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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps more than any other occupation, waitressing represents the epitome of a service-based occupation. The primary task performed by the waitress is meal service. Such a role has traditionally been associated with subordinate service status. Historically, the house servant of yore was employed "to wait on the table." Today, the waitress is employed to perform the task of "taking the diners' order." The waitress-diner relationship is usually thought to be analogous to the super-subordinate form, given the rather menial and subserviant role performed by the waitress. The titles assigned to diner and waitress during dining interaction episodes, for example, indicate the subordinate status of the waitress and superordinate status of diner. The waitress generally refers to diner as "Sir" or "Ma'am" and diners often refer to the waitress as "the girl."

While the waitress is conceived of as a subordinate in her occupational relationship with the diner, preoccupation with the subordinate service image of the work status serves to overshadow or ignore the possibility of subordinate as manipulator. In this regard, it is the major premise of this investigation that the waitress steadfastly persists in attempts to manipulate the diner. Such manipulation takes on a general front of guidance, in the form of suggestion and recommendation. In this manner the waitress attempts to direct and influence diners' actions throughout the dining episode. In general, this guidance is articulated by means of product promo-
tional activities, directed toward the goal of selling the diner the maximum quantity of food and liquor possible. Often, diners are not aware of the promotional activities or saleswomanship to which they are being subjected and in most cases, diners view promotional activities as indicative of good service performance.

The rationale supporting promotional activity might be termed the "waiting occupation's law of increasing returns." This law is derived from the relationship generally expressed between tip and tab. Basically, the relationship holds the greater the amount of the tab the greater the amount of tip. It therefore behooves the waitress to concentrate on building the tab, as the amount of tip will normally be dictated by the tab amount. It must be recognized that promotional activity is ultimately based on the waitress' assumption that all diners tip on the average of 15%. Given the inflexibility associated with the standard tip percentage it follows that the waitress must concentrate on the more flexible area of tab building.

Tips in the waiting occupation generally account for 50% or more of the waitress' income. Waitresses working in the "leisure dining restaurant" depend almost exclusively on tips as they account for approximately 80% of income. Product promotional manipulation is the most efficient approach to increasing the size of tip. However, it must be acknowledged that promotional activity is not the only variety of manipulation available to the waitress. There are at least two alternate varieties of manipulation that the waitress may have occasion to practice in her dealings with the diner. They are the "increased ritualization" variety and the
"friendly rapport" variety. Manipulation attempted through increased ritualization involves an overemphasis of service exercises. This form takes on the dimensions of work role showmanship. The second variety of manipulation is the friendly rapport variety. This form is akin to "buttering-up" the client. Manipulation of this type is characterized by the absence of social distance between waitress and diner. Either of these manipulative strategies are extremely risky for the waitress to practice, and generally, they do not serve to increase the established tip percentage of 15%. In fact, these two approaches are more apt to result in the waitress "getting stiffed." "Getting stiffed" refers to one receiving little or no tip. The term implies that the waitress was caught off-guard, that she had miscalculated the tipping pattern practiced by diner.
Ultimately, "getting stiffed" reflects the waitress' inability to predict tip. If a waitress has calculated certain diners as poor tippers and they live up to the calculated expectations—the result is not explained as "getting stiffed." Stiffing behavior only occurs when expectations are not met. It is the combination of the unexpected element and poor tip which characterize the incident of "getting stiffed." It might be noted that "getting stiffed" is rarely an event that is shared with other waitresses. "Getting stiffed" is not a source of prestige for the waitress, rather it is an indicator of the waitress' inability for "sizing up the mark."

While waitress manipulation may occur in a variety of forms, manipulation by means of product promotional activity offers the least risk. A study provided by R. L. Karen, "Some Factors Affecting
Tipping," supports the argument against using the two alternate forms of manipulation. Karen's primary objective was to investigate the mechanisms of manipulation conducive to tipping behavior in the cabdriving occupation. Ultimately, Karen reports that the variable of special service does not evoke a significant increase in tipping frequency. Karen describes these special services (opening doors, carrying packages, engaging in conversation) as creating no climate of obligation (Karen, 1962). Similarly, the waitress recognizes that the customer tips on the basis of tab. The 15% tip is generally not influenced by special services rendered. Like the cab-user the diner appears to experience no climate of obligation for the performance of special services.

Statement of the Problem

The problem framing this investigation focuses on the issue of subordinate influence. This issue is to be researched within a waitress work role context. There is one basic question underpinning this investigation—does the waitress influence the diner? Hence, the research design has been structured to test for the possible existence of waitress' influence. Group consumption patterns will be employed as an indicative measurement of influence. To be determined are what effect, if any, the waitress may have in increasing the food and liquor consumed by diners. Furthermore, a test will be employed to establish if certain age groups practice particular consumption patterns regardless of the waitress' promotional treatment. In summary, two explanatory variables, age composition of group,
and waitress manipulative treatment, are examined as to their possible relationship to consumption patterns practiced by leisure dining groups.

Ultimately, this investigation centers on consumption patterns practiced by diners. This point of focus has been chosen as it is generally identified by the waitress as the primary locus of manipulation. The waitress persistently attempts to increase diners' consumption. This is the major occupational intention of the waitress. It is the purpose of this paper to test for the success or failure of manipulation directed at diners' consumption patterns.

Leisure Dining Restaurant Setting

The problem statement directing this investigation was translated into the waitress work role within the "leisure dining restaurant." The leisure dining restaurant is often distinguished within the restaurant spectrum as a "fancy" restaurant. That is, the leisure dining restaurant differs from the "counter-top" or "plain" restaurant in basically three areas (Whyte, 1948). Most simply they are identified as menu options, length of dining episode, and presence of live entertainment. Entertainment is not a necessary condition in distinguishing restaurant types, however it generally characterizes leisure dining restaurants. The first source of distinction, menu options, is associated with the notion of full course dinners. The leisure dining restaurant menu is characterized first by the serving of liquor. Generally, a full selection of wines and liquors as well as beer are available. Claude Levi-Strauss provides a telling
statement in regard to food and liquor and their relationship to leisure dining. He claims, "there is a peculiar difference of attitude that immediately manifests itself in regard to liquid nourishment and solid nourishment. The latter," he remarks, "serves the needs of the body the former its luxury. The one serves first of all to feed; the other to honor." (Levi-Strauss, 1964:78). Levi-Strauss' comment is central in distinguishing the leisure dining restaurant from the "counter-top" restaurant. Difference in menu options is indicative of varied clientele attitudes characterizing these two restaurant types. Besides liquor as a distinctive menu option, appetizers, soup, salad, and main entree, are all elements of the leisure dining restaurant. A second condition distinguishing the "counter-top" and leisure dining restaurant involves clienteles' length of stay. That is, duration of the dining episode. The dining episode within the leisure dining restaurant, ranges from 1-1/2 to 4 hours. In contrast, this episode in "counter-top" restaurants is generally much shorter, ranging from 1/2 to 1 hour. Finally, a third factor generally characterizing the leisure dining restaurant is the presence of live entertainment. Very often the leisure dining restaurant is characterized by accommodations for those desiring to dance.

These three distinctions are most insightful in explaining waitress-client interaction within the leisure dining restaurant. The lengthy duration of stay by the leisure dining clientele allows the waitress considerably more time in interaction with client. It is the existence of these interaction episodes that permit for the
possibility of product promotional activity. Furthermore, the extensive menu listings provide a large area from which to promote. Restaurants with extremely limited menus hamstring the "waitress-as-promoter."

Finally, live entertainment often aids in fostering an attitude of "eat, drink, and be merry." This attitude is most conducive to product promotional activity.

The leisure dining waitress is subject to a significantly smaller number of "parties" and consequently she concentrates more pointedly on them for tips. On the average a leisure dining waitress is assigned five to ten parties per evening. Table assignment is generally presided over by the host, hostess, or maître de. Assignments are generally based on "turns-up." The expression, "who's up?" often voiced by waitresses, refers to this table assignment procedure. The expression implies a team effort in process.

The locus for this investigation is situated in a summer resort area in the north eastern portion of the United States. The investigation, which lasted approximately six weeks, occurred during the resort areas "in season." The restaurant employed approximately 25 workers. Generally, restaurant workers are stratified as kitchen and dining staff. The kitchen staff consisted of 1 chef, 2 short-order cooks or broilermen, 2 kitchen helpers (counterman and an appetizerman) and 3 dishwashers. In contrast, the group composition of those "out on the floor" was headed by a host and hostess, 3 bartenders, 2 busboys, 8 waitresses and 1 waiter. The restaurant had a seating capacity of approximately 200. The dining room or "the floor" was broken down into approximately 10 waitress stations. Stations
were rotated every week so that no waitress claimed a prime territory.

The site of investigation was chosen for two reasons. First, it was necessary to find an establishment where tips were not "pooled." Pooling tips implies that all waitresses share the work and likewise share the tips. Given this sharing context it would be impossible to measure single waitress manipulation as dictated by the study design. Finally, the particular restaurant chosen had been the site of previous employment. This factor allowed for comfortable "entrance" to study and minimal difficulty in role transition.

The establishment under study might best be classified as a middle class establishment. Justification for this categorization is based on two factors, credit card affiliation and menu price range. The establishment under study accepted two credit cards: American Express and Diners Club. These credit cards are indicative of clientele's socio-economic status as they are more difficult to attain than Bank Americard and Master Charge, which the establishment did not honor. The second factor responsible for characterizing the restaurant a middle class establishment involves menu prices. The restaurant under study was considered a steak and seafood 'house,' with entrees ranging from approximately six to fifteen dollars. The entrees included lobster tails - $8.50, filet mignon - $9.50, chateaubriand for two - $17.50, steak and tails - $12.95, special sirloin - $6.25, house sirloin - $7.25, seafood combination - $6.95, king crab - $7.95 and prime rib - $6.95. Credit card preference and
menu prices both indicate the socio-economic status of clientele frequenting the restaurant under study.

The establishment under study operated on a six day week, and served dinner only. Business commenced each evening at five o'clock except for Sunday when meals were served after two p.m. Generally, the kitchen closed at eleven o'clock, however, the bar remained open until three a.m. The leisure dining restaurant experiences maximum clientele attendance at certain hours depending upon particular days of the week. Monday through Thursday attendance peaks between six o'clock and seven-thirty. In contrast, on Fridays and Saturdays the leisure dining restaurant is rushed between seven o'clock and eight-thirty.

These peak periods in the leisure dining restaurant are labeled by restaurant workers as "rushes." A similar expression used in describing peak business periods is "getting hit." A "rush" differs from "getting hit" in that during the rush the staff is able to cover and "pull-off" their expected performance. In contrast "getting hit" connotes a "rush" that has escaped control, generally due to a shortage of waitresses to cover clientele attendance. During the six weeks of work many "rushes" occurred primarily on weekends, however only once on a Sunday afternoon did we "get hit."

It is imperative that discussion of work setting precede the theoretical and methodological issues pertinent to investigation. Elaboration of the work setting serves to clarify study focus, informing the reader of the background in which waitress manipulation is practiced.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Various explanatory threads bearing upon the problem statement of subordinate influence may be located within the body of sociological literature. The literature search was directed at disclosing statements speaking to the issue of subordinate manipulation and influence in a work relationship context. Statements pertinent to the problem of investigation will be presented in the following manner. First, Georg Simmel's discussion of the super-subordinate interactional form will be presented. Following this general discussion of the forms of interaction, discussion will center on the waitress-client occupational relationship as depicted in the work of W. F. Whyte. Next, parallel work relationships as demonstrated by the cabdriver and fare are examined. Justification for examining parallel relationships is based on the common denominator of the super-subordinate form as unit of investigation. Use of the common denominator should allow for some insight into the problem of subordinate manipulation. The final set of statements to be presented are offered by Erving Goffman. Goffman's work allows for a linking together of the various explanatory threads presented.

The first work to be addressed is that of Georg Simmel. Much of Simmel's work is associated with the sociology of forms or what has been termed social geometry (Abel, 1970). Simmel speaks of forms of sociation (Spykman, 1964). Forms of sociation are types of interaction that occur over and over again. The content or context in
which the forms are located changes however, the forms of interaction retain their typical identity. Simmel further notes that once these forms are identified they are to be singled out, or abstracted from other elements of interaction. The concept sociation Simmel relates is a general process in which individuals draw together into social units. He further maintains that sociation makes for reciprocal shaping of individuals. More specifically, every interaction involves reciprocal orientation of the interacting persons toward each other (Spykman, 1964). These statements are the general referent from which Simmel's pertinent statements are further derived.

The issue of subordinate manipulation is not discussed per se by Simmel. However, Simmel defines a concept closely related to manipulation, that of influence. Simmel defines influence as determination of the other (Levine, 1972). This determination is derived given the reciprocal nature of social interaction. Simmel comments, "nobody in general wishes that his influence completely determine the individual, he rather wants his influence, this determination of the other to act back upon him" (Levin, 1972:108).

Thus far no clear distinction has been established between the concepts manipulation and influence. The major distinction to be drawn between the concepts involves a means-end variation. Manipulation is an attempt to determine another's action. Influence is determination of another's action, consequently influence is an illustration of successful manipulation. It is the purpose of this investigation to test for the success or failure of subordinate manipulation within an occupational frame of context.
The super-subordinate interaction form is a further borrowing from Simmel's work. Simmel maintains that superordination may be divided according to a three fold scheme; subordination to an individual, subordination to a group, and finally subordination to an impersonal principle. Subordination forms two and three (group and principle) are most useful in explaining the waitress' position within the occupational relationship under study.

Subordination to an objective principle is the initial form of subordination to be examined and framed within study context. It would appear that an objective principle subordinates leisure dining behavior within the leisure dining restaurant. This principle governs the behavior of both waitress and client. It might best be summarized by a theme of "eat, drink, and be merry." The principle implicitly defines the restaurant rules prescribing behavior for all interacting members of the leisure dining episode. Simmel reflects that "subordination to an impersonal principle gives therefore to individuals concerned a peculiar double relationship. The fact that as a group they are imbued with a single spirit or subject to a single objective principle gives them in their relation to outsiders a more or less equal position within the group. On the other hand they stand to one another in different relationships of superiority or inferiority" (Spykman, 1964:105). Finally, an interpretation of Simmel's work for the problem under study is viewed as follows: there is a dining principle superordinating behavior within the leisure dining restaurant. Waitress' view clientele as personal agents of this dining principle. Waitress and clientele are imbued with a single
spirit dictating a policy of eat, drink and be merry. The waitress and diner enlist each others cooperation in their attempt to carry out behavior prescribed by the dining principle. This "leisure dining spirit" is most compatible with product promotional activities.

In contrast to the groups governed by an objective dining principle, that will be referred to as diners, it would appear there are members of a separate clientele type. These groups are classified as "dinner-out" clientele. Such groups are not subordinated to an objective dining principle. They are not governed by rules summarized by the eat, drink, and be merry theme. Rather, members of this group do not markedly enlist the cooperation of the waitress. Consequently, product promotional activity is more difficult to pursue with this group. The waitress is more clearly defined as subordinate in her dealings with the dinner-out clientele groups. In the case of dinner-out clientele we witness an example of waitress subordination to a group rather than to an objective principle as may be the case with dining clientele. It would appear that the form of subordination imposed on the waitress may be useful in explanation of success or failure of subordinate manipulation and influence. Put more simply, the linkages relating Simmel's work to an explanation of success or failure of subordinate manipulation might be stated as follows: it appears that type of subordination is related to type of clientele group, which in turn may be related to success or failure of waitress' product promotional activity and the issue of subordinate influence.

William F. Whyte does not explicitly address the issue of subordinate manipulation in his book, Human Relations in the
Restaurant industry. His most pertinent comments however, are to be found in the chapter dealing with the Crying Waitress. His depiction of the crying waitress provides an account of the rush situation and resulting tension the waitress is subject to. Whyte emphasizes the importance (for the waitress) of setting the emotional tone of the relationship, as he claims, "if the waitress appears timid or harassed the customers are likely to be uneasy and expect the worst" (Whyte, 1948:109). Whyte concludes his remarks concerning manipulation and control with the following statement,"it is part of a girl's social training to get the upper hand for herself while appearing to play the subordinate role" (Whyte, 1948:97). This statement implicitly speaks to Simmel's notion that particular forms of interaction are characterized by identical elements. Whyte implies that articulation of waitress manipulation is reminiscent of manipulation practiced in the subordinate female role.

The form of relationship attendant between waitress and client parallels several relationships previously considered in sociological literature. For example, Odia Bigus (1972) in his study of the milkman and customer concentrates on what he terms the servicer-servicee relationship. Bigus recognizes the super-subordinate form of the relationship and develops the concept of "cultivation" in explanation of subordinate manipulation. Cultivation is a general process of developing relationships with clientele, which will result in occupational gain. In this regard, cultivating activities are defined as courting and wooing activities engaged in by servicers in relations with those whom they service. Generally, the leisure dining waitress
does not engage in activities of courting and wooing. Bigus' explanation of subordinate manipulation is reminiscent of the "buttering-up" manipulative treatment. The leisure dining waitress finds there is little "pay-off" in "buttering-up" customers. Rather, it is promotional activity or salesmanship that the waitress recognizes as the superior method of occupational gain.

A study provided by R. L. Karen, "Some Factors Affecting Tipping," supports the argument against over ritualizing and "buttering-up" the client (Karen, 1962). Karen's primary objective was to investigate the mechanisms of manipulation conducive to tipping in the cabdriving occupation. Ultimately, Karen reports that the variable of special service does not evoke a significant increase in tipping frequency. Karen describes these special services (opening doors, carrying packages, engaging in conversation) as creating no climate of obligation (Karen, 1962). Similarly, the waitress recognizes that the customer tips on the basis of tab. The 15% tip is generally not influenced by special services. Like the cabuser, leisure dining clientele appear to experience no climate of obligation for special services.

Fred Davis provides a further illustration of the super-subordinate occupational relationship. This parallel relationship is examined in his article, "The Cabdriver and His Fare" (Davis, 1959). He refers to the relationship under study as the practitioner-clientele relationship. Davis devises a typology of cabusers which provides the cabbie with a basis of anticipation of clientele needs. Utilization of the typology permits the "cultivation" of the superordinate as
formulated by Bigus. Davis discusses clientele stereotypes (the sport, businessman, blowhard, etc.) and the specific strategies useful in attempting to cultivate the clientele types. The author's typology provides the cabbie with a basis for anticipation of clientele needs. This understanding predisposes the cabbie to act in a manner commensurate with the wishes of the client. (Davis, 1959).

Roy DeGroot, a restauranteur, has written extensively on the servicer-servicee relationship. The waitress work role is an implicit referent throughout his discussion, as he speaks to the manipulative ploys of service workers. DeGroot emphasizes the importance of anticipation in the servicer-servicee relationship. He states, "the servicer must know what the servicee wants a fraction of a second before he knows it himself" (DeGroot, 1973:86). Again the notion of anticipation as somehow associated with the issue of subordinate manipulation.

Generally, the literature cited has implicitly delimited the notion of anticipation as a key to explaining subordinate manipulation. Whyte terms it "getting the jump." Davis formulates practitioner stereotypes which allow for anticipation, and DeGroot points to the importance of servicer knowing what servicee wants a fraction of a second before he knows it himself. However, none of the authors provide the reader with a specific understanding of the processes associated with subordinate manipulation.

In an effort to integrate the seeds from these statements, it is useful to examine some of Erving Goffman's work. Goffman provides a series of concepts that are useful in explicating the processes associated with subordinate manipulation. Goffman claims "regardless
of the particular objective which an individual has in mind and of his motive for having the objective it will be in his interests to control the conduct of others, especially their response treatment of him" (Goffman, 1959:4). He details this statement in claiming, "this control is achieved largely by influencing the definition of the situation which others come to formulate. He can influence this definition by expressing himself in such a way as to give them the kind of impression that will lend them to act voluntarily in accordance with his own plan" (Goffman, 1959:4). Thus the waitress attempts to control the impression she fosters for diners. The waitress, engaging in impression management, provides the front of a dedicated service worker. Consequently, waitress sales promotional activities are masked throughout the dining interaction episode.

Goffman cites the concept of "definition of the situation" as central in explaining subordinate manipulation. The scheme he provides is most useful in explanation of waitress manipulation. The waitress (subordinate) apprehends or penetrates clientele's (superordinate) definition of situation. This apprehension is actually a process of evaluation. The evaluation develops as the waitress recognizes certain cues given off by clientele (time of arrival, type of dress, amount lapsing between cocktails and placement of dinner order).

Goffman claims, "if unacquainted with the individual, observers can glean clues from conduct and appearance, which allow them to apply their previous experience with individuals roughly similar to one before them" (Goffman, 1959:1). This process of evaluation provides subordinate with an appreciation of superordinate definition of
situación. Following this process of evaluation the subordinate engages in impression management. That is, the waitress operates "in-tune" with the evaluation apprehended. Finally, a working consensus or negotiation is achieved when "together the participants contribute to a single overall definition of situation" (Goffman, 1959:9).

Several processes are closely associated with the concept definition of situation. The process of evaluation, ensuing impression management and finally working consensus are all derived in a definition of situation context. This configuration of processes is implied in several of the statements cited in the literature review. The anticipation issue delimited by several of the authors is akin to the process of evaluation and ensuing impression management.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Participant observation was employed as the method of investigation. Determination of method was based on the boundaries set by the problem of study. An investigation of subordinate manipulation practiced within the waitress work role is an issue not easily identified by the outsider. For this reason, immersion into the work role was deemed the most efficient approach to researching the problem. The researcher was immersed into the waitressing work role for approximately six weeks. Taking on the role of waitress allowed the researcher to engage in episodes of interaction with dining clientele. Such experience permitted a first person assessment of interaction characterizing the problem of study. The processes associated with clientele manipulation are characterized by an obscure and often indiscernible nature. Initiative, recommendation and suggestion, the major tools employed by the manipulator, are concealed by the front of service and guidance. It is doubtful that the questionnaire and structured interview techniques would claim the efficiency of participant observation, given the waitress manipulation problem. These traditional tools of social research might handicap the investigator in the task of illiciting the "essence" of subordinate manipulation.

A primary problem confronting the traditional interviewer involves drawing a sample. Would waitresses speak freely of their efforts in pursuing manipulation? Furthermore, it might be extremely
difficult to formulate a tight set of questions tapping the full
dimensions of the problem under study. Consequently, this researcher
decided participant observation would yield a more precise explanation
of waitress manipulation and influence.

The waitress is a performer within the leisure dining restaurant. Erving Goffman comments on dramaturgical performance in his statement, Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Goffman points out that, "the performer may be engaged in a profitable form of activity that is concealed from his audience, and that is incompatible with the view of his activity which he hopes they will obtain" (Goffman, 1959:47). He further maintains that a performer tends to conceal and under-play those activities, facts, and motives which are incompatible with an idealized version of himself and his products" (Goffman, 1959:48).

The waitress is viewed by the public as a service worker, accordingly the role of manipulator is not compatible with the service image. Therefore, manipulative action employed by the waitress must be concealed from the eye of the observer. The issue of concealment permeates much of the waitress' performance. The method of participant observation allows a researcher to become an insider, and consequently permits disclosure of concealment.

Participant observation has been classified into four distinctive researcher roles by Buford Junker (Gold, 1958). Junker lists the four roles as (1) complete participant, (2) the participant as observer, (3) the observer as participant, and (4) the complete observer. The complete participant researcher gains full fledged membership of the in-group. Gold notes that generally the in-group is not aware of
the researcher's investigation. The second role type delimited is
the participant as observer. This role lacks the quality of con­
cealment associated with the complete participant role. Gold iden­
tifies the primary problem inherent to this role is the disability
of getting at information of the secret level observable to the
researcher assuming the complete participant role. The third role
distinguished by Junker is the observer as participant. Generally,
the researcher assuming this role is sponsored by people in the
situation studied. The researcher's presence and purpose are made
public given the observer as participant. Junker comments that
secret levels of information may be granted the observer as participant,
however, freedom in divulging such confidences may become problematic
for this role player. The final research role practiced in participant
observation is the complete observer. Generally, the in-group or
subject of study is not aware of observation by researcher in this
role. The complete observer is disqualified from participation with
the in-group.

Florence Kluckhohn is frequently cited within participant
observation literature, for her definition of this method of study.
Kluckhohn describes participant observation as, "conscious and
systematic sharing, in so far as circumstances permit, in life
activities and on occasion in the interests and affects of a group
of persons" (Kluckhohn, 1940:331).

Severyn T. Bruyn allows further appreciation of the method of
participant observation through comparison. Bruyn compares the
traditional methods of social science with participant observation.
He reflects, "unlike traditional empiricists the participant observer must view a culture just as the people he is studying view it, including reflecting on the social processes in which he is inwardly engaged. This means he sees goals and interests of people in the same way that people see them, not as functions or experimental causes as would traditional empiricists; it means he sees people in the concrete reality in which they present themselves" (Bruyn, 1966:22).

Both comments addressing the method of participant observation stress the importance of "sharing" the life (work) activities (goals and interests) of the in-group. Ultimately, it is this sharing of goals and interests that permit the participant observer to produce knowledgeable statements concerning the problem under study. The dimensions of waitress manipulation can only be apprehended when one is able to understand the work situation from which these activities are derived. Certainly the issue of waitress manipulation is bound-up with the goals and interests set by the waitress. How are these goals and interests to be identified? The primary recourse in answering this question is to assume the waitress work role.

One criticism levied against this method of study involves validity of participant observation findings. Bruyn claims that validity in participant observation is concerned with, "what the researcher says is reality in the minds of those he studies must be reality the same way they conceive it" (Bruyn, 1966:255). Bruyn further claims, "the findings of a participant observer can seldom be judged as either totally valid or invalid. Such findings are subject
to the same kind of approximations which affect statistical correlations in the empirical tradition" (Bruyn, 1966:270).

An initial pragmatic problem confronting the participant observer is, how to gain entrance to the in-group. This problem posed no difficulty in this investigation. Prior to the study, the researcher had gained experience in the work role on three separate occasions. A return to the most recent leisure dining restaurant of employment was easily accomplished as the same host and head waitress were still presiding over operations. Entrance to the in-group was readily accomplished as several of the waitresses had previously worked with this researcher. They knew that my admission to the in-group posed no threat to existing work operations. On the basis of past performance, I was able to forego those tests of honesty and surveillance conducted by management. Furthermore, the in-group of waitresses did not find it necessary to carry out any rights of passage ceremony. The only initiation imposed by the group involved "getting stuck" late. That is, as newest recruit one is often relegated the task of "late girl" on weekends. This involved staying late, until nearly 3 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights. Responsibilities of "late girl" included cleaning up, refilling certain supplies and waiting for the "heavy" drinkers to depart.

Finally, the investigation was conducted over a six week period. The last two weeks in June and the entire month of July 1973 was spent working within the leisure dining restaurant. This six week period is considered the business peak period for the resort area in which the leisure dining restaurant was located. The researcher
was scheduled on a four day work week, Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. This was the typical schedule, however on occasion substitutions for several of the waitresses occurred on Monday and Wednesday. Most evenings work started at 5:30 p.m. and ended anywhere between 11 p.m. and 3 a.m.

**Research Design**

The occupational relationship attendant between diner and waitress assumes the general appearance of a super-subordinate relationship. An assumption is made when we identify an occupational relationship as an illustration of the super-subordinate form. Generally, we assume that the superordinate is in command of the situation in which the subordinate merely complies. This assumption fails to consider the possibility of subordinate influence. Preoccupation with the status differential existing between superordinate and subordinate serves to overshadow and ignore the possibility of subordinate influence. Does the waitress assert influence within the waitress diner relationship? This is the basic question precipitating our investigation. The research design has been structured to test for the existence of waitress influence.

The test for subordinate influence was based on a comparison of two groups. These groups were subject to distinctive treatments by the waitress researcher. Waitress treatment of groups was defined in terms of a manipulative dichotomy. That is, one group was subjected to the typical tactics of manipulation employed by the waitress.
The manipulative treatment of diner is the typical treatment performed by the waitress. The rationale supporting this treatment has been identified in terms of the inflexibility of the tip percentage (15%) and the "waiting occupations law of increasing returns."

During the six week period of observation and research, one particular discussion, provided by four waitresses, served as a significant indicator of this typical manipulative treatment performed by the waitress. The discussion was initiated by waitress A, a novice with three months experience. She was complaining about the consistently low tip totals she had been accumulating over the weeks. She complained that she hadn't had a $30 night all summer. Waitress B, a veteran of seven years, asked her what she thought the problem was. Waitress A claimed that it seemed as if she always got "stuck with" the "cheap" diners, who really didn't eat or drink much. Waitress B commented "well keep trying to sell them all you can, that's the only way your tips will increase." Waitress A laughed, "you can't do that! They know when they come in here how much money they have and exactly what they want and will spend. Besides I'm not about to try and convince them to buy all kinds of things."

Waitress C, who hadn't taken either side during the conversation directed her statement to Waitress A. She claimed that people come out for a good time and as such it's your job to sell them all the food and liquor you can.

Finally, the waitress-researcher joined in claiming perhaps Waitress A was right, maybe diners do know exactly what they want and exactly how much they will spend, when they enter a restaurant.
Waitresses C and B continued to disagree. Waitress B claimed that in this kind of restaurant you've got to sell the most you can to each party, "cause you can't make it up in numbers."

The discussion terminated as Waitress A left to check on a dining episode in process. Her final remark was directed at Waitresses B and C, "I still think people know exactly what they want and nothing I do or you do can change that." Waitress B somewhat sarcastically responded "and that's why you've never had a $30 night."

A contrasting group was subjected to a non-manipulative treatment performed by the waitress researcher. This treatment lacked the typical tactics of waitress suggestion and recommendation. The test for waitress influence was based on a comparison (in terms of mean tab) of the two groups. The null hypothesis structuring the test presumed that there is a difference between manipulated and non-manipulated groups. This difference was measured by a comparison of the mean tab per group. If the tabs accumulated by distinctive groups were found to be significantly different, one could infer that this difference might be explained in terms of the waitress' treatment of the group. Finally, the general assumption supporting the research design supposed that if the typical manipulative treatment practiced by the waitress was successful, that is, if there was a significant difference between manipulated and non-manipulated group tabs, then there is some evidence supporting the issue of subordinate waitress influence.

An alternative hypothesis was tested based on the general age of the dining group. In this regard, it had previously been suggested
that generally, the waitress identifies young diners and middle age
diners as promising prospects. In contrast, older diners are often
stereotyped by the waitress as poor promotional prospects. Ultimately,
it was hypothesized that a difference in group tabs (based on consumption
of food and liquor) might be explained in terms of age of group, rather
than the manipulative treatment variable.

In summary, this investigation has been structured to identify
those groups consuming the greatest quantities of food and liquor. Two
variables have been identified as possible links for an explanation
of diners distinctive consumption patterns; they are (1) waitress
treatment of group, and (2) age composition of group. The results from
testing the two hypotheses will be presented and summarized in Tables
1 through 5. However, before tabular presentation, it is necessary
to identify how the variables employed for the testing of the two
hypotheses were operationalized.

**Operationalized Variables**

Two independent variables and one dependent variable were
identified and operationalized for testing two hypotheses structuring
this investigation. The dependent variable was delineated in terms
of amount of dining group consumption. This variable was measured
on the basis of final tab accumulated. Such a figure is based on the
diners' cost of food and liquor consumed during the leisure dining
episode plus an additional figure of state sales tax (5%). It was
discovered in analyzing the data that it was necessary to introduce
a control variable to standardize the mean tab amounts per group.
This control variable was size of party. That is, the number of diners in a party served to inflate or deflate tab amount. Analysis of data is based on comparison of group means, therefore control of group size was necessary.

The rationale supporting measurement of dependent variable on the basis of tab amount must be considered in light of two interrelated issues, the waiting occupations law of increasing returns, and the relative inflexibility of the tip percentage. The waiting occupations law of increasing returns dictates that the waitress concentrate on tab building rather than concentrating on increasing tip percentage. We have identified the general inflexibility associated with the average tip percentage of 15%. This inflexibility serves to further waitress attempts at manipulation of tab totals. Attempts at manipulating the size of tips are too risky for the waitress to engage in. It was demonstrated in the Literature Review (R. L. Karen) that generally special services do not create a climate of obligation on the diners part. That is, services deemed above and beyond the call of duty may not serve to increase the tip percentage. Ultimately, the inflexibility associated with the tip percentage, and the waiting occupations law of increasing returns justify measurement of the dependent variable as expressed in terms of tab amount.

The independent variable of age groups was measured subjectively. That is, the waitress-researcher assigned groups to categories of young (20-34), middle (35-54) and old (55+). There were some cases of mixed or nonhomogeneous groups. These groups generally consisted of parents and children and as such were not included in data analysis.
of age groups. Basis for assigning groups into certain age categories was ultimately a subjective judgement. However, if there was some question concerning age assignment, the researcher enlisted supporting judgement from another waitress who was aware of the investigation.

The second independent variable is the dichotomous manipulative treatment variable. Every other week the waitress-researcher practiced the alternative group treatments. That is, the first week a manipulative treatment was practiced, followed by a second week of non-manipulative treatment. The third week, manipulative treatment was resumed, etc. Given that the researcher was scheduled to work a four day week over a six week period the treatment variable was subject to standardization. There were more groups subject to the non-manipulative treatment; however, this was a function of more parties during weeks 2, 4, and 6. Explanation for this occurrence might be based on one waitress and one waiter quitting during the six week period, thus providing more parties for the remaining waitresses.

Definition of treatment styles is based on waitress initiation, suggestion and recommendation. The manipulative treatment was characterized first by waitress initiation, that is, the researcher practiced what Whyte terms "getting the jump." Upon initial contact with the group the waitress suggested "would anyone care for a drink?" After consumption of the first cocktail groups subject to manipulative treatment were asked to consider a second cocktail. Generally, the researcher prompted the group for the dinner order asking first "who would care for an appetizer?" It should be noted that appetizer
promotion was not fruitful. Most diners knew about the extensive salad bar and the choice of complementary soups which accompanied all meals. During the process of ordering dinner the waitress recommended, to the undecided, certain items. Generally, promotion was based on diners interests. In this regard, seafood enthusiasts were recommended to try lobster or seafood combination rather than the less expensive flounder, scallops, shrimp or king crab. Similarly, beef enthusiasts were recommended to try prime rib, the house steak or filet mignon, rather than the less expensive cuts of beef. The waitress checked back twice during the consumption of the main course. This is typical procedure in the leisure dining restaurant at which time the waitress promotes further consumption of liquor. Finally, upon completion of the main course the waitress suggested dessert or after dinner drinks. Only one dessert was worthy of promotion, consequently more promotion was given the after dinner drinks. Throughout every course of the meal the waitress continued to suggest and recommend to dining groups subject to manipulative treatment.

This suggestion and recommendation procedure was absent in the treatment of non-manipulated groups. The non-manipulated treatment was more difficult for the waitress to perform since nonmanipulative action is atypical of the waitress; nevertheless, upon initial contact with these groups the waitress questioned, "are you ready to order?" Specifics concerning cocktails, appetizers, and main course were not mentioned. If members of this group asked "what's good?" they were politely reminded that everything was "good." The two phrases used extensively in this treatment were, "are you ready to
order?", and "would anyone care for anything else?" Those subjected to the non-manipulative treatment were subject to the same two check back procedures typically practiced by the waitress during main course consumption. The waitress was as attentive and "ever present" as in the case of the manipulated group. However the waitress' presence was marked by a lack of initiative, that is, the waitress did not attempt to "get the jump."

The variables were recorded during and after particular treatment of groups. Generally age of group and treatment were recorded while waiting for drink orders. Tab amount and tip amount were recorded at completion of the dining episode. This recording of data became routinized and generally it occurred while waiting for drink orders, or while waiting at the bar for change from the bill.

Sample

The sample drawn for this study consisted of 70 dining groups. Dining groups are considered "parties" by the waitress. Party size ranged from one to six persons. Over 50% of those parties comprising the sample were comprised of two persons. Past experience in the work role had demonstrated that duces or twosomes generally predominate within the leisure dining restaurant. Parties of four were the second most frequent party combination in the sample. Foursomes accounted for approximately 35% of the total party combinations. Parties of six accounted for approximately 10% of the sample. Finally, parties consisting of singles, threes, and fives represented approximately 5% of the sample.
The sample drawn consisted of 202 individual diners. There is a distinctive clientele profile that emerges when age is related to the 202 individuals in the sample. It was established that 44% of the sample were members of a middle age category (35-54). Old age followed claiming 22% of the sample (55+). Young diners constituted approximately 22% of the sample (20-34), and finally, 12% of the sample consisted of families with small children. These percentages attest to the predominant pattern of middle age dueces frequenting the leisure dining restaurant.

Four parties were deleted in analyzing the data. These parties were families consisting of mother, father and small children. The dependent variable is to be measured through comparison of group mean tab totals. Given this factor, including children's consumption in mean tab analysis would confound findings. A child's complete dinner was purchased for $4.00, this figure was extremely small in comparison with adult dinner cost per meal ($5.00 to $13.00). The sample size of 65 dining groups accounts for total group data to be analyzed. This figure is further reduced in Table 3 to 55 dining groups. This reduction is the result of deleting parties of 6 from analysis. This deletion was prompted by an insufficient number of cases in old and young categories. Finally, 5 cases have been deleted from data analysis in Table 5. These cases were odd numbered party sizes (1, 3, 5) and would not lend themselves to the scheme of analysis employed in Table 5.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this section data are reported concerning the relationship between each of the independent variables; age composition of dining group, and the manipulative treatment dichotomy as they relate to the dependent variable of diner consumption. Simple and multiple analysis of variance were employed to test all hypotheses.

As concernsings the first of these independent variables, age composition of dining group, the "young" dining group was shown to have a mean tab of 19.7, as compared to 17.6 for the "middle aged" dining group, and 17.2 for the "old" dining group.

Table 1 summarizes the results of calculating a simple analysis of variance to test for differences in consumption patterns among the three age groups surveyed. The F-ratio calculated .15 was not statistically significant, therefore the null hypothesis presuming a difference among groups was not rejected.

\[ H_0 \text{ There is no relationship between the age composition of group and pattern of dining consumption. } \]
not rejected

Given the results of Table 1, it was hypothesized that perhaps size of party, should be introduced as a control variable. That is, perhaps age composition controlled by party size would render significant findings.

The party size variable was defined by 3 values, parties of 2, 4 and 6. The mean tab totals calculated on the basis of party size
TABLE 1

AGE GROUP DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.43</td>
<td>38.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16,152.40</td>
<td>256.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16,229.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-ratio = .15
were as follows: duces, 17.55; foursomes, 19.51; and finally parties of 6, 21.42. The mean tabs for groups of 4 and 6 were standardized to compare with parties of 2. That is, the mean tab for parties of 4 was divided by 2, thus providing a figure comparable to the mean tab accumulated by duces. Likewise, the mean tab for parties of 6 were divided by 3, again permitting comparison with parties of 2.

Table 2 summarized a simple analysis of variance calculated on data related to party size. The null hypothesis was not rejected as a significant difference was not established between party sizes of 2, 4 and 6.

\[ H_0: \text{There is no relationship between party size and pattern of dining consumption.} \]

not rejected

Despite the lack of a significant relationship reported in Table 2, party size was utilized as a control variable for a retest of the age difference hypothesis (Table 1).

The Table of means (3a) describes the relationship between age of group and size of group, when simultaneously related to dining consumption patterns. Young parties of two accumulated the highest mean tab total of 19.9. Duces in the old age category followed with a mean tab total of 17.2. Finally, middle age groups of two were found to have a mean tab total of 16.4. Findings in regard to age groups and patterns of consumption changed in computing mean tab totals for parties of four. It was found that middle age groups of four accumulated a higher mean tab total 20.6 than young or old groups of
TABLE 2
PARTY SIZE DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.98</td>
<td>46.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,505.80</td>
<td>26.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,599.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-ratio = 1.77
TABLE 3a

AGE GROUP x PARTY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young</th>
<th></th>
<th>Old</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Totals)
four, 19.3, 17.2, respectively. This finding was in direct opposition to the middle age mean tab calculated for groups of two. Middle age groups spent less in groups of two than either of the other groups, however, they spent more in groups of four than both young and old age groups. Comparison of mean tabs for the three age groups has illustrated that no pattern for age groups is discernible. That is, no age group consistently accumulated the greatest mean tabs. Therefore, age of group does not appear to be a useful variable. This finding partially refutes the widely held notion among waitresses that young diners are inherently more promising promotional prospects.

Introduction of the party size control variable failed to render the age groups as a significant variable, as reported in Table 3a. It should be noted that groups of six were deleted in this test as the young and old categories did not contain a sufficient number of group size 6 cases.

The F-ratio 1.10, reported in Table 3a, although greater than .15 resulting from simple analysis of variance calculations was still not rendered significant. Interaction between the two variables age and size was not found to be statistically significant.

When controlling for party size, there is no relationship between the age composition of group and pattern of dining consumption.

The second independent variable employed in analysis of data is the manipulative treatment variable. Those groups subjected to waitress manipulative treatment had a mean tab total of 20.41.
TABLE 3b
AGE GROUP x PARTY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>Corrected Squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sum of squares</td>
<td>1,461.64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares between party size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>43.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares among age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>29.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/party size by age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>29.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares original data</td>
<td>1,302.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast, those groups not subject to manipulative treatment accumulated mean tab totals of 16.64.

Table 4 summarizes a simple analysis of variance calculated on the basis of manipulated and non-manipulated groups. The null hypothesis was not rejected as the difference between distinctive treatment of groups was not established as statistically significant.

$H_0$ There is no relationship between waitress treatment of group and patterns of dining consumption.

not rejected

Table 5a provides a description of the relationship between the treatment variable and the diner consumption variable while controlling for size of group. This description is summarized in terms of group mean tab totals.

Comparison of column totals of the mean tabs reveals that those groups subjected to manipulative treatment averaged a mean tab total of 20.1. By contrast, the same figure for the non-manipulated groups was considerably smaller, 16.64. This difference is further portrayed by the tables interior means. Here we find that in all cases (party size 2, 4, 6) the mean tab totals representing the manipulative treatment portion of the Table are considerably higher than those presented in the non-manipulated section. The greatest distinction appears between manipulated and non-manipulated parties of 4. Groups of 4 subjected to manipulative treatment had a mean tab total of 21.07, this figure is substantially larger than the 17.96 calculated on groups subject to non-manipulative treatment. The smallest difference between mean tab totals of manipulated and non-manipulated groups was
### TABLE 4

**TREATMENT DIFFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>323.1</td>
<td>323.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15,912.9</td>
<td>248.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16,236.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-ratio = 1.3
TABLE 5a
MANIPULATIVE TREATMENT x PARTY SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MANIPULATED</th>
<th>NON-MANIPULATED</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
found in comparing groups of 6. The manipulated group mean 21.89 barely exceeded the non-manipulated group mean of 20.72.

Finally, Table 5b summarizes a multiple analysis of variance retesting the manipulative—non-manipulative treatment variable, however this time controlling for size. One F-ratio was established as significant in this test. It was found that there is a significant difference (.05 level) between non-manipulated and manipulated dining groups as measured by mean tab totals.

\[ H_0 \] When controlling for party size, there is no relationship between waitress treatment of group and patterns of dining consumption.

rejected at .05

The two hypotheses structuring this investigation were tested by employing multiple and single analysis of variance. Our purpose was to identify differences between groups. It was found that the differences between age groups in terms of mean tab was not significant. That is, the variance as measured by mean tab amounts was as great or greater within groups as it was between groups. Thus, we may conclude that age composition of dining group does not significantly discriminate why some diners buy and consume more than others in the leisure dining restaurant.

It was found that party size (2, 4, 6) was not significantly related to the amount of food and liquor consumed in the leisure dining restaurant. Parties of 4 did accumulate a mean tab greater than parties of 2, however, this difference was not rendered as significant by simple analysis of variance test.
### TABLE 5b

**MANIPULATIVE TREATMENT x PARTY SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>Corrected Squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sum of squares</td>
<td>1,598.89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares between party size</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.87</td>
<td>38.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares among manipulative treatment groups</td>
<td>188.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188.04</td>
<td>186.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/party size by manipulation</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of squares Within</td>
<td>1,291.90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most insightful finding rendered in analyzing the data was presented in Table 5b. It was discovered that the difference between manipulated and non-manipulated dining groups is significant. In all cases (party size 2, 4, 6) mean cost per meal was greater for those groups subjected to the typical waitress manipulative treatment. This finding provides partial evidence supporting the issue of subordinate (waitress) influence. The waitress persistently attempts to manipulate the leisure diners consumption of food and liquor. The findings illustrated in Table 5a and 5b permit us to conclude that the waitress' manipulative treatment has resulted in higher mean tabs in the manipulated groups. It would appear that the waitress is able to influence diners consumption by means of initiation (getting the jump), suggestion and recommendation.

Ultimately, the research design has been structured to identify those groups engaging in above average consumption of food and liquor. It has been established (Tables 1 and 3) that age composition of group provides little in the way of explaining group consumption patterns. In this regard, young groups do not inherently consume more than older groups. Rejection of the age group variable as an explanation of above average consumption strengthens further the explanatory power of the manipulative treatment variable.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Explanation of subordinate influence in terms of the waitress manipulative treatment variable is closely linked to Simmel's statements presented in the literature review. Simmel maintains that there is reciprocal shaping that operates within the interactional form (super-subordinate). This notion is supported by the significance of the waitress manipulative treatment variable. The waitress assumes some influence in shaping the diners consumption patterns within the leisure dining restaurant. Influence is defined by Simmel as determination of the other (Levine, 1972). Simmel comments "nobody in general wishes that his influence completely determine the individual, he rather wants his influence, this determination of the other, to act back upon him" (Levine, 1972:108). In this regard, the waitress seeks to determine the diners consumption of food and liquor. However, this determination is assumed for the purpose of increasing the amount of tab, or as Simmel has stated, it is practiced in anticipation to act back upon the influencer.

Further integration of the manipulative treatment finding can be related to the work of Erving Goffman. His work speaks to manipulative actions performed by the waitress. Goffman claims "regardless of the particular objective which an individual has in mind and of his motive for having the objective it will be in his interests to control the conduct of others especially their response treatment of him" (Goffman, 1959:4). He details this statement in
claiming, "this control is achieved largely by influencing the definition of the situation which others come to formulate. He can influence this definition by expressing himself in such a way as to give them the kind of impression that will lend them to act voluntarily in accordance with his own plan" (Goffman, 1959:4). Thus the waitress engaging in manipulative treatment of diner is perceived not as a manipulator but as a "guide." Suggestion and recommendation are viewed as indices of good service performance. Subordinate influence is the central issue structuring this investigation. This issue has been generally examined in the work of Goffman and Simmel. The significance of manipulative treatment within the waiting occupation serves as an explicit referent supporting previous statements presented by Goffman and Simmel.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

The issue of subordinate influence has served as the sociological problem in this investigation. Basically, we have been concerned with questions of how and why waitress influence is articulated. The major explanatory variable rendered in this study is the waitress manipulative treatment variable. It has been established that manipulative treatment by waitress results in increased consumption by diner. However, during the investigation a further set of possible explanatory variables emerged. These variables were identified as situational variables. They included such items as diner's time of arrival, diner's attire, and the amount of time laping between cocktails and dinner. These situational variables provided a basis for further
speculation. It was hypothesized that the leisure dining restaurant is frequented by two types of clientele. These types were identified as dinner-out and dining clientele. The major distinction separating the types was conceptualized in terms of clientele's definition of situation. It was further hypothesized after much observation that those parties arriving later in the evening, decked out in finery and ordering dinner after a leisure cocktail period had defined the dining episode differently than parties not engaging in this behavior.

The distinction between types of leisure dining clientele (dinner-out and dining type) may serve to further explain the shaping influence assumed by the waitress. It was observed that the alleged dining clientele were more responsive to the manipulative treatment by waitress. In many cases it appeared that this type of clientele sought to enlist subordinate manipulation. In contrast alleged dinner-out clientele were generally not as responsive to waitress promotion.

Future research directed by the problem of waitress subordinate influence might be designed to test for a difference in types of clientele frequenting the leisure dining restaurant. It may be that situational variables as defined by distinctive types are useful in explanation of the subordinate influence issue.
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AN EXAMINATION OF SUBORDINATE INFLUENCE
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(ABSTRACT)

Although many interactional situations are manifestly of a super-subordinate variety; upon closer examination there would appear to be certain mechanisms operating which enable the subordinate to exert influence over the superordinate. The problem structuring this investigation focuses on the issue of waitress subordinate influence. Data analysis is based on a six week period of participant observation. During observation the waitress-researcher recorded information concerning three variables. These variables structured two hypotheses which were employed to test for subordinate influence. The major independent variable was identified as the waitress treatment variable. This variable was dichotomized as waitress manipulative treatment, and, waitress non-manipulative treatment. It served as the basis of an experimental test. That is, two separate groups were subject to two different waitress treatment styles. One treatment style performed by waitress was characterized by waitress "product promotional activity." While performing this treatment the waitress attempted to sell the maximum amount of food and liquor to dining groups. The contrasting treatment performed by waitress was characterized by an absence of "product promotional activity."
The dependent variable was identified as consumption patterns practiced by diners. This variable was measured in terms of tab size. To be determined was, what effect, if any, waitress treatment of dining group had in determining the amount of food and liquor consumed by diners. A significant relationship was established between waitress treatment style and size of tab. The findings suggest that the waitress does assert influence over the consumption patterns practiced by diners.