for measuring the dependent variable of the study were compiled, consisting of the fifteen statements judged most critical (Appendix 1).

**Factor Analyzing the Pretest**

Factor analysis provides a powerful tool for the sorting out and organization of subject response in attitudinal studies (Rummel, 1970). According to Rummel:

Factor analysis can be applied in order to explore a content area, structure a domain, map unknown concepts, classify or reduce data, define relationships, illuminate causal nexus, screen or transform data, test hypothesis, formulate theories, control variables and make inferences.

In this case, factor analysis will be used to map the concept of vulnerability. Specifically, twenty attitudinal statements will be factor analyzed to derive their underlying structure.

There are a variety of decisions that must be reached before submitting attitudinal information to factor analysis. The first decision concerns the type of factor analysis to be employed. Given the task of mapping an attitude, the necessary choice is R-factor type in which correlations between variables are established.
A second decision concerns the method of factor extraction. At least two alternatives to this problem are available: principle component solution and common factor solution. In keeping with Armor's discussion of building factor scales, principle component solution will be used (Armor, 1974).

A third decision in developing the vulnerability measure is the rotation problem. "The major option available to the analyst is whether to choose an orthogonal rotation method or an oblique rotational method" (Kim, 1975:472). The goal of rotation, Schussler notes . . . "is simple structure" (1971:123). In pursuing simple structure an attempt is made to reduce the complexity of the variables (Schussler, 1971). Orthogonal rotation will be employed in this study, since Armor's method of building factor scales requires its use (1974).

A final decision concerns the analytical method chosen for the rotational choice. In the case of orthogonal rotation the SPSS program employs varimax unless otherwise specified. There appears to be no reason to specify otherwise, and therefore the varimax type is used.

Once the items that experienced severe crossloadings had been eliminated in the factor analyzed pretest, fifteen statements were identified. These statements will serve to tap the vulnerability attitude expressed by waiters and waitresses employed by the restaurants sampled.
Factor Scaling the Dependent Variable

Once the data had been collected from the eight restaurants sampled, the next step in developing the dependent variable is factor scaling the fifteen vulnerability statements. According to Armor, "A factor scale is a composite formed to measure a factor by using only the highest loading items on a factor" (1975:33). Taking Armor's lead, .40 was used as the standard for exclusion. "Although there is no precise rule to define the highest loadings, experience has shown that items with loadings below .30 should be excluded" (1975:35). In a similar manner, all factor loadings that crossload are systematically excluded. The rigorous criterion .40 left six well defined items that loaded on two distinct factor scales. There is a rather weak correlation between the two factor scales (.32).

The first factor scale extracted consists of the following wage specific statements. The first statement, "Working for tips is like gambling, there is always a risk involved," focuses on the uncertainty of exchange outcomes. The unrotated loading on this item is .75 while the rotated loading increases to .88 (Table 2).

The second item, "You can never be sure of your wages in this job, because when it comes to tipping, you never
### TABLE 2

**THE VULNERABILITY FACTOR SCALES**

#### UNROTATED FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Gambling'</td>
<td>0.75069</td>
<td>0.38335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sure Wages'</td>
<td>0.77654</td>
<td>0.20124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Same Amount'</td>
<td>-0.61952</td>
<td>0.36043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Regular Customers'</td>
<td>0.30630</td>
<td>0.71872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Customers Care'</td>
<td>0.39198</td>
<td>0.41606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Customers no Tip'</td>
<td>0.40498</td>
<td>0.45631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ROTATED FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Gambling'</td>
<td>0.88528</td>
<td>0.01276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sure Wages'</td>
<td>0.72694</td>
<td>0.24532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Same Amount'</td>
<td>-0.79959</td>
<td>0.09798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Regular Customers'</td>
<td>0.27245</td>
<td>0.74653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Customers Care'</td>
<td>0.22280</td>
<td>0.75326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Customers no Tip'</td>
<td>0.20576</td>
<td>0.78653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
know what customers will do," reiterates the emphasis on uncertain exchange outcomes. In this case the unrotated factor loading was .77 while the rotated loading was .73. The final item isolated is, "In this job I am fairly certain of making the same amount in tips each night." The unrotated factor loading for this item is .61, while the rotation process, with its goal of simple structure yields a .79.

The second factor scale extracted focuses on the customer-waitress exchange. The first statement, "I would much rather have all regular customers, that I can depend on, and not take a chance with new customers" suggests a dimension of customer trust. Similarly, customer concern is tapped in the statement, "Most customers I wait on care nothing about the waitress' feelings." In order to respond to this question, the waitress must take the role of the other. Finally a trust dimension is included in the statement, "If most customers could get away with it, they would not leave a tip." The respective factor loadings for the unrotated factor matrix are .71, .41, .45, while rotation distinguished a simple structure of .75, .75, .79.

It should be noted that the social trust factor is not nearly as powerful as the economic factor, since it accounts for approximately 25 percent of total variation expressed by the factors. Reliability coefficients for the factor scales are .93 and .44 for economic and social factors, respectively.
The average for the two scales is a reliability coefficient of .68.

**Dependent Variable Summary**

Two factor scales developed from twenty original pretest items will serve as the study dependent variable. A first economic factor scale will allow an examination of the attitude clustered about the uncertain exchange outcomes of waitress work. The second factor scale will allow examination of the attitude clustered about the measure of trust which informs the waitress-customer exchange. According to the exchange paradigm waitressing is a combination of social and economic exchange elements. However, neither exchange prototype dominates the work relationship and consequently the terms of exchange between waitress and customer are not clear. When the terms of exchange are not clear, the exchange relationship assumes the dimensions of a trust relationship in which the waitress takes the role of the entrustor while the customer is the trustee (Klatzky, 1973).

Waitress vulnerability is a work attitude derived from unspecified terms of a work exchange. This attitude will be represented by two factors. The first factor allows the waitress to express her perception of the economic uncertainty of exchange outcomes, while a second factor permits an expression of perceived trust in the work exchange. The two analytically distinct dimensions of vulnerability are
not highly correlated (.32) and the items representing the dimensions do not crossload. It is important to recognize that although not hypothesized, vulnerability is a multi-dimensional attitude which contains both a social and economic referent. Factor analysis extracted two factors which represent two patterns imposed on the statements by the respondents. Each of these factor scales will be evaluated in light of the five blocks of independent variables.

Independent Variables

In this section the independent variables will be reintroduced. Their operationalization will be examined rather than their model derivation which is described in Chapter II. It will be recalled that the independent variables are organized into five blocks which represent the specification and structural models. The work interaction, restaurant trade, and occupational history blocks which constitute the specification model are presented first. Operationalization of the discipline and surveillance blocks will follow.

The Specification Model/Work Interaction Block

Three items represent the principles of work interaction derived from the specification model. First, the interaction duration item is an estimate assigned by the waitress to the following question, "From start to finish,
how much time do you spend with each group of customers?" The respective alternatives are 45 minutes to an hour / 1 hour to 1½ hours / 1½ hours to 2 hours. A second interaction attribute is measured by the question, "On the average how many individuals do you serve per shift?" The final interaction attribute is measured by the question, "What percentage of your customers are regular or repeat customers?" Response to this question is predefined, ranging from less than 10 percent to more than 30 percent. Each of these provides information regarding the circumstances of waitress-customer interaction. These circumstances are hypothesized to influence the specification process which has been identified as the mechanism of the specification model. In combination, the work interaction attributes will permit an evaluation of a dimension of the specification process on the vulnerability work attitude.

The Specification Model/Trade Evaluation Block

The trade evaluation block operationalizes three items which assess the impact of restaurant trade on the vulnerability expression. An estimate by the waitress of the number of hours worked per week is the first item. The average tab for a meal is the second trade assessment item. The final item in the trade evaluation block is an estimate of weekday trade. It is phrased as follows: "How would you describe weekday trade?" Constant, steady, varying, and
irregular are the alternatives available to the waitress. This block serves a control function, since it is hypothesized that when the restaurant enjoys a stable trade pattern, the waitress simultaneously enjoys a stable work pattern. As a consequence, vulnerability cannot be explained in terms of the external economic system, but rather in terms of the internal economic arrangements. In combination, the trade evaluation items reflect the specification process, since a stable work pattern facilitates the specification of exchange terms.

**The Specification Model/Occupational History Block**

Occupational history, the final component of the specification model, is operationalized through the use of three questions. They are: "How long have you worked at your present job?"; "How many years have you been waitressing?"; and "Prior to this job, what was the last job you held?" The combined impact of these items permit examination of the vulnerability expression in view of work experience. Therefore, the work attitude may be studied in terms of the number of years working for tips, and also the number of years at the present job. This classification of time in occupation is hypothesized to influence the specification process which, according to the specification model, regulates the vulnerability expression.
The Structural Model/Discipline Block

The two structural blocks contain questions that are asked of restaurant management. The first item in the discipline block considers the practice of authorized meal time. Restaurant managers are asked if there is one designated meal time per shift or if workers are permitted to have their meals at their convenience. Restaurant policy regarding breakage and check errors provides the remaining variables in the discipline block. These items are an indication of the climate of trust sponsored by restaurant management. According to the structural model, the restaurant that fosters a 'credit mentality' as reflected in meal, breakage and check errors policy facilitates a similar 'credit worthy' orientation in restaurant workers.

The Structural Model/Surveillance Block

The final block of independent variables consists of only two items. For the first item, managers were asked if waitresses are responsible for station inspection or is station inspection the job of the manager. The second attribute of the surveillance dimension is the rigor associated with inventory control. Three categories defined this procedure. All of the restaurants used some form of duplicate books, however, some supervisors check these food and beverage requests sporadically, some check them every night, and some have the technical equipment to check them after each
transaction with the customer. These items provide an indication of the measure of trust and support given the waitress by restaurant management. According to the structural model those restaurants that foster a climate of trust, facilitate the same orientation in their employees.

Data Analytic Procedures

Fourteen independent variables have been derived from two alternative models. Few analytic tools in the field of social science are capable of handling this number of variables. Given the investigation of the vulnerability problem, and with little to go on in the way of similar studies, it becomes necessary to adopt a data analytic technique capable of accommodating the fourteen independent variables and two dependent variables.

Therefore in selecting the data analytic tools two considerations are critical: measurement and manageability. The variable measurement consideration lead to the use of multiple regression (Kerlinger, 1973). A relatively new procedure, the use of blocks of variables, was judged the most efficient and parsimonious solution to the manageability problem. Sullivan is credited with identifying the advantages of this procedure (Sullivan, 1971; 1974). In the section to follow a discussion of tools of analysis will be presented, by describing the methodological decisions which lead to the use of the block procedure and multiple regression.
The Block Procedure

The block procedure is a rather recent arrival on the data analytic scene. It has been heralded by Sullivan as an innovative approach to model building in the social sciences (1971; 1974). It is particularly appealing in light of the paucity of assumptions that define its usage. Sullivan describes the block procedure as follows:

No assumptions about the causal inter-relations of any one block of indicators need be made. They may take any form, including reciprocal causation. We do not have to know which variables in Block A affect which variables in Block C, but we do assume that no variables in Block C affect Block A. That is, we assume a block recursive system, and attempt to assess relationships between, but not within, the blocks.

Perhaps the most obvious advantage provided by the block procedure is the simplification of analysis it affords. Instead of examining an initial fourteen different independent relationships, which unfold into a multitude of derivative independent linkages, an examination of only five relationships is possible. In addition the block procedure permits the construction of multiple indicators. The block procedure will allow the testing of individual blocks and block combinations. The multiple partial correlation coefficient is the statistic that measures the impact of the block.

According to Sullivan the multiple partial, when used in combination with the block procedure provides a number of
advantages. First, it permits the simultaneous operation of all blocks of variables upon the dependent variable. In addition, it allows for the testing of complex models with a minimum of predictions.

Testing complex models is accomplished by . . . "using the indicators of the dependent variables separately, but allowing the indicators of the independent and control variables to operate as a block" (1971:329). In yet further detail, Sullivan defines the operation of this tool of analysis. "We allow all of the indicators of the control variables to wipe out as much variation as they can in the dependent variable, and then see how much of the remaining variation is explained by all of the indicators of the independent variable" (1971:330).

The multiple partial correlation coefficient will provide a measure of the relationship between each of the blocks of independent variables and the vulnerability expression. It will also provide a measure of the relationship between combined blocks and the vulnerability expression. In this manner, the specification model consisting of the combined effect of the work interaction, trade evaluation, and occupational history blocks, may be tested. Use of the block procedure and multiple partial make it possible to weigh the relative influence that both the specification and structural models have on the vulnerability expression.
Multiple Regression

Eight of the fourteen independent variables adapt easily to interval measurement, a criterion of the multiple regression technique. Length of time at present job, total number of years waitressing, hours worked per week, individuals served per shift, average tab per couple, duration of interaction episode, percentage of regular customers and estimate of week day trade are all interval measures. The six remaining variables (inventory control, station inspection, responsibility for check errors, responsibility for breakage, authorized meal time and previous occupation) can be modified by the dummy variable procedure, for use in multiple regression.

The multiple regression technique will permit the examination of relationships attendant between dependent or criterion variables and a set of independent or predictor variables presented in block form. According to Kim and Kohout there are two tasks that the technique may address. First, "Multiple regression may be viewed as a descriptive tool by which the linear dependence of one variable on others is summarized and decomposed" (1975:321). In addition, multiple regression may be employed as an inferential tool. Placed in this context, "Relationships in the population are evaluated from the examination of sample data" (1975:321). The nature of the vulnerability problem requires use of the descriptive task.
Unlike other data analytic techniques, multiple regression permits the assessment of numerous independent variables. This ability, according to Cohen, ... "is the single most important advantage of the multiple regression procedure" (1968:431). 'The Guide For Selecting Statistical Techniques for Analyzing Social Science Data' stipulates the use of multiple regression when the following measurement criteria are employed. First, as previously noted, the dependent variable must be an interval measure. Next, the independent variables, unless dummied or contrast coded must also be interval measures. Although six of the independent variables are not interval measures, the decision to use them is defended by Bohrnstedt and Carter in their discussion of the "Robustness in Regression Analysis" (1972).

The authors conclude that, "When one has a variable which is measured at least at the ordinal level parametric statistics not only can be, but should be, applied" (1972:132). It is further argued that parametric statistics, specifically multiple regression, can be used with ordinal measures and even nominal variables by using dummy variables as long as the dependent variable is not nominally measured (Boyle, 1976; Lyons and Carter, 1971; Suits, 1967; Cohen, 1968). Finally, the advantage for using the parametric statistic is the increase in analytic power. This increase, ... "makes the risk (associated with interval measure criteria) seem small" (Bohrnstedt, 1972:133).
The dummy coding procedure will be used to translate nominally measured variables into appropriate categories. Kerlinger describes this procedure by stating, "A dummy variable is a vector in which members of a given category are assigned an arbitrary number, while all others, not belonging to the category are assigned another arbitrary number" (1973:106).

In further discussion of dummy variable regression, Miller and Ericksen report, "The set of dummy variables will consist of a dummy variable for the constant term in the regression equation, plus one dummy variable for each possible combination of the categories of the independent variable" (1974:411). The items contained in the discipline and surveillance blocks will be dummied for regression analysis. In most cases these variables consist of two categories. A first category refers to the presence of certain restaurant practices, while a second category designates the absence of such practices. In the case of the structural model items, the presence and absence alternatives will be coded (0,1) respectively, thus conforming to the dummy procedure described by Kerlinger.

Statistics to be Presented in Data Analysis

The power dimension ascribed to multiple regression by Bohrnstedt and Carter make reference to the variety of interpretable measures furnished by this technique (1972).
Kerlinger supports this reference: "A final strength of multiple regression is its rich yield of various statistics to be used in the interpretation of the data" (1973:445). Several of these statistics are useful for interpreting variable relationships under study, and their description will follow.

The first statistic useful in examination of variable relationships is the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. It will allow an evaluation of the relationship between items within blocks. Blalock describes the task of this correlation coefficient: "It measures the amount of spread about the linear least squares equation" (1972:376). It has further been described as being, . . . "a measure of the goodness of fit of the least squares straight line" (1972:377). In addition, the square of the correlation coefficient will be used to interpret the relationship between the fourteen independent items and the vulnerability scales. These relationships will be tested for their significance. In reporting significance, .10 level will serve as the decision standard.

The third statistic useful in the interpretation of variable relationships is the multiple partial correlation coefficient. Its utility has been described in connection with the block procedure. The formula for this statistic is provided by Blalock (1972). In order to present the
multiple partial formula, the block identities will be re-assigned so that the specification model will consist of Blocks A, B, C and the structural model Blocks D and E.

Block A contains variables 1, 2, 3, Block B variables 4, 5, 6 and so it goes in multiples of three until Block E which contains variables 13 and 14. Both the item numbers and letters representing variables and blocks respectively will be used in reporting the formula for the multiple partial correlation coefficient.

Blalock presents the formula in the following expression:

$$r^2_i (j\ldots n) \cdot tu\ldots w = \frac{R^2_i \cdot jk\ldots w - R^2_i \cdot tu\ldots w}{1 - R^2_i \cdot tu\ldots w}$$

By way of illustration, substituting A, B, C, D, E for respective blocks of independent variables j, k\ldots w, and using Y and X as representing the dependent variables social and economic vulnerability, the following formula would allow isolation of the impact of the structural factor E on economic vulnerability.

$$r^2_X(E) \cdot ABCDE = \frac{R^2_X \cdot ABCDE - R^2_X \cdot E}{1 - R^2_X \cdot E}$$

It should be noted that the numerical expression in the numerator preceding the minus sign is the full model, while the expression following the subtraction sign is the increment to be partialled out. The denominator consists of 1 minus the increment to be partialled or 1 minus Block E consisting
of variables 13 and 14. Calculations rendered from this formula should yield a model that expresses the impact of the ABCD partial model upon the economic dimension of vulnerability. When this coefficient is compared to the full model the impact of Block E is realized. In this manner an assessment of the impact of each of the blocks results. In addition, block combinations can be partialled from the full model. This operation allows an evaluation of the specification and structural models.

The multiple partial will be tested for significance by way of enlisting the following formula furnished by Blalock (1972:462):

\[
F = \frac{r^2s(23),1467}{1 - r^2s(23),1467} \frac{N - 7}{2}
\]

This formula employs the partial of analysis as the numerator in the first expression, divided by 1 minus the numerator. Once this calculation is rendered this figure is multiplied by the study N, minus the number of variables (numerator) divided by the number of blocks. The resultant of this formula along with appropriate degrees of freedom serve as the criteria for the F table.

The test for significance of the multiple partial correlation coefficient provided by Blalock is one standard used to evaluate findings. From another point of view it is suggested that the amount of variance explained in the dependent variable by the block or blocks of independent variables may
further serve as a standard of judgment in evaluation of the vulnerability model. Any single block (A, B, C, D, E) capable of accounting for 20 percent or more of the dependent variable variance, should be judged as important to explanation of the vulnerability work attitude. Given the exploratory study assumptions, that each of the blocks is equally responsible in the formation and maintenance of the vulnerability attitude, then it is not beyond expectation that each block accounts for 20 percent of the dependent variable variance. This standard will provide a further criterion of evaluation.

In addition, any combination of blocks capable of explaining 50 percent or more of the dependent variable variance is also to be considered a powerful predictor of the vulnerability work attitude.

When compared to journal reports of variance explanation, these standards are conservative. Miller and Stokes, in a journal article content analysis of path analytic models report that, "The average number of variables per model approaches six, with an average residual of .79" (Miller and Stokes, 1975:196). "A residual of this magnitude indicates that on the average less than forty percent of the variance was accounted for" (1975:196).

In yet further detail, it is documented that 25 percent of the articles reported in seven journals in sociology,
... "had residuals of .90 or larger," thus providing models which accounted for 10 percent or less of the total variation" (1975:97).

The block procedure is a rather recent arrival to the data analytic task. Consequently, a content analysis, describing average variance explanation by average number of variable model is not yet feasible. However, the study by Miller is provided to illustrate the 'norm' that has developed in the discipline.

As a final comment to this chapter, it should be mentioned that the statistical yield of the regression analysis reported in this study is made possible by the SPSS computer package. The printout provides both the multiple $R^2$ square for respective models and the adjusted multiple $R^2$ square. Calculations reported in this study have been based upon the multiple $R^2$ square.
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The most instructive method for presenting the study findings is to systematically identify variable relationships. First, the zero order correlations assessing relationships between independent variables within blocks will be presented (Table 2). Relationships recorded in Table 3 will permit an examination of how individual independent items like 'hours worked per week' and 'length of interaction episode' correlate. Next \( r^2 \) the coefficient of determination, reported in Table 3 will assess the contribution of individual independent variables for explaining variation in the dependent variables. In keeping with the study objective of explaining vulnerability variation, this Table will describe the power of items within blocks to explain vulnerability variation.

A third statistic reported in Table 5 is the multiple partial correlation coefficient which assesses the power of individual blocks of independent variables in explaining the variation in the vulnerability scales. The effect of interaction attributes, occupational history, trade evaluation, discipline, and surveillance factors upon vulnerability variation will be individually recorded in Table 5. The combined effect of the specification blocks and the structural
blocks on vulnerability variation will be reported in Table 6. In this manner, the specification model and structural model may be tested and compared for their ability to explain variation in the vulnerability work attitude.

In sum, interitem correlations within blocks (Table 3), the square of the correlation coefficient for individual independent items and the vulnerability scales (Table 4), multiple partials for single blocks (Table 5), and multiple partials for the combined blocks (Table 6) will consecutively inform the reader of the statistical relationships attendant between independent and dependent variables. This deductive format, moving from the general, more peripheral relationships (Tables 3 and 4), to the ultimate testing of the specification and structural models will yield the most insightful presentation of findings.

**Dependent Variable Findings**

Before reporting the general relationships described in the introduction, a detailed assessment of the dependent variable is in order. It has been proposed that vulnerability response by the tipped employee to the six factor analyzed statements will vary according to the effect of five different blocks of independent variables. However, prior to isolating independent/dependent relationships, a closer examination of the dependent variable is necessary. Thus, a report of waitress response to vulnerability statements
without the impact of independent variables will serve as the basic point of analytic departure.

The dependent variable economic vulnerability consists of three factor scaled items, with a range of 3 to 15. The mean for the economic vulnerability factor scale, in which 1 designates strongly agree, while 5 designates strongly disagree is 6.9, with a standard deviation of 2.0. When each of three economic vulnerability items are broken out of the factor scale the expression of vulnerability becomes less complex, permitting a closer examination of waitress response. In response to the statement, "working for tips is like gambling, there is always a risk involved," 82 percent of the waitresses agreed. The mean reported for this item is 2.2.

