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INTRODUCTION

For over two years, the author of this paper was employed in a particular hospital during which time he carried, successively, three different job titles in two different departments. The first job was that of receiving/stock clerk in the purchasing department and the last position was as assistant food buyer in the dietary department. During this period his compensation came from the hospital, but during his being in the dietary department, he worked first for the hospital and during the final ten months for a national food service management corporation which had been contracted by the hospital to operate the dietary department. The food service replaced the dietary department head with a unit manager. The former department head, identified in this paper as F___, served as assistant to the unit manager for slightly over a year before resigning. This unit manager was given the title of department head about two months after the managerial change. The food service created two other new positions in the department, food production manager and unit clerk. The food production manager was an employee of the food service company and was largely responsible for assuring a profitable cost-income ratio. This writer served as his assistant. The unit clerk position was filled by a person employed in the department prior to the arrival of the management company and was responsible for bookkeeping.

The various positions held by this writer allowed contact with a
variety of personnel from all departments of the hospital as well as numerous employees of the food service company. This allowed observations to be made of interaction on several status levels. Most of these observations dealt with non-medical personnel or what has sometimes been called support workers. Through these observations during the time of employment came evidence of one pattern of behavior recurring among personnel of both the hospital and the management company. This pattern of behavior was labeled "favors" defined as any act performed by one person or a group of persons for the benefit of another person or group of persons. This behavior consisted of the exchange of several types of favors which have been labeled material, service, and deference favors.

At the beginning of the research there were approximately 950 employees at the hospital. At the conclusion, the hospital had been relocated on a new site and employed slightly over 1,000 persons. The purchasing department had five full-time employees during most of the period, although occasionally a sixth person would be involved. The other department in which much of the research is centered, dietary, employed varying numbers, but usually there were about 55 full and part-time employees. These included from 34-41 adults of which 27-33 were full time employees and 15-20 high school students employed part-time on weekends, vacations and in the evenings. Some of the other departments which entered into the research were the engineering with 7-8 employees, housekeeping with several dozen, and nursing with several hundred.

This paper, then, is concerned with the workers of a medium-
sized hospital as their interactions involve exchanges of favors. It is not proposed that all behavior can be explained in these terms, nor is there an attempt to say that favor exchanges are the only variable involved in any particular actions. We seek only to identify the process and consequence of the type of interaction which was sometimes called "favors" by employees and which has been labeled in this paper as "favor exchange." That favors are important to interaction and how they effect interaction to produce expectations for future actions will be shown.

This thesis will identify the everyday interaction processes between employees who develop relationships based on favors and the reciprocity of favors. It will further identify a link between favor exchanges and deference, demonstrating the development of identities of prestige out of interpersonal favor exchanges which demand deference. It will show that persons capable of demanding deference are able to develop power outside the authoritative organizational structure. The organization then must include the informally powerful person into the formal system of authority. The paper further will show how interpersonal favor and deference relationships are linked to become exchange networks. These interpersonal networks create a social organization and establish situational definitions of behavior. Favor networks are adaptable to include exchanges of information, exchanges of advice and services, and exchanges of material goods.

Chapter I will begin the discussion with an overview of the various levels of status and corresponding perspectives present in this hospital and the images attached to each status level. We will
discuss the importance of image and perceptions for developing a 
rationale of the favor system. An investigation of the 
importance of identities in constructing favor relationships and 
defining patterns of deference will be initiated. The thesis is 
restricted to the non-medical aspect of the hospital and the 
construction of informal social organization through favor networks.
PART I

ENTRY INTO FAVOR RELATIONSHIPS
Life in the work setting of a hospital exposed me to a number of systems of interactions. The various systems often overlapped with each other and extended beyond the walls of the physical location. These systems—or their levels—varied in amount of official recognition, ranging from those formally established in writing to those which were regularized but informal patterns of interaction. Each system, be it the formal organizational structure or the less formal favor system, made up the total life in the work setting. In certain ways the formal organization and the favor system were interdependent; in other ways their respective purposes conflicted. Each system

1The author of this paper was both a participant in the work of the hospital and an observer. For a complete discussion of the methodological technique used, refer to Appendix A: Methodology. Descriptions of incidents involving the author as a participant in the setting have been treated as separate data from descriptions of events observed by or told to the author as observer. To develop a distinction between the two roles, the author-participant has been identified as Juan throughout. Juan acts only within the boundaries of his occupational role. The author-as-observer has been identified as "I" when acting as the subject and as "me" when acting as the object of observation. The observer, whether I or me, engaged in asking occasional questions of other actors and receiver of direct responses. All hypothesizing about data or analyzing of data was done by I or me. The behavior of Juan was also subject to the scrutiny of I and me.
created its own subtle definition of the work situation for the workers to observe when interacting in that particular system. Likewise, the actors created different identities to handle their respective roles in each of the systems. These identities were seen as the result of processes in both structures and include status and interpersonal interaction that created "personal images" of the setting.

The definition of the situation involves both elements of the setting and personal predispositions brought into the setting by actors. However, it is largely the setting that determines which predispositions will be activated. The appearance of the setting to an actor will be somewhat dependent upon that actor's identity within the setting. The location of the definition of the situation is determined through four stages "in relation to the initial reaction of the individual to the setting. 1. Typical actors in a given identity enter a typical setting with a specific intention or action orientation in mind. 2. Certain aspects of these surroundings, some of which are related to the intention, activate or awaken some of the predispositions the actors characteristically carry with them. 3. The aspects of the surroundings, the intention, and the activated predispositions, when considered together, lead to the selection of a cultural or habitual definition. 4. This definition directs subsequent action in the situation, at least until a reinterpretation occurs" (Stebbins, 1972: 135-155).

My use of the term identity in the work setting is similar to what Erving Goffman (1963: 2) has labeled, but used in relation to social deviance, in the concept "virtual social identity."

Severyn T. Bruyn (1966: 149) defines an image as "the visual picture of sensory experience which develops in the mind as an aftermath of such experiences." It "is created by rhetorical devices such as . . . metaphor, . . . simile, analogy, allegory, fable, parable, and myth." The image "represents or stands for an entity other than being an entity itself . . . (thus) . . . an image must necessarily be removed and different from the entity."

However, this definition leaves out two important points which became apparent from the data to be a part of imagery. First, an image is not only a visual picture, but a mental construct based on all the senses rather than being restricted to the visual. Second, an image is also created through the exchange of information, e.g., rumors and impressions, among a collective of persons. Therefore, an image is a mental construct of sensory experiences developed out of first-hand experience and/or empathetically understood communication.

It should be noted that I do not see a myth as a rhetorical
actor himself and the other actors.  

"Very frequently we find that the thing we see and that we suppose answers to the character of an object is not really there; it was an image" (Mead 1934: 332). The individual can never view another individual or action of another individual as an object in its totality. The individual can only view the other or action of another as he has learned through interaction and personal experience to perceive certain signs of that object and to impute meaning into those signs to construct an image in his mind of the object. Alfred Schutz commented that

\[ \text{... all our knowledge of the world ... involves constructs. ... Strictly speaking, there are no such thing as facts. ... All facts are from the outset facts selected from a universal context by the activities of our mind. They are, therefore, always interpreted facts, either facts looked at as detached from their context by an artificial abstraction or facts considered in their particular setting. This does not mean that we are unable to grasp the reality of the world. It just means that we grasp merely certain aspects of it, namely those which are relevant to us ... for carrying on our business of living ...} \] (in Warriner, 1970: 58).

The facts we perceive as relevant in this research, then, are related to each other in patterns embedded in a situation socially understood and given social meanings by the actors themselves. Individuals then react to these understood meanings on the basis of past experience.

device, but consider a myth to be a social fact if it is believed by a group of people. Likewise metaphors become real in their consequences if believed to be true by a group of people. In building "grounded theory" it is necessary to take the perspective of the actors in the setting as the reference point. Therefore, to me, an image is the result of perceptions rather than rhetorical devices.

\[ ^5 \text{For a further discussion see Anselm Strauss, Mirrors and Masks, 1959, pp. 69-76.} \]
with similar meanings.

No experience is completely new, if for no other reason than that the actor will have no perceptions unless he can structure his sensing in terms of previous experience. . . Without perception there is no experience; without experience there is no perception (Warriner, 1970: 77).

Experience and perception\(^6\) are built up through a continual process of interaction beginning with the simplest forms. When an individual as an actor enters a new setting, that actor attempts to relate the new setting to previous ones he has experienced in order to construct a mental conception of the situation he is acting within and to develop basic images of the other actors of that situation. Through continual interaction and immersion in that situation, the actor develops complex identities of himself, others, and events about him. In addition, the actor learns his own roles and the roles of others as structural placements in systems carrying expectations. The actor's own and others' identities are completed by structural requirements and expectations to form the work identity.\(^7\) The

---

\(^6\)Perception is a process of selective awareness of elements in the environment. Perception is limited by what exists in the environment. But more important is the dependence of perception upon socially acquired habits of inference, value systems, linguistic classifications, previous experience, interests, and concerns. Perception involves the labeling and classification of an element according to classifications that are possible within the scope of the language of the perceiver. Perception, therefore, is a social act effecting the selection of elements to be recognized as real and the labeling of recognized elements (Lindesmith and Strauss, 1968: 148-152).

participating observer has a similar experience except that the canons of objectivity and detachment are maximized.

I deal specifically with the statuses, identities, symbols, signs, interaction patterns, and the definitions of the situation as defined by the favor system. This system existed as a social reality to many employees of the observed hospital. It was developed and continued through face-to-face interaction. I have further chosen to view the favor system from the perspective of the lower echelon workers in the hospital.

Entry

Upon entering employment in the hospital, a new worker perceived numerous identities in addition to the one he has learned. The observed identity of another was to a large extent dependent upon the viewpoint of the work and the opinions of those communicated.

Identity refers to an "individual's attempt to achieve some expression of uniqueness in situations that structure his behavior to a considerable degree." Goffman (1963) sees the individual as existing between a "virtual self" and an "actual self." The virtual self is that which is situationally assigned. The actual self is that which reflects the individual's status which is not contained in a particular situation. My virtual self was that of a worker, however, my actual self was that of sociologist. "Behavior results from the tension of the virtual and actual selves. . . . The person must, however, find the means to express his actual self in the activities available to his virtual self" (Encyclopedia of Sociology, 1974: 132).

The term communication is used in this thesis to refer to an act of transmitting information, normally communication as an event would exist as an exchange of information between two or more actors.
with informally. Due to the fact that communication and organizational position were important in shaping identities of lower echelon workers and observed identities of others, identities frequently became generalized group constructs rather than individual identities.

Persons in the hospital were grouped according to their organizational status. Workers in the lower echelon all held a similar formal status in relation to each other. Other major status categories were those of nurses, department heads, administrators, and physicians. The lower echelon workers when viewing these other status groups from the substantial social distance of the opposite end of a power continuum tended to merge the group members into a generalized characterization or group identity.

The members of the other status groups when dealing with lower echelon workers tended to present themselves in such a manner as to emphasize their social distance and position of power. Interaction between members of the two groups was seldom based on an equalitarian relationship. Both the lower echelon workers and the other groups developed generalized expectations of their counterparts which effected interaction across the separating space and in turn reinforced perceptions and identities of the other.

Three status groups and their respective perceptions and

---

10 Vidich and Bensman (1968: 348) report that "the social position of the observer determines what he is likely to see." This remark was made in reference to participant observers. The statement is as true for participants as it is for scientific observers.
identities were important to this research. First, the lower echelon workers who perceived themselves in a disadvantageous position. Their identity was one of being dominated by the "virtual self" while their "actual self" caused them to complain that their position should have been better.

Second, the departmental management (middle management) was perceived by the workers to be in an advantageous position. Members of middle management perceived themselves, however, as being placed between workers on one side and administrators on the other. Their generalized identity was one of advantage.

Third, special groups had power in the hospital but were not employees of the hospital, e.g., physicians, chaplains. They were perceived to be in the most advantageous position of these three groups. Their generalized identity, especially that of the doctors, was one of power.

11 One can look at an organization from the point of view of what the participant is expected to do and what he actually does. Expected activity implies a conception of the actor, thus the organization becomes a place for constructing assumptions about identity. By accepting the expectations and performing in accordance, the actor assumes the organizationally constructed identity. This identity is termed an official self (Goffman, 1961: 186-7).

12 These classes along with other classes defined in this paper were developed from a process termed "grounded theory." This theory as a methodological approach is discussed in Appendix A: Grounded Theory. A theory that is grounded is built "from data systematically obtained from social research" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967: 2).
Lower Echelon Workers

To most workers, the controlling forces of the hospital were conceptualized in vague language, usually prefaced by the term "they." Almost everyone knew the names of the four assistant administrators and the chief executive officer. Some employees even claimed to know an administrator personally. A few more claimed to know about the "administration" or some administrative policy.

These workers frequently saw power in terms of money. The apparent gap between the workers' wages and salaries of middle management or income of the physicians symbolized to the workers the difference between themselves and the others. Workers often discussed schemes or rumored schemes for obtaining money. The importance of money was at least in part based on the fact that it could

Lower class workers see the difference between themselves and upper class persons largely in monetary terms (Warner and Low, 1947: 19-21). By propagating rumors and myths about how certain persons did or could make money, the workers were reasserting the American equality dogma. The effects of these rumors and myths were to encourage the lower status workers to continue to work.

Taylor believes that most people see work status as directly effecting their overall social status. Therefore people tend to seek promotion at work in order to raise their overall status. He reports that when asked if they felt harder work would lead to advancement, favorable responses were received from 40% of factory workers, 49% for salaried workers, and 59% from professionals (Taylor, 1968: 401-404).

The school has become the place for the mobile and ambitious children of workers. Education has also boomed among the workers in the form of adult education and correspondence schools. The appeal of education has been based on its offer of "a royal road" to easy success. This myth becomes the "most-used route to power and prestige for all classes of men in American society" (Warner and Low, 1947: 185).

One employee in an unskilled job at the hospital spent a year going to night school to learn a skilled job. He hoped that the schooling would allow him to transfer to a job in a new occupation in
be carried beyond the organization and used in other areas of their lives. Power such as held by "the boss" was based upon status within the organization and was not important to the majority of the workers. Their chief concern for being in the organization was the money they received. At the same time, most of the workers wanted more money but few wanted power. It was recognized, however, that promotions within the organization were necessary in order to raise one's wages noticeably. Therefore, promotions were sought largely for monetary purposes which could be transformed into power outside the organization rather than for organizational status which translated as power within the organization.

Wages, through their connection to life outside the organization, were a source of constant discussion by the employees. At various times, rumors would circulate that this was the "richest hospital in town but we're the lowest paid." There were also stories about the director of finance being extremely "tight" with the money. Several people commented that Mr. ____ finance director, probably still had the first dollar he ever made. The topic of money in one fashion or another was undoubtedly the most frequent subject of conversation

another department. During the period of discussion with the personnel office, he told Juan that if the proposed transfer wasn't approved by the time he reached the nine-month point in his training, he would quit the hospital and look for a job in his new field elsewhere. The hospital wasn't paying him enough to stay where he was and "he had paid too much money (borrowed) to the school not to use his training." The transfer did go through and his wage increased.

Status changes based upon education have been shown to be generally nonreversible unless the person involved acts to reverse the change (Glaser and Strauss, 1971: 17-21).
among workers during break periods.

According to hospital policy, workers were not supposed to discuss with other employees the amount of their wages. Once the head of the personnel department told a dietary department meeting that they should not even discuss their earnings with friends or neighbors, but they could be assured that they were being paid a competitive wage. Whether or not wages really were competitive was not in fact known, but most employees who expressed an opinion felt the wage scale was too low. In discussions among themselves concerning wages, workers noticeably failed to mention the exact amount of their own wages preferring to imply that more money could be received for the same amount of work elsewhere. It was common to hear workers complain about their own wages and talk about an acquaintance who made $4.00 an hour for "sitting around and doing nothing." In over two years, not one person ever expressed publicly, in my hearing, that his pay was adequate. It is probable that none would or could have, considering the social atmosphere, even if they did feel fairly paid.

The new worker soon learned that he was expected by his peers to complain about wages. There was some evidence that part of the role of the worker was to complain and thereby fulfill an expectation but not necessarily to express his actual feelings. Frequently, complaints about money carried threats of quitting if the pay was not increased. Seldom were these threats carried out, however. In fact, the people who seemed most often to make threats were among the employees who had been employed at the hospital the longest. Shortly after my
resignation, an employee told me that Sue, a supervisor, had quit. Upon inquiring as to why she had resigned, the response came back, "She was always talking about quitting, but nobody ever thought anything about it. . . . She said she had a job doing the same thing for more money."

The norm and expectation of talking about quitting was so typical that people hardly noticed. However, some workers did not bother to threaten to quit but merely said they could make more money elsewhere and quit. Therefore, complaints about wages and threats to quit seemed to be an inadequate predictor of who actually would quit. Complaining seemed to have served two purposes, first as an expression of feeling toward the administration and second as a device for relieving tension.\textsuperscript{14}

Complaints and Money

With reference to complaints as a tension-release\textsuperscript{15} device, it was noticed that the number of complaints and threats to quit varied with such factors as work load, the "moods" of supervisors, and

\\textsuperscript{14} Employees used several devices for relieving tension; 1) complaints; 2) aggressive physical acts such as throwing or striking an object; 3) shouting or cursing directed at an object or person.

\\textsuperscript{15} Gouldner hypothesized that tension developed out of close supervision. Bureaucratic rules have been developed as a defense mechanism to reduce tensions through routinization, however, close supervision is needed to enforce these rules. Therefore, bureaucratic organizations are both a source and solution for tension (Gouldner, 1954: 240-2).
weather conditions, among other more strictly personal factors. Through complaints to each other, the workers aired their grievances.

Complaints fell into two general categories. The first may be labeled complaints against inanimate objects, such as equipment. Usually these complaints arose out of frustration with a malfunction of a piece of equipment. The worker reaction ranged from striking or throwing the object if it was not breakable to shouts or curses, to critical assessments of the inferior quality of the object. Frustrated cooks were seen throwing down knives; one employee had a habit of striking a box with his fist; there were numerous other similar incidents. The alternative to physical acts were verbal acts, such as curses hurled at blenders which came open in mid-cycle or complaints about the equipment. One worker stated that he had worked at a "hospital in the 50's that had more modern equipment than this place." This class of complaints involved events which the worker could not do anything about and could not personally be hurt by publically stating the complaint.

An additional degree of tension was produced by the feeling of job insecurity among workers. Contrary to the belief in one's freedom to select and continue employment, a considerable amount of time was spent discussing the possibilities of a person being fired. Some people have combated this feeling through a rationalization which was often verbalized along the lines of "I've been out of work before, so it would be nothing new." Despite the concern by many about firing, there was little evidence of it occurring very frequently. Generally, employees left on their own accord, whether they were encouraged to by informal forces or not couldn't be determined in most cases.

This is not to convey that the workers did nothing but complain. The topic of money was not always the subject of complaints. Frequently money would be discussed in the context of 'how to get rich quick.'
The second class was labeled complaints against persons. When a worker was disturbed by the action of a co-worker, he would generally take one of two courses. Choice one was to make his complaint directly to the offender. Choice two and the more frequent was to make his complaint to a third person knowing that there was a good chance that the complaint would travel through established routes of information movement and eventually become known to the offender.

However when the complaint was directed toward a higher status person the worker was aware of the dangers involved in complaining about the actions of a person with power over him. In this latter case the worker would air complaints to his status equals who would be expected not to transmit the complaint to the higher status worker. The effect was to leave middle management and especially administrators unaware of feelings and problems among workers. One management person told Juan that he felt the workers appreciated his frequent visits to the work area and efforts to work with the employees. I was aware of considerable discontent over these practices by this management person. Most complaints of managerial personnel occurred when an act was made by the managerial person which emphasized the differential power relationship; at times the mere presence of a higher status person in the work process was enough to produce complaints.¹⁸

¹⁸"Americans, and American workmen particularly find it hard to think and talk about status and social class. Our reigning ideology of 'I'm just as good as anybody else' denies the existence of rank; 'what ought to be' is substituted for 'what is' in the minds of the people." Lower status workers in particular deny the existence of
Such acts frequently occurred when the "count" (a term referring to the number of patients in the hospital) rose, causing managerial personnel to increase the workload of the workers while not visibly increasing their own. One time a worker complained that her work group was overburdened and needed help, but that the department head had walked right by them on the way to get a cup of coffee. The department head had neither offered help nor tried to find help elsewhere in the department. It should be noted that on one occasion management was condemned by workers for getting involved directly and on another occasion was criticized for not doing anything.

Complaints could also be divided into those involving money and those not involving money; we will be concerned with money complaints. These complaints can be divided into two general classes, one concerning pay and raises and the second being fringe benefits. The class of money complaints, with the exception of raises, has been somewhat discussed. Raises were closely tied to the overall subject of wages. A not uncommon incident occurred when one of the dietary clerks was promised a raise after being re-evaluated by her supervisor, but it was four weeks before the raise showed up on her pay check which led to complaints. Another employee commented "that's the hospital for you," in a tone that nothing unusual had happened and this was status hierarchies asserting democratic dogma. It is when these workers are forced to see the inequality that a reaction, sometimes violent, occurs (Warner and Low, 1947: 172).
expected organizational procedure.

Another confirming instance of the hospital's image among its employees occurred when Juan resigned. One of the people who had worked under him was promoted into his position and promised his wage. However, the hospital administration stated that because Juan had had a college education and his replacement did not no raise would be granted. The food service manager of dietary protested along with the department head and the administration ultimately allowed the raise three weeks after Juan resigned, but not retroactive. Thus the employee lost three weeks of increased wages which had been promised upon his promotion.

In October 1971, there was to have been an across the board wage increase, but shortly before implementation of the increase, the President of the United States invoked a freeze on wages and prices. The terms of the wage-price freeze allowed for a 5.5% wage increase per year, but the hospital put on a complete freeze. It was not until October of 1972 that the hospital again began to grant raises and then on a conditional basis.