Similarly, 69 percent of the respondents agree with the statement, "you can never be sure of your wages at this job, because when it comes to tipping you never know what customers will do." This item had a mean of 2.4. Finally, when asked to respond to the statement, "in this job I am fairly certain of making the same amount in tips each day," 80.3 percent of those questioned disagree while 6.6 percent strongly disagree, resulting in a mean of 3.95. This suggests that the waitress both recognizes and articulates the vulnerability associated with extending credit to customers.

By comparison, the social dimension of vulnerability is not as clearly articulated by the waitress. Given the format
of the scale items, if extreme social vulnerability were expressed then each of the indicators should register somewhere in the 2.0-2.5 range, yet the means for respective items are 3.6, 3.5, 3.5. When asked if they preferred the regular customer whose intentions are specified 79 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. From the same vantage point, 59 percent of those waitresses questioned disagreed with the trust indicator which stated, "if most customers could get away with it, they would not leave a tip." Finally, when asked to assume the role of the other by responding to the scale item, "most people I wait on care nothing about the waitress' feelings," 75 percent of those waitresses questioned disagree.

By way of conclusion, the waitress clearly articulates the vulnerability work attitude when wage arrangements serve as the vulnerability referent. However, this is not nearly so apparent when the customer or social arrangements serve as the vulnerability referent. It is interesting that the blame for economic uncertainty appears to be detached from the customer. The waitress hesitates to identify the customer as the culprit. In a somewhat contradictory manner, the waitress simultaneously reports, "yes" we perceive our economic interests as vulnerable and unspecified; however, "no" we do not want a specified clientele. Clarification of these scales will be provided through independent variable analysis.
In this manner, variation on the vulnerability scales can be matched with variation on the independent variables. Fourteen different independent items contained within five distinctive blocks representing two alternative models will lend further insight to the workings of the dual vulnerability dimensions.

**Interitem Correlations Within Blocks**

Fourteen different independent variables contained within five blocks generated from two models have been selected to explain variation in the vulnerability work attitude. In Table 3 interitem correlations between independent variables within blocks are recorded. Only interitem correlations within blocks will be reported for as Sullivan argues in his discussions of the block, "we do not have to know which variables in Block A affect which variables in Block C" (1971:333). Therefore, analysis in Table 3 will be confined to an examination of the relationships found within the five blocks of independent variables.

[Table 3 About Here]

It is apparent upon inspection of Table 3 that few of the interitem correlations contained within the five contributing blocks are strong. That is, for the most part independent variables are not highly correlated. It should be recognized that such conditions may be advantageous when
TABLE 3

INTERITEM CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES WITHIN BLOCKS

**BLOCK A ** INTERACTION ATTRIBUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Interaction Episode X Individuals Served Per Shift</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Interaction Episode X Repeat Customers</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Served Per Shift X Repeat Customers</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLOCK B ** TRADE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked Per Week X Average Tab/2</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked Per Week X Weekday Trade Estimate</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Trade Estimate X Average Tab/2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLOCK C ** OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time At Present Job X Total Number Years Waitressing</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Job Held X Total Number Years Waitressing</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time at Present Job X Last Job Held</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLOCK D ** DISCIPLINE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Check X Responsibility for Breakage</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Check Errors X Authorized Meal Time</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Breakage X Authorized Meal Time</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLOCK E ** SURVEILLANCE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Inspection X Inventory Control</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the block procedure and multiple regression team up as the primary data analytic techniques. Given the goal of explaining the greatest amount of vulnerability variation, it is important that items within blocks each contribute distinctively to variance explanation. Generally speaking the "soaking up" of dependent variable variance is accomplished when there exists no explanatory overlap between independent variables. Such overlap has been labeled the redundancy problem and according to Table 3 only one possible case, in the surveillance block is suggested (inventory control x station inspection = .69).

According to Gordon the term redundancy refers to "high correlation between two or more independent variables" (1968: 596). Specifically he describes the redundancy problem in the following passage:

As redundant independent variables are successively introduced into a regression problem, their common predictive value gets averaged, in a weighted manner over all of the regression coefficients. As a result, all of the regression coefficients decline in absolute value. At the same time, multiple correlation increases only a trivial amount with each new variable, reflecting the fact that little new information is being added.

Gordon speaks specifically to more traditional multiple regression statistics, yet, the multiple partial correlation coefficient, to be presented in Tables 5 and 6, may suffer from redundancy in the same manner as the multiple correlation coefficient described by Gordon. All of this is to
suggest that the surveillance block should contribute less to vulnerability variance explanation since it consists of only two items which may suffer somewhat from redundancy.

As can be seen in Table 3 the interitem correlations in Blocks A, B, C, D are very similar. The coefficients range from a low of .04 to a high of .37. In each of these blocks two of the reported correlations are moderate while a third is consistently weak. This pattern which defines specification blocks and the discipline block is not repeated in the case of surveillance factors, since .69 is the single interitem correlation between station inspection and inventory control.

### Individual Independent Variables with Vulnerability Dimensions

When each of the fourteen independent variables is associated with the dual dimensions of vulnerability and squared, the resulting yield, the coefficient of determination, is generally weak with a few exceptions.

[Table 4 About Here]

Table 4 describes the amount of vulnerability variation accounted for by the individual items within blocks. In the case of economic vulnerability reported in Column 1, the coefficient of determination ranges from a low of .0004 (the average tab for two customers) to a high of .10 (the number of hours worked per week). It should be mentioned that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Economic Vulnerability</th>
<th>Social Vulnerability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Interaction</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Served</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Repeat</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked Per Week</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Trade Estimate</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Tab/2</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time at Present Job</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Years Waitressing</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Job Held</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Check Errors</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Breakage</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Meal Time</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Inspection</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory Control</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .10
** Significant at the .05
these extremes are both found in the trade evaluation block.

In the case of the discipline block each of the items consistently accounts for 8 percent of the variation in the economic vulnerability factor scale. A less sharply delineated pattern is evidenced by the components of the surveillance block, station inspection (.07) and inventory control (.05).

The most powerful contributor to the explanation of economic vulnerability variation within the interaction block is the 'length of interaction episode' accounting for 7 percent of economic vulnerability variation. In the case of the trade evaluation block, the most powerful predictor of economic vulnerability is the 'hours worked per week' item. This item claims 10 percent of the variation of economic vulnerability as recorded in Column 1 of Table 4. The 'total number of years waitressing,' is the most powerful item within the occupational history block (.07). In the surveillance block, the station inspection item with a coefficient of .07 exceeds the inventory control item registering .05. Finally, there is no single item which outperforms all others in the discipline block since all three of the items representing management discipline, as witnessed in Column 1 of Table 3, claim 8 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability.

According to the square of the correlation coefficient, $r^2$, reported in Table 4, the structural items in Blocks D and
E consistently explain more economic vulnerability variation than do the specification items, with the exception of the 'length of interaction episode item' (.07) and the 'hours worked per week' item (.10).

Upon inspection of Column 2 of Table 4 it is apparent that the two dependent variables, economic and social vulnerability are dissimilar when matched with the identical set of fourteen independent variables. The square of the correlation coefficient recorded in Column 2 is seen to range from a low of .0009 (length of interaction episode) to a high of .19 (station inspection).

The most powerful items within blocks found in Column 2 are quite different from that reported in Column 1. In the case of the interaction block the 'individuals served per shift' item explains the greatest variation in social vulnerability (.09) while compared to the 'length of interaction episode' (.0009) and the 'percentage repeat customers' item (.01). Neither of the two remaining specification blocks, trade evaluation or occupational history, contain even moderate predictors of social vulnerability. When the items in the trade evaluation block are considered the most powerful item, 'average tab per two' accounts for only 2 percent of social vulnerability variance.

Similarly, the greatest contributor to variance explanation within the occupational history block is the 'length of time at present job' item (.01). The discipline
block which produced consistently moderate contributors to economic vulnerability provides only one relatively weak relationship with social vulnerability. In addition, in Column 2 of Table 4 the 'responsibility for check errors' item claims 4 percent of the variation in the social dimension of vulnerability.

The surveillance block provides the best predictors of social vulnerability. The inventory control item accounts for 8 percent of the variation in the dependent variable while the station inspection item outperforms all others with its claim for explaining 19 percent of the variation in social vulnerability.

In further comparison of Column 1 of Table 4 with Column 2 several distinctions are apparent. First there is considerable disparity between the columns indicating the difference between social and economic vulnerability. For example, 'length of interaction episode' registers .07 in the case of economic vulnerability and .0009 for the social dimension of vulnerability. In a similar fashion, responsibility for check errors was found to account for 8 percent of economic vulnerability variance, while only contributing .004 in the case of social vulnerability. A final example of disparity between respective columns concerns the 'hours worked per week' item. As can be seen in comparing coefficients in Column 1 and 2 fully 10 percent of the variation
in economic vulnerability is accounted for by this item compared to only .002 of a percent in the case of social vulnerability. There are three items which explain more variation in social vulnerability than in economic vulnerability.

Two of the three are found in one block, the surveillance block. Station inspection (.19/107) and inventory control (.08/.05) are both better predictors of social vulnerability than they are of economic vulnerability. In a similar manner the 'individuals served per shift' item found in the interaction block is more powerful in explaining social vulnerability variance (.09) than it is in the case of economic vulnerability.

There are two items that are nearly congruent when Columns 1 and 2 are compared. A first item is found in the occupational history block, the 'last job held' variable. This item is a poor predictor for both dimensions of vulnerability (.002/.006). The second item of near congruence is the 'inventory control' item found in the surveillance block. Although there is some difference between the 5 percent of the variance it contributes in economic vulnerability as compared with the 8 percent for social vulnerability the respective coefficients are relatively close.

Two relationships have been recorded as significant in Table 3. The 'station inspection' item claims significance at the .05 level when pared with social vulnerability, while
the 'hours worked per week' item when coupled with economic vulnerability is significant at the .10 level. Station inspection, although not recorded as significant is a valuable predictor of economic vulnerability; however, this reciprocity does not hold for the 'hours worked per week' and social vulnerability relationship, since it claims no power in explaining social vulnerability variation (.10/.002).

It could be argued that the small study N (N=61) may be responsible for under-emphasizing the relationships reported in Column 1 of Table 4. This argument cannot be applied in explaining the absence of significant relationships reported in Column 2 (Skipper, 1967; Labovitz, 1968; Selvin, 1966).

Single Blocks and the Vulnerability Dimensions

[Table 5 About Here]

The multiple partial correlation coefficients recorded in Column 1 of Table 5 describe the amount of variation in economic vulnerability explained by the combined efforts of block items. For the most part, the pattern that develops in Table 4 is continued in Table 5. Accordingly, the three interaction attributes in combination, (length of interaction episode, individuals served per shift and percentage repeat customers) account for 6 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. The weakest block for prediction of economic vulnerability variation is the trade evaluation block which
### TABLE 5
MULTIPLE PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR INDEPENDENT BLOCKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCKS</th>
<th>ECONOMIC VULNERABILITY</th>
<th>SOCIAL VULNERABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A--INTERACTION ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B--TRADE EVALUATION</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C--OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D--DISCIPLINE</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E--SURVEILLANCE</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .10

** Significant at .05
contributes 4 percent toward dependent variable explanation. Occupational history consisting of the combined input of, 'length of time at present job,' 'total number of years waitressing,' and 'last job held,' accounts for 5 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. The predictive power of the discipline block is equal to the interaction block for they both contribute 6 percent towards the explanation of economic vulnerability variation. Finally, the most powerful predictor of economic vulnerability recorded in Column 1 of Table 5 is the surveillance block which explains 7 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability.

For the most part, the same blocks explain less variation when social vulnerability is considered. For example, interaction attributes account for 5 percent of social vulnerability, while 6 percent is recorded in the case of economic vulnerability. Similarly, trade evaluation consisting of the 'hours worked per week' item, the 'weekday trade estimate,' and the 'average tab for two,' is only half as powerful in explaining social vulnerability (2 percent) when compared with economic vulnerability (4 percent). When occupational history is paired with social vulnerability the resulting multiple partial correlation coefficient is .04. This measure of variance explanation is only slightly increased when the discipline block is considered as a predictor of social vulnerability (.05). Each of the multiple partials recorded in Column 2 of Table 5 is smaller
than its counterpart in Column 1 with the exception of the surveillance block. It claims the only significant relationship when paired with social vulnerability. In combination the station inspection item and inventory control variable account for 13 percent of the variation in social vulnerability. This relationship as seen in Table 4 is significant at the .10 level of significance.

When the findings reported in Table 5 are considered in light of the 20 percent standard discussed in the previous chapter, only one multiple partial approaches this level. It will be recalled that a second standard of evaluation beyond traditional significance tests was set at 20 percent of explained variance. The surveillance block which contains only two items as compared with three in all other blocks is the only multiple partial to approach this second standard of evaluation.

According to hypotheses stated in Chapter Three no one block is identified as most powerful in explaining vulnerability variation. According to findings recorded in Table 4 this assumption is rejected, since the surveillance block exceeds all others in its explanation of vulnerability variation.

In an effort to further clarify the findings recorded in Table 4, a formal presentation of hypotheses is instructive.
1H: There is a relationship between interaction attributes and economic vulnerability. rejected

2H: There is a relationship between interaction attributes and social vulnerability. rejected

3H: There is a relationship between trade evaluation and economic vulnerability. rejected

4H: There is a relationship between trade evaluation and social vulnerability. rejected

5H: There is a relationship between occupational history and economic vulnerability. rejected

6H: There is a relationship between occupational history and social vulnerability. rejected

7H: There is a relationship between discipline factors and economic vulnerability. rejected

8H: There is a relationship between discipline factors and social vulnerability. rejected

9H: There is a relationship between surveillance factors and economic vulnerability. rejected

10H: There is a relationship between surveillance factors and social vulnerability. not rejected (.10)
Combined Blocks and the Vulnerability Attitude

[Table 6 About Here]

Thirty-nine percent of the variation in economic vulnerability is explained when the five blocks operate in unison. This combination of all blocks is labeled the full or total model and is presented in Table 6. In the case of social vulnerability the identical measure of variation, thirty-nine percent is claimed by the five block model.

The multiple partial correlation coefficient permits the partialling out of one block or a combination of blocks from the dependent variable variation. Table 6, Column 1 records the amount of variation that can be claimed by the combined efforts of the interaction block, trade evaluation block, and occupational history block. These three blocks are referred to as the specification model since they contain the items which represent the specification of exchange terms process. The specification model claims 14 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. By contrast, the structural model claims 17 percent of the variation in this dependent variable. The explanatory power of the structural model clearly exceeds that of the specification model when economic vulnerability is considered.

Yet, the structural model is at a disadvantage for it consists of only two blocks made up of five items instead
TABLE 6
MULTIPLE PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
FOR COMBINED BLOCKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC VULNERABILITY</th>
<th>SOCIAL VULNERABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MODEL (A,B,C,D,E)</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFICATION MODEL (A,B,C)</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL MODEL (D,E)</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIFICATION MODEL COMPOSED OF INDIVIDUAL ATTRIBUTES
BLOCK A,B,C=INTERACTION, TRADE EVALUATION, OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY

STRUCTURAL MODEL COMPOSED OF COLLECTIVE ATTRIBUTES
BLOCK D,E=DISCIPLINE AND SURVEILLANCE BLOCKS

** Significant at .05
* Significant at .10
of the three blocks and nine items which constitute the specification model.

The pattern assumed by the two divergent models is further amplified in the case of social vulnerability. The specification model explains 13 percent of the dependent variable variation, while the structural model claims 24 percent of the variation in social vulnerability. The power of the specification model is nearly equivalent for social and economic vulnerability. However, this is not the case when the structural model is considered. The combined efforts of the discipline and surveillance blocks account for 17 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. By contrast, they are nearly 30 percent more powerful when in relation to social vulnerability since they explain 24 percent of the variance in this dependent variable. The structural model when tested for significance is significant at the .10 level for economic vulnerability and at the .05 for social vulnerability.

By way of conclusion, a formal presentation of hypotheses is in order.

11H: There is a relationship between the specification model and economic vulnerability. rejected

12H: There is a relationship between the specification model and social vulnerability. rejected

13H: There is a relationship between the structural model and economic vulnerability. not rejected (.10)

14H: There is a relationship between the structural model and social vulnerability. not rejected (.05)
CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This Chapter is divided into two sections. The first section will be devoted to an evaluation of the independent variables. It will begin with an examination of individual items (1-14), followed by a critique of individual blocks (A-E), and culminating with a critique of the specification and structural model.

The second section will be devoted to integration effort. An interface will be described between the findings and the principles which they support within existing sociological theory.

Interaction Attributes and the Vulnerability Work Attitude

According to principles of exchange theory, trust or the credit extended the customer during the restaurant exchange, is developed over time (Blau, 1964). Consequently, the length of the restaurant episode, and related work interaction attributes should prove to be good predictors of the vulnerability work attitude.

The combined impact of the interaction attributes (length of interaction episode, individuals served per shift, 93
and the percentage of repeat customers) operates from a rationale which provides that stable social interaction between small numbers of repeat customers promotes familiarity which in turn serves to specify the exchange terms between waitress and customer. To paraphrase Klatsky and Teitler, familiarity identifies the intentions of the customer, and as a consequence the perception of vulnerability diminishes.

As can be seen in Table 4, the combined interaction attributes contribute approximately 6 percent of the variance towards an explanation of economic vulnerability. By contrast, the identical grouping of attributes explains 5 percent of the variation in social vulnerability.

A combination of factors may be responsible for the poor showing made by the interaction block. In an effort to identify the problems it is necessary to examine the three items within the interaction block. First, the limited variance on the duration of interaction episode item in part may be responsible for the lack of power. Approximately 92 percent of the responses were split between two categories, 45 minutes to an hour, and 1 to 1½ hours. The half hour differential may not facilitate greater familiarity and specification of exchange terms. Perhaps this variable would claim more explanatory power if the restaurant episode ranged from 10 minutes to 2 hours or more. Unfortunately, this range of variance would force a sampling of restaurants that would not fit into the leisure dining restaurant category. Given
the necessity of tips as the wage structure and the importance of unspecified terms of exchange, and also realizing that most fast food restaurants (10 minutes for meal episode) do not permit tipping, it would appear to be extremely difficult to sample the variety of restaurants that would supply maximum variance on this item. Perhaps a diner would provide a setting in which a maximum range for the interaction item could be attained, since tipping is practiced in this type of restaurant.

Table 3 reports the coefficient of determination \( r^2 \) for the length of interaction episode and economic vulnerability. Seven percent of the variation in economic vulnerability is accounted for by the length of episode item. Given the minimum variance that characterizes this item, and the strength of the relationship attendant between it and economic vulnerability, it would not be wise to discard it. However, this is not the case when social vulnerability is considered. The comparable \( r^2 \) for social vulnerability as shown in Column 2 of Table 3 is .009. This measure gives no indication that length of interaction episode even minimally influences the waitress' attitude towards customer relations.

Concerning the second interaction attribute, 'individuals served per shift,' approximately half of the waitresses questioned served between 11-30 customers per shift. When this item is correlated with the vulnerability dimensions and squared only social vulnerability is influenced as recorded
in Column 2 of Table 3. Nine percent of the variation in social vulnerability is contributed by the 'individuals served per shift' item, while only 2 percent is explained by the same item when economic vulnerability is considered.

The number of customers like the size of groups may influence social vulnerability by way of the quantity and quality of interaction (Cartwright, 1968). There is some evidence that this item should have explained more variance in economic vulnerability. Latane reports that waitresses received less tips from contributing individuals as more individuals joined the dining group. That is, responsibility was diffused among more members of the group, and tips for the waitress decreased. The relationship between the number of customers served per shift and economic vulnerability is weak, thus providing little support for previous research.

The final item operating in the interaction block is the percentage of repeat customers variable. As Column 1 of Table 3 indicates there is a weak relationship between this item and economic vulnerability (.04). Even less explanatory power is exerted by the regular customer item when social vulnerability is considered, since it explains only .01 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. Yet the root of occupational vulnerability is the uncertainty of customer intentions. Thus it would seem when the percentage of regular customers varies so should the vulnerability work
attitude expressed by the waitress. According to the specification model, the terms of exchange attendant between waitress and regular customer are subject to specification, thus reducing the expression of the vulnerability work attitude.

Webster speaks to this issue in a discussion of trust formation (1975). "If interaction between actors will continue for some time, as for example it usually will between friends or members of the same family or social group, then trust is relatively more likely to develop than if interaction will not persist"(1975:258). The extension of credit to the customer is ensured by the regularity with which they frequent the restaurant. In short, once the waitress knows the intentions of the customer, the terms of exchange between the two are specified. Theoretically, the principles supporting these predictions are well documented (Webster, 1975), however, their applicability for the vulnerability work attitude is less certain.

The percentage of regular customers item explains 4 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability and only 1 percent of the variation in social vulnerability. Why is it that the waitress rejects the certainty of regular customer intentions and the specification of exchange terms that it ensures for the anonymous everchanging clientele to which she must extend credit and assume the role of creditor? Vulnerability has been conceptualized as uncertainty associated
with unspecified exchange terms which characterize a work relationship. Yet when conditions permitting exchange specification are introduced, they demonstrate little impact upon the vulnerability expression. Several interpretations can be offered for this inconsistency.

The variance on the regular customer item was limited even though restaurants were stratified on the basis of it. As previously noted half of the sample consisted of motel restaurants which ensured that customer anonymity could be examined. The distribution of response on the repeat trade item is limited, since 67.2 percent of those responding reported 15 percent or less regular trade, and only 13.1 percent reported more than 30 percent regular customers. The limited variance on this item may in part explain its weakness.

A second explanation for the weak showing made by the 'percentage repeat customers' is based upon observations drawn from conversations with waitresses. When regular customers become identified, a set of increasing expectations on the part of the customer develops. In such cases, special service and attention may be required. As principles of exchange theory would suggest, many waitresses would rather forego such a time investment considering the rather ordinary reward that generally accompanies such demands (Blau, 1964).

In an effort to exemplify this rather complicated disposition assumed by the waitress, participant observation
may be instructive. Upon leaving the occupation a waitress passed on a regular trade deuce to a waitress friend by way of introduction. Some weeks following the transition the friend rather sarcastically thanked the ex-waitress for her disguised benevolence. She accused her benefactor of 'spoiling' the customers, with extra service and attention that were both time consuming and nonproductive. In an effort to break the bond with the regular patrons, the waitress had taken to hiding in the kitchen when the couple in question entered the restaurant, in hopes that they would not request her as their waitress. As might be expected, management caters to the whims of the regular customer and in so doing expands the expectations of the regular trade.

This observation suggests that the terms of exchange may become too specified in the case of regular customers, and such rigid specification may take additional service requirements which may interfere with the typical procedures for ordering and delivering meals. It must be recognized there is only so much time for each group. If one group demands more than their share of time and service, problems within other groups in the station may develop. In addition, when one group in the station receives some special service or attention then other groups having observed the exception expect the same and when it is not provided dissatisfaction expressed by way of the tip may result.

Perhaps an example can best illustrate the costs
associated with regular customers (Thaibut, 1957). The example concerns a couple that were teetotalers. According to an interviewed waitress, once the couple had established themselves as regular customers they asked management if it would be suitable if they provided their own tea. At first, they brought their tea along on each visit; however, it got to the point where on one occasion they forgot their tea, leaving it at the restaurant, and it became customary for the waitress to set it aside at the beverage stand for their use. This may appear a trivial incident to those not socialized to the requirements of the waitress work role, but most waitresses would agree that such expectations can interfere with the regular routine of setting up and delivering the meal to the customer. Such an intrusion to routine may hamper waitress efficiency for the entire evening and generally does not warrant the inconvenience.

Principles of exchange theory, with an emphasis upon cost and reward may be used as a possible explanation for what appears to be an inconsistent finding. The seasoned waitress regardless of the 'gracious service ethic,' may find that regular trade customers demand more investment in both time and energy than is warranted in light of rewards rendered. These findings would seem to suggest that strict social exchange providing certainty of customer intentions, may in the long run be a less efficient form of interaction for both waitress and restaurant.
The trade evaluation block is included in the study so that the effect that restaurant business has upon the expression of vulnerability may be examined. It was hypothesized that a restaurant in which customer attendance was both meager and subject to an irregular pattern might influence the expression of economic vulnerability. According to Table 4 the trade evaluation block has almost no effect on social vulnerability, since only 2 percent of the variance in the dependent variable can be attributed to it.

In the case of economic vulnerability, it doubled its impact. It accounted for 4 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. The trade block explains the least amount of dependent variable variance for both social and economic vulnerability. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the individual effect of each of the three trade items. Generally speaking, not one of the items exerts much influence upon the dual dimensions of vulnerability with the exception of the impact of the average number of hours worked per week item, upon economic vulnerability. This variable, as reported in Column 1 of Table 3, accounts for 10 percent of the variance in economic vulnerability. It is significant at the .10 level of significance.

The 'hours worked per week' item, like each of the interaction attributes, is recognized as important in the
specification process. It is hypothesized that as the number of hours spent working or in interaction with the customer increases, so the intentions of the customer are identified and the terms of exchange between waitress and customer are specified.

The second item within the trade evaluation block, the weekday trade estimate, explains only .008 percent of the variance in economic vulnerability and .005 percent of the variance in social vulnerability. A minimum of variation in response to this item was recorded, since nearly 60 percent labeled weekday trade as varying and 10 percent labeled it as irregular. This item was included so that economic vulnerability in particular might be compared with the amount of weekday business claimed by the restaurant. Most waitresses move on to new jobs once the reputation of a restaurant declines and business suffers.

The final variable within the trade block is the average tab for two customers. It accounts for 2 percent of the variation in social vulnerability while only explaining .0004 of a percent of economic vulnerability. It was hypothesized that the cost of the meal might be a reflection of the time spent in preparing and serving it, thus indicative of the specification process. However, as seen in Table 3, 'the average tab' item exerts little power on either vulnerability dimension.
Although minimal explanatory power can be claimed by the three item trade evaluation block it cannot be eliminated from follow up research since it operates as a control factor. One item, 'the hours worked per week' item and economic vulnerability form a significant relationship.

**Occupational History and the Vulnerability Work Attitude**

Occupational history explains 5 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability and 4 percent of the variation in social vulnerability. The vulnerability expression reported by the service worker was hypothesized to be produced in part by individual work history. According to the specification model, those who have previously worked for contracted wages in jobs where the terms of exchange are clearly specified are expected to express vulnerability, while those workers better acquainted with the uncertainty of tips are expected to report less vulnerability. Vulnerability variation is seen to be a product of the length of time spent in the occupation and the wage arrangement in the last held occupation. There is some evidence that length of time spent in a service occupation promotes a kind of specialization which facilitates the process of specifying the terms of exchange. This brand of specialization is exemplified by Davis (1959) in his description of the cabdriver.

When the individual impact of the three occupational history items is examined only one item claims some success
in explaining dependent variable variation. As seen in Column 1 of Table 3 the 'total number of years waitressing' item explains 7 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. The same item claims only .004 percent of the variation in the social dimension of vulnerability.

More than seventy-five percent (75.4 %) of those waitresses questioned had spent one year or less in their present job. The lack of variation on the length of time at present job item may in part be responsible for the rather modest $r^2$'s which are reported for this item in Table 3. One percent of the variation in social vulnerability is contributed by the 'length of time at present job' item, and 4 percent is claimed by the same item in the case of economic vulnerability.

The last job held item explains less than 1 percent of the variation in both social and economic vulnerability as recorded in Table 3. Once again the variation on this item was limited, since 65 percent of the waitresses reported their last job to be restaurant work.

Two important observations may be made at this juncture. First, the 'total number of years waitressing' item and the 'hours worked per week' item are both better predictors of economic vulnerability than to social vulnerability. Since they both are indicators of the specification model, and they both explain considerably more variation in economic than in social vulnerability it would seem that the specification
model is more powerful in the explanation of the economic dimension as compared with the social dimension of vulnerability.

The second observation consists of combining two findings on items within the occupational history block. Seventy-five percent of the waitresses sampled reported only one year or less at their present job, yet 65 percent of the waitresses reported their last job to be restaurant work. This would seem to suggest that turnover in this occupation can not be explained as leaving to accept more secure jobs. In this regard, Smythe has argued:

Aside from the fact that there are little or no spectacular gains to be made in tipping occupations, workers go into them not for gains as such, but for a livelihood; and they are forced to accept the insecurity of tips where no better opportunities for making a living present themselves.

It may be that the more seasoned waitress recognizes the disadvantages owing to the wage arrangement in her work, but she may be in no position to change occupations. Instead, the waitress may move from restaurant to restaurant anticipating a change in work arrangements.

**Discipline Factors and the Vulnerability Work Attitude**

The discipline block, unlike the three preceding blocks, contains items which are collective attributes. These items are not based upon waitress response but rather they reflect the response of management. In combination the
three discipline items explain 6 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability and 5 percent in social vulnerability. Each of the items within the discipline block represent properties of the structural model, an alternative to the specification model.

The rationale of the structural model depicts vulnerability as produced by the absence of organizational support for the service worker. Since vulnerability stems from the act of extending credit to a customer whose intentions are not clear, it is hypothesized that the restaurant which extends credit to its waitresses will employ service workers who extend credit to their customers, while expressing the least perception of uncertainty or vulnerability. The mechanism that regulates this model operates so that those who give credit produce the same orientation in their employees, who extend credit to customers. The extension of management credit is operationalized in terms of the absence or presence of certain rules and regulations that define waitress work.

According to Column 1 of Table 3 each of the three discipline items explains 8 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. By comparison, not one of the items claims such power over the variation of social vulnerability. The 'responsibility for breakage' item explains 4 percent of the variation in social vulnerability, while the 'responsibility for check errors' and the 'authorized meal time' item
each explain less than 1 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

The discipline variables alone and in combination explain considerably more variation in the economic dimension as compared with the social dimension of vulnerability. This finding suggests that the supportive organization may provide some compensation for the tension produced by uncertain wages. In other words, the wage relationship may not be supportive of the waitress but this strain or tension may be offset by a supportive organization. A restaurant that demonstrates its support of the waitress may represent a source of power or reinforcement which may be tapped in the event that a customer defaults on the act of credit extension. The waitress may view the supportive restaurant as the 'reserves' which may be 'called out' in the event of exploitation. In short, the supportive restaurant may be viewed by the waitress as an arm of power. This arm may never be flexed but knowledge of its existence may influence the vulnerability expression. In summary, it would appear that restaurants in which punitive constraints (discipline items) are placed on the worker do not extend credit to their workers who in turn express uncertainty over their wages.

**Surveillance Factors and the Vulnerability Work Attitude**

The surveillance block is more powerful than any other block tested in explaining variation in both dimensions of
the dependent variable. In the case of economic vulnerability, 7 percent of the variation can be attributed to the surveillance block while 13 percent of the variation in social vulnerability is claimed by this same item. The relationship between the surveillance block and social vulnerability is significant at the .10 level of significance.

According to the standard developed in the preceding chapter, any single block that contributes 20 percent toward explaining the variance in the dependent variable would be judged as a significant relationship. The surveillance block accounts for 13 percent of the variance in social vulnerability. Since only two items make up the surveillance block, only two-thirds of the 20 percent standard or approximately 14 percent is acceptable. In other words, the surveillance block is the only configuration of variables that approaches standard. It may, therefore, be concluded that when compared to the four other blocks tested, the two factor surveillance block is the most powerful predictor of both vulnerability dimensions.

Within the surveillance block, the inventory control item explains 5 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability and 8 percent of social vulnerability. Station inspection, the second item in the surveillance block, is the best overall predictor of the vulnerability work attitude in the study. It explains 7 percent of the variation in
economic vulnerability. In the case of social vulnerability 19 percent of its variation can be explained by the station inspection item.

Station inspection is a restaurant practice whereby the waitress' station or assigned territory is checked for cleanliness, supplies, etc. by management, that is, the waitress is not given full responsibility over her territory. In one of the restaurants sampled there was a movement started to rebel against the restaurant manager. According to the waitresses, the manager in question constantly criticized the manner in which they set the table. Either the wine lists were not properly positioned or the silverware was spread too far apart or the salt and pepper did not look full enough. Any number of examples were listed by a group of angry waitresses. In contrast, the manager claimed that the waitresses did not pay attention to table detail. From the perspective of the manager the waitresses had no sense of detail in their work, while the waitresses viewed the continuous inspection of station as an insult to their ability to waitress.

Research in the area of personal space and territoriality, suggests that the inspection of the station by management may be identified by the waitress as an invasion of her personal space. It may be that waitresses are territorial about their restaurant stations. This disposition may in
part explain the significance of the station inspection item. Ultimately, it is the most critical indicator of credit extension practiced by the restaurant organization.

The Full Model and the Vulnerability

Work Attitude

The full or total model refers to the amount of variation that is explained in the dependent variable when all blocks contribute simultaneously. As shown in Table 5, when all five blocks simultaneously operate on the vulnerability dimensions the identical measure of dependent variable variation results. Thirty-nine percent of the variation in both economic and social vulnerability is explained by the combined forces of the full model. This may be somewhat surprising in light of the fact that the individual blocks almost consistently claimed more power in the explanation of variance in the economic dimension of vulnerability, as compared with its social counterpart. However, this advantage was counterbalanced by the surveillance block which explained 13 percent of the variation in social vulnerability.

Thirty-nine percent of the variation in social and economic vulnerability is explained by the full model. This leaves a residual of 61 percent. According to the content analysis provided by Miller (1975), the vulnerability model approaches the mean path model standard since, ... "on the average less than forty percent of the variance was accounted for" (1975:196). It is more encouraging to conclude that the
vulnerability model exceeds at least one quarter of the path models reported in seven sociology journals. This conclusion is based on Miller's discovery that 25 percent of the articles surveyed, "had residuals of 90 percent or larger," thus accounting for 10 percent or less of the total variation in the dependent variable.

The Specification Model and the Vulnerability Work Attitude

The rationale underlying the specification model provides that vulnerability is a product of the unspecified terms of exchange attendant between waitress and customer. Because the terms of exchange are unspecified the waitress must extend credit to the anonymous customer. According to the specification model the act of extending credit to the customer provokes less vulnerability as the length of the restaurant episode increases or as the total number of years waitressing increases or as the number of hours per week at work increase. Each of these items serves to regulate the specification process. The specification of the terms of exchange varies as these items vary.

Table 5 reports the multiple partial correlation coefficient for the specification model. According to Table 5, when the surveillance and discipline blocks are partialed out the remaining three blocks in combination explain 14 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. In the case of social vulnerability, the same blocks which constitute the
specification model account for 13 percent of the dependent variable variation. Neither of the coefficients is significant at the .10 level. However, several of the items within the three specification blocks could be extracted and recombined into a new specification block. This consolidation is suggested for improvement in explaining variation in the economic dimension of vulnerability.

The particular items in question are, 'length of interaction episode,' 'the total number of years waitressing,' and 'hours worked per week.' A reconstruction of the specification model is not possible in the case of social vulnerability since only one item, 'the individuals served per shift,' claims influence over this dependent variable.

The specification model is a better predictor of economic vulnerability. Its abilities in explaining economic vulnerability should be improved if the six noncontributing items are removed since in combination they pull down the overall significance of the specification model. It will be recalled that the formula for the multiple partial provides that one must subtract the number of variables from the study N and divide by the number of blocks; this calculation is multiplied by the partial.

When the number of variables and blocks is decreased, the remaining three items claim increased power in the explanation of economic vulnerability variation.
Reconstruction of the specification model to a three item block produces a multiple partial correlation of .12. This coefficient is significant at the .10 level of significance. The original specification model consists of nine variables that account for 14 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability, while the modified specification model consists of three variables contained in one block which account for 12 percent of the variation in the economic dimension of vulnerability. The modified version of the specification model forms a significant relationship with economic vulnerability.

The Structural Model and the Vulnerability Work Attitude

The rationale underlying the structural model provides that vulnerability is a product of the uncertainty that accompanies the act of extending credit to the customer. According to the structural model the restaurant organization that extends credit to its worker, fosters or encourages the same positive orientation in its workers. The extension of credit is operationalized in terms of particular rules and procedures practiced by the restaurant.

The structural model consists of two blocks composed of five items. The discipline block and the surveillance block in combination account for 17 percent of the variation in economic vulnerability. This relationship is significant
at the .10 level of significance. By comparison, the structural model explains 24 percent of the variation in social vulnerability. These findings must be considered in light of the disadvantages inherent in the structural model. Not only is it a full block weaker, but further, one of its blocks consists of two rather than three items. The original specification model uses nine items to explain vulnerability variation, while the structural model uses only five. As pointed out earlier, this may be an advantage in disguise, since calculations for the significance of the multiple partial correlation coefficient make use of the number of variables (items) and the number of blocks.

The significance of the structural model suggests that the orientation of the restaurant toward its employees has more to do with the vulnerability expression than does the time orientation reflected in the specification model. More specifically, it would appear that those restaurants which extend credit to their waitresses foster a credit orientation in their employees which extends to restaurant customers. It can further be concluded, on the basis of coefficient size, that this organizational orientation has a greater influence upon social relationships that develop in the restaurant than it does on wage relationships, although both are influenced.

It would seem to follow from these observations that any restaurant concerned with 'gracious service' and
hospitality should consider the extent to which they have extended credit to their employees. The practice of station inspection has been reported as the most critical indicator of the restaurant's "credit policy." Working for tips instead of wages is tension producing due to the uncertainty of both wages and customers' intentions. Such tension does not contribute to an industry where hospitality is the product promoted and sold. According to study findings this tension may be offset by a supportive organization.

When findings thus far reported are combined, a pattern operating in the restaurant industry is established. Seventy-five percent of those waitresses questioned had worked at their present jobs less than one year. Yet, the last job held for 65 percent of those questioned was restaurant work. Waitressing, with its unusually high turnover rate, is an occupation of new recruits.

New recruits in any occupation are likely to be subject to increased surveillance. According to study findings, the surveillance block, or more specifically, the station inspection variable, is a critical indicator of the 'credit mentality' sponsored by the restaurant (Ekeh, 1976). New recruits are subject to surveillance which promotes the vulnerability work attitude. Although not tested, an extreme expression of vulnerability may explain a portion of the turnover rate.

In short, the findings suggest a 'viscious cycle.'
The waitress, typically a new recruit, is closely observed while completing her first year of service. This surveillance adds to the tension produced by unspecified terms of exchange with the customer. In combination, these factors would seem to contribute little to the hospitality industry. Instead, they may contribute to the turnover rate which in turn refuels the cycle by producing vacancies for new recruits. Finally, the cycle is likely to be reinforced by increasing numbers of rules and procedures, a response to the continuous cycle of new recruits.

The Structural Model as an Example of Structural Effects

The structural model exerts significant influence upon the vulnerability work attitude. The components of the structural model are attributes of collectivities, not attributes of individuals. Each of the items within the discipline and surveillance blocks is descriptive of the restaurant organization. Unlike the occupational history block which contains individual attributes and the interaction block which contains attributes of the individuals' work routine, the two blocks which make up the structural model contain characteristics of the restaurant social structure. They provide an indication of the flexibility/rigidity of the restaurant structure. Authorized meal time, responsibility for check errors and station inspection
reflect the collective rules or structure that is imposed upon restaurant employees.

The relationship between restaurant structure and vulnerability expression can be described as an example of structural effects. According to Blau, "if a structural effect is observed, it invariably constitutes evidence that social processes originating outside the individual personality are responsible for the differences in the dependent variable" (1960:190). The study findings suggest that the vulnerability work attitude, an expression of the individual, is a product of social structure reflected in the orientation practiced by the restaurant organization. This orientation has been described as the extent to which restaurant management extends credit to their employees. The restaurant that extends credit to its workers, fosters or encourages the same orientation in its workers.

Perhaps this relationship between organizational structure and individual attitude is best described as a problem of status support. People who work for tips hold positions in the economy that are not supported by their customers, whose intentions are generally unknown. Given these two relationships which are unsupportive of the waitress position, it becomes critical that the employing organization provide some measure of support to the position. According to findings, as this organizational support varies, so does the individuals' expression of the vulnerability
attitude. Therefore, the structural model consisting of the organizational attributes found in the discipline and surveillance blocks constitutes an example of the power of the structural effect.

The Structural Model and Worker Autonomy and Job Discretion

The significant relationship between the structural model and both dimensions of the vulnerability work attitude both supports and is supported by 'worker autonomy' research and 'job discretion' research (Gouldner, 1967; Fox, 1974). Both issues describe the decision making power extended the worker (worker autonomy) and the decision capabilities associated with a position in the organization or job (job discretion). Fox has described high discretion jobs as those where, "obligations are diffuse, and left to the interpretation of the role incumbent in light of his or her judgment, knowledge and capacity to evaluate consequences" (1974:83). Low discretion jobs, by comparison, place an emphasis upon conformity to the prescribed elements which make up the greater part of the work role (1974:82).

The critical variable, station inspection, would seem to be a measure indicative of job discretion. Restaurants practicing a rigid inspection schedule sponsor low job discretion, while restaurants in which the waitress assumes sole responsibility for the station sponsor high job discretion. Job discretion is the amount of credit given a position in
the organization, while worker autonomy is the amount of credit given the individual.

The rationale of the structural model, consisting of the discipline and surveillance blocks, reflects the issues of job discretion and worker autonomy. These study findings suggest that the vulnerability work attitude may in part be a product of limiting job discretion and limiting worker autonomy.

Vulnerability has been shown in part to be a product of the credit orientation of restaurant management. According to the structural model, the restaurant that extends credit to its workers fosters or encourages the same orientation in its workers. Fox identifies a similar theme in a limited content analysis of industrial plant research. He documents the transformation of management worker relations from high trust to low trust (Gouldner, 1955; Chadwick-Jones, 1969; Cotgrove, 1971).

The principles responsible for the trust transformation are cited as increasing bureaucratic procedures. Gouldner has described these procedures which represent the credit extension principle generated by the structural model. He lists them as: timekeeping policy, a tightening of absence policy, sickness and overtime procedures, and increased supervision. Each, according to Gouldner, is responsible for the trust transformation. The actual process of trust transformation is described in the following manner, "faced
with a manifestation by management of low trust attitudes towards them, employees reciprocated with low trust attitudes in return" (Fox, 1974:30). This description of the transformation process is slightly modified in the case of the waitress. In addition to the possibility of directing the low trust attitude to management, the waitress may direct the low trust attitude toward the customer.

The bureaucratic procedures enforced by the restaurant reflect the level of trust between employer and employee. The restaurant industry, with its cycle of new recruits, would seem to be especially susceptible to increasing bureaucratic procedures. These study findings suggest that increasing bureaucracy may facilitate the 'new recruit cycle' which characterizes operations in the restaurant industry.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Occupational vulnerability is a work attitude that is produced by unspecified terms of exchange. When work is done for tips the outcome of the work exchange is uncertain. The vulnerability expression serves as the dependent variable in this study; it is defined as the perception of uncertainty that accompanies the act of extending credit to a customer.

Waitressing in a leisure restaurant is an example of a work situation that encourages the expression of the vulnerability work attitude. The waitress must engage in a series of acts in which she extends credit to an anonymous customer without the promise of reward. Upon completion of her service, she must, in the tradition of the servant, accept the customers' interpretation of a fair exchange.

Waitressing can be described as an exchange dilemma since it is not really social exchange (Blau, 1964), although several characteristics, the master-servant model, the dining ethic and the lack of contract securing wages all give the appearance of social exchange. Nor is waitressing really an example of economic exchange (Blau, 1964), since no wage contract secures the reward for service. Instead waitressing is a unique position in the economy, for it contains elements
of both economic and social exchange, yet neither dominates, and therefore the outcome of the waitress-customer exchange is not certain.

The terms of exchange between waitress and customer are not specified. This characteristic derives from the mixture of exchange types. It is the root of the vulnerability expression. When the terms of exchange are not specified, then the act of credit extension to the customer must follow. It is this act that produces the vulnerability work attitude.

Research Design—The Independent Variables

The vulnerability work attitude is the dependent variable in this study. It develops from an exchange dilemma already described. Exchange theory provides the theoretical tools for analysis of this work attitude (Blau, 1964; Ekeh, 1974; Fox, 1974; Mauss, 1959; Thaibaut and Kelley, 1957). With the assistance of exchange theory, two alternative models are developed to explain variation in the vulnerability work attitude.

The specification model and the structural model are used to generate fourteen different independent variables. They are consolidated into five blocks. The block procedure (Sullivan, 1968), allows for testing variable relationships through the use of the multiple partial correlation coefficient. In this manner, each block in its relationship with the vulnerability expression can be tested. In addition,
combined blocks representing the structural model and the specification model can be tested.

The specification model consists of nine of the fourteen independent variables which are contained in three different blocks. The rationale underlying the specification model provides that vulnerability, the product of unspecified terms of exchange, varies along several dimensions of time. Time variation serves as the mechanism of the specification model. As it varies so does the process of specifying exchange terms. The amount of time in interaction with the customer, the number of years spent in the service occupation, and the number of hours worked per week are just three of the nine specification variables hypothesized to regulate the vulnerability expression.

The first block that contributes to the specification model is the interaction block. An estimate of the length of time in interaction with the customer, the number of persons served per shift and the percentage of regular customers all contribute to the impact that the interaction block has upon the dependent variable. The trade evaluation block is also part of the specification model. It estimates the effect that the number of hours worked per week has on vulnerability. In addition, the effect of weekday trade is evaluated. This block serves a control function, since it accounts for the effect that restaurant business has on the vulnerability expression.
Occupational history is the final block representing the specification model. The total number of years waitressing, the last job held each reflect a dimension of the specification process. According to the rationale of the specification model there is likely to be less vulnerability accompanying the act of waitress credit extension to the customer as the length of the exchange episode increases, or as the total number of years working a service job increases, or as the number of hours in employment per week increases. Each of these items is found within one of the three blocks representing some aspect of the specification process. According to the manner in which these independent variables vary so the vulnerability work attitude is hypothesized to vary.

The structural model provides an alternative explanation for vulnerability variation. It consists of five variables contained in two blocks. The rationale supporting the structural model operates on a principle whereby the employing restaurant that extends credit to its service worker fosters or encourages the same orientation in its workers. The mechanism which activates this model is a variant of the reciprocity principle (Gouldner, 1960; Levi-Strauss, 1949). It operates so that those restaurants who extend credit to their waitresses, positive orientation, receive the extension of credit to their customers in return, while by contrast,
those restaurants extending little or no credit to their waitresses promote the vulnerability work attitude.

Two blocks represent the structural model, the discipline and surveillance blocks. Each contains independent variables that describe rules and procedures that a restaurant may or may not practice. Organizations that subscribe to these rules and procedures are recognized as extending less credit to their employees than are those that do not implement such policies.

The discipline block examines the combined effect that authorized meals and work time errors have no vulnerability variation. By comparison, the surveillance block evaluates the effect that close supervision has upon the vulnerability work attitude. Inventory control practices, and station inspection policy are the only contributors to the surveillance block. Unlike the other four blocks which are composed of three items, this final block contains two. Combining the discipline and surveillance block will permit testing of the structural model.

Research Design—The Dependent Variable

A measure of the vulnerability work attitude, the dependent variable, was developed by compiling a list of statements that focused on the uncertainty associated with extending credit to customers. Assistance in developing these twenty statements was provided by exchange theory
(Blau, 1964; Ekey, 1974; Fox, 1974; Mauss, 1967). Twenty statements were used in the pretest in three restaurants (N=21). Following factor analysis, fifteen were selected for the final questionnaire.

Eight restaurants stratified on the basis of lodging facilities and corporate affiliation were purposively sampled to insure variation on a number of critical variables. Sixty-one waiters and waitresses (77 percent rate of return), imposed a two dimensional structure on the fifteen vulnerability statements. This pattern was revealed by principle component, orthogonal rotation factor analysis. Two factor scales were constructed according to Armor's technique (1971). Each of the factor scales consists of three items (reliability coefficients .93, .68).

The first factor scale consists of wage uncertainty items while a second less powerful scale is composed of customer uncertainty items. According to the factor analyzed pattern imposed by the response of the 61 service workers, vulnerability is a two dimensional attitude that incorporates both an economic and social referent. This dual dimensionality is seen to support the argument distinguishing social and economic exchange.
Research Design-The Relationships Tested

The relationship between each block and the dual vulnerability factor scales is measured by the multiple partial correlation coefficient. Two standards of evaluation defined the significant relationship. Blalock's F-test for the multiple partial serves as one standard, while the second standard is set by the researcher. The .10 level is used for the traditional test (Blalock, 1972). The criterion set by the researcher is 20 percent explained variance per block. Given five equally contributing blocks, and realizing the chance for residual, also the exploratory nature of the study, the 20 percent block rule is a rigorous standard.

Findings

In combination the specification and structural models explain 39 percent of the variation in both the social and economic dimensions of vulnerability. The specification model did not yield a significant relationship with either of the vulnerability dimensions (Table 6).

According to findings the specification model is better suited to an explanation of economic vulnerability than for social vulnerability. A modification of the specification items yields a significant relationship with economic vulnerability.

The structural model yields a significant relationship with both dimensions of vulnerability (Table 6). The
surveillance block is the most powerful single block for both dimensions of vulnerability (7 percent--13 percent). The rationale supporting the structural model and responsible for generation of both the surveillance and discipline blocks provides that the orientation of the restaurant organization towards its employees has more to do with the vulnerability expression than does the time orientation emphasized in the specification model. The significance of the structural model confirms the model rationale. As a consequence, the following principle is confirmed: as the extension of credit by the employing organization varies so does the individual expression of vulnerability. This principle operates as a structural effect, since, "social processes originating outside the individual personality (restaurant organization) are responsible for the differences in the dependent variable (Blau, 1960:190)."

Authorized meal time, and work errors, the discipline items proved to be more powerful in explaining economic vulnerability. By contrast, station inspection and inventory control proved more powerful in explaining social vulnerability. The station inspection item in the surveillance block is the best overall predictor of the vulnerability work attitude. The issue of personal space (Little, 1965) and territoriality (Sommer, 1969) may influence the station inspection variable.
The dual vulnerability dimensions are distinctive. This distinction was first identified by factor analysis. It is further demonstrated by the vulnerability dimensions' relationship with the independent variables (Tables 4, 5, 6). These findings support the distinctions between social and economic exchange drawn by the collective exchange theorists (Ekeh, 1974). In addition, study findings suggest that attributes of the collectivity (structural model) are more useful for understanding the individual vulnerability expression than are individual (specification model) attributes.

Although the structural model is better equipped than the specification model in explaining vulnerability variation, it must be recognized that the best explanation of dependent variable variation is provided by the total model which explains 39 percent of the variation in the vulnerability expression. The research design has been structured so that it is possible to compare the abilities of the structural model based on collective attributes with the specification model based on individual attributes. However, the combination of both models is important to an understanding of vulnerability variation as evidenced by the multiple partial correlation coefficient of the total model (Table 5).

Suggestions for Further Research

Continued research on the vulnerability work attitude should be extended to related service occupations. Bellhops,
skycaps, busboys, bartenders, and cabdrivers each provide a
different setting complete with different control conditions
for the study of the vulnerability work attitude. In adapt-
ing the models used in this study for expanded research
several modifications would be necessary. The revised
specification model should easily conform to the study of
related occupations. The structural model, by contrast, may
not so easily convert to the study of the vulnerability
expression in other service occupations. The discipline
block should be adaptable since most occupations describe
work errors and attendant penalties. However, it would be
necessary to reformulate the surveillance block to tap the
employing organizations' methods and practice of surveil-
ance.

Follow up research in the restaurant setting could
expand the structural model by including the 'credit
orientation' operating in other forms of waitress exchange.
For example, the waitress-chef relationship, the waitress-
bartender relationship and the waitress-pantry worker
relationship each may contribute to the vulnerability
expression.

A field experiment might provide more information on
the relationship between the vulnerability work attitude and
customer hospitality. Recognizing that station inspection
promotes the vulnerability attitude: this condition could
be produced and the customers' perception of hospitality
could be compared with a control group customer response from a restaurant that would practice no station inspection.

Finally, the relationship between the vulnerability work attitude and the waitress turnover rate should be examined. If turnover rate information was made available to the investigator it could be compared with structural characteristics recognized to promote vulnerability. In this manner, controlling for the effect of contamination factors, a link between the vulnerability work attitude and occupational turnover could be established.

Future research should include two additional variables in the examination of the vulnerability work attitude. Some measure of the quality of the waitress-customer interaction is required. The work interaction block and the occupational history block measure the quantity of waitress-customer interaction, but not the quality. Measurement of the perception of interaction quality might include items dealing with anonymity or impersonality and the treatment of the waitress as a servant. The addition of the interaction quality items to the specification model could serve to increase explanation of vulnerability variation.

A second variable that should be included in future study is a measure of the incidence of default exchange. In the argot of the waitress, a measure of "stiffing" experience is required. It would seem that the vulnerability
expression is influenced by the incidence of exchange default or the customers' failure to tip. This item could be included in the work interaction block and could serve to improve the explanatory abilities of both the work interaction block and the specification model.

A final consideration for future research involves an historic examination of the waitressing occupation. Placed in this context, the commercialization of the occupation could be examined in terms of its conceptualization. A description of the gradual transformation from household table servant to restaurant waitress would permit an evaluation of the commercialization process.
CHAPTER VII

STUDY IMPLICATIONS

The restaurant is conceptualized as a social system in Whyte's classic study, *Human Relations in the Restaurant Industry*. The intricate interaction network that operates in the restaurant serves as the subject of investigation. The waitress is described by Whyte as the interaction coordinator (1949). The coordinator status is identified as a location in the restaurant system where emotional tension flows and tends to concentrate. Whyte reports, "we did see a number of 'girls' break down and cry under the strain" (1949:304). The source of such strain is traced to "the problem of adjusting to service, pantry workers, bartenders and perhaps checkers" (1949:304). Increasing technological advance has served to lessen some of the tension produced by the coordinator status. Computerized inventory, audio and video systems operated by chef, bartender and pantry worker have clarified considerably the communication process.

Whyte reports a second source of tension in the restaurant social system. It concerns the supervisor/waitress relationship. "We observed a change in dining room management when a supervisor who was skillful and responded to the waitress was replaced by a supervisor who had less skill" (1949:305). Of the new supervisor, the waitresses would
say, "she's always finding something to criticize, she's never around when we need her" (1949:305). This change in supervision, Whyte reports, "was followed by evidence of increased nervous tension, especially among the less experienced waitress and finally by a series of waitress resignations" (1949:305). This observation and its implications concur with findings reported in the vulnerability study. Both studies recognize the necessity of waitress support by management. For Whyte this support was measured by supervision style and in the vulnerability study it is measured by discipline and surveillance procedures practiced by restaurant management.

The waitress status remains as it was thirty years ago; the recipient of scarce support and limited security. Gallagher describes the waitress as "an independent contractor selling services to restaurant customers" (1977:179). This description applies to most tipped employees who do not belong to a union. For the waitress, "there is no job security, no fringe benefits such as health insurance or paid vacations and no pension plan" (Gallagher, 1977:179). In addition, "because their official wages are so low--between $30 and $40 a week--unemployment insurance is all but meaningless" (1977:179). Finally, the absence of negative sanctions or penalties for those who fail to tip is yet another indicator of the support deficit that has traditionally defined the waitress work status. Neither the economic
system of which it is a part nor the service organization in which it is located provide support or security for the waitress work status.

The independent contractor image in conjunction with the marginality of the occupation, the absence of benefits, and the ineligibility for unemployment insurance each define a pattern of non-support. With this depiction of the waitress work status in mind, the question is raised, why would the waitress expect support from the customer, when she has been denied it in related work relationships?

Cognitive consistency theory, which argues that an individual will seek consistency among his various attitudes and beliefs, and among his various attitudes and actions, would suggest that the cognitive consequences of non-support would result in a consistent cognitive orientation toward the customer. This orientation or attitude is also suggested by a derivative of the norm of reciprocity principle. According to Gouldner the norm of reciprocity may operate in reverse (1960). That is, "men reciprocate suspicion and distrust as well as confidence" (Fox, 1974:98). Placed in study context this principle provides that denial of support for the waitress may induce absence or refusal of support for the customer, especially as it concerns the uncertain outcomes of service exchange with the customer.

Study findings contain implications for the operation of both the norm of reciprocity and cognitive consistency
theory. According to study findings, vulnerability, the attitude toward uncertain exchange outcomes, is a product of restaurant support. When restaurant discipline and surveillance practices demonstrate trust for the waitress a similar orientation is practiced by the waitress toward the customer. This finding suggests that the norm of reciprocity operates as a process that may be described as subject to a spiraling effect. Reciprocity as a spiraling process differs from the traditional structural representation which emphasizes its regulatory ability and not the influence it extends to related work relationships. In sum, study findings suggest that reciprocity is not simply a norm or support structure for exchange, but further it operates as a spiraling process that sponsors comparable orientations to be introduced in new exchange relationships.

In addition, study findings suggest that cognitive consistency processes operate in a similar fashion. That is, cognitive consistency or attitudinal disposition in one relationship is subject to an extension or spiraling process in related relationships. This spiraling process would seem to link cognitive consistency theory and the norm of reciprocity. Their interface suggests that cognitive consistency theory operates on reciprocity principles which, when applied in this theory, are limited to the description of cognitive or attitudinal data. The spiral linkage between
the two strains of theory suggests that efforts to bridge the two discrete fields might be advantageous in social scientific movement toward cumulative research. In other words, the norm of reciprocity focusing on a structural level may provide insight to the cognitive level of attitude consistency and vice versa.

A second implication raised by study findings concerns the issue of trust, and the manner in which it is conceptualized. According to the specification model, trust is a formative process. It is a bond that develops through exchange (Blau, 1964; Webster, 1975). It was hypothesized that vulnerability, the attitude toward uncertain exchange outcomes, is a product of trust formation over time. As a consequence, the length of interaction episode between waitress and customer, the number of hours worked per week and the number of years waitressing each were seen to contribute toward trust formation and concomitantly vulnerability variation. The lack of explanatory power claimed by the specification model holds the implication that the conceptualization of trust as a formative process is inadequate. Instead, the depiction of trust as a climate for exchange, reflected in the structural model, appears more useful (Ekeh, 1974; Mauss, 1967). Study findings suggest that trust may be a foundation upon which exchange is supported.
The more useful depiction of trust as climate for exchange is proposed by Mauss (1967). His rendering of trust and social exchange may also be suggestive in understanding the new recruit cycle operating in the restaurant industry. According to Ekeh, this conceptualization predicts that, "exploitation of the social exchange situation for power and status differentiation is anomic and ultimately leads to the abortion of social exchange relationships" (Ekeh, 1974:57). The outcome of the waitress credit extension act may be exploitation, as there is no real sanction which enforces the norm to tip. Social pressure, a penalty for exploitation, may be minimal because awareness of the exploitative outcome may be limited to waitress and customer.

**Status vs. Contract**

It is further evident that the vulnerability study holds additional implications for social exchange theory. According to Ekeh there are five unit-ideas which serve as the foundation of social exchange theory. Findings reported in the vulnerability study speak directly to the nature of the relationship between economic and social exchange. This unit idea has been the subject of considerable controversy (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1964; Ekeh, 1974; Levi-Strauss, 1957; Fox, 1974). Ekeh argues that social exchange is distinguishable from economic exchange. This position is supported by the collectivistic exchange tradition, and is exemplified in
the work of Mauss, Ekeh, and Levi-Strauss. The individualistic exchange tradition, with Homans as leader, claims that no distinction can be drawn between social and economic exchange. Economic individualism, a strictly rational approach, serves as the central theme for this alternative variety of exchange theory. According to Homans and the individualistic exchange tradition, there is no referent for social exchange in the social world since all is derived from economic individualism.

Blau, by comparison, claims that both social and economic exchange can be distinguished. It is argued that they are qualitatively different exchange forms. Social exchange tends to engender feelings of personal obligation, gratitude, and trust, while economic exchange does not. In addition, economic exchange is transacted through a well-defined medium of exchange, money, while social exchange lacks a single medium of exchange. Still further, it is argued that social benefits from social exchange are less detachable from the source that supplies them, than are economic commodities. Finally, "the basic and most crucial distinction is that social exchange entails unspecified obligations" (1964:93), while for economic exchange obligations are specified. "In economic exchange, reciprocation lies in honoring terms which have been specifically defined, the specificity of the terms excludes choice" (Fox, 1974:82).
The distinction between social and economic exchange has historical roots that may be traced to the nineteenth century writings of Toennis (1957) and Maine (1963). Toennis distinguishes between the natural will which is fostered by the gemeinschaft, and rational will fostered by the gesellschaft. Like social exchange, the natural will has been defined as an association based upon a relationship valued as an end in itself (1957). By contrast, economic exchange, like rational will, involves a relationship that is . . . "willed because those involved wish to attain through it a definite end are willing to join hands for that purpose" (1957:5). In the case of rational will the ends have been sharply defined; in other words, the terms of exchange have been defined.

In a similar context Maine argues that . . . "the movement of the progressive societies has hitherto been a movement from status to contract" (1963:168). Maine's description of the status/contract transformation is reminiscent of the distinctions drawn between social and economic exchange.

...Nor is it difficult to see what is the tie between man and man which replaces by degrees those forms of reciprocity in rights and duties which have their origin in the family. It is contract. Starting, as from one terminus of history, from a condition of society, in which all the relations of persons are summed up in the relations of the family, we seem to have steadily moved toward a phase of social order in which all these relations arise from the free agreement of individuals (1963:168).
In the context of exchange theory, this passage describes a movement from a social exchange relationship based upon reciprocity to an economic exchange relationship... "arising from the free agreement of individuals" (1963: 168).

Findings reported in the vulnerability study would seem to support several of the claims made by Blau. It will be recalled that ten statements were used to measure vulnerability. In the tradition of the individualistic exchange model, given the problem of occupational exchange, it was hypothesized that one measure would be developed from the series of questions concerning tips and customers. The response pattern imposed by the waitress upon the ten questions did not concur with the economic individualism hypothesis. When waitress response was subjected to factor analysis two distinct factors were isolated. Upon further inspection of the items composing these factors two distinct patterns are identifiable. The economic factor uses tips, wages and tips as the subject of question. By comparison, the social factor uses dependability, trust, and concern of customers as the subject of inquiry. These discrete economic items and social items can be classified as distinctive media of exchange, thus confirming one of the four distinctions between social and economic exchange proposed by Blau (1964).

A further refutation of the individualistic exchange
tradition is evidenced in the overall pattern assumed by the variable relationships. The economic factor correlates distinctively with the fourteen independent variables when compared with the social factor (Table 3). The findings reported in Table 3 suggest that two different exchange models are recognized by the waitress. The isolation of the two exchange factors, the distinctive patterns of correlation they assume, and the discrete media of exchange they reflect tend to confirm the conceptualization provided in the vulnerability study. In other words, the distinctions between social and economic exchange provided by methodological testing confirm the conceptualization that depicts waitressing as the work of the servant and of the salesperson. One final confirmation of Blau's proposals for distinguishing social and economic exchange concerns the specificity versus diffuseness issue. It will be recalled that economic exchange is described in terms of specificity. Findings suggest that the economic factor correlates more closely with the specification items than with the structural items (Tables 4 and 5). This finding provides further evidence of the distinction between social and economic exchange proposed by Blau, Ekeh, and Fox.

The issue of social exchange as distinct from economic exchange would seem to hold certain implications for the restaurant industry. When this issue is considered in
conjunction with cognitive consistency research, several implications emerge. Cognitive consistency theory predicts that an individual will seek consistency among various attitudes, beliefs and actions (Webster, 1975:309). This striving towards consistency is fueled by tension or anxiety, a manifestation of inconsistency. The exchange models and the interaction they prescribe, existing side by side in the waitress status-role may promote inconsistency or tension which in part may facilitate certain work attitudes and ultimately influence the 'new recruit cycle' characteristic of waitressing.

It will be recalled that waitressing has been depicted as the work of the servant operating from a social relationship, and concomitantly the work of the salesperson operating from a money relationship. Two distinctive exchange models are prompted by the servant and salesperson role. Yet neither exchange model is seen to dominate, thus the terms of exchange and the expectations of the work are subject to variability and inconsistency.

Exchange model consistency, the solution to the present dilemma, would seem advantageous for both the waitress and the restaurant industry. It could be accomplished from one of two directions. One approach to exchange consistency is an exchange relationship between waitress and customer that is consistent social exchange. In this case, the waitress'
wage would be absorbed into the cost of the food and beverage costs. Waitress and restaurant management would negotiate the cost of service and specify the exact terms of exchange for customer service. In short, no money relation would exist between waitress and customer. The drawback to this solution is that the waitress would retain certain trappings of the servant demeanor.

An alternative solution would be to define the waitress-customer exchange as a consistent economic exchange. In this case, a percentage of the food and beverage tab would automatically be applied to the cost of the meal. This solution would provide a type of contract. No doubt a third party, the Internal Revenue Service, would prefer this solution, since taxation of wages would be simplified.

Finally, the issue of dual exchange types and inconsistency should be examined in the context of the hospitality industry and the customer. A central concern of the hospitality industry is the welcome and comfort of the customer. Service workers suffering from the tension of uncertain exchange outcomes are probably not the best candidates for performing acts of welcome and comfort. Although the research design did not permit its testing, a difference in hospitable service may exist between the worker uncertain of exchange outcomes and one who feels more secure in occupational exchange. Exchange consistency established by either a consistent social exchange or a consistent economic exchange
model could bring new stability to the waitressing occupation by terminating the 'new recruit cycle.' In addition, a stable exchange relationship might improve hospitality throughout the restaurant industry.
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Each of the following statements conformed to a Likert format in which five response alternatives were available to the respondent.

**STRONGLY AGREE  AGREE  NOT SURE  DISAGREE  STRONGLY DISAGREE**

1. In this job I am certain of good wages, as almost all my customers tip well.
2. Working for tips is like gambling; there is always a risk involved.
3. It has been my experience at this job that good service brings a good tip.
4. You can never be sure of your wages in this job because when it comes to tipping, you never know what customers will do.
5. Customers that come into this restaurant can be trusted; they will not take advantage of you.
6. Just when you think you have figured out how customers tip, they will surprise you.
7. I like to think of my customers as my friends.
8. In this job I am fairly certain of making the same amount in tips each night.
9. Most customers I wait on thank me personally following their meal.
10. I am generally surprised by the tips customers leave.
11. Most customers feel an obligation to tip the waitress, regardless of the service they receive.
12. I would much rather have all regular customers, that I can depend on, and not take a chance with new customers.
13. In this job you can not be sure until they walk out as to whether the tip will be good or bad.

* designates the items used in development of the dependent variables
14. Most people I wait on care nothing about the waitress' feelings.

15. If most customers could get away with it, they would not leave a tip.

* designates the items used in development of the dependent variables
The vita has been removed from the scanned document
Service workers who are paid in tips experience a particular type of occupational uncertainty. It stems from the lack of contract securing wages. When wages, the terms of the work exchange, are not specified, then the outcome of work exchange is uncertain. The attitude that develops in response to uncertain exchange outcomes is defined as occupational vulnerability. It serves as the study's dependent variable and is researched within the context of waitress work.

Two models are developed to explain variation in the dependent variable. The specification model provides that occupational vulnerability is a product of time variation which is seen to facilitate the specification of exchange terms. Three blocks of variables are generated by this model. The work interaction block, the restaurant trade block and the occupation history block are operationalized and tested for their individual and combined effect upon vulnerability variation. When tested, the block relationships, interpreted by the multiple partial correlation coefficient, are not significant.
The structural model, an alternative explanation of the vulnerability work attitude, provides that the expression of vulnerability varies according to the climate of trust sponsored by the employing organization. The structural model consists of the discipline and surveillance blocks which measure the climate of trust sponsored by the employer. When tested the structural model and the surveillance block form significant relationships with the dependent variable.

The significance of the structural model holds implications for the conceptualization of occupational trust. According to study findings, the waitress' expression of vulnerability is a product of the climate of trust sponsored by the employing organization. This suggests that a climate of trust is a prerequisite to a stable work exchange.