Upon the employee's anniversary date of his hiring, an evaluation of his work would be made by his immediate supervisor rating his improvement on a scale from 0 - 5. The numerical rating that an

19 The "new" system was explained at a departmental meeting by the personnel director, personally. We were told that the new system would be better since it would allow for more incentive and reward the hardest workers. He further indicated that each job position would have definite descriptions of what was required to be raised one step, two steps, and so forth. Doubting the existence of such descriptions, I asked if I could find out what I should be performing to be raised
employee received would then be applied to a ten-step wage scale for his position, thus a rating of three would raise the employee from the wage of step 1 cook to a step 4 cook. Once an employee reached step 10, his wage could not increase without a change in job description. Because of the practice of giving wage increases on anniversary dates, most employees had to wait for a still longer period after the wage freeze was lifted. It was theoretically possible for an employee to go from October of 1970 (one year before the cancelled raise) until September of 1973 without a pay increase. It was not known if anybody actually had to wait three years, but many people went considerably over two years without a raise. Despite this long wait, none of the long time employees of the hospital became too excited over the prospect of a raise, as one worker commented, "A big raise around here used to be two or three cents an hour."

A second category of money complaints involved benefits a worker received for being an employee. One of the two hospital organs, the News, ran a story entitled "The Other Paycheck" which made the case that the benefits an employee received were worth a great deal of money and should be viewed as part of one's regular paycheck. The article stated that "total benefits are apt to be

one, two, or more steps. He responded that it involved a complex mathematical formula which I wouldn't understand. When probed further, he told me to talk to my department head.

The purchasing agent later told me the new system would actually save the hospital money. Reasoning that instead of giving yearly across the board raises, the hospital could raise only a few salaries the maximum and hold the other employees at minimum wage increases saving the remainder which would have gone to these latter employees in an across the board raise.
worth much more than $1,000.00 a year above your annual salary."

Many employees scoffed at this article saying they earned these benefits and the money was really coming out of the employee's salary, not the hospital's pocket. Other people felt that the benefits were not as valuable as they were made out to be and were less than what other employers or organizations offered. Some pointed out that many of the benefits were worthless, such as 10% to 25% off on drugs at the hospital pharmacy. Even with this reduction, Walgreen's was considered cheaper. Several benefits were questioned as to their existence, such as the program whereby the hospital would pay some of the tuition for an employee going to school to further his training.

A member of the physical therapy department was talking to Juan about going back to school to raise his job rating. Juan mentioned that he might be able to get the hospital to help finance such a venture. The therapist responded that it would really be helpful if the hospital did, but he was a little skeptical of the

To arrive at this figure the writer of the article had added together the employer's share of Social Security (5.2 percent of the total earnings), the hospital retirement plan (optional), a health insurance program (the employer paid 50 percent the first year of an employee's tenure and 100 percent afterwards with a partial payment for other family members), a life insurance program (free after one year of employment for the amount of an employee's expected total annual wage), a long-term disability income insurance program (free after one year of employment), a liability insurance plan for those with direct patient contact (free), two weeks paid vacation per annum, six paid holidays per annum, and six sick days per year (could accrue up to twenty days). In addition, free employee parking was valued at $50.00 to $100.00 or more a year. Discounts on purchases at the pharmacy and gift shop were added in to complete the total. Outside of the total was a newly developed program to pay school tuition for employees taking advanced training in their respective fields.
possibility asking, "Do you know anybody that's having their tuition paid?" Juan admitted that he did not.

There existed a skepticism among many employees similar to that of the physical therapist. Regardless of what might have been his reason for not going to the personnel office to inquire about the program, he was willing to accept a negative answer from another employee as substantiation for his opinion. It was rather typical for employees to ask questions about organizational policy from other employees rather than going to the personnel office, which had an "open-door" policy, to ask for themselves.

The refusal to use this "open door", as well as scoffs at "The Other Paycheck" and cynical comments about wage policies indicated a lack of confidence on the part of the workers in the information provided by the hospital. As a result, workers had little motivation for seeking information publically supplied by the hospital. Instead, workers relied on information obtained from co-workers to construct their perceptions of the hospital. Reactions to these perceptions were the basis of complaints.

Complaints appeared to function to relieve tension in several areas. If the tension being relieved was the feeling that the worker was underpaid, that feeling was changed from an individual condition to a part of a group condition through an interchange of complaints with other workers. By sharing complaints, the workers could feel that all were sharing the same condition. This developed an "own" 21

21 Considering the feeling of being underpaid by one's employer as a type of stigma, the concept "own" is used to indicate a group
group feeling among the interacting workers.

Perceptions of Department Heads

The second set of perceptions made by lower echelon workers was to view department heads as using their authority for personal advantage. These perceptions had three general empirical forms: 1) the department heads' appropriation of goods no longer required by the institution for personal use; 2) management personnel acquiring

of persons coming together who share a similar stigma. Erving Goffman defined "own" as a "set of sympathetic others . . . who share his stigma. Knowing from their own experience what it is like to have this particular stigma, some of them can provide the individual with instruction in the tricks of the trade and with a circle of lament to which he can withdraw for moral support and for the comfort of feeling at home, at ease, accepted as a person who really is like any other normal person" (Goffman, 1963: 19-20).

Hopper and Pearce as a result of their study of workers in a bureaucratic setting proposed that the greater the discrepancy between the accomplishments of a group and the level of their achievement goal, the greater the feelings of relative deprivation with respect to this goal. Increased awareness of deprivation could also be increased in a bureaucratic-type organization (the non-medical side of the hospital) as opposed to a professional-oriented organization (the medical side of the hospital). In a bureaucratic setting, the awareness of deprivation is increased by the greater number of contacts with other more powerful groups, especially if one's own group acts as a reference group which reinforces an actor's personal perceptions of relative deprivation. The topic most apt to become an issue of comparison is that of income (Hopper and Pearce, 1973: 211-255).

The department heads, however, perceived themselves in a disadvantageous position in comparison to both upper echelon administrators and "special groups." The dietary department head, F, after briefing her assistant for a meeting with Mr. , an administrator, commented that she felt like she was sending the assistant into battle. The purchasing agent frequently complained of exhausting conversations with the finance director. The food service manager once described one of the administrators as "tough but thorough."
usable hospital goods for their own private use; 3) management ordering their subordinates to work for the personal advantage of members of management.

An example of the first form occurred after the health inspector commented on a wicker 'tea-table' supporting a mimeograph machine in a storage alcove of an auxiliary kitchen. He apparently felt that its presence was unnecessary and unsanitary. The dietary department head, F____, decided to take the table home, give the mimeograph machine back to the department that owned it, and put five dollars in petty cash.

The rumor that the 'tea-table' had to be discarded got around and several employees expressed a desire to buy the table. However, F____ acted quickly by having Juan and Mark pick up the table the next day and put it in F____'s car. Obvious to workers, the department head had used power to appropriate hospital goods for personal use.

An example used for the second form involved both an administrator and a department head. In the purchasing department, the store-keeper used an old style, full-sized roll-top desk that was in good condition except for the need of a coat of varnish. Even the lock still worked. In the fall of 1972, the hospital hired a new assistant administrator who happened to notice the particular desk. Approximately two weeks after the arrival of the new administrator, it was announced that he had offered the hospital a sum of money to buy this desk and the hospital accepted. The purchasing agent, John, commented that the new administrator had made a good deal for himself. John,
revealing his intent, said he would have liked to have the desk for himself but he had never figured he swung enough weight in the right places to get it. The storekeeper was disappointed to lose his roll-top desk and have it replaced by a standard metal desk.24

A third form of management's ordering subordinates to work for the personal advantage of its members was probably the most common form throughout the hospital. In dietary, F____ frequently had the head cook prepare special dishes for F____ to take home when she had a dinner party. The head cook considered this to be extra work for

---

24 The standard metal desk was moved in by two maintenance men. They had been sent to the hospital security office while the occupants were in a break period, to remove the desk from that office and place it in the storekeepers office. The maintenance men thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity to "steal" from security. To them this supported a hospital joke about the ineffectiveness of the security force. They reported taking the phone and other materials from the top of the desk (nothing was inside, therefore, apparently the desk did not "belong" to anyone) and placing the items on the floor. The director of security was reportedly very curious as to what happened to the desk.

Later incidents showed that this particular new administrator had a habit of doing practical jokes to try to catch worker carelessness. One time he "stole" two cases of juice from dietary and then called the department head, reported the location of the stolen cases and provided the department head with strong encouragement to correct the situation.

The department head in housekeeping, for one, sought favor in the administrator's eyes by reporting the carelessness or mistakes of other departments to this administrator. The result was to heighten a defensiveness within departments, that if an error or oversight occurred within a department, no outsider was to hear about it. On several occasions, Juan was told to make sure certain named persons did not find out about certain events that occurred within dietary. Middle management tried to protect themselves by placing controls on information. Needless to say this did not encourage interdepartmental cooperation. On the contrary it produced a number of petty incidents in which one department head would report an error of another department to get that department's head "called on the carpet."
her with no compensation.

Department heads frequently requested personal favors from their subordinates which usually could not be refused by the subordinates. Such requests ranged all the way from walking down the stairs to buy cigarettes for the boss to preparing the boss' dinner. Such requests were usually phrased as expectations of the workers and were not viewed as favors by the department heads.

A department head might well use the same approach, same voice tone, and same type of sentence construction in telling an employee to do a job-related task as to go after a pack of cigarettes. The worker received no return favor from the department head. On occasion, the department head might give some type of recognition, such as a simple "thanks" or a nod of the head to indicate approval.

Favors an employee might perform voluntarily (without being ordered) were more apt to be seen by the recipient department head as requiring recognition or return. However, to perform this type of favor so as to be really meaningful to the department head, the employee had to be in an organizational position which allowed an opportunity for such conduct.

The foregoing actions were representative. Opinions on this topic which came out in the normal course of conversation without this researcher inquiring indicated a general opinion by workers questioning why should department heads have the right to take hospital goods. One worker said, "They're employees just like everybody else, it (hospital goods and equipment) belongs to the hospital, not them." Other comments were along the line of: "they didn't pay
for the food, why should they get to take it home when we (the workers) aren't supposed to even take stuff that's going to be thrown away."

Many workers saw the department heads as people who were employees like themselves, except with different titles and amounts of power. To these workers it was the adage, "do as I say but not as I do." The result was a perception of having been taken advantage of by the department head.

Special Groups

Another set of perceived identities was seen as a process of catering to certain organizationally designated groups. Many employees felt that the catering was either unnecessary, or not appreciated enough by the privileged persons. Usually, negative reactions to acts of deference involved how the person receiving the special treatment was perceived. The employee felt that he was somehow slighted as a result of special treatment to others or that persons receiving special treatment were rude to the lower echelon employees and therefore did not deserve it.

One such group were the hospital chaplains who were sponsored by the church that owns the hospital. The chaplains were related to the hospital at a high level, but were somewhat separate from the effective organizational machinery of the hospital. The chaplains received free board in the employee cafeteria and room in adjacent apartments owned by the hospital. Several of the chaplains made a habit of asking for larger than normal helpings or came through the serving line twice to get two portions of food, more often at the
evening meal when the cafeteria was not too busy. The dining room
employees in particular, as well as other employees who knew of this
practice, expressed feelings that the chaplains did not deserve extra
portions. Some were heard to say that the chaplains should not get
free meals. The negative attitudes arose from people who felt that
the chaplains were exploiting the formal arrangement by taking more
than normal portions of food.

Still another group which was perceived to be receiving special
treatment was the doctors. The doctors were given the most convenient
parking lot to "park their Cadillacs", a private lounge, as well as
a separate dining room. The parking issue was one of irritation to
employees when no parking spaces were available in the employee park-
ing lot. Often, lower echelon employees would comment that the doctors
thought they were too good to eat in the same room with "us." There
was however one doctor who often came in for breakfast in the cafeteria
and would sit with employees. This doctor was characterized as "a
good guy" who wasn't like those other doctors.

About four times a year, a staff dinner was given, and physicians
who used the hospital would be invited for a free dinner. Usually
there were between 70 to 100 people for a menu such as high quality
steaks, which would never have been served to the employees as a whole.
The physicians were not expected to go through a cafeteria line, but
were served by waitresses. Previous to the period of this research,

25The doctors had to go through the single employee cafeteria
line and then carry their tray to the area designated for doctors.
the head cook had ordered all the meat used by the dietary department. This cook told me that one time the administrators had "come down" and demanded to know why she had ordered so much meat in a particular month. Apparently the budget, particularly for meat, had been exceeded. She reported to the administrators that the problem was that she had had to order choice steaks "to feed all the doctors." The cook was not only unhappy about the extra work involved in preparing the staff dinner but in addition being 'called on the carpet' for ordering meat she had, by situational definition, needed to satisfy the demands of the physicians' status.

Once again, as in the cases of lower echelon employees perceiving themselves as an "own" group against the administration on one hand and against a particular group of employees who were department heads on the other hand, the workers found themselves in an "own" group opposing privileged outside groups. Both chaplains and physicians worked in the hospital and had defined authority in the hospital but were separated from the employee "own" group as they were not employees of the hospital. The members of this "own" group were members as a result of their perception of the situation as one in which they were underprivileged. The persons who were perceived as being privileged were those who were organizationally separated from their "own" group, by either being a member of a higher level of the bureaucracy or being a person outside of the bureaucratic structure but having authority in the organization.

To turn to further consideration of privileged groups in the hospital, it should be noted that their members were often perceived
as being rude in dealings with the lower echelon employees. For example, a physician had made some comments to the cashier, after purchasing his lunch in the cafeteria, which caused the cashier to slam the cash drawer closed and turn to some other dietary employees saying, "These people who think they're so much better than us make me sick."

Many lower echelon workers were aware not only of the status of the physicians in the hospital, but of the power which they wielded with the hospital administration. A complaint by a doctor to an administrator could easily result in a department head being called in by the administrator after which the employee in question would be reprimanded by the department head. Many employees have been made uncomfortable by doctor's complaints. Employees have responded by referring to the physicians as being anything from rude to acting like pigs.

Juan was ordering supplies for the cafeteria when F___ asked him if there was enough silverware. Juan replied that the only shortage he was aware of was in forks. F___ reported that Mr. ___ (an administrator) had seen Dr. X in the dining room that morning eating with a plastic spoon. The administrator had then told F___ that there was an apparent shortage of metal spoons. The dishwasher who had to wash all new silverware before it was put into use, later told Juan that the only time new silverware was put out was when a doctor or F___ had to eat with plastic utensils.

I would hypothesize that the power and potential power which the physicians were perceived to hold over the employees sensitized the
employees to the extent that many signs the doctors made were interpreted by the employees as being rude or damaging. These signs included walking past an employee while looking away from him, purposely separating themselves in reserved areas, and making comments to employees concerning something they perceived the employee was doing wrong. The employee could not "talk back" to the doctor without risking his job, nor could he defend himself when a doctor's complaint was channeled through an administrator as a third party. All an employee could do in his situation was complain to the other workers about the physicians, a practice which occurred with a great deal of frequency. An attempt to test this hypothesis, however, falls outside of the scope of this paper.

Conclusion

Workers in the hospital perceived others as seeking personal gain. As these perceptions were related to the respective roles and statuses of the others, identities were modified. Persons with similar identities, i.e., department heads, doctors, administrators, were considered together as a group with a group identity. Perceptions of actions by group members were defined through status relations between the respective groups of perceiver and perceived. Workers carried an image of the generalized group identity of other groups than their "own." This image was developed through interaction within the "own" based upon perceptions of the organizational identity of the other group, a synthesizing of individual identities within that group, and the power relationship of the other to the "own."
This image formed the ideas of what to expect in new encounters with members of other groups and tended to act as a selector in perceptions and interpretations of the behavior of the other. Therefore the image that had been collectively developed acted as a modifier of behavior in each new interaction with the particular other group member and served through selectivity to reinforce the image of that other.

Due to lessened social distance and increased interpersonal interaction, an actor was generally more familiar with the identities of members of his "own" group. The actor was aware of a similarity of power relationships in his "own." My hypothesis was that the effect of lessened social distance and increased knowledge of the identity of individuals resulted in a leveling of power relationships among one's "own" group.

On occasion, a member of another group, separated by social distance and a differential power relationship, would be known as an individual identity to a member of the worker group. In such a case the other group member would find himself treated as an exception to the group image. For example, the previously mentioned doctor who often ate breakfast with a group of workers carried the identity of physician but was perceived as different from "the doctor image." Instead he had an image of being "a good guy," allowing the breakfast group to respond to him more positively than they did to the other physicians—his role and status were the same, but his personal image was different.

I do not know what the image of this "different doctor" was among
the doctor's own peers, but he seemed to enjoy being part of a particular breakfast group. This group awarded him a high status in the group largely as a result of his identity as a physician. The workers were willing to disregard the collective image of an other group, e.g., physicians, chaplains, when a member of that other group displayed a willingness to develop an identity among the workers.

It is important to remember that the workers were not a single group by definition but an aggregate of groups that held the lower status positions in each non-medical department.

The aggregate of worker groups had similar generalized images of higher status, other-groups, e.g., physicians, department heads, administrators, but the particular other-group members who established identities among worker groups differed from group to group. The "different doctor" had an identity among the breakfast group, but other workers saw him as just another doctor.

There was a myth that before the hospital got as large as it is now—"so large"—such an impersonal system had not existed. According to the myth, even lower echelon workers were known by name by the chief administrator. The organization supposedly had a "gemeinschaft" orientation a decade or so ago.

The foregoing three sets of perceived identities indicate a complex of attitudes among many lower echelon workers that they were being shorted on wages while their superiors were taking advantage of the possibilities of managerial or high status positions. This paper takes the position that this attitude, whether justified or not, served as a rationalization for certain actions taken by the workers
which have been termed "favor relationships".

Erving Goffman (1961) used the term secondary adjustments for favor-like relationships as well as other actions designed to acquire desired goods or services among subordinates in a mental hospital. This paper, however, sees secondary adjustments as operative also for employees in a bureaucratic organization. Secondary adjustments to an organization were defined as:

any habitual arrangement by which a member of an organization employs unauthorized means, or obtains unauthorized ends, or both, thus getting around the organization's assumptions as to what he should do and get and hence what he should be. Secondary adjustments represent ways in which the individual stands apart from the role and the self that were taken for granted for him by the institution (Goffman 1961: 189).

The lower-rung employees of the hospital discovered shortly after employment that their status had placed them in a situation of being expected not to indulge in any possible advantages which might be acquired through incumbency in their particular position but enabled them to observe their status superiors taking advantage of higher positions. Therefore, the employees were able to rationalize stepping out of their roles and taking what possible advantages were available to lower echelon roles.

The term "advantage" is used here to denote acquisitions and favors an employee received as a result of holding a position in the organizational structure or in the power structure but apart from those rewards which are officially sanctioned by the formal structure. These acquisitions and favors would in fact be considered by the formal organizational rules to be anything from appropriate to gross
mishandling of hospital goods.

This paper does not claim that secondary adjustments on the part of lower echelon employees were the direct result of secondary adjustments by higher status persons, but that the adjustments by superiors were used by workers as rationalization for and justification of reciprocal adjustments in the roles of lower echelon workers.

In the next chapter, the content of secondary adjustments, which involve favor relationships, by the employee will be examined.
CHAPTER II
ADJUSTMENTS TO FAVORS

Susceptibility

When workers were hired, they were given an orientation to the hospital by the inservice education department which presented the ideal of working to help the patients. The idealistic view of employees and orientation was that of making patients well. It was, however, one that was probably for the average employee second to the paycheck, as indicated in Chapter I. The administration undoubtedly realized this even though, as an incentive to work, they often approached workers with the idea of helping the patient.

When the hospital sought to organize its employees in early 1974 for a letter writing campaign aimed at lifting price controls on health care, the hospital justified its position to the public with statements that higher prices were needed in order to assure continued

---

1E. T. Hillel (1947: 503) felt that work had been "deprived of moral and public significance" by the capitalists of the last several centuries. Therefore, the worker has "no moral obligation to the employer or to the public," since he is working strictly out of his own economic necessity.

2Employees were asked to sign a petition to be printed in the Washington Post along with petitions from other hospitals. The workers signing were asked to contribute money to help pay for the newspaper space. In addition, workers were asked to write letters to their congressmen, but if, as the public relations director put it, "you are unable to compose your own letter, you may sign a 3x5 printed card and bring it over to public relations who would mail them a few
quality health care. However, when hospital public relations people met with hospital employees, the appeal was strictly in economic terms and carried the same tone as the card which they had been invited to sign. Employees were told that if Congress allowed the

at a time." The card read:

Dear Sir:

As a hospital employee, I want to express my concern over current legislation on the Economic Stabilization Program (s. 3032, S. 2961 and H.R. 13206).
Relief from continued control is vital to me in terms of my very existence. It is grossly unfair to discriminate against one area of the economy to the exclusion of others. Prices are going up on materials from non-controlled industries. My wages get caught in the squeeze. I am emphatically opposed to this utter disregard for the health care industry employee. In addition, patient care can suffer if cut-backs must be made.

As an elected representative of the people, you can help me. Please vote NO to extension of controls in regard to the health care industry. Thank you.

________________________  ______________________
Name                      Address

On April 7, 1974, the major local newspaper printed an article from the Associated Press stating that health care costs could rise 9 percent for physicians and 16 to 17 percent for hospitalization. Several middle management personnel responded by attacking the newspaper for printing the article saying that the newspaper was "going downhill" or it was "not worth reading" because they felt that the newspaper was providing too much coverage to forces desiring to keep controls on health care. They did not contest the probability of increasing costs, but would have preferred that the newspaper give the hospital line that rates had to be increased in order to continue "excellent health care." The difference between the official hospital line and that given to the workers differed considerably.
price increase, all employees of this hospital would receive an across-the-board raise. Employees reacted with strong support for allowing a price increase; almost no one opposed the increase publicly. However, Don did express in private that he did not want a raise if it meant that hospital rates would be increased so that people who needed hospital care could not afford to come to the hospital. Another employee had overheard the comment and attacked Don on the grounds that we needed more money to keep abreast of the rising prices. Obviously the public relations people were aware that the more effective appeal to the workers would be based on the realization that many of them were alienated from the stated goals of the organization.

This is not to say that all workers were alienated from the managers of the organization. In this regard, there were two distinct groups among the workers of this hospital.

One group invested themselves in their job and often expressed feelings that if they left this particular hospital they wouldn't know where they would go for another job. They completely associated themselves with their work identity at this hospital.\(^3\) The other group remained intellectually and emotionally detached from their job

\(^3\)Among workers who had been at this hospital over a long period of time, there was considerable expression of concern for the patients. This concern was used by both the workers and the organization as an indicator of loyalty to the stated goals of the hospital. The organization frequently would state that the reason for any particular action was to improve patient care; any protest by employees could then be labeled as against the best interests of the patients. The ideal of patient concern could operate as an integrating device or as a rationalization for arbitrary action.
and the organization. This latter group developed a segmentation
between their identity as a worker at this hospital and their identity
outside of their work role, tending to limit their work identity. 4
Many of these latter workers remained employed at this hospital only
a short time and then moved to another job. Anna once commented how
many come and go so quickly, some before anyone even knew their names
and how some persons seem to stay for a long time.

When a worker entered employment with attitudes that could be
labeled "alienation" and was confronted with the situations reviewed
in Chapter I, he might view his own actions differently than he

4 This latter group was undoubtedly the larger. On this same
topic, Julian Roth points out that many sociological studies of
occupations have concentrated on a vertical mobility system whereas
horizontal mobility has probably been the more typical. Workers
move from job to job on a similar status level, but frequently not
confining themselves to a single occupation, nor planning an "orderly
career" design. Workers change jobs not so much as part of a goal to
move up an occupational ladder as to find a job that has fewer demands,
less supervision, fewer layoffs, less monotony, and does not require
getting dirty. The subject of wages has to be played against these
non-monetary values, so that the worker tends to hope for a job which
"slightly increases his income or job security or conserves his energy
so that he will be better able to use his off-work time." Roth quotes
Riesman that "success in one's general style of life, at home and off
the job" may increasingly be more important than occupational success
(Roth, 1963: 89-92). The myth among part-time high school workers in
dietary was that the "good job to get" was working for the major
insurance company in the city. It was thought to be better because it
involved slightly higher pay, no week-end or night work and cleaner
work, even though the job would probably be only filing.

The main concern at my hospital, however, was money since it
was the most tangible and easily translated into objects for a
person's off-work hours.
otherw ise would. A very influential worker in the dietary department once said "I don't guess it's right to take food, but the dietitians do and dining room [employees] always eat free, so the rest of us might as well, too." On another occasion, a worker commented that a business man isn't going to pay retail prices if he can get away with paying wholesale prices.

Generally the persons who were aware of the department heads' taking advantage of their positions and of special treatment for certain groups were those who expressed attitudes that everybody was looking for an advantage. This feeling that everybody else was involved, combined with a feeling that wages were too low, served as a rationalization to justify seeking an advantage. As advantage seekers realized that each could achieve more advantages by sharing each others resources, exchanges occurred which we label "exchange of favors". These people often used expressions of the term "giving" or "getting favors". It, therefore, is appropriate to refer to these workers as a favor-susceptible group.

---

5 Rosengren and DeVault found that time and place were important in hospitals in defining how the participants of the setting would behave toward each other. The setting determined the symbols and meaning of status (Rosengren and DeVault, 1963: 266-292).

6 Lang and Lang (1961: 260) propose that the clearer and more stable the norms of a situation, the more susceptible the actors are to re-enforcing the norms through their interpersonal actions. This tends to stabilize the situation.

"Susceptibility depends in part on how a situation is defined. The follower who in his judgement or behavior deviates from an accepted norm does so in response to certain cues that elicit responses that no longer support the norm. Much depends on what cues are perceived and how important the various alternatives are ... even in the same situation, confronted with the same influence, people display different
The number of people in the hospital who were favor susceptible was impossible to estimate. That number would, of course, depend on the degree of susceptibility that was defined as the group boundary. For the purposes of this study, favor was defined as any act performed by one person or a group of persons for the benefit of another person or group of persons. All persons who perform such acts could be considered to be susceptible to favors and willing, in turn, to grant an advantage to another person.

The degree of susceptibility to favors existed between two roughly differentiated but often overlapping groups. The first group was made up of those who performed only favors which were covertly approved by management. The second group consisted of members of the former group who were willing to engage in any activity which promised a personal, individual advantage to the actor. This paper contends that the category of favors a person was involved in was reflected by their degree of rationalization of personal behavior by pointing to the favor actions of their superiors and by claiming that any personal gain acquired through favors was merely making up for the low wages being received from the organization. Such persons placed money as primary compensation for work performed. This attitude was verbalized frequently in group settings and was supported and approved by other members of the groups as well as by the hospital administrators, as previously indicated.

degrees of involvement" (Lang and Lang, 1961: 261).

Susceptibility, then, seems to be a reflection of how norms are perceived in any particular situation.
Together, the various persons that an employee interacted with, in various group settings, made up a general reference group\(^7\) which established informal limits on favors as well as definitions of which conditions favors were deemed proper for favor exchange. These groups were also important in defining appropriate behavior in other areas of action by the employee. For example, one group among part-time dietary workers defined card playing in the dining room as inappropriate. The general opinion was that such activity could create problems in their relations with administrators. Therefore, those people wishing to play cards were forced either to cease or to go elsewhere.

**Networks**

Actual participation in favors and the socialization into this activity occurred in the reference group. Generally this group could be best described as a network\(^8\) of individual interactions.

---

\(^7\)Persons identify themselves with the occupational subgroup that holds a "set of expectations he thinks he can meet" (Roth, 1963: 103). After associating oneself with a group, whether occupational or favor oriented, the worker as a result of his choice and the acceptance of him by other group members becomes obligated to the group in defined ways. "Reference groups are thus said to establish the individual's organizing conceptions or frames of reference for ordering his experiences, perceptions, and ideas of Self (Lindesmith and Strauss, 1968: 347).

\(^8\)John Barnes conceived of the network as an image of those ties of friendship and acquaintance which each individual largely builds up for himself and which he uses for mutual aid, entertainment, and for finding work" (Aronson, 1970: 260). Noel Chrisman (1970: 245-256) states the position that an individual's network is made up of all personal contacts of ego, but those links between individuals which are supported by similar value orientations are apt to be stronger. Elliot Liebow (1967: 161-207) describes networks as a constantly
Any particular individual's network of favor relations included others who had their own different but somewhat overlapping network. A fuller discussion of the mechanics of favor networks will be presented in Chapter III.

George Homans (1950: 116) makes the case that sentiments are expressed through activity (doing favors). He further makes the point, relevant in our discussion here, of networks which interact frequently.

The more frequently persons interact with one another, the more alike in some respects both their activities and their sentiments tend to become ... the more a person's activities and sentiments resemble those of others, the more likely it is that interaction between him and these others will increase (Homans, 1950: 119-20).

As new employees enter into interactions with other workers, it is probable that they will increase and intensify interaction with those with whom they share common sentiments. If these sentiments are of a favor-susceptible nature then it is probable that these sentiments will be expressed in activity. If the relationship is one that is agreeable to both parties, then it is likely that interaction between these workers with common sentiments will increase and the social bonds between them will be strengthened.

Marsha was hired as a salad girl in dietary; she had no qualms about giving away food "samples" to other persons or taking "samples" for herself. Additionally, there were also certain materials such as changing "web-like arrangement" between people considering each other as friends. My use of the term "favor network" will closely parallel Liebow's concept of friends.
salad plates which she needed for her work. Normally, there were not enough salad plates for her to work with for the evening meal until after 12:30 P.M. when the dryers came back from lunch. If she could get the plates at 11:30 A.M. when the dishwasher came back from lunch, she could work at a slower pace in the afternoon. The dishwasher was willing to run the salad plates an hour earlier if there was a reward in it for him. As it happened this particular dishwasher, Bill, liked salads and especially some of the foods Marsha used in their preparation. Since Bill and Marsha both held sentiments which were positive in the area of giving favors in an otherwise instrumental relationship, they were able to work out an exchange in a fairly short period of time.

As the relationship continued, Bill began doing Marsha other types of favors. She in turn allowed him free choice of any food item that was on the table and on occasion dished up generous portions of food for him to eat. This interaction however was cut off abruptly by Bill's transfer.

The new dishwasher, Don, established a similar relationship with Marsha although not as strong. A difference in rate of interaction between Don and Marsha as contrasted to Bill and Marsha, was created by Don's lesser interest in the food. Even though Don was not as interested as Bill and did fewer favors for Marsha, he still found enough encouragement to keep the relationship going.

\(^2\)The dryers were those who removed dishes from the clean side of the dishwasher and distributed them to the proper employees or places to be used again.
The same pattern of sentiments being converted to actions was
sometimes initiated by a third party. The favor relationship between
the dining room workers and Juan was initiated by Bill. "If you get
on good terms with the dining room (workers) you won't have to worry
about meals. Do them favors whenever they ask, they'll remember,"
Bill told Juan. The position of Juan was conducive to granting favors
to the dining room workers since he controlled many of the material
supplies for dietary as the requisition and storage clerk. In return
for free meals, Juan, among other favors, allowed an occasional extra
pint of hand lotion soap, which many female employees desired for home
use, to be taken into the dining room.

After "introducing" Juan to the dining room workers, Bill had
stepped aside and allowed the relationship to develop. Juan had been
willing to enter the relationship due to a willingness on his part
to perform favors. Bill, after discovering Juan's willingness, had
brought together two willing parties, thus performing a favor for both.
Juan and the dining room people both were indebted to Bill and had to
pay a non-material favor of deference to Bill for arranging for their
exchange of material favors for mutual advantage.10

Many favor relationships reached a point of intensity over time
that neither actor was particularly aware of keeping track of favors,

10 Ralph Ross (1970) in Obligation: A Social Theory maintained
that "all of us have obligations to other men, even in the absense
. . . of a universal morality based on the family, or association of
man" (100). "We owe our obligations to behave in certain ways to
all men by virtue of membership in less universal groups that create
those obligations" (100-101). "My statuses are my membership and
positions . . . in groups and my social obligations, or duties are
in general the functions of my statuses" (66). "The group is the
thus supporting Homan's thesis that frequent interaction produces similar activities and sentiments. Each actor granted favors to the other and expected favors to be coming back. In return, if favors did not appear or if they were qualitatively insufficient, then the unpaid actor would likely become aware of the situation. However, unlike the situation reported in Liebow's (1967) *Talley's Corner*, actors did not always keep accurate account of debts owed them.

Comment on Exchange Theory

The favor system as viewed to this point may be considered in terms of an exchange theory. Marvin Olsen (1968: 240) has stated four assumptions of exchange behavior.

1) Social actors engage in activities as a means of obtaining desired goals.
2) All social activities entail some cost to the actor such as time, energy, or resources expended.
3) Social actors seek to economize their activities as much as possible, by keeping their costs below their rewards.
4) Only those activities which are economical tend to be perpetuated through time.

locus of social obligation, and we are properly responsible to it for our moral acts" (77). Ross viewed obligation as a social phenomenon arising out of interaction in groups.

11 It appeared that an actor receiving a return favor was his own judge as to whether the return was equal to the original favor.

12 Marcel Mauss (1967) in *The Gift* compared pre-modern "potlatch" and "kula" ceremonies, which involved gift exchanges, and found much more than economic factors operating. The "potlatches" and "kulas" involved status, prestige, obligations, as well as providing an occasion for social and symbolic exchanges following ceremonies of rites of passage.
George Homans (1958) felt that some understanding could be gained of small groups and the dynamics of influence as well as other areas through the study of social behavior as exchange. Exchange involves the reciprocal transfer of both material and non-material goods from one person to another. This movement of material extracts a cost from each participant as well as contributing an income to each. Cost and income are measured on a scale of personal values. The value a person may place on a good may decrease in proportion to the quantity of that good in his possession. He tends to value goods which he does not hold in substantial quantity, causing him to emit behavior that will allow him to acquire the valued good. Thus, values tend to reinforce exchange behavior; however, as the value of a good declines, so does reinforcement of the behavior that was designed to acquire that particular good.

One type of exchange used as an example by Peter Blau (Homans, 1958: 597-606) was a worker's exchange of advice to co-workers for prestige; as prestige increased, the less valuable an increment of prestige became; conversely the more advice the worker gave the more costly it became in terms of time--time that was needed for his own work. In this example, the cost built to a point far greater than the declining incremental value of prestige. However, in order for a person to acquire a great deal, he must also appear to give a great deal and this cost of giving may or may not equal the value of the income. Each person of course will attempt to produce a profit from his exchanges; failing to do this may reduce the reinforcement for costly exchanges causing these exchanges to occur less frequently.
This theory can be helpful in explaining those favor relationships whose sole motivation was economic and consequently utilitarian. This theory does little to explain favors resulting from personal friendship or humanitarian favors given freely. Understandably, the actors of a purely utilitarian relationship might trade an act of work assistance for a material good, but they would interact very little outside of the work setting. Homans commented on this type of relationship as being typical among workers, that the interaction between co-workers builds to a point and then "instead of tending to increase, is held close to the amount strictly required for business" (Homans, 1950: 116).

Applied to the hospital in which this research was carried out, the theory does not mean that participants in a favor relationship only interacted when there was an opportunity for an exchange of a favor; it meant persons who interacted together on a basis of favor relationships maintained a social distance between them. Two persons trading favors would seldom know a great deal about each other's personal life away from work. This was a categorized relationship established for obtaining personal advantage within a specified situation. To expand this relationship beyond the work setting would have been pointless in terms of seeking personal gain.

On one occasion, the assistant director of housekeeping and the stockroom person in dietary employed utilitarian exchange for mutual

There is increasing evidence that most workers are not members of primary groups consisting only of persons from the work setting. Work groups tend to be made up of secondary relationships (Etzioni, 1961a: 165).
advantage. Plastic products were in short supply due to a general shortage of petroleum, thus the purchasing department often had problems acquiring enough plastic bags to satisfy the demands of the entire hospital. The purchasing department responded to this problem by rationing the bags out to the various departments. The bag allotment to the housekeeping department was considerably greater than that of the dietary department; however, the dietary department considered the bags essential to its operation. To move garbage out of the dietary department with bags was a relatively easy and simple process, but to move that same garbage without bags became difficult and required numerous man-hours. The dietary management held the requisition clerk responsible for keeping enough plastic bags on hand.

During this period in which the purchasing department was unable to purchase bags, the dietary department exhausted its supply. However, the housekeeping department had run out of a particular type of cleaning agent also used in dietary. The dietary stockroom employee needed bags to protect his position and the housekeeping assistant, who was responsible for the housekeeping supplies needed this type of cleaner which was also handled by the dietary department. Therefore, an exchange was arranged in which both departments obtained the needed goods and both individuals protected their positions in their respective departments.

This exchange did not occur so much to help the department as from a desire by certain employees to prevent trouble from arising with superiors. Both actors had to consider cost, the possibility of
being caught giving departmental materials to another. In this
case, due to circumstance the cost was low, especially compared to
the cost of not making the exchange.

On another occasion, the housekeeping assistant came to the
dietary storeroom person and asked if he could have a small birthday
cake to give to an employee for her birthday. It was hospital policy
to give an employee their birthday off, but he couldn't afford to let
her go for one day. Instead he planned to give her a small cake
obtained from dietary and hope to appease her for having to work on
her birthday, "it's the small things that count," he said. One

14 There were often feelings of antagonism directed toward
"generalized others" in the form of other departments. In a sense an-
other department would become a scapegoat for problems which occurred
within a department. The management personnel often tried to build
worker loyalty toward their own department while attempting to
personify the department in the form of the department head. A
worker who gave loyalty to the "department" in approved ways could
expect some return of gratitude from the department head, either as
gifts or friendliness or power. Two techniques used for enhancing
departmental loyalty was to try to limit the flow of information
between departments and to use other departments as scapegoats. It
was disapproved for workers of one department to discuss events which
occurred within the back stage of their own department with members of
another department. Once a dietary worker made a joke in the dining
room to a cook about the cook having dropped ten pounds of ground beef
on the floor earlier. The cook told him that he wasn't supposed to
talk about what went on "back there out here." This demonstrated
Goffman's concepts of team and team solidarity. However it sometimes
made information collection difficult for the observer.

Housekeeping and the nurses served as scapegoats for the dietary
department most of the time. One time when several dustpans disappeared,
F___ phoned the housekeeping department telling one of the officials
that "somebody in your department likes our equipment so much that they
keep taking it." The housekeeping official defended his department, but
finally agreed to send a dustpan to the dietary department. The point
was that when no evidence was available as to what had happened, a
generalized member of the housekeeping department, not the dietary
department, was immediately suspected.
person did a favor for the assistant so that the assistant could give a favor which he considered meaningful to a third person; there was no immediate return favor to the storeroom person. However, due to their relationship, the storeroom person was willing to give up the cake, knowing that the housekeeping assistant had indebted himself to the dietary employee in the amount of the meaning which the cake contained at the moment for the assistant. "A person responds to the meanings that he and others attach to both acts and objects ... the person pieces together and guides his actions by interpreting everything of relevance to him in terms of its significance for his goal-seeking activities" (Olsen, 1968: 243).

I consider exchange theory to be a contributor to the overall theoretical perspective of this paper, but by no means is it the dominant or basic perspective. Exchange theory is seen as helpful in explaining some actions, but it ignores the importance of the non-economic dimension of the favor system constructed of interpersonal relations of friendship and gratitude.

Normative Behavior

Exchange processes utilize self-interests of actors who are seeking benefits through reciprocal exchanges with others, but over time these processes develop into stable patterns of social order and give rise to culture.

---

15Normative behavior is considered to be repetitive patterns of activity within a group that develops shared expectations upon each of the members respectively by the members of the group. There is an assumption of "a relationship between the perceptions of these shared expectations by members of the social group and the extent to which the norm influences behavior" (Encyclopedia of Sociology, 1974: 199).
norms, toward which the participants are committed (Olsen, 1968: 241).

Olsen saw the favor relationship developing into a normative system of reciprocity of favors based on personal self-interest. The factor of personal gain was suggested above as important in certain relationships. However, those relationships at the hospital which appeared to be more long standing tended to develop a justification separate from the goods of exchange. This justification was a feeling of indebtedness to another person, not so much for the economic value, which often could not be measured, of the favor received from that other person as the meaning of the favor as a symbol\textsuperscript{16} of the interpersonal relationship, itself.

\textsuperscript{16} Lindesmith and Strauss (1963) comment that "humans act not in terms of things as they really are, but according to the ideas or conceptions of things that they acquire from their society. These conceptions of the world may be said to constitute symbolic environments" (42). It is through symbols that we organize and adjust our behavior toward things and persons constructing a plan of action around these symbols. Symbols, thus stand for something else, "indicate the significance of things for human behavior," and "organize behavior toward the thing symbolized" (43). Symbols mediate man's relationships with the external world (53). It is through these relationships that "meanings" develop (48) as a product of the exchange of symbols. To develop meanings, "man is able to invent symbolic structures and be affected by" these structures introducing new dimensions and levels of interaction into a relationship of "man to man, of man to the external world, and of man to himself" (54). Relationships which constitute group membership are symbolic. Therefore, questions of affiliation and allegiance to a group "must be discussed in terms of identification rather than simple belonging" (345-6).
Simmel (1950) identified the concept of "gratitude" as the "moral memory of mankind" (338). Gratitude exists as the residue of human feeling for a favor received of another after that favor has been repaid. Over time, gratitude, in itself may become sufficient justification for giving a favor to a particular person. In fact, favors become required as a sign\(^{17}\) of gratitude. The norm to express gratitude becomes the force demanding reciprocity.

In all economic exchanges . . . the legal constitution enforces and guarantees the reciprocity of service and return service . . . But there also are innumerable other relations, to which the enforcement of the equivalence is out of the question. Here gratitude appears as a supplement. It establishes the bond of interaction, of the reciprocity of service and return service even where they are not guaranteed by external coercion (Simmel, 1950: 387).

Alvin Gouldner picked up the theme of reciprocity as a "moral norm." He developed the concept to mean "that each party (in an exchange) has rights and duties" (Gouldner, 1960: 169) to perform in accordance with what Malinowski termed "a definite social machinery." Malinowski (1932: 55) held that "people owe obligations to each other" including "conformity [to] norms [which] is something they give to each other." Reciprocity according to Gouldner (1960) further "entails a mutual dependence . . . [making it] the complement to and fulfillment of the division of labor." The "norm of reciprocity is universal . . . [and] makes two interrelated, minimal demands: (1) people should help those who have helped them, and (2) people should not injure those who

\(^{17}\)Severyn Bruyn (1966: 127) defines a sign as "any individual's expression to another individual that communicates a message in a particular situation."
have helped them." Gouldner stated that its universality does not make it unconditional nor always accepted (emphasis added). The observance of this norm "stems not only from sheer gratification which Alter receives from Ego but also from Alter's internalization of a specific norm of reciprocity which morally obliges him to give benefits to those from whom he has received them."

Reciprocity becomes an expectation of the giver that there will be a response to his gift. Expectations between actors are at the crux of social interaction. An actor who does not place expectations upon other actors in the setting does not give these others any clue as to how he is defining the situation and what he considers to be appropriate behavior. An actor without any expectations upon him has no guidelines for his behavior, nor any clue as to how others will view his actions or respond to his actions.

---

18 Richard Titmuss (1971: 71-72) commented "the forms and functions of giving embody moral, social, psychological, religious, legal and aesthetic ideas. They may reflect, sustain, strengthen or loosen the cultural bonds of the group, large or small . . . [In small-scale economics] exchange of goods and services was not an impersonal but a moral transaction, bringing about and maintaining personal relationships between individuals and groups." Gift exchange occurs in dyads and "is characterized by elements of moral enforcement." "Malinowski . . . showed that gifts and counter-gifts comprise 'one of the main instruments of social organization, of the power of the chief, of the bonds of kinship, and of relationships in law.' The social relations set up by gift-exchange are among the most powerful forces which bind a social group together."

19 "Rules of conduct impinge upon the individual in two general ways: Directly as obligations, establishing how he is morally constrained to conduct himself; indirectly, as expectations, establishing how others are morally bound to act in regard to him" (Goffman, 1967: 49).
The favor system has developed a pattern of understood norms which defined what was available for exchange, the continuity of exchange, and when exchanges could occur. The term "understood norms" has to be emphasized in a situation in which favor interactions occur through personal networks.

In respect to what was available for exchange, an incident can be considered which occurred shortly before the hospital cafeteria opened to serve a noon meal. On this occasion, there had been some raspberry cheesecake left over from a dinner meeting the night before. Gail, the cashier, asked an assistant department head about the price to put on the dessert. The assistant decided that 25 cents would be enough. Gail immediately made a tag and set it in front of the dessert showing the price. Calling to the assistant again, Gail held up a quarter and proceeded to ring the price up on the cash register announcing, "I'm going to take a piece." The assistant replied, "Fine," and turned to Juan chuckling, "I wouldn't have paid for that, there should be some advantage to working in the kitchen."

A moment later another kitchen employee who was in the habit of getting free meals in the cafeteria, walked in and took a piece of the raspberry cheesecake, sat down, and began to eat. Gail grabbed the tag marked 25 cents and threw the tag on the table where the newly arrived employee had sat and demanded, "Where's your quarter?"

A study of a psychiatric hospital found that the staff through both scheduled and incidental encounters developed an unwritten set of norms with respect to handling patients. Few if any of the staff could identify or state these norms yet they used them as guidelines in making judgments. These staff norms often existed in the form of pacts or alliances or special agreements. These norms were operational philosophies between pure idea and pragmatic necessity (Strauss, et. al., 1964).
employee being questioned tried to laugh and finish eating the cheesecake.

This was a relatively simple incident involving an insignificant amount of material, but several expectations and rights of the favor system are demonstrated by it. First, an employee did not take hospital goods in front of a management person without paying for it. Second, management people expected workers to take some advantage of their position and take hospital goods without paying. Third, the person in control of the goods, in this case, the cashier, had the right to determine whether a certain item was available for exchange or not. Fourth, a person who had previously established a favor relationship (the employee who took the cheesecake) and had established the material to be used in the favor relationship (free food) expected to be able to draw that material when there was a personal desire (entering the cafeteria and taking the cheesecake without asking).

On this particular occasion, two general norms had worked against each other: the cheesecake had been defined as ineligible for exchange but was taken anyway. Gail had challenged, but the cheesecake was not paid for regardless, indicating that even though the person in control of an item had the right to define whether or not it could be used for exchange, once another employee had been given access to those goods (free food), some control had been given up and could not easily be reinstated. Therefore, an employee has control over certain goods until that employee defines those goods as available to another person. Once the goods have been redefined as available in the eyes of all people involved in a favor relationship, there can be no easy
withdrawal of those goods without jeopardizing the entire relationship.

A fifth general norm was that favors had to be returned. The person who had received an unreturned favor could not expect many more favors. When Juan discontinued favors to the dining room employees, an obligation was ignored and the dining room people reacted by cutting back on the flow of food to Juan. The relationship was broken. Juan had decided that the costs of the relationship were too high to continue exchanges. However, some residue of it remained with the actors on both sides allowing them to perform an occasional "gratitude" favor more in remembrance of their past relationship than for an interest in a more current relationship. Homans has commented:

Men never do behave the way they say they ought to behave; in fact they never behave in quite the way they say they behave. At the same time, no set of norms can be wholly out of line with the possibilities of the real world. If it is, it loses its value both as an incentive and as a standard of judgment (Homans, 1950: 413).

The general norms of the hospital and its constituent groups were broken on occasion; the actors in fact were not entirely bound to the principles described above so that a favor relationship may not necessarily be damaged by a broken norm on the part of one actor. However, sometimes permanent damage was done to a relationship as in the example immediately previous even though a residue of gratitude remained. This researcher hypothesizes that permanent damage to a

---

21 A pattern was never established as to how frequently norms could be broken without damage to the favor relationship, the level of acceptable norm breakage varied with individual actors. However, certainly the most enforced norm was that of reciprocity.
relationship was as much the result of a decision by one actor unsatisfied with the favor relationship and desiring to end the relationship as it was a result of a broken norm. Therefore, the decision to break the norm of reciprocity may reflect a rational decision to alter the relationship. Thus, the breaking of the norm becomes a symbol for the desire of one actor to alter a relationship.

Types of Exchanges

A discussion of what types of exchanges were used as favors may be divided into six subtopics which can be grouped into three categories or types. The first category may be labeled "goods" and subdivided into two classes: those goods used for work purposes and those goods used for personal purposes. The second category can be called "services" and be divided into work assistance and work advice. The final category may be referred to as deference and considered in terms of deference as respect and deference as bribery.

Considering the first category, "goods" have been defined for this paper as any material object which can be touched. In favor relationships, goods were traded when one worker either physically moved or allowed the movement of an object from his control to another worker's control. The concept of control was critical since an object could not be given as a favor unless the giver was in control of that object, nor could the receiver receive the object. If a person acquired an object without the consent of the person controlling that object, he
had "swiped" the object, not received it, and no favor had occurred. When a worker had "swiped" an object, he could be considered the controller of that object through possession and then use that object for favor exchanges with others.

Goods, regardless of their acquisition, could be used by the controller in making a favor for work purposes. Such a favor occurred when Bill swiped some screwdrivers from the Engineering Department for Juan to use in doing his (Juan’s) job. Goods were often used to make a favor in which the receiver would use those goods for his personal use. Such a favor occurred when an employee in a key position made a favor of two "swiped" 35-gallon steel garbage containers to a certain cook to take home.

The second category known as "services" refers to non-material favors given by one worker to help another worker in his job task. The most usual form of service was a work assistance favor. To perform work assistance, one worker who was not busy at the moment would aid another worker who was extremely busy. Bill would give Juan assistance when Juan was busy with supplies in one room and a cook (for example) needed something from Juan that was in another room. In return, Juan would help Bill on the dishwasher between 11:30 and 12:30 when he, Juan, was not doing anything.

A service favor in the form of advice was frequently not seen as a favor; only when the receiver of the advice had solicited that advice

---

22 The writer hesitates to use the word "steal" due to its connotations, thus the word "swipe" was chosen since it was sometimes used by the actors to describe the situation for which this word is being used.
would he feel that he had received a favor. To qualify in this
category, the advice had to come to the receiver from a status equal.
This type of favor almost always existed between co-workers who
shared the same job position and had near equal seniority such as two
of the cooks who had worked together on the morning shift or some of
the trayline people in dietary who had the same seniority, or
secretaries in two interrelated departments or secretarial pools. It
is recognized that status can never be exactly equal. Advice as a
favor often became entangled with attitudes of deference.

The third category involved deference and was defined as paying
respect to a status superior. The act of deference may be considered
a favor, but such favors would never be returned in the form of
deference, the usual return fell under the subtopics of goods for
work purposes or services as advice. The general topic of deference
and its implications is discussed in Chapters IV and V.

Deference, as noted, can take two forms the first of which was
deference as respect. This respect was given to a co-worker who was
seen in the eyes of the giver as deserving respect because of his
status. The second form was deference as bribery which was given to
a person who desired but could not demand deference. In this latter
case, the awarding of deference became a tool to pry certain favors
out of workers who were in a position to control those desired favors.
Summary

This paper has made considerable mention of position of the worker as a variable in the exchange of favors. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider the topic of position as related to the favor system.

This chapter has examined the effects of socialization to the hospital setting as providing justification for exchanges of goods and services among workers. The exchanges of favors were important both in economic terms and in symbolic terms of expression of a relationship between actors. The latter aspect of favors was often seen in the form of gratitude.

Favor exchanges developed a normative pattern of expectations, especially the expectation of reciprocity. To refuse to provide reciprocity was a sign by one actor to the other actors in a relationship that he desired a change in the relationship.

Favors were classified as either goods, services, or deference. These favors moved among persons linked in a network of relationships.
CHAPTER III

POSITION AND THE EMERGING SYSTEM

Position

The position that a worker held in the formal structure of the organization determined to a great extent who he would come into contact with in the course of the normal day and what material goods would be at his disposal. As with most organizations, the higher a worker rose in position, the more people he was in contact with and, likewise, the greater opportunities for favors and favor exchange were open to him. ¹

In a favor system, we might expect persons at the lower levels of the organization to have greater desire, due to the limited amount of goods at their disposal, to enter into an exchange of material goods. The department head could acquire most non-capital goods in his department without too much effort or worry since he was responsible for the control and distribution of these goods. In moving down the organizational ladder, we found people who had successively more limited fields of responsibility in both quantity and variety

¹In a study of hospital patients it was found that classification of persons contained definitions of privileges available to persons according to their classification. "These privileges are desired not only in themselves, but for their symbolic value" (Roth, 1963: 4). This assertion could be applied to employees who are classified by organizational rank and department.
of goods. A worker who desired a material object could often find that the particular object was controlled by another worker. Therefore, in order to obtain that object, the worker had to contact the other one who controlled the object and discover what might be exchanged for that object. Of course, no exchange would happen exactly like this, but the elements of 'what do I want,' 'who controls it,' and 'what does he want,' must enter into consideration at some point. The availability of an object thus depended a great deal on who controlled that object.

Positions vary a great deal with the completeness of control of material goods; some goods were controlled by several people, some by only one. The position of the cashier in the dining room was invested with the power to control the goods that were there for sale. In theory, the cashier charged everyone that passed through the line the marked prices for the items he or she took. In practice, the cashier may charge no more than the marked price, but may charge less to those favored persons. The following illustrates the ramifications of such a less-than-instrumental arrangement.

The cashier had been allowing various people to pass without paying or paying a reduced rate, which meant that the amount of money in the cash register did not directly reflect the number of people who had eaten. However, the department needed an estimation of how many people were eating in the dining room to estimate how much food to prepare. The estimate was obtained by dividing the total cash by 85 cents (this was estimated to be the average purchase per person). At noon when about 300 people normally ate, a few free
or reduced price meals would not greatly effect this ratio, but the evening meal usually saw less than 100 people so that the cash deficit in the register produced a proportionately more inaccurate ratio.

Jane, one of the evening cooks, commented that she liked the arrangement of being charged less than the actual price by Joan, the cashier, but so many people were being charged less that the count was always too low for the dining room, which made it impossible to plan how much food to prepare. Jane was unable to determine the amount of food to prepare due to the inaccurate count; there were always more people served than counted and thus more people served than expected. The result was that the dining room often ran out of food and Jane was blamed for not preparing enough food.

Another cook, Howard, understood Jane's position and said that Joan charged what she felt like charging to whomever she wanted to charge.

This indicates both the importance of position and the effects of giving favors. The cooks suffered the blame, although not severe, for Joan's favors, but they did not report Joan because they themselves were benefitting. Jane once threatened to report Joan when she felt that Joan was giving too many favors, but the report was never made.

2The cooks were not supposed to eat in the kitchen, but were expected to go into the dining room and buy back the food which they had prepared. Several ignored this rule and ate in the kitchen anyway, but others preferred to go into the dining room or elsewhere in order to get away from the kitchen.
Generally the workers felt that giving favors was justified as long as it did not become too disruptive. It was never possible to determine how many dollars' worth of goods a worker would be allowed by his co-workers to consume in favors, but there was a vague limit, beyond which the worker would find himself being condemned for his actions by his co-workers. Of course, this point might be determined more quickly and with greater precision if, as in Joan's case, the favors being granted put other workers in a tight spot with management. Position gave a worker control over certain goods, but if this control was used "irresponsibly", other workers might apply sanctions.

An Emerging System

Positions such as dining room cashier allowed the worker to come into contact with a large number of people through normal working associations, permitting the person to make contacts, give and receive favors, and continue his or her job. Bill was often assigned to take coffee and food over to the administrative annex. This assignment brought Bill into frequent association with the administrative secretaries. Once while returning food from the annex, Bill exchanged several apples and oranges, which he had, for two dozen pencils. When Bill returned to dietary he hid one dozen of the pencils and gave the other dozen to Juan. The secretaries were hungry while Bill and Juan needed pencils for use in doing their job. Bill, in his job, went to several parts of the hospital and made contact with a number of people outside of the dietary department. This gave him the opportunity, without appearing conspicuous, to engage in favor exchanges with
people of other departments. The result was that the dietary department benefitted by the bringing of goods into the department which might have been hard to obtain through normal channels.

Pencils and pens were difficult to obtain by the dietary employees and carried considerable value. In order to control usage and loss, F____ had made a rule that all office supplies were to be stored in her desk which was kept locked when she was not in the office. Thus, before 9:00 A.M. and after 4:00 P.M. and on weekends, additional office supplies were unavailable and workers had to make do with what were already in use. The available supply was usually not large since F____ issued pencils and pens one at a time keeping this commodity in short supply. The importance of pencils should not be underestimated because they were needed by the workers to perform their tasks and were easy to lose by anyone who did not have a desk in which to keep them. When Bill was able to bring back two dozen pencils, this had a great deal of meaning in the dietary department.

It is obvious that positions that controlled the movement or storage of goods were not always at the department head level. In every department there was one position that was formally responsible for ordering goods and for storing most of the items, with the exception of special items such as office supplies in dietary. Typically, this formal position would involve making out requisition forms to send to the hospital central stores, a part of the purchasing department. In the case of dietary, some of the supplies came from central stores and some were ordered directly from a wholesale purveyor.
After the food service management company acquired the dietary department, almost all non-capital goods were purchased directly from wholesalers. However, when goods came from the hospital central stores a work relationship was established between the person who made out the requisitions in each department, referred to as a clerk, and the personnel in central stores, who filled the requisitions, a storekeeper and a stock clerk. This was a cross departmental relationship that gave central stores and the clerks a considerable role in the flow of goods.

Clerks and the storekeeper were brought together in a work relationship complicated by two factors, time and the supply of goods. The time factor held a different meaning for both sides, the clerk needed the requisitioned supplies before a particular time to prevent his department from exhausting its supply of that particular commodity, whereas the storekeeper had several dozen requisitions which had to be filled before, say, Friday evening of the week in which he had received the requests. The storekeeper, depending on the time sequence in which he filled the requisitions, might or might not fill a particular department's requisition by a particular time. To aid both the storekeeper and the clerk, agreements both formal and informal were made pertaining to the requisition dates and delivery dates for the various departments. Appeals by the clerk to the storekeeper that an emergency existed and a particular item was needed were seldom considered by the storekeeper. One purchasing agent told this researcher that "all emergencies are created, there's no such thing as an emergency. People just think there are." Under these
circumstances many private arrangements developed between clerk and storekeeper which tended to benefit both sides. A clerk who was under pressure could get an adjustment in the delivery schedule, or the storekeeper might obtain the assistance of the clerk in rearranging the delivery schedule when the storekeeper was overburdened. These private arrangements were part of the favor system and frequently included deference as discussed in Chapters IV and V.

The previously described situation between clerk and storekeeper demonstrates how favor relationships contrary to formal rules might develop out of normal work situations. In establishing favor relationships, whether arising as complementary to work requirements (clerk-storekeeper) or apart from work requirements but with work contacts (dining room cashier), three other considerations were given to shaping the resulting favor relationships. The parties involved in a potential favor relationship had to consider first the status of each party; second, the secondary status of each party; and third, personal images.¹

Status and Secondary Status

Considering status, all persons in the organization carry an official status based on their job position. When two people meet, before interaction can occur they must make certain assessments about

¹These three concepts were described by Anselm Strauss as structural and interpersonal variables affecting interaction between persons (Strauss, 1959: 69-76).
each other. One important assessment is the status of the other in relation to the self. If there is too much social distance between the two persons, it is doubtful that the two will be comfortable interacting with each other. The lack of sympathetic understanding between two people severely limits the likelihood of any favors being exchanged, particularly favors which are opposed by the formal organization. There is, however, an important exception located in the power and deference that occasionally entered a relationship.

Secondary status of a person refers to the status he holds separate from his organizational status. Examples in the hospital might be the status that of college student or the employee who has a great deal of seniority. As with organizational status, two people with widely divergent secondary status would probably feel uncomfortable with each other in informal interaction also. Favor relationships did not normally develop out of widely separated secondary status relations, except in the form of deference relationships.

There were occasionally exchanges between persons of widely divergent status, as with the exchange of food for pencils engaged in by Bill and the administrative secretaries, but these exchanges seldom developed into a continuing relationship. There was never a repetition of the food for pencils trade. In fact, it was not long

---

4 For a discussion, see Strauss (1959: 56-64, 75-84).

5 The secretaries involved, it should be reiterated, were administrative secretaries or rather personal secretaries to the five hospital administrators which gave them a perceived status considerably above Bill.
before the administrative secretaries redefined the situation. By making the exchange, Bill had demonstrated the availability food left in the conference room after the luncheon meeting. The secretaries realized that after the administrators had eaten, the remaining food was de facto in the public domain until someone came from dietary to claim the luncheon remnants. Furthermore, the status differential in the eyes of the secretaries did not encourage involvement in a favor relationship with Bill nor could it be very rewarding. Therefore, the secretaries would "swipe" food after the meeting had ended and hide it from both the administrators and dietary personnel.

The situational definition changed again when the secretaries discovered that the administrators didn't care whether or not they took food once the luncheon was over. Under this new definition, the food officially became public domain until dietary claimed it. This observation is supported by the act of the secretaries asking permission of dietary to take more food, if they had not taken as much as they wanted before dietary had reclaimed it. The new reasoning allowed the secretaries to eat the swiped food publicly.

This public consumption of the left-over food, probably as much as any other factor, advertised its definition as being in the public domain. Thus more and more people began swiping food, other secretaries near the area, doctors who happened to be passing by, medical interns, chaplains, as well as other employees who might be momentarily in the area. Often the new people, aware of the availability of food were, nevertheless, unaware that, by definition the food reverted to dietary upon the arrival of dietary personnel. Physicians or
chaplains would often walk into the conference room after dietary's arrival, take food and walk out without even acknowledging the presence of the dietary people. Dietary personnel "could not possibly" tell a doctor or a chaplain not to commit a particular act, or so the worker perceived the situation. To attempt to deny something to a physician or chaplain could result in all sorts of difficulties for the worker unless he was certain that his department head would support such a denial. In this instance, there was no indication that the department head would actually support a refusal of food to these people, so the doctors and chaplains came and they were followed by the less privileged interns. Food could not openly be allowed to doctors and denied to interns, so the defined availability became more widespread. The secretaries, realizing that a new situation had developed, stopped asking permission from dietary people before taking food.

Shortly after the extension of the definition of food as being in the public domain as existing until dietary workers had physically removed remaining food from the area, a new definition was publicly invoked. The secretary to the hospital's chief administrator announced that all food brought into the annex conference room had been paid for by the administration and therefore was the property of the administration. She then claimed the right to grant permission for taking food. She thus redefined the food as a good under her control.

This new definition was only partly successful in that too many persons had already developed norms which gave them rights in the
food without asking anyone. Bowing to social necessity, the secretary often granted permission to a person already in the act of helping himself. This change in definition cut dietary out of the system entirely and transferred control to the administrative department. It also redefined the secretary's behavior from "swiping" to merely "cleaning up the leftovers," even though it was still "swiping" from the point of view of dietary.

This extensive example demonstrates several points. First, the link between the perceived definition of a good and the responding behavior associated with that good. Second, control of a good was partly defined by the status of the people present. When there was no clear mandate for control from the organization, the highest status person in the situation interested in control assumed control. Third, the definition of the condition of a good was a result of interaction. Fourth, the definition of a good was subject to changes. Fifth, favor exchanges of goods for goods have no basis in developing favor relationships between persons of widely divergent status.

When a person did hold a recognized mandate of control over a particular good, that person was able to participate in favor exchanges with higher status persons without experiencing the previously described change of definition of the good being exchanged. Usually this occurred when a worker acted as an agent for a higher status person who held status equal to that of the other with whom the worker was dealing. Juan frequently acted as an agent for F____ and later for the food service manager in dealings with the purchasing agent. Phil, the "delivery boy" from the purchasing department often
acted in the role of agent for the purchasing department when dealing with heads of various other departments. Both Juan and Phil were involved in favor exchanges with management people, but only in their role as agents for their respective departments. It would appear that people preferred to deal with others who were of near equal or equal status. This, of course, would prevent higher status persons from becoming indebted to lower status persons. When it became necessary for an upper and lower status person to exchange favors, some device, such as the role of agent or emphasizing an employee's competence or seniority, would be found to elevate the status of the lower person to near equal with the higher status person.  

This researcher had a separated status, an official status that until the final nine months of his employment was quite low and a secondary status of university graduate. Interaction with persons on the lower level was eased by entering the interaction with the official status. Access to persons at a slightly higher level was facilitated by invoking the secondary status of university graduate.

Personal Images

A third factor in favor relationships were personal images which

6 This was an attempt to modify Alvin Gouldner's statement: "The norm of reciprocity, however engenders motives for returning benefits even when power differences might invite exploitation. The norm thus safeguards powerful people against the temptations of their own status; it motivates and regulates reciprocity as an exchange pattern, serving to inhibit the emergence of exploitative relations which would undermine the social system and the very power arrangements which had made exploitation possible" (Gouldner, 1960: 174).
developed between two interacting persons. In the area of exchanges of goods and services, trustworthiness was the most important image; with respect to deference, an image of competence was critical.

It should be apparent that an extended favor relationship could not easily develop between two people who did not trust each other. Since many favors were against the rules of the organization, but also ignored by the organization, a person had to believe that favors he did would not be reported to the organization by another thus forcing the organization to focus upon the deviation (favor) from the rules. A lack of trust not only stymied favor relations but caused persons not to commit actions that were condoned by the organization with distrusted others.

For example, Doris, the part-time day cashier in the dining room, reported that she normally dropped money for coffee (a dime) in the cash register without ringing it up when a person bought a cup of coffee between meal times while she was near the cash register. Normally, customers who purchased coffee between meal times were expected to drop their dimes in a metal coin box placed near the register; this freed the cashier for other duties. However, when the cashier was near the cash register, the buyer through habit would generally hand her the money instead of dropping it into the coin box. Doris wanted the extra money in the register to insure that she would not come out short at the end of the day. When the money was counted, if there was extra money, Doris would place the extra in the coin box (a separate fund). However, Doris was supposed to give the extra money to F____ to put into the dietary petty cash fund. This, Doris refused
to do because she believed that \[\text{F} \ldots\] pocketed the petty cash.

An image of competence had to be established by a worker before he could receive deference from another worker. This competence may be expressed through seniority and job knowledge or a demonstration of an ability to solve problems that arose. Martin in engineering was seen as competent and had worked in the hospital in the same capacity for thirty years. Most department heads gave deference to Martin, even though his status was that of a skilled worker. In essence, Martin had created an image of competence throughout the hospital which supported his claim for deference. The engineers frequently used Martin's name as an authority to substantiate a statement about a piece of equipment: "Martin said the drain pipe is too small to handle the overflow." Many times, the conclusion reached as to why a particular machine was malfunctioning was made through the combined efforts of several engineers, but it would be Martin who would explain the situation to the department head.

Rights of Favor Participants

Status, secondary status, and personal images laid the basis of a favor relationship. Interacting in the ensuing relationships led to the development of favor system identities. An individual identified as a member of a particular network of workers exchanging favors among themselves held the right granted through the network to participate in the benefits of goods considered available to members of that favor network. An outsider, who was not a member of the particular network, would be condemned if he attempted to participate in the
advantages of the network. An example occurred when Bill and Gail, the cashier, were discussing employees "taking" food out of the dining room without paying. Bill and Gail were very actively involved in a favor system that gave Bill a free lunch daily. However, they condemned those people who took food without paying and felt that there should be better security measures to prevent such behavior. In essence, they seemed to be condemning not so much the taking of food without paying as taking the food outside of the favor system and without their permission.

Gail and Bill had developed an identity of themselves, each to the other, which justified their behavior in their own eyes. Each viewed the other as deserving of the favors the other received as an appropriate reward for the actions of the other. People who were taking the rewards without having committed the appropriate actions beforehand were to Gail and Bill committing an offense. These persons existed as "generalized others" and were in essence "cheating" according to the definition of Gail and Bill and causing other's behavior to be labeled as "taking" food. Gail and Bill could use the word "taking" for others and not for themselves because they had socially defined the situation to condone their behavior. They had also defined appropriate actions and rewards in order to engage in their favor exchanges. Their definitions had not been formed in a vacuum.

Payment for coffee and doughnuts was on the honor system, employees were expected to put their money in a coin box for payment.
but through social interaction in favor networks. In short, the expectations and perceptions in the situation as defined by the favor networks were internalized in the actors.

Favor Networks

Noel Chrisman describes networks as the "residue" after "other principles of grouping in the society (in this case work organization) are removed. All members are potential contacts of ego in an open society" (Chrisman: 1970). In this situation all members may be potential contacts of ego, but due to bureaucratic rankings, job descriptions, and job expectations, some members may be more probable contacts of ego than others. Yet, despite this qualification, when we strip away employee groupings according to department, job title or occupation, there remain skeletal patterns of interpersonal contacts known as networks. Members of networks are held together by "similar value orientations" (Chrisman: 1970) and the expectation of finding "mutual aid, entertainment, and work" (Aronson: 1970).

Network relations refer to contacts outside of the nuclear family which are conducted as "informal contracts existing at the pleasure of the contractants" (Chrisman: 1970). Networks are never static, but are dynamic and changing reflectors of the shape of "face-to-face interaction." The changing shape may be rapid as individuals seek to "manipulate the choices available to them" within the context of "norms they have" (Aronson: 1970) while seeking new choices and dispensing with choices that are too expensive. "Expensive" in this context means that the effort required to
"manipulate" a choice is too much or too distasteful to justify selection of that particular choice (see Part III).

"Selection" is a key word here and emphasizes that in networks "contracts are only between two individuals" (Chrisman: 1970) who choose to construct a relationship around the "ties of friendship and acquaintance" (Aronson: 1970). Persons bound in such a manner will unusually choose to "interact with themselves [in a situation] than with other members of that situation" (Chrisman: 1970).

The principle value of network analysis lies not in the delineation and classification of networks themselves, but rather in what such delineation and classification can tell us about processes of social and cultural adaptive change (Whitten: 1970).

In considering change, Whitten notes a particular society where actors rising in status take more than they give in network exchange, while using the networks to improve their position.

Individuals can seldom rise in their own communities except by becoming a successive node in a series of networks and giving conspicuously [to a locally important organization]. . . . A successive node [being a process whereby] one uses different chains of interaction and exchange consecutively to accomplish one's goal. . . . The manipulator of social capital is taking, but not returning [as much] before he completes his expected reciprocities [and moves] on to new exchange patterns with other partners (Whitten: 1970).

In consideration of this hospital, the realization of a large number of networks being present, several of which may be engaged in by any one time, is critical. Socially constructed networks were dynamic in terms of membership and the ability to adapt to different situations. In interaction in favor networks, social capital could be considered largely in terms of deference which was an unmeasurable quality that lay at the base of a particular type of informal power.
Thus networks became an organizing principle for certain types of informal status and social structure as well as serving as an informal social control device. Jacobson found networks operating for similar purposes among migrant workers in East Africa (Jacobson, 1970).

A dual view of networks developed. The first was a "microview" concentrating on the contract between two individuals which forms the base of any network. The second was a "macroview" which considers the result of numerous contracts made by either member of the hypothetical original contract as well as contracts made by other later members of the network. The resulting network was a structure of social bonds into whose end points individuals move in and out. These bonds did not connect defined positions in a system, nor was there by any limit on the number of possible bonds. As old contracts were broken and new contracts formed, not only did the actors in the network change, but so also did the bonds change producing a change in the overall configuration of that network system. Each contract, each bond, each moment in the life history of a network system was unique, none entirely different, but none exactly the same (Liebow, 1967; Aronson, 1970; Barnes, 1954; Chrisman, 1970; Jacobson, 1970; Whitten, 1970; and Wolfe, 1970).

Through the process of continual formations of contracts in the hospital, a network system was produced which could indirectly bond together large numbers of people. Across these social bonds was carried information, rumors, or any variety of goods regulated by norms socially developed out of network interaction. It was possible to receive information about other members of the network without
ever actually coming to know that person on a personal basis. This
was knowing of a person, but not knowing, an occurrence which Gerald
Suttles notes in reference to the Italian population of the "Addams"
area (Suttles, 1968). Just as complaints were earlier described to
flow along paths of communication or rumor, so did favor networks
transmit information. Personal images of workers one had not had
face-to-face interaction with could be constructed by bits of inform-
ation about events in other parts of the hospital. Juan had an
image of Martin before he could visually recognize Martin. Then
Juan discovered what Martin looked like. Eventually Juan met Martin
and began to interact with him, but Juan had known of Martin for a
long time prior and carried a certain image of Martin into his first
face-to-face meeting with Martin. The restructuring of the hospital
in anticipation of a move to a new location (see Chapters VI and VII)
provided a more favorable situation for interaction between Martin
and Juan allowing each to develop an identity in the relationship.
Juan had progressed from knowing about Martin, to sympathetically
knowing Martin albeit limited to an identity in a work setting.

Networks considered as systems could be categorized according
to their organizing principle of central purpose. As noted in
Chapter I, there was in the hospital a formal organizational system
and an informal favor system to cite two examples of systems that
were operating. Both of these systems could be conceptualized and
analyzed as network systems.

In addition to the organizational network and favor network,
some other identifiable networks included various occupational
networks particularly a physician network, a nurse network, and various medical specialty networks. Also, frequently extended beyond the physical boundaries of the hospital, there were networks serving to communicate various types of information, e.g., professional news, job tips, and other items of importance to the members. Intra-departmental networks transmitted rumors and information that was either interesting or useful to the members of particular departments. A network of volunteer work consisted of high school students who worked parttime. Each of these networks had norms which defined what type of information would be transmitted to its members as well as what types of information was taboo to outsiders. In many respects the operation of the favor network system was similar to these other networks in all areas except the type of goods moved between its members. General areas of similarity could be described as development of common network symbols, status, means for conferring deference as reward, development of network norms, constructing a system of social control, and recognizing advancement within the context of the network.

A physician reported that favors occasionally moved between doctors. A physician unable to perform a specialized treatment or operation on one of his patients would "refer" this patient to a second doctor capable of performing this type of treatment. The second doctor would charge the patient a higher rate for medical services than would normally be charged for the particular type of treatment involved. The extra charge made to the patient above the normal fee by the second doctor would be returned to the first physician in return for referring the patient to him. The physician stated that this form of "kickback" is considered unethical in terms of the profession.

There are two types of control exerted within occupations: direct and indirect. Our discussion of networks applied to occupations
Mark, from the dietary department, and Karl, the assistant head of the housekeeping department, had formed an arrangement whereby after a luncheon in the administrative conference room, Karl would send a couple of housekeeping employees over to the conference room to help Mark, the one who usually picked up the food to bring back to dietary. The pick up job involved gathering the uneaten food and all utensils onto two or three carts and then hand-carrying the carts down a flight of stairs. As a return favor, Mark would make sure that a sizable portion of the uncontaminated, non-used food was directed into Karl's hands. Karl would then distribute the goods among his employees or others as a type of employee relations project.

The amount of food left over was usually sizable due to the procedure used for determining how much food was to be sent to a luncheon. F would check the carts before they left the dietary department to see how much food was on them and then check the carts when they returned to see how much food was left. Since Mark "arranged" for very little food to be left on the returning carts, F was under the impression that the administrators had very healthy appetites and continued to authorize large amounts of food to leave the dietary department. Often as much as thirty to forty

involves what Lee Taylor has termed direct controls by members of an occupation over themselves.

Indirect controls include codes of ethics, social distance, colleagueship, and superordination-subordination. Some occupations set forth elaborate codes of ethics, but usually ethics exist among members of an occupation in general terms and could best be described as an ideology. Colleagueship is the strongest indirect control operating in the continuous interaction among occupational members. Social distance operates to define the non-members in the same organizational setting. Superordination-subordination defines occupational superiors who are recognized as being authorities (Taylor, 1968: 325-342).
percent of the total food sent would be left to distribute as Mark
desired.

After Mark resigned from the department, Juan handled this
particular chore of catering administrative luncheons for several
months. Juan was told of the arrangement with Karl by Mark, Juan made
signs to Karl which Karl accepted to form a similar favor relationship
between Juan and Karl as had existed between Mark and Karl.

Mark had established a favor relationship with Karl which had
developed into a network with customs and conventions for including
others who were given food by Karl as a favor. Therefore, goods
were passed on to third persons who had no contact with the originator
of the process. In fact, Karl once told Juan that he (Karl) often
gave sandwiches to Phil and Paul (the delivery man from central stores
and the storekeeper in central stores respectively) in exchange for
faster delivery of the housekeeping department supplies. Karl
commented, "I don't think Alex (Karl's superior) would do anything
like that. He's strictly business, but it [favor exchange] gets
things done." After Mark left, Juan stepped in to form a similar
bond with Karl, but not an identical one.

Karl resigned shortly after Juan changed jobs. Karl's replace-
ment showed no indication of desiring to continue the favor relation-
ship, so the favor exchange between Juan and the housekeeping depart-
ment ceased. Juan had made a sign to Karl of desiring to form a
favor relationship by asking Karl for assistance in cleaning up a
luncheon. Karl personally had gone with Juan casually mentioning that
Mark had sometimes arranged for him to get the left-over food. Juan
indicated that he wasn't opposed. Karl commented that he liked to see Juan "playing the game." The situation with Karl's successor was different in that the successor did not give signs of being interested in contacts outside his department, but interacted largely with members of his own department. The fact that there was never more than formal meetings between Juan and Karl's successor made the likelihood of favor exchanges highly improbable.

Two probable factors in the discontinuation of favor exchange with Karl's successor was first, the successor was black, the only black person in a position of directly managing employees in this hospital. A high percentage of the employees in the housekeeping department were also black persons. It was noted that the successor associated largely with either the other black members of the housekeeping department or with Alex, his superior (who was white).

Second, at about this same time the executive secretaries, as discussed earlier, were beginning to take control of the excess food leaving less for Juan to distribute.

The favor network established a series of contracts which carried obligations to give and return favors; this developed a system whereby contacts were formed by the worker which could be called upon in periods of need. Mauss suggests that modern society has developed a system of gifts in the form of "co-operation" (Mauss 1967: 76). This function was performed by the favor network in

---

10 Mauss discusses "potlatches" and "kulas" which carry three obligations: to give, to receive, and to return (Mauss, 1967: 37-41).
addition to its materialistic functions of distributing desired goods and services.

A case in point was an occasion when Juan had to report the disappearance of a pair of pliers (the incident had occurred three weeks prior to the report) and request approval to purchase another pair. F____ apparently did not want to commit any money from the departmental budget for such an expenditure, thus Juan was told to "go borrow some from the engineers and forget to return them. Just drop them in a drawer or something." Juan instead mentioned to another member of dietary, Bill, that he needed a pair of pliers. Later that day, Bill gave Juan a new pair of pliers. Juan had used a potential network to seek a needed item; Bill had co-operated.

A more common form of co-operation, although less dramatic, occurred every day as workers in similar spatial areas assisted each other. However, it was not a "one-for-all, all-for-one" attitude; the work assists followed network lines. Among one set of young workers, Julie and Helen helped each other; Joy and Julie assisted each other, but Joy was not involved with Helen. Joyce was aided by all three, but gave little return aid. Billie was alone, separated from her co-workers in terms of voluntary assistance. There was another network among the older workers in the same division.

Joyce was somewhat unique in receiving consistently much more than she gave. In some respects she could be considered the mascot. Whether Joyce could not or would not return aid would be difficult to determine, but most workers felt that she could not and in addition was not capable of doing her own job fast enough to keep up without
the aid of other members. Despite the fact that workers were willing to help Joyce, it was more like adults would help a child, and this feeling was reflected in the low status that Joyce had. Mauss notes that there was an absolute obligation to return an equivalent gift for a gift under "penalty of losing the mana (face), authority, and wealth" among the tribes using a "potlatch" or "kula" system all around the Pacific (Mauss, 1967: 6, 19-29). He also notes that this same obligation, although uninstitutionalized, exists in modern societies making it sometimes "dangerous to receive a gift" (Mauss, 1967: 62-71). This same obligation operated against Joyce causing her to be held in low regard by fellow workers.

Billie, by contrast, neither gave nor received gifts. However she did not work fast enough to complete her tasks within the group setting. This caused others to do part of her job, due to pressure being applied to the entire group by supervisors to keep the work process moving on schedule. Probably of more importance, however, the members of this work group received longer breaks if they finished their collective task ahead of schedule; if they fell behind schedule, their break was correspondingly shortened. Therefore, pressure developed within the work group to finish on schedule. When Billie consistently lagged behind, the other workers were faced with the dilemma of always having shortened breaks or giving work assists to

---

11 J. K. Brilhart in reading this thesis noted that the situation involving Joyce could be viewed as a favor relationship in the context of Transactional Analysis Theory. Joyce was "kept" in a child role to allow those who did her favors to occupy superior "parent" roles, in essence a favor to themselves.
Billie to keep the work process on schedule. This situation caused unrest among the members of the work group, all the more because the assists were never returned nor recognized. The result was increased dislike of Billie. The difference between Joyce and Billie was that while Joyce was seen as incapable, Billie was seen as capable of doing her job as well as giving gifts, but she would not. Billie was often described as "lazy", a belief probably reinforced by certain personality characteristics.

A final comparison of the cases of Joyce and Billie came in their respective manners of departure from the department. Joyce was given a gift and well-wishes when she resigned due to her moving her home to another community. Billie left after she was loudly bawled-out and cursed for her laziness by a co-worker. The supervisor at the time looked on without comment and made no move to interfere with the worker criticizing Billie. Billie responded by walking out and not returning. The supervisor later told Juan that she hoped Billie didn't come back--and she never did.

Mauss commented that

It is something other than utility which makes goods circulate in these multifarious and fairly enlightened societies [modern societies]. Gifts aren't solely in payment for goods and services, but also to maintain a profitable alliance which it would be unwise to reject (Mauss 1967: 70-71).

The favor networks were profitable at this hospital for personal self-interests, co-operative group interests, and as objective symbols of friendship and support, and, ultimately in many instances, to achieve the formal goals of the hospital. The networks as informal
constructs separate from the formal organization could perform or allow for actions contributory to the goals of the formal organization, but actions the formal organization could not perform for itself.

A person who had received a gift not only was expected to return the gift, but the original giver was expected to accept the gift. A failure to accept a returned gift would be a refusal to allow a debt to be repaid, therefore, the original recipient would be forced into a situation of continued indebtedness to the original giver. In practice, seldom could an original giver be identified, nor could a return gift be differentiated from an initiating gift. In such a situation, a gift offered to another member of one's immediate network of favor relationships had to be accepted or risk hostile feelings. A dining room worker once offered a food item to Juan, Juan responded negatively, but the dining room worker set the item down and walked off saying that it belonged to Juan. In this situation, Juan was forced to receive the favor whether he actually took possession of the object or not.

Favors as Symbols

In the foregoing cases, Juan found support in the favor network when he needed some pliers. Billie, without support, found herself literally run out of the department by her co-workers with the tacit approval of, but without the active participation of her superiors. When an unusual expectation such as obtaining pliers without the expenditure of departmental funds was placed on Juan, he could activate his network ties. Naturally, the network did not always operate to
produce a needed favor for a worker, but it was effective enough to make the worker feel that he could obtain support and assistance when he needed it. Billie had no supportive network and in fact was the object of the hostility of her co-workers. The favor network as a symbol of support became a type of security for workers.

Not all favor relationships were initiated in the manner described in Chapter II, in which Juan's efforts were purely economically motivated in establishing a favor relationship with the dining room workers. Juan became involved apparently by chance in a number of other favor relationships. Juan and Anna, the head cook, worked together considerably and had formed a friendship. As the friendship increased, Anna and Juan began giving and receiving favors to each other. In this case, the favors became a symbol of friendship.

Favors that were promised but not performed became symbolic of untrustworthiness. An example in point was that two management people in the dietary department had different ideas toward "working with their people." C____, the food service production manager, said that he liked to work with the employees and felt that it promoted better employee-management relations. F____ on the other hand maintained a clear distinction between the activities appropriate to management and those appropriate to lower echelon employees. F____ sometimes became the brunt of complaints by employees, a situation that was irritated by the social distance she maintained between herself and the workers, especially the manner she often used to emphasize the
distance. C by contrast, was accepted rather favorably at first for his co-operation with workers and desire to help them in visible ways.

C would have succeeded in his employee relations project had he not over-committed himself. C insisted that the workers ask his assistance whenever they needed it. Anna told me that she intended to tell him anytime she needed help. The requests for assistance came to C faster than he could possibly handle them, but instead of refusing some requests, he promised to help everyone who asked and, in addition, volunteered to help a few people who hadn't asked. The promises were too numerous to keep and many were broken. The workers responded by condemning C for his broken promises and a feeling was generated that C could not be trusted. C had committed himself to gift giving. When he was unable to follow through, it was taken as a sign of a general character trait. C told me that he felt his working with the employees when he could--and he did frequently--helped his relations with them. Anna and the other workers, however, told me that "you can't count on C, he tells you one thing and does something else." The negative definition was much more powerful in shaping employee images of C than the actual completed acts by C. At first, the workers welcomed the aid of C, but when the aid was not forthcoming, they felt they had been lied to and reacted negatively. The symbols

12 T once told Anna, on a particularly hot summer day, that the reason Anna was working in the kitchen and she (F) was working in an air-conditioned office was because she (F) had gone to college. Perhaps F meant it as a joke, but Anna did not consider it as humorous.
being transmitted by C____ to the workers became confused in the light of this latter interpretation of C____'s behavior. Therefore the intentions of C____ were lost and his transmitted symbols were misunderstood by the workers.

For symbols to be interpreted properly by the receiver, both the sender and receiver must understand each other. It would appear that some consistency in behavior was necessary for understanding to occur between two parties. C____ made verbal promises to assist the workers, but emitted contradictory nonverbal signs of not wanting to aid the workers. This contradiction created an ambiguous situation which overshadowed the promises C____ had kept. In this case, nonverbal acts were more important than verbal statements and workers were more willing to accept insincerity than sincerity on the part of a management person.

Unrequested Favors

The unrequested favor became a sign of one's desire to either form a favor relationship or to fulfill a perceived obligation due to the situation. The unrequested favor may also take the form of a "pure" gift, but it still carries implications that return is expected. These implications may be latent features of the relationship which the participants themselves may not even think about, but which, out of custom, the receiver feels the obligation to return and from which the giver expects a return.\textsuperscript{13} This, in a simple form, involved the

\textsuperscript{13}Mauss, 1967, found in almost every society a process of giving gifts and expecting returns.
practice of a department's sending a card and frequently a gift, paid for by donations of members, to a co-worker who had experienced some misfortune.

There was also a custom of taking up a collection among workers, both kitchen and office, to buy a gift on an employee's birthday. Each member contributed a quarter or so and expected, without saying so, to get back their contributions in the form of a gift on their birthdays. The birthday custom stretched well back into the history of the department when there were considerably fewer employees. Due to the size of the department at the time of this research, many employees were beginning to complain that the collections were coming "too often". It was informally agreed that the birthday gifts should be discontinued but not until "the cycle" had been completed. The system had reached the point where the gifts had to continue until everyone would be considered to have received gifts for the money they had contributed. The decision as to when "the cycle" would end was made by two office workers.  

A slightly different type of unrequested but expected gift or favor was the custom in all of the hospital departments as well as in the food service management company to buy "the boss" a birthday present (some departments also bought their department heads Christmas presents). There was a feeling of obligation among most workers to express deference to "the boss" in the form of a present.  

14 The fact that the departmental workers entrusted the decision to office workers rather than "kitchen" workers seems indicative of the higher status of office workers.
Since this was a sign of deference to the formal status of department head rather than to the individual occupying the position, little reciprocity was required on the part of the various department heads. It was customary, however, for the department head to make a verbal "thank you" at the time of acceptance of the gift. The "thank you" was a verbal symbol of gratitude, without which the employees would feel their act of deference to be refused. It was sometimes hoped that timely gifts could make a status superior more agreeable and easier to get along with, especially if that superior was only going to be present for a day or two. The food service director for this hospital once made a statement to make sure to get a cake for X's birthday (a regional vice president), the implication being that when X made an inspection tour of the "unit" he might be easier to get along with—he would reciprocate the gift—than if no birthday cake were given.\(^{15}\) This gave overt expression to the latent feelings among workers that the boss deserved and expected a gift and if none were forthcoming the boss could be difficult. Unrequested gifts to status superiors served as both a sign of appeasement and were symbolic of the superior position of the one receiving the gift.

\(^{15}\) When an important or powerful visitor appears, "then we can expect the preparation of a display to be especially elaborate" (Goffman, 1961: 103).
Developing Signs and Gestures of Request

The construction of favor networks produced shared signs between and among persons engaged in face-to-face relationships. Signs were generally localized rather than being network wide. Any particular individual would have several different sets of signs that could be used depending on the person being dealt with and the situation involved. The favor itself was the only symbol which carried the same or similar meaning throughout the network. Following are several examples of signs which existed between two people for the purpose of giving or receiving a favor.

Kathy was smoking a cigarette at a table across from Don. Don wanted "a drag" on Kathy's cigarette, so he reached his arm toward her shaping his fingers as though he were holding a cigarette. She caught his gesture and laid her cigarette between his fingers. He took a puff and returned the cigarette. The entire process occurred without the exchange of a word.

Donna frequently arranged for Bill to get a free malt while he was working in the steam of the dishwasher. She would either hand the malt directly to him or set it on a convenient shelf. She would never say anything about it being a malt, instead she would always say something to the effect of "Here's a cup to throw away," or "Would you throw this cup away?" By using these phrases, she called attention to the gift without referring to it directly or being too obvious about the fact that there was a malt inside the cup. In this case, the phrase became a standard sign or verbal gesture between the two noting the exchange of a gift. This gesture was also
important in pointing out that a gift was indeed being given and that the acceptance of that gift required a verbal agreement on Don's part that he would throw away the cup, meaning he had accepted Donna's favor. Such a verbal recognition of a gift would not allow the favor to be forgotten as easily as if Donna had merely set the cup by Bill and kept on walking.

Sometimes an unrequested gift from an unusual source would cause the receiver to comment along the line of "he (or she) is buttering me (or us) up." The workers were well aware of the expectation to return a favor for a favor. Thus a favor, coming from a person who did not usually do that particular recipient a favor, often carried the created impression of preparing the ground for an upcoming request. The worker's acceptance of such an unusual favor was signaling his willingness to perform a favor for the giver, depending, of course, on what the favor was to be and if it was within the realm of possibility.

Many times favors were misread in their symbolic meanings, thus causing hard feelings in one or both persons. One time Jane offered to carry a dirty pan for a trayline worker back to the pot and pan area since she was going that direction, a humanitarian favor that sought no personal gain. The trayline worker was willing and gave Jane a pan while she carried one herself. After delivering the pans, the trayline worker turned to go on break saying, "You can bring those other three pans back too." Jane was rather indignant, feeling that it was not her job as a cook to bring back dirty pans. Sue, observing the situation commented, "If you help somebody out, they
expect you to do their job for them." Although Sue participated frequently in favors, her use of help "somebody" obviously meant a person with whom you did not have a favor relationship and consequently a shared understanding of the meanings of your symbols. Sue was skeptical of helping others merely for the sake of helping. She implied in her conversation that a person one did not have a relationship or understanding with was prone to take advantage of "humanitarian" favors connoted by her term "help".

Summary

The development of a favor relationship between workers was dependent upon several factors. First was the organizational positions held by the respective workers and the types of goods available to each of them and the assessments made by each worker of the value of the goods available to each resulted in a judgment of the costs expended for the advantage gained.

A second factor involved an assessment by each worker of social characteristics of the other worker. This assessment included the formal status of each in the organization. The formal status could be modified by a secondary status. Favors more easily developed into a favor relationship between workers when the workers were near equal in status. Another assessment included personal images of trustworthiness and competence.

Favor relationships developed in the context of a favor network. The network was a set of social bonds linking actors together. Old bonds were dissolved by actors when indicative signs were made by one
actor to the other actor in a relationship signifying a dissatisfaction with their relationship. Signs were also used by actors to develop new social bonds. Thus, favor networks were continually shifting patterns of relationships.

Chapters IV and V will examine the development of informal power as a result of interaction in favor networks.
PART II

DEFERENCE AND POWER THROUGH FAVORS
CHAPTER IV

DEFERENCE AS A FAVOR

Status and Stratification

Inevitably, then, a society must have, first, some kind of rewards that it can use as inducements, and, second, some way of distributing these rewards differentially according to positions. The rewards and their distribution become a part of the social order, and thus give rise to stratification. In a sense the rewards are built into the position. They consist in the rights associated with the position, plus what may be called its accompaniments or perquisites. Social inequality is thus an unconsciously evolved device by which societies insure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons. Hence every society, no matter how simple or complex must differentiate persons in terms of both prestige and esteem, and must therefore possess a certain amount of institutionalized inequality (Davis and Moore, 1945: 242-243).

Status systems will form within large organizations as well as in communities. These systems will respond to the values expressed by the society at large, the community, and those of particular occupations.

The hospital studied exhibited a status system which was grounded in the values of the community from which the workers came and in the values of the dominating medical profession and its constellation of related medical-technical occupations. The values of this particular hospital were also modified by the influence of a Protestant church which owned the buildings and placed chaplains in
the organization. All these influences resulted in two general indicators of higher prestige and power status among employees. These indicators were embodied in those positions which either demanded direct patient contact such as helping the patient either medically or spiritually or which required technical or educational training to perform. The type of training required was stratified from highly specialized technical training at the top through designation by a college degree, especially one related to the medical profession; further down, training from business college, then trade school and, finally, "on the job training."

A segment of employees with direct patient contact had positions which required both university and highly specialized training. These people occupied the highest strata among hospital employees and it was through them that the hospital, by placing them on front stage as spokesmen sought to convey its image to the public.

Held to the back stage were the occupants of positions requiring less formal or non-medically linked training. These persons were denied the rewards of status that were institutionalized by the formal structure. However, they were given two non-formal routes to certain types of status rewards. These rewards did not include official recognition, admission to the front stage, nor formal positions of power. The rewards for back stage workers involved

---

1 The functions of the chaplains were to comfort dying patients and to handle the families of deceased patients. After a patient died, the attending physician and other medical people who saw themselves as "lifesavers" quickly dissociated themselves from the ex-patient.
unofficial recognition by other employees and informal authority. The routes to these rewards were largely through personal investment and manipulation of communication networks.

Personal Investment

Howard S. Becker (1960) writing on the concept of commitment reported that commitment occurred as a result of making "side bets" that linked outside interests with a particular activity producing consistent behavior. "Side bets" were seen as the frequent consequence of an individual's participation in and adjustment to a social organization in which that person holds a position. Through adaptation of life style and the investment of time a person accumulates a "side bet" on the position he occupies. "Side bets" may be repaid in terms of job security and deference from co-workers.

Paul had worked the same job for over ten years; Anna had worked at the hospital for fifteen years. Paul, while retaining the same job, had acquired a great deal of status and had acquired a helper to whom he could give orders. Anna had risen both in status and formal rank, from cook to most influential cook and finally she had been given the title of head cook. Both of these people had received a degree of formalized authority and considerable amount of prestige status in the form of deference expressed through acquiescence to their respective advice. Both had acquired enough job security and prestige so that on separate occasions they were able to gain pay raises by threatening to quit. Both admitted that they didn't know what they would have done if the hospital had allowed
them to quit. So much effort had been invested in their respective jobs that they did not want to give up their "side bets", but they did want better incomes and were able to acquire them because of their importance in the operations of their respective departments. Their importance was two fold: first, they had extensive job knowledge, and second, they exercised a great deal of leadership among their co-workers. The latter factor has implications for this paper due to the reciprocal relationship of leadership at the hospital involving advice favors and deference. Through personal investment involving the placement of "side bets" the employee bonded himself to the hospital and his position of its social organization. The employee thus yielded possibilities of career advancement or better jobs in other organizations. Anna refused an offer to manage a small restaurant preferring to stay where she was. The employee expected and often demanded as a return for his or her investment, recognition from both the organization and from their co-workers. This recognition was expected to be paid in terms of money and deference from the organization, and from their co-workers in terms of deference and advantage.

This paper has mentioned the monetary benefits which an employee with heavy investments demands, but which deference was demanded also. In the purchasing department, neither of the two purchasing agents who

---

2The night crew in the housekeeping department once walked off the job en masse. Management responded not by firing the workers, but by replacing the night supervisor. In extreme circumstances, even officially appointed superordinates could be made vulnerable to the workers and thereby forced into reciprocal relationships with the employees.
were there during this study made any important decisions about the warehouse and storage space without talking to Paul. Paul and the purchasing agents held an unspoken agreement that Paul would not dispute the purchasing agent unless Paul's advice was asked directly. However, regardless of whether advice was requested there was the symbolic act of a department head talking to a subordinate, blue-collar worker about his decision and why he thought such a decision should be made. An example was the frequent occurrence in which the purchasing agent came to Paul and said that X or Y company could give a big discount on a certain amount of Z product and asking whether the department could handle that much of Z. Paul would always agree and then look for storage space, but the purchasing agent had taken the time and effort to talk to Paul personally before buying, rather than buying and letting Paul find out about the purchase when the order arrived in the warehouse.

There were other ways in which Paul was rewarded for his personal investment. One of the purchasing agents once made a public statement that was printed in the hospital newsletter that he, the purchasing agent, was indebted to Paul for the help Paul had given him in adjusting to his job when he had come to this hospital. This type of statement was seldom made by an administrator or department head about a subordinate.

From their co-workers, the employee with heavy personal
investments expects deference\textsuperscript{3} to his wishes and opinions. In addition, he expects to receive favors that will make his own job easier from other employees in return for his advice. The employee with large personal investments in his position received deference when he was asked for his advice on a project. More deference was granted by the acceptance of his advice. In return, the person receiving advice was expected to do a favor for the employee who had given the advice. In this way, "side bets" were collected in terms of deference as well as through returned favors resulting in considerable advantages for the invested person. By implication, this situation, repeated over time, resulted in the transfer of deference to status.

In his interactions with both organizational superiors and co-workers, the invested employee was allowed, even if only symbolically, to play the role of advisor rather than worker. Advisor roles were associated with higher status in the work organization. Thus, the invested employee was awarded status by implication through being allowed to play the role of higher status. The awarding of status could be seen as personal gratification and repayment for the "side bets" in terms of time and energy placed on an organization. Status and deference was the favor used to reward personal investment and status itself was then used as a tool in other work-oriented

\textsuperscript{3}Goffman, (1967: 56-76) has said deference is not always given by subordinates to superordinates, but may exist between equals or on occasion by superordinates to subordinates such as the obligation of a high priest to respond to an offering with a blessing to the giver. Deference may also exist as an agreement between actors to maintain a certain amount of social distance between them, even to the point of avoidance.
relationships to verify the reality of power and acquire other favors.

Communication Networks

Communication networks have been defined as interconnected positions and interpersonal relationships which carry information. Unlike the material favor networks, these networks tended to have central collecting points toward which information flowed and from which it was distributed. As a result these collecting points held possibilities for social manipulation for gatekeepers located at them.

The person at the central point received a variety of information from several sources. Instead of passing all of this information along, he would retain some and disseminate selected bits to selected others. The gatekeeper had access to a considerable number of rumors from which to determine his future actions. A person removed from the collecting point needed to rely on a limited number of rumors for determining his course of action that happened to come his way. Rumors, for most lower echelon workers, fulfilled the needs to explain events which were happening to or occurring around the workers or to inform the workers of possible future events. The individual's scope of interest was generally narrow and restricted to his personal welfare.

For department heads, knowledge of both rumors and events within

---

4Rumor was defined as all information unable to be confirmed and passed verbally among individuals.
their departments was of extreme importance as an aid in successful administration. A manager acting without knowledge of the events occurring in his department and the rumors about these events would be likely to make numerous mistakes in handling his personnel and resolving intra-departmental problems. The department head needed information of events and rumors and was willing to pay for it.

For the department head to receive information, a mutually dependent relationship would be formed between the head and an occupant of an information collecting point. The collector provided the head with needed information. The head gave the worker bits of information to distribute among the workers. The head gained by learning what the workers in his department were doing and discussing and at the same time placing desired rumors in circulation for the workers to hear.

The collector helped and enhanced his position by acquiring new information to distribute among workers. For the collector to continue receiving information from co-workers, he must be in a position to provide new information or additional insights into existing rumors. In a sense, for the collector to continue to operate, he had to have access to information that other departmental members didn't have. Access to such information gave the employee a reputation for being knowledgeable enough to serve as a source of advice.

In the dietary department, two of the three collecting positions were held by persons who had placed heavy "sidebets", Anna and Donna used their positions in the communication networks to strengthen their status and gain by personal investment.
Donna worked in the office and was aware of most decisions before they were officially enacted and also of the rationale behind the decisions. However, after the food service management company took over, other persons gained more favorable physical locations, limiting Donna's access to information. When the hospital was moved into a new building, three offices instead of one large one that had existed in the old hospital were set up. Donna was placed in an office entirely removed from the two offices in which administrative decisions were being made. As Donna was gradually cut off from information, her influence declined dramatically. She still held some status as a result of her "side bets", but she was paid less deference by considerably fewer people under the new system than under the old. Personal investment and being an occupant of an information-collection position could be worked together to enhance an individual's deference and his resulting unofficial status considerably, but it was situationally dependent. 5 Donna found herself isolated and declining in deference while Anna was able to hold her position.

A third collector position was held by Sue, who used her position as a lever in acquiring personal power. Whereas Donna and Anna were very discrete in what information they passed to F____, Sue was not. Several employees had disciplinary action taken against

5"When an (employee's) power derives solely from his access to his employer's resources, that power can only be exercised over clients. In the absence of valued personal qualities his position in the organization itself will be a lowly one" (Swartz, 1974: 844).
them on the basis of information which Sue had passed to F____. This produced considerable resentment. Donna and Kathy once told this researcher never to tell Sue anything because she brings it right into the office to F____. However, Sue was rewarded for her efforts by F____, through acquisition of a great deal of authority as well as the most information about upcoming events, decisions, and work loads. Even though the workers resented Sue, they continued to communicate with her to gain the quality information she possessed.

After the new management acquired dietary, Sue and Donna each lost access to information and likewise the position of information collector while Anna retained hers. Anna was joined by Kathy who acquired the position of secretary to the new food service director, a promotion within the department.

Bill and Juan had both held secondary information collecting positions prior to the arrival of the management service. Bill left the department before the food service came, but Juan retained his position after the administrative change.

The position of information collector was a position formed through a reciprocal relationship of collecting information from both above and below in the stratification system and redistributing it in both areas. An occupant's continuance in a collecting position was dependent upon the continuing access of information from above that was not available to his co-workers. A person who remained careful of what type of information he transmitted could perform a favor for both employees and the department head while acquiring deference for himself. However, the person who was not careful of
what type of information he transmitted could be resented by a
coworker who was injured by the transmission. Anna received
deference from both her coworkers and from F___. Sue received
authority over her coworkers as a reward from F___, but she
received little deference from her coworkers. Anna converted
deference into support for position and power. Sue acquired status
through association with F___, a status that was ascribed by F___,
not granted by coworkers.

**Prestige Status by Association**

Those workers who are not granted hierarchical status may seek a
status based on prestige. C. Wright Mills (1956: 354) defined pres-
tige as being determined by power.

Prestige involves at least two persons: one to claim
it and another to honor the claim... In the status
system... these claims are organized as rules and
expectations which regulate who successfully claims
prestige, from whom, in what ways, and on what basis.
The level of self-esteem enjoyed by given individuals
is more or less set by this status system (Mills,
1956: 239).

C. W. Mills in *White Collar* sets forth the argument that white
collar workers derive their prestige from sharing the

... place and type of work (of the) older middle
classes which has permitted them to borrow prestige.
As their relations with entrepreneur and with esteemed
customer have become more impersonal, they have
borrowed prestige from the firm itself. The styli-
ization of their appearance, ... the wearing of street

---

6 Unofficial deference refers to that given by the workers, while
official deference is demanded by the position held by a superordinate.
clothes on the job, has figured in their prestige claims, as have the skills required in most white-collar jobs. . . . (1956: 73-74).

Prestige may be borrowed from the type of goods being handled, the status of the people contacted, and the identity of the employing organization (Mills, 1956: 173). If a feeling of prestige can be produced, even if borrowed, the resulting satisfaction in work arising out of successful role playing may become a source of self-esteem (Mills, 1956: 231), demanding status recognition from others.

Mills (1956: 173) considered "borrowing prestige" to be opposite of "the power to change people." People may attempt to change their image to fit into a generalized image of the person who has prestige. Whereas with personal investment and information collecting, the employee sought to change the image others held of him, among the "prestige borrowers" deference was required in the attempt to associate themselves with higher status persons and places.

Consider the case of Phil, the employee who manually delivered goods from the hospital central stores to the various departments. He was quite obviously a blue collar worker and as such held a low status. However Phil worked with goods, many of which were extremely expensive and technical, and was required to have a signature of a responsible person in the receiving department to verify delivery. Phil did not relish handling groceries or various paper products. However he did not miss an opportunity to deliver a medical or surgical product.

Central stores had a rule of only one delivery a week to every department except the dietary department and central service department, which each received two deliveries a week. This rule would
seldom be broken for the dietary department or for a nursing station. However the central service department, surgery, and the pathological laboratory got what they wanted with little or no delay. Phil and his superior Paul frequently expressed the opinion that they should not have to handle groceries, that handling medical supplies took enough work. They felt that the dietary department should receive and store their own goods. Paul and Phil were more than willing to give up handling supplies related to low status job operations, but they wanted to retain control over those goods related to high status activities.

When Phil needed a signature for goods he had delivered to a department he would seek out the highest ranking person available for signing for the goods, giving Phil contact with a higher status person. When a question concerning a product occurred, Phil would call up the department in question and ask to speak to the department head instead of the requisition clerk who could have given the same answer as that from the head. Phil's status was particularly enhanced when a department head asked him a question, allowing Phil an opportunity to explain a matter to a department head. These personal contacts with department heads gave Phil and other employees with similar associations a feeling of raised status through borrowed prestige.

In the past, when this hospital was smaller, the reports were that it was much easier to 'borrow prestige.' The popular myth was that Mr. T____, the former chief administrator, would often have coffee with the employees and knew many of them by name, even the
lowest echelon workers. However, as the bureaucracy grew and the number of employees increased, contacts became more impersonal and greater distance was created between strata and between departments. Few people other than the executive secretaries were in the position of being able to 'borrow prestige' from administrators at the time of this project. However, many people sought to borrow prestige from contacts with department heads or physicians, or from the departments they worked for such as surgery, cardio-pulmonary, pathology or from the areas in which they worked. There was more status attached to an engineer working on equipment in surgery than on equipment in the kitchen.\(^7\) After the hospital built its new structure, persons working at the new location attempted to borrow prestige from that fact and act as status superiors when meeting with employees still located at the old site.

Many of the employees who remembered the previous period expressed regret at its passage. Some complained that the new administrators did not meet the employees like the former administrator had and seemed to feel that this indicated a lack on the new administrator's part. In essence, the growth of the organization had made the difference between strata levels more important and had lowered the workers' self-conceptions of their statuses by giving

\(^7\)After an engineer had been working in surgery, he would come for coffee break wearing the green coveralls required in surgery, even if he had finished the job and was not returning. This was a presentation signifying to everyone that he had been working in surgery.
them less opportunity to borrow status and less status that could be borrowed. In the new structure, the acquisition of deference was probably more important because of the increased separation of strata and decreased borrowing opportunities. There was an apparent need for prestige or recognition that had to be met one way or another.

Presentation of Rank

The organization generated a number of presentations which were indicative of superordination and subordination among persons working in the hospital. These presentations were divided into four classes based on the manner in which deference was expressed.

The first type was the power of a higher status person to demand a service from a lower status employee. This was repeatedly demonstrated when a superior would send a subordinate out to get him a cup of coffee or a pack of cigarettes. Frequently such a favor was demanded from a person's immediate subordinate rather than sending the lowest ranking person on the desired errand. This practice appeared to be fairly generalized in all hospital departments as well as in the food service company. Such a practice, although undoubtedly not consciously intended, operated to crystallize the social distance between a superior and his subordinates. The exception to this scheme occurred when the immediate subordinate was preoccupied with another task. In such cases the most available subordinate was ordered to
perform the desired favor. 8

The second type involved personal titles that were enforced by the members of the organization. All physicians were referred to as "doctor." All department heads, administrators, or other higher status persons were referred to as "Mr.," "Mrs.," or "Miss." This practice was strongly enforced in face-to-face meetings between members of higher and lower status levels. However, in conversation among lower status persons, the absent higher status person would be referred to by last name only or some type of shortened term so that communicating actors knew who was being referred to--e.g., "Mrs. H," "the boss," or by less flattering terms such as "the fat one."

In return, upper status persons would refer to workers or speak to them using only the worker's last name or first name; seldom would both names be used and never would a title (Mr. and Mrs.) be added. 9 Frequently when a superior was addressing a group of subordinates, the superior would call them merely "boys" or "girls."

This standard practice of referral tended to establish social distance and status relationships immediately at the beginning of an interaction. Any subsequent actions including requests for or grants of favors had to be considered in light of the established status of the referent. 8

8Reciprocity to this type of favor was usually in a negative form. The subordinate realized that if he did not perform the desired favor, unpleasant sanctions could possibly be invoked against him such as "loss of favor" of the superior. Note, though, it did obligate the superior to maintain favor.

9Exceptions to this practice was sometimes granted to employees, especially females, who had accumulated a great deal of personal investment in the department as well as in the organization.
positions.

The third type was the presentation created by the style of dress the employee was permitted to wear on the job. These were particularly effective in that they could be spotted at great distance and carried status connotations for persons outside the hospital organization as well as insiders. This class of dress presentations was divided into five subclasses ranked hierarchically. Subclass A included the lower echelon workers who were permitted only to wear work clothes or some type of blue-collar uniform. In this subclass were manual workers both unskilled and skilled.

In subclass B were the workers designated to wear white uniforms. This category included other than registered nurses and various other employees required to maintain certain quality standards of sanitation due to at least some patient contact. Whereas members of subclass A worked only in the backstage area, members of subclass B spent at least part of their time on the frontstage contributing to the public image of the hospital.

The intermediate subclass C consisted of the workers who were permitted to wear white lab coats. Their basic dress might be either a white uniform (for registered nurses) or street clothes of modest price for office workers and laboratory technicians. The improved standard of dress for members of subclass C signified their higher prestige based on specialized training. This subclass was divided between two competing groups, those with responsibilities in the area of patient care and those with responsibilities to the functioning of the hospital organization. These responsibilities were
reflected by the considerable wage increase over subclasses A and B.

Subclass D included middle management workers who wore street clothes of good quality. Once again a wage increase occurred over the prior subclass. Unlike subclass B and C, the members of this subclass were entirely backstage and were oriented to the hospital organization.

Subclass E was the elite stratum consisting of top level administrators and doctors who were expected to wear expensive suits. Power in the areas of both hospital organization and patient care was held in this subclass.10

The fourth class of status symbols concerned the identification badges associating employees with a status and a department. Many employees wore name plates that were printed with the name of the wearer, including professional title, e.g. L.P.N., R.N., etc., job title capable of being placed into a conceptual status hierarchy by another person familiar with the organization, and finally, the name of the department. Those departments performing a highly skilled and

10 Perrow (1963) in a case study of a private urban hospital identified three separate power groups, the physicians, especially those on the medical staff; the hospital trustees; and the organizational administrators. Perrow saw these groups as being somewhat equal but representing divergent and often conflicting goals. Therefore, a multiple leadership developed with each group holding veto power. The consequences were the hospital's inability to engage in long range planning which would have required agreement upon specific goals. The hospital instead was forced to deal only with short range goals that could be compromised between the power groups holding a specific interest in the question at hand. In this situation, even a "trivial" issue can create conflict if different group's goals are in question (Perrow, 1963: 112-146).
medical function held the higher status, e.g., surgery, cardio-pulmonary, pathology. Departmental status was also determined by the status of the occupation of most of the members of any particular department. For example, dietary was made up largely of food service occupations with relatively low rank in comparison to other occupations within the hospital, thus the status of a person from dietary was relatively low. In addition the major occupation of a department tended to create an image of that department as a whole based upon the public image of the particular major occupation. Therefore, the occupational image and status held by the major occupation was applied to all departmental members.

These four categories of status presentations were invoked to identify those officially sanctioned to demand deference from lower status workers. This system of official status identities generally existed separate from the informally determined status identities described previously. Persons with official status could use the authority of the organization in an interaction with a lower status person. Persons who had acquired status through informal means, e.g., personal investment, communication collecting, and association, had to rely on whatever authority or power could be made to appear to be theirs. The resulting conclusion was two power-prestige status systems, one officially regulated by the institution, the other a

11Departments usually included occupations that were related. Therefore the application of an occupational image to all members of a department was relatively easy.
by-product of the social organization growing out of interaction between employees and middle management personnel.

Official and Informal Deference

Official status was ascribed as a result of occupancy of a particular role in a hierarchy. Deference was assumed to flow upward, while work directives and work-related advice was assumed to flow downward.

There was, however, some deference moving downward in that the superordinate person was obligated to give work directives according to organizational roles occupied by workers. Thus a worker occupying a dishwasher role did not expect to be directed to carry out trash. If a superordinate found it necessary to have a subordinate perform a task unrelated to his role, the superordinate was obligated to request the subordinate to perform a task outside his organizational role. An order for such a change, rather than a request, was met by hostility on the part of the worker.

Requests were usually phrased as "Joe, can you do _____?" Or at other times, "Joe, how busy are you?" Joe was expected to reply that he was not very busy, at which point the superordinate would make a request that Joe was obligated to accept on the basis of his admission to not being very busy. If Joe, as sometimes happened, broke the expectation and replied that he was very busy, the superordinate would label Joe's action as complaining and order him to perform the desired task. Workers were expected to comply with directives given by superiors, but superiors were expected to respect the division of
labor when giving directives.

Deference was also paid by superordinate persons to subordinate persons along formalized section lines. Larger departments were divided into sections with a supervisor over each section. A supervisor was expected to restrict his work directives to the workers defined as part of his section. This also applied to departments restricting department heads to giving directives only to members of the same department. Therefore, a department head or supervisor was superordinate only to those persons organizationally defined as subordinate to him. A violation of this expectation by a superior produced resistance from the worker and sometimes retaliation. Such an occurrence happened when F____ tried to demand the storekeeper, Paul, to make an unscheduled delivery to dietary. Paul simply refused. When the head of housekeeping insisted on immediate deliveries of supplies, Paul punished housekeeping for three weeks by making sure that they were the last department to receive the weekly requisition of supplies. Paul, of course, was in a better position than most employees to enforce the expectation that management personnel could exercise their organizational authority only over defined subordinates. Other employees, faced by supervisors or department heads crossing defined sectional boundaries, would respond with signs of lack of interest or ignoring the directives.

When an employee did allow a management person to cross a section line and give him a work directive, the situation was immediately redefined. The worker had acknowledged the power of the outside supervisor over him. Once this power had been established the outside
supervisor could continue to use the new power thus reinforcing it through custom.

This extension of the requirement of deference based on official role occurred when the dietary worker who carried trash out of dietary allowed a housekeeping supervisor to assert control over the trash compacting area. On another occasion, a cook's assistant in dietary allowed Sue, a supervisor of another section of dietary, to co-opt her for work in Sue's section. After working several times for Sue, the cook's assistant found it burdensome and sought to halt the arrangement. Sue responded by reporting to F____ that the need of more man-hours of labor in her area had been solved by using this particular cook's assistance a few hours a day. F____ responded by officially redefining the cook's assistant role as one of shifting between two sections.

A worker who acquired informal status from others on the basis of competency was able to demand deference as a measure of prestige or power. Deference in this case was earned by the person and was paid to him as an individual and not to the person as an occupant of a particular official role. A relationship of informal deference was not defined by the organization, but developed out of interaction among members of a work group or a favor network.12

12Blau (1961: 352-4) stated that peer relationships rest on reciprocity in social exchange which develop equality of status among several interacting peers. Cohesion between these peers is promoted through voluntary exchange of valued assistance. However, the continuation of exchange of assistance develops status distinctions, with higher status awarded to those able to provide the most desired assistance.
Informal deference could be used by management personnel to strengthen their authority. One worker commented about a former head of purchasing who had commanded a great deal of informal deference from his subordinates. This department head "could get more work out of you without even trying." This department head had relied upon an informal system of deference to bolster his official authority. He had participated in a limited favor relationship with the members of his department, giving them favors of advice when requested, a few material favors, and deferential favors of supporting the actions of his subordinates when they became involved in a conflict with other departments. The latter was the precedent which allowed Paul to develop the power to retaliate against aggressive actions by other department heads. The former purchasing head also rewarded his subordinates with the favor of lessening the social distance between them, symbolized by dropping the title of Mister. However, he was able to maintain the image of official authority. His subordinates responded by awarding him a large amount of informal deference resulting in greatly increased power and prestige for the purchasing head.

Deference based on formal status was oriented to the hospital structure, creating a dependence upon the authority of the organization for retention of one's status. Deference based on informal status was based largely on competence in a situation.

13 The strengthening of managerial authority through informal status and deference is discussed in Chapter V.
Deference As An Identity

Employees who were able to receive deference regardless of means were able to gain higher prestige than the one accorded them by the organization. Likewise middle management persons who had official authority and could command official deference were differentiated from those who, through personal behavior, had also gained prestige and deference as a sign of that status and those who had not.

Deference granted to a worker and informal deference given to a management person tended to expand the organizational roles of the deference recipients. The role was extended by personal actions on the part of the role incumbents. However, expansion was defined and limited by the group of orientation granting deference and the organizational setting of the role. Role expansion was not so much the result of a personal decision as the result of a complex pattern of interaction.

We have discussed in earlier sections of this chapter how prestige was conferred by certain others. However, persons of superior status tend to regulate the opportunity of an employee to attract status by limiting the flow of new information from above, and limiting associations with status superiors. As noted earlier, the new management in dietary shifted Donna away from a source of information and Kathy into a position of information-collector. The shift to a new management decreased the role of dietitian in dietary and increased the emphasis on profits resulting in an increase of status in the roles of all persons involved in the procurement and inventory control of goods.
Juan, who held a role in the latter category, was allowed increased association with status superiors. In Chapter III, the importance of position in allowing an employee to participate in meaningful favor relationships was discussed. How a role attached to a position was fitted into the organizational ecology of roles helped predetermine opportunity for generating deference.

All organizational roles, except those newly created, contained a history of image projections in terms of expectations for performance and status rewards. A new occupant of a role inherited this history including the expectations and limitations. At the hospital each new role occupant was expected by his co-workers to maintain the continuity of that particular role. The worker was made continually aware of this expectation through continual comparison with former occupants of that particular role. Anna often enforced the definition of another worker's role by commenting that "when Q___ had that job he (she) always did" whatever the present occupant was not doing. This expectation upon the worker came not from decisions made by administrators but from the history of the position as remembered by other workers. A similar process also occurred with expectations of what other persons an occupant of a position would interact with. The organization defined who a person would be officially required to interact with in the course of his job. However, as was shown in Chapter III, frequently patterns of interpersonal relationships would be passed from one status occupant to another so that not only did the official but the informal expectations and patterns of interaction became a part of a network.
This is not to contend that roles do not change, but is a presentation of the role as an on-going set of expectations and interactions which change through a process of evolution. Changes in the definition of the situation may effect its evolution as much as the personality of the occupant, e.g. the evolving change in the relationship between the executive secretaries and the dietary clean-up people.

Evolution of roles was not a unidirectional progression along any type of scale. Roles progressed, regressed, or changed directions in terms of their development as new situations presented themselves. A major change in the situation in dietary occurred when the food service management company replaced the organizational department head. This change, as has been shown, produced a number of changes in status as well as in the roles played in both official and informal systems. The official role held by Juan changed while both Donna and Kathy experienced change in informal network roles.

As a role evolved, so also did the image presented to the actors in the hospital. The actor in a role developed an identity based on at least four images: a) the image of his role in the organization; b) the image of the actor personally as an occupant of that role viewed by other actors filling other hospital roles; c) the image of the actor in a non-hospital role--e.g. an actor in the role of male, female, friend, etc--, viewed by other actors employed by the hospital; d) the image produced by the mixing of any of these.

An employee's role identity combined with the perceived role aspects he was granted to create a personal identity. This identity
varied slightly from one situation to another due to its subjective character based on perceived images and status. Paul maintained a personal identity which demanded a great deal of deference, especially in the role of gatekeeper for supplies. However, deference was not granted Paul when he interacted with a person not in need of his services.

Personal identity was maintained within a network of individuals and modified by the setting of the hospital. When two hospital employees met outside the setting of the hospital their identities were expressed through different symbols having meaning in that particular non-hospital setting. In such a case, the signs of presentation, e.g., uniforms, name tags, etc., were not present and the workers needed to find new presentations upon which to base an identity. If such a meeting were uncommon, they would struggle to determine how to present themselves to each other. An uncommon meeting tended to be uncomfortable with neither actor able to think of anything appropriate to say in the different setting. In this struggle, some residue of their respective hospital identities often helped structure the degree of social distance and communication. They must depend on knowledge of the other actor in the setting of the hospital to consider his hospital identity in formulating a presentation to the other in an outside setting. Persons who interact regularly outside of the hospital setting are each apt to develop two separate but not entirely independent identities, one for use within the hospital and one for use outside. This was most clearly demonstrated in the area of deference.
An employee who is awarded deference by a particular other within the hospital is likely to expect some type of deference from that other when a meeting between the two occurs outside of the hospital. Margaret is expected to refer to Mr. Jones as "Mr. Jones" and Jones will refer to her as "Margaret," whether they are interacting at work or happen to meet in a store where Margaret is shopping for her grandchildren.

Two persons who interact both inside and outside the hospital and have each developed two identities sometimes find difficulty in the area of deference. Person X may receive deference from person Y inside the hospital, but X may have no sound basis for demanding deference from Y outside of the hospital due to a different relationship. X, however, may desire deference on the outside and attempt to develop an identity requiring deference from Y here also. Such a construction may be engaged through frequent reminders of incidents in which X had aided Y at work, stories that illustrated the status of X at work by telling of middle management persons asking advice of X. X may also take the role of information collector and knowledgeable person with regard to work and feed bits of this information to Y in the outside setting. These techniques could bring a particular person's work identity more into play in X and Y's personal relationship. This effort may be furthered by an attempt on the part of X to interact with Y on the home ground of X as much as possible.

Occasionally, two persons would meet outside of the work setting for a party or some other temporary scene of interaction. In the
case of an "office party" at the home of the "boss" or at a restaurant, the deference identity along with other work identities tended to be transported to the new setting to give some structure to the interaction and behavior by placing expectations upon the actors. This prevented some awkwardness in a situation where actors confronting each other in different roles would not be forced to discover new roles for each other because the new situation is generalized from the older. By importing identities from another setting, the situation was defined in accordance with known roles, and modified only enough to handle the new setting. As actors became more accustomed to the new setting and perhaps less informal, identities centered around deference relationships often waned in favor of other identities built on new images, but the deference identities never completely disappeared.

The acceptance of deference was a major factor in one's identity, a factor that colored the relationships between individuals both in the work setting and away from the setting with other employees. Deference was so important that it became a type of identity. Persons with an established identity of deference tended to expect certain favors from their status subordinates. If these favors of recognition were not forthcoming due to a redefined situation, they tended to seek to influence the situation so that their actions would have to be replied to by the others with symbols conveying deference.

A relationship in which deference is a dominant characteristic can be converted to a more equalitarian relationship only at the option of the higher status person and only if recognized by both of
such a shift. Although the social fact of deference cannot be
forgotten, it can be pushed aside in a step-by-step process. The
initiating higher status person must enter an area defined as neutral
grounds and present a series of cues which indicate that he desires
to step out of his status role.\textsuperscript{14} Neither actor can relax completely
because both realize that the prior status roles can be resumed at
any time.

With regard to official status and its demanded deference, there
were regions defined as belonging to one group or another within the
work setting. Under F\textsubscript{1}, in the dietary department, the office
belonged to management, the kitchen was neutral ground, and the "back
porch" (a small anteroom) belonged to the workers. When F\textsubscript{2} wanted
to drop the management role in meeting workers, the kitchen became
the location of interaction. F\textsubscript{3}, however, seldom entered the
"back porch" except to use the back door, leaving this area as a zone
where workers could relax, talk among themselves, exchange rumors and
complaints without being disturbed. This area served as an escape
from the work role, conversation here frequently involved topics either
unrelated to one's work role or centered around the airing of com-
plaints against middle management.

After the management company took over the dietary department,
the kitchen was redefined as management's ground when the manager set
up a desk in the kitchen. The frequent use by the manager of the

\textsuperscript{14}For a related discussion of territory and role playing, see
Erving Goffman, \textit{Presentation of Self in Everyday Life}, 1959,
especially pages 190-207.
"back porch" as a "smoking room" served to redefine this area as neutral ground leaving the workers with no safe territory of their own. The result was that the workers were constantly aware of an enforced deference system which could be escaped only by leaving the area of the department entirely. Leaving usually tended to segregate the dietary workers from each other and mix them with members of other departments reducing the opportunity to air one's complaints due to the lack of an interested audience. Leaving also required more time and effort than going to the "back porch" had; therefore, the use of this technique for escaping the work role was limited. The result was an atmosphere of tension developed from the deference system, from work in general, or the problems of a change in management with little opportunity for releasing these tensions.

Signs of Deference

Deference as a sign by one actor to another can originate from two general areas. First, there is informal deference arising out of the perception of actions by another person which deserves a signification of respect. Second, is the official deference defined and institutionalized by the formal organizational structure. The remainder of this discussion will concern only the first category, considering the latter category to be relatively apparent.

There were several general types of actions performed by workers which required acts of deference to be returned to the initiators of these actions. The first type was advice given by an actor on how to perform a job task when the actor giving advice was recognized to be
competent in the area of his advice, such as Paul giving advice to
Phil who as Paul put it "worked with him."

A second type, related to advice, consisted of tasks performed
to organize the work routine with co-workers. This occurred when a
work team had several tasks to perform, but the supervisor had not
identified the exact order in which they were to be completed or which
person was to perform what task. The leader took the responsibility
to specify details and structure the work group. Anna frequently per-
formed the task of organizing the cooks who accepted her directives.
In this manner, the workers paid deference to Anna by following her
and thus promoting her into a leader. This will be dealt with further
in Chapter V.

A third type involved actions taken by an actor to arrange a
favor for a particular other person. A case in point was illustrated
in Chapter II with the description of Bill arranging for Juan to
receive food from the dining room. For this act, Juan was indebted
to Bill in the form of gratitude.

The above discussed actions were favors performed by persons
who had the requisite power and position and were allowed by the
recipients to grant such favors. Two types were non-material and the
third involved material goods in a special way. The recipients of
these favors were bound not only to reciprocity in returning favors,
but also in granting deference to these necessary and specialized co-
workers. There were four typical categories or signs of deference:
The first type occurred when an employee desiring advice would select
the actor he considered to be most capable of giving good advice
from whom to request advice. This request signified recognition of competency which in effect gave the selected one a certain prestige over his co-workers. Mark based his claim for prestige upon the fact that his co-workers would seek him out to answer their questions. Mark would also occasionally point to this tendency by his co-workers as a demonstration of his competency. Therefore, the workers by continually seeking out a particular co-worker established a pattern of deference toward that co-worker.

A second category of signs occurred when a judgment of an other was accepted with little or no question by a particular actor showing confidence in the advice, suggestions, or leadership decisions of that other. This demonstration of an other's influence in directing the character of actions enhanced the prestige of that other. When Anna was asked for advice, her advice or judgment was almost always accepted, supporting her prestige.

A third sign was usually given by a higher status person to a lower status person. An actor verbally granted credit to another for the successful completion of a task. The deference acted as a reinforcement of the prestige of the other. Paul on occasion was given credit for a particular accomplishment by the hospital central stores, but would indicate Phil as being partially or fully responsible for the accomplishment. In this manner Paul gave Phil public recognition allowing Phil to enhance his appearance of competency. Related to this general type was deference to the maker, in that the workman producing a particular product or performing a certain service would be sought out for comment on any discussion related to his product or
service. Thus, when Anna was preparing to ask for a special order of food product, she asked the cook who was to make the particular meal how much of the food product in question would be needed. Anna would not make the decision of quantity needed herself. This was deference to the person who was to make the product.

A fourth sign of deference was made when an actor made a public statement of gratitude to another for his specialized services. This could be a verbal statement or a token material gift which served notice that the actor had become indebted to another for needed assistance which he could not have performed himself. This also was generally a sign of deference passed from a higher status person to a lower status person. Such was the case of a purchasing agent giving credit to Paul for assisting him when the purchasing agent came to the hospital. This was an expression of gratitude. When expressed publicly, gratitude became a form of deference in its effect.

Gratitude is a sentiment which is apt never to be fully exhausted, but to remain as a permanent part of the relationship into which it enters. It is also a type of relationship between two people which can operate in both directions so that each person owes the other gratitude, but for different reasons. Such a case was the "potlatch" mentioned in Chapter III of workers interacting to assist each other. In this type of relationship, gratitude is a by-product, but it is also a reason for the continuance of exchanging assists.

Georg Simmel held that gratitude is both the practical and impulsive moral memory of mankind. We become grateful of the other not only because of his gifts to us, but because we experience him.
Thus,

... two individuals offer one another different parts of their inner lives ... [realizing] that there is something which places the receiver into a certain permanent position with respect to the giver, and makes him dimly envisage the inner infinity of a relation that can neither be exhausted nor realized by any finite return gift or other activity ... for it [the original gift] has a freedom which the return gift, because it is that, cannot possibly possess. This perhaps, is the reason why some people do not like to accept, and try to avoid as much as possible being given gifts. ...

Every human relationship of any duration produces a thousand occasions for it, and even the most ephemeral ones do not allow their increment to the reciprocal obligation to be lost. ... [The sum of] these increments produces an atmosphere of generalized obligation which can be redeemed by no accomplishments whatever ... threads which tie one element of society to another, and thus eventually all of them together in a stable collective life (Simmel, 1950: 388-395).

The idea of an original favor given in freedom must remain strictly theoretical. However, in comparison to later favors it was undoubtedly freer since the entanglements of obligatory reciprocity had not yet entered into the situation. Among the employees, a certain segment tended to avoid favors, whether for the reason given by Simmel could not be determined. For many other employees, gratitude was an important concept often allowing deference to flow both ways between employees.

Jane was taking a college course and wanted help, she asked and received some tutoring from me for which she paid deference to me. On other occasions, I asked for and received information from Jane on matters—-one involved data for this paper—-with which she was familiar. There was a relationship of information exchange between us. However, each one of us was also paying deference to the other in the area of
Deference Seekers and Demanders

C. Wright Mills commented that prestige claims are organized as rules and expectations which regulate who successfully claims prestige, from whom, in what ways, and on what basis. The level of self-esteem enjoyed by given individuals is more or less set by this status system (Mills, 1959: 239).

Given an operative status regulatory system to establish who is to be given deference and who is not, it would follow that everyone who might desire deference will not be awarded it by the system. When two individuals in their private interactions make agreements as to whom should receive deference and when, perhaps each can receive deference from the other at different times and involving different issues. However, it is likely that one of these two individuals will receive more deference from the other than he gives, producing a slight prestige advantage for himself. The other person receiving less deference may desire more, but realizes that within the context of this relationship developed through interaction it is not realistic to expect more deference. The amount of deference which is appropriate is a subjective amount built into the structure of a relationship and known by agreement to both actors through a communicating process with common symbols.

The greater share of interaction at the hospital occurred within social networks which provided certain situational definitions. The networks also defined who deserved deference, how much, when it should be awarded, and how. Within the context of the network, some persons
who might receive considerable deference from one particular person, might not be defined as deserving of deference in the favor network from a "macro-view." Mark received deference from workers closely associated with him. However, Mark could demand little deference from the "macro" favor network—his services were not needed by most of the members of the network. Paul, on the other hand could claim deference from most members of the favor network based upon his control of needed goods which could not be obtained elsewhere. Martin from engineering had developed an image throughout the favor network and the hospital which demanded deference.

Networks further tended to create a type of linear deference. A person who received deference from a less prestigious person, would be required to pay deference to a more prestigious individual who, in turn, would be expected to pay deference to a yet higher person. This was not strictly one-to-one since a highly prestigious person could receive deference from a number of individuals at various levels of prestige within the network. There tended to be several persons in a network toward whom deference was expected to flow. These persons usually did not interact with each other, but limited their activities to their own segment of the network system.

Paul and Anna both enjoyed a great deal of deference in the favor network. They seldom interacted with each other, but each was well aware of the other's prestige. Anna once said that "Paul likes to be babied" meaning that Paul responded most favorably to the requests of others when a good amount of deference was paid with the request.

The lack of interaction between members of a higher prestige
level did not mean that their spheres of influence were separate. Bill was for some time in a position that required the payment of deference to both Paul and Anna. In fact, when it was necessary for Anna to make a request of Paul, she would avoid direct confrontation, choosing instead between two alternatives. Anna could tell Bill to make the request causing Bill to pay deference to Paul and also to Anna by following Anna's wish. The other alternative was Anna could ask her organizational superior to approach Paul, in which case Anna would pay deference to her superior by admitting the necessity of the superior's intervention. Both approaches prevented a direct confrontation between Paul and Anna in which case one or the other would have had to yield deference to the other.

Deference was attached to all the various networks. In the case of an occupational network, the new food service company at the hospital manipulated the latent possibilities of deference to work in its favor to establish control of the department. The food service company realized that Anna was the most prestigious person at this hospital in the network of cooks. Thus the food service company brought in a male, Tim, with the title of chef and assigned him to work directly with Anna. Tim apparently was a highly competent chef and quickly gained the respect and deference of Anna. Anna did not care for the food service company; however, she directed her complaints and comments at the new manager and not at Tim. Her deference to Tim was passed onto the other cooks who took their cues from Anna. The deference to Tim provided a stabilizing force as well as control for the food service company over the cooks. Tim stayed for about a month,
by which time the manager had proven his credentials to Anna enough to exercise control over the cooks. However, the manager never acquired the degree of prestige which Tim was able to command. The manager sought deference, but Tim demanded and received deference almost from the time of his arrival. The difference between the two was the amount of perceived prestige they commanded.

Simmel differentiated between prestige defined as a quality attached to the individual personality and authority which he defined as the identification of a particular individual with an "objective power or norm" (Simmel: 1950, 184). Tim had occupational prestige because of what he was in his occupation. The manager was defined by the organization to have authority, but he was unable to provide leadership at first because he could not define himself as deserving prestige in either the network of cooks or the structure of the organization.

Likewise in the favor network there were those who sought deference but did not have the prestige to demand it. To acquire prestige a worker must possess competence in an area of knowledge considered to be useful to one's co-workers. Prestige was determined by the collective values of the network or networks serving to define any particular situation.

Jane was a cook who sought deference, but she was not perceived to be as experienced as some of the other cooks. She did not receive as much prestige nor deference as she desired. One time Jane assisted another worker and instead of receiving déference, she found herself stuck with the entire job as the other worker slipped away. In effect,
she wanted to show her competence by assisting when her assistance was not requested. Such efforts to help or advise others instead of building up a basis for prestige resulted in a rejection by co-workers who saw no advantage in becoming obligated to Jane.

Anna, by contrast, did not have to seek deference, but rather expected and demanded this quality. Not only was Anna considered to be a competent cook, but she was considered to be an experienced worker who knew "the ropes" as to which norms in the department should be obeyed under what circumstances. She was also known to have a considerable influence on the department head. In short, Anna had made a very successful personal investment in the department. Workers came to Anna and asked advice and then followed that advice. Workers not performing as Anna felt to be proper were told of their mistakes and expected to correct them by bringing their behavior into line with what was considered proper.

Anna defined proper behavior through a combination of experience, custom, and formal rules. Anna was allowed to serve as spokesperson for others in enforcing the agreed upon normative behavior.

Jane received deference from a few of her co-workers, but Anna could demand deference from any worker in the dietary department. Jane was sometimes resentful of this fact and sought to decrease her own obligation to Anna. Jane denied that Anna had ever done anything to help her, "everything Anna's ever done has been for Anna." Jane claimed that what she had accomplished had been on her own.

Perhaps what Anna did had been for Anna, or at least worked out that way through personal investment which built an obligation for
return on that investment. However, Anna had performed a number of favors for Jane in order to make Jane's job easier. Jane was aware of these favors and was resentful of the obligation to repay these favors in terms of deference to Anna. Such a payment was proof of Anna's prestige over her as well as her own dependency upon Anna. Anna's tremendous prestige tended to minimize the perceptions of competence in others which might result in prestige for those others.

Anna demanded considerable prestige and deference from her co-workers supporting a de facto leadership position in the department with personal power. In July, the kitchen supervisor quit and was not replaced. The cooks, in need of leadership, promoted Anna into an unofficial leadership position which she readily accepted. Not until March was she given the official title of head cook. At the time the title was conferred, Anna said she would not accept unless she received more money to go with the responsibility. Such a statement was meaningless except as a lever for a salary hike since she exerted no more and no less power over her co-workers than she had before. Under the food service company, Anna was supervisor for the cooks but here as under F____, she exerted power over all the department and not just over the cooks. Both F____ and the food service manager relied heavily on Anna's judgment, thus tending to pay more deference to her and increase her prestige and power that much more.

In the case of Anna, prestige had built to the point where it was recognized by the title "supervisor" which objectified her authority. However, as shown in the subsequent chapter, everyone was well aware of her authority before the title change. Some prestigeful
employees acquire authority and the power that goes with it, while others seem to savor their prestige and resist any desires to seek to convert it to formal authority.

Summary

There was a status system in the hospital based on patient contact, technical training, personal investment; and the position of information collector. Status sometimes was transferred or borrowed by lower status workers from higher status workers through association. Deference became a reward of both formal and informal status.

Deference existed in several forms. A personal identity of deference resulted in power and prestige granting the right to demand deference from other members of a worker's favor network. Deference also existed in the forms of courtesy and gratitude.

Chapter V will explore authority, power, and leadership constructed out of demands for deference.
CHAPTER V

POWER

Types of Authority

The workers were subjected to four types of authority\(^1\) by two sets of agents.

The first type is rational-legal authority. This was held by and experienced by the members of middle management. In theory, they used their authority to support the goals of the organization. However, as was demonstrated in Chapter I, they often used their authority which depended somewhat on their personal prestige for personal advantage. Their authority was bureaucratically defined and deference to that authority as symbolic of their position was enforced among the employees by the organization. When demanding that an employee perform tasks outside of those defined by the organization as appropriate, the middle management person must appeal to his personal prestige.

\(^1\)Weber (1961: 4) described authority as based on an internalized power structure for legitimacy. It refers to the probability that a specific command will be obeyed whether due to interest, or a calculation of expediency, or simply as a matter of custom or routine that has developed. Authority differs from prestige in that it contains an identity of the personality with an objective power or norm. Prestige leadership stems from pure personality and is determined entirely by the strength of the individual. Authority leadership stems from the norms of a social group and presupposes a freedom on the part of the individual to subject himself to the authority (Simmel, 1950: 183-4).
In the dietary department, F was able to acquire numerous favors for personal advantage, however K, an assistant to F, was unable to demand favors from the workers. In fact, K had trouble enforcing legitimate (organizationally defined) demands upon the employees. The difference between F and K lay in the personal prestige F held to support the rational-legal authority. F could be said to have power in that F was able to extend the authority officially granted beyond the defined limits for that position, regardless of the fact that some persons may not have trusted F.

The second type is rational-legal authority without prestige. This type was seen in the middle management person or supervisor who held a title indicating authority, but due to lack of prestige among his subordinates the extent of real authority was limited. In the case of K, above, the employees did not perceive K to be capable of backing up decisions. Nor was K granted any more deference than absolutely necessary. K actually had less authority over subordinates than the amount defined by the position he held. K recognized this fact and limited contact with the employees as much as possible, electing to remain behind a desk in the office. Even when F once attended a convention and appointed K as temporary department head, K remained in the office allowing Anna and Sue to run the department. K had rational-legal authority, but lacked prestige, and thus had little real power.

The third type is charismatic authority. Bendix quoted Weber that charisma is
... a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with ... at least specifically exceptional power or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person ... and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader (Bendix, 1969: 169).

Weber also noted that the followers of a charismatic leader expected to benefit by following that person; if benefits were not forthcoming they would discontinue following. Charismatic leadership required recognition by followers producing deference and resulting in mutually advantageous relationships (Bendix, 1969).

Bill exercised a type of charismatic authority over a number of his co-workers in the department. This authority was largely an outgrowth of personality and a presentation of competence and knowledge. Bill provided leadership in several specific work tasks. This tended to increase the feeling of efficiency among his co-workers since he was able to arrange for them to take longer and more frequent breaks than otherwise would have been possible and still accomplish the required amount of work. He also served as a type of leader in the favor network, developing new relationships which benefited not only himself but other members of the department when they were given access to goods of other departments. Bill's charismatic authority was based entirely in favor relationships. Other employees received tangible rewards for paying deference in terms of following Bill. His authority was limited to the number of workers he could directly effect in the work process largely due to limitations placed upon Bill by

---

2 Bill at the time of this example had moved to another area of dietary outside the sphere of Anna's influence.
other authoritative persons. Anna would not permit Bill to enter her sphere of influence in another part of dietary. F held rational-legal authority over Bill which was used to hold him in a subordinate position to her.

The fourth type is institutionalized charismatic authority. The persons in this category differed from the previous category only in that their authority had de facto or official recognition by the formal organization. Paul was given de facto recognition. Anna had for a period of time received de facto recognition before it was formalized in the title of supervisor. Anna as a supervisor, however, maintained authority on the basis of charisma more than through rational-legal authority. Anna remained a worker and was considered by management personnel as a worker but as a very special worker with whom they had to deal. Anna had been given authority by her co-workers which management had to recognize in the interests of effective management. There were two other supervisors in the department. Both had been selected and given authority by management but lacked any charismatic appeal to their subordinates. Neither of the latter two supervisors could match the power held by Anna who received power through the formal organization and her personal prestige.

Lang and Lang (1961: 238) comment that power is legitimated by position and personality in that the image followers hold of an individual, along with leadership legitimated by personal appeal, tends to

3Lang and Lang (1961: 238) maintained that leadership legitimated by personal appeal will tend to find sources and channels that formalize this authority.
discover sources and channels to formalize that authority.

Charismatic Leadership

Lang and Lang (1961) define leadership as being an emergent and reciprocal relationship which always involves effective action. While authority has only a potential for action which need never be exercised, leadership exists in action. Leadership further demands the ability to affect the behavior of others to the point that they identify with the leader and adopt his perspectives.

Leadership applied to charismatic authority results in a situation similar to that which Anna had developed. Anna mobilized the favor network and the departmental communication network to create an image of herself as a leader who deserved deference. Anna's decisions were carried out by others without her having to follow through to make sure the decision was carried out. She was bounded by the range of her sphere of influence and certain traditions that had emerged as well as the obvious limitations applied by the organizational superstructure.

Over time, the schedule of days off for workers had become traditionalized. Employees knew which day of the week was their day off and tended to plan their private lives around these days well in advance. When Anna was given the "power" to make out work schedules, she found that she was bounded by tradition to continue the same schedule pattern. A couple of times when she attempted to rearrange the schedule, she found her attempts met with hostility. Anna became disgusted and began referring to the making out of the schedule as a
"chore." Eventually she convinced the new food service production manager to assume the task.

A part-time worker commented that Jane and one of the dining room supervisors were continually treating her like an inferior. She had reportedly told Jane to "get off her back." However, this same part-time worker got along well with Anna and did not object to following Anna's directives. The favorable reaction to Anna seemed to be true among many of the workers. Anna was an informally powerful worker in the sense that her work role and image of authority were not ordained by the organization to be a part of her position.

Independence of the Informally Powerful Worker

Most department heads spent much of their time with paper work or defending their departments to higher administrators. They usually tried to set down general policies for the department but seldom actually came out of the office to supervise the implementation of these policies. Instead they relied upon appointed supervisors and informally powerful persons to operate the department in accord with guidelines. The department heads depended on information received through communication networks to inform them as to how their policies were being implemented. This system produced two results: first, it placed the powerful employees in positions of responsibility; and second, it provided these employees with a certain independence.

Considering the first, Paul by being given responsibility, was expected to make many of the day-to-day decisions in his part of the
purchasing department, thus largely running his own job. This involved a type of exchange. The department head gave Paul additional power and responsibility which lightened the load of the department head, and Paul received, as a result, an increase not only in responsibility but also in power which allowed him to demand deference from other workers. In effect, Paul was made to feel that he was advancing in his occupation and that his side-bets were being paid. The department head was made to feel grateful to Paul that he, a member of management, did not have to be directly involved in supervising manual labor, which thus created an image of increased status in this hospital.

Paul was willing to use his power to insure the receipt of deference. This power included filling requisitions in the order he considered proper and allotting the amount he considered to be adequate. During one summer, a new requisition clerk at one

4 A person or group who holds a monopoly on a particular service may take their time about performing it allowing the client to wait. This emphasizes the autonomy and power of the person or group supplying the service. The power to make another wait may be further emphasized by not telling the client when the service will be performed or how long it will take (Schwartz, 1974: 841-870). Purchasing frequently practiced both of these devices to emphasize the dependency of others upon their department. When the food service company assumed control of dietary, purchasing resisted the plan of the food service to purchase their own supplies directly. A compromise was reached allowing the food service to handle all buying except the purchase of capital goods. The food service, however, retained and occasionally used an option to buy capital goods directly from wholesalers when purchasing delayed too long. The food service company also used the device of cancelling orders after lengthy delays by purchasing, leaving purchasing with unwanted merchandise on order.
of the nursing stations began ordering what Paul considered to be excessive amounts of supplies. Paul began sending what he felt was a reasonable amount instead of the amount requested. The clerk complained to Paul that she was not getting enough supplies to keep the station stocked and was having to borrow from other stations. This created a situation of having to order not only enough for her station for a week but also to repay the other stations.

Paul stood his ground. The clerk tried to move Paul by complaining to the nursing administrators. The complaint was passed to the purchasing agent who told Paul of the complaint, but also told Paul to keep track of the clerk’s requisitions and to issue only reasonable amounts. Paul, with departmental backing, considered the matter in his hands. He proceeded to keep xerox copies of the requests for supplies from the clerk while continuing to send only what he considered to be adequate. About two weeks later this particular clerk disappeared and was replaced by one that paid a little deference to Paul’s judgment and held down the size of the requisitions. It was not known whether this clerk transferred to another position, quit, or was fired. However, it would be safe to assume that her conflict with Paul was not conducive to her continuation as a requisition clerk. The fact that she was a new employee on the traditional 90-day probation did not help in a conflict with an established employee receiving departmental support for his non-official decisions and actions.

A second consequence of independence was also a type of exchange in which the worker accepted some freedom of action in his present
job for putting aside desires for promotion. In effect, the department stabilized a position by retaining an employee in it, an employee who was given a degree of independence from organizational demands. Whereas responsibility constituted a power position in relations with other workers, independence gave the employee power over his own commitments. Power of independence was held by more persons than was power to make responsible decisions.

Included in power of independence were the elements of territory, work prerogative and a sense of importance of the work with a self-pride. The right of territory allowed the worker the right to control action within a defined space, a home ground. A hospital employee working outside of his home ground would be more apt to receive orders from a supervisor, whereas the supervisor would be more apt to make requests to a worker on his home ground. In essence, the supervisor takes a role of visitor when on a worker's home ground and surrounded by the artifacts of that worker's occupation.

Work prerogative allowed the powerful employee an option of accepting a request to perform a work task not normally defined as belonging to that worker. If a particular worker chose to decline a supervisor's request, then the supervisor would go to another less powerful worker and order that worker to perform the designated task.

The instillation of a sense of importance of the work with a

---

5A request was separate from that of an order backed by the authority of the person issuing the order. A request was not directly backed by authority, although the known authority of the person making the request could act as a persuasive element in determining the worker's response.
self-pride in the work turned out by an employee was facilitated if the worker felt some control over his own work process. These workers often expressed their pride through statements like "we don't sit behind desks back here," or "I like to work with my hands."

There was an effort on the part of these workers to put out what they considered to be a quality product which they could express self-pride in as craftsmen might. T from engineering would state with pride and confidence that he had completed the repair of a piece of equipment and it was in good shape. If, as sometimes occurred, the repaired item of equipment broke after a short period, T would express consternation and disappointment that his repairs had not lasted. Often the workers held conceptions of quality that were higher than the expectations of the organization.

It was noted, however, that some of these workers who had expressed pride in their work were only making the best of their situation. W often expressed pride in manual work, but he never missed an opportunity to do desk work when it came his way. The department head had also noticed this preference and made sure a little desk work came to W every so often as return for the investment W had made in his job and the department. This occasional desk work seemed to give W a feeling of prestige. One time the department head asked a subordinate of W to perform an essentially

6Karl Marx saw one aspect of alienation in work as the worker being controlled by the work process and the objects produced from work. For a more detailed discussion of alienation, one may refer to any of a number of translated and edited versions of the early writing of Marx, for example, the T. B. Bottomore translation (Marx, 1964).
desk-oriented task. After the subordinate had finished, W___ refused to allow the results to go to the department head, but did the task again himself and presented the department head with his results. W___ once told me that he would never be able to move out of manual labor and knew it. Therefore, W___ and others like him tended to be resigned to their present positions and work. They responded by trying to bring a sense of pride to the job by making the job appear more desirable and foster an image of themselves as being more competent than other workers, an image which was preserved by taking special tasks such as desk-oriented ones for themselves.

Powerful Employees As Intermediaries With Management

The informally powerful employee provided a channel through which the complaints about the work situation by other workers could be presented to management. Anna performed this service not only because she was selected, but because she felt it was rightfully a part of her informal role. She insisted that complaints meet her criteria for legitimacy before she would present them to F____. Nor would she transmit complaints which she felt she could solve. On occasion, Anna verbally denied her role but she did not deny it by her behavior.

L____ had become upset about being taken off his job and assigned to do work on the trayline. L____ and Anna both agreed that L____ should not be asked or required to do this task so often, but Anna reported that F____ would not listen to her on this matter. Anna told L____ and the other workers with the same complaint that they should all individually go to F____ and tell F____ that they did not think
the reassignment was fair. The workers continued to complain but with the exception of L____ did not take any action. L____ staged a small protest by refusing to work trayline one day saying that it was not his job. Anna, contrary to her statement, rejected the action of lodging a complaint directed toward F____ without going through her. L____ suffered shame as Anna made it clear through verbal and physical signs that she felt L____ had stepped beyond his rights as a worker. Anna's statements tended to preclude any possible support other dietary workers may have given L____, leaving L____ without a chance of success. L____ had to withdraw from his position, although he maintained it long enough to prove his point to the department without incurring managerial sanctions.

This incident was clearly inconsistent with earlier descriptions of the power of Anna and her relationship with F____. One of two explanations could be suggested. Either Anna actually supported F____ and was trying to cover her support while interacting with her co-workers or F____ was firmly committed to the policy of shifting workers to trayline. Despite Anna's charismatic authority, she was on a hierarchical level below that of F____. Anna may have told the workers to make individual statements, but did not mean for it to be taken seriously. The suggestion by Anna may have been intended to halt discussion on this particular subject. Anna, nevertheless, was able to avoid any diminishment of her prestige.

Supervisors appointed by management felt more associated with management than the workers and would not carry complaints to the department head. Instead they tended to side with management and to
tell the workers that they had no grounds for complaining.

Management, when dealing with the informally powerful worker often gave that worker a small part in decision-making by allowing him to influence minor decisions. Slight influence tended to enhance the powerful worker in his own eyes and in the eyes of his co-workers. In return for being allowed into the departmental administration, the worker was frequently assigned the task of reporting management's decisions concerning the workers to the departmental employees. In this way, the powerful worker could be made to take the brunt and often some of the heat of unpopular decisions. Of course, informal leaders could side with the workers and oppose certain decisions, but the leader was nevertheless associated with the decision. This association was much stronger for supervisors who derived their power from management rather than from the workers. These persons could not easily side with the workers since they depended on the goodwill of management for their position.

Sue had been given her power by management and was appointed by F___ to make out the schedule for the part-time employees. Sue had to abide by guidelines laid down by F___ and often the direct orders of F___. However, the names were written on the schedule by Sue and it was Sue who took the complaints when anyone had to work a day he or she had wanted off.

Reality of Recognized Power

The power of a superordinate is as great as the subordinates perceive it to be. The subordinates will adjust their actions and
grant deference in accordance with their perceptions of the power.

If a superordinate is perceived to be powerful, he will be so treated and his influence will be equally great. If a superordinate feels that he should be more powerful in an interaction with subordinates than his present situation, he may take steps to convince his subordinates that he should be treated as having more power.

One of the most frequently used strategies at the hospital was to present oneself as a representative of a recognized powerful person. This was similar to status by association except in such an instance the individual was not trying to change his identification but only invoke the power of another person separate from himself. If nurses or ward clerks were denied something they wanted, they would claim that Doctor Z had ordered it. This was generally sufficient since most workers were not willing to risk a confrontation with a physician.

---

7Mauksch (1970: 190) looking largely at the medical side of the hospital felt the actual running of the hospital to be in the hands of those who were continuously present on front stage, the nurses. The nurses were both deputies to the physician and representatives of the administration. In such a situation, the nurses view themselves as the group who really runs the hospital and have reacted by attempting to arrogate power to themselves. Habenstein (1970: 116) also notes the tendency of lower status occupations attempting to usurp the "higher status tasks of another occupation whose higher prestige has been long established." In the case of the hospital of my research, the nurses made demands on others for the presumed benefit of the patients—demands which were typically the right of physicians. When employees hesitated in responding to the demands of the nurses, they invoked the authority of a physician to support their demand.

8The physicians based their authority upon their position in the hospital and deference received from the hospital administration. The physicians claimed professional autonomy in treatment of their patient. Their presence was also vital for the hospital to obtain its ideal goal of patient treatment. The hospital, in order to encourage
Meaning of Power

Power was meaningful to workers only so far as it could be used as currency in acquiring other goals. If it could not be used to gain a higher wage for oneself or a few favors from subordinates or inclusion in decision making, then power was useless, in fact the worker would hardly recognize its existence if all that could be done was pass orders on to subordinates.

To many workers, money symbolized a tangible measure of power. This feeling was based on a popular belief in the hospital at the time of the research at least that, with enough money, a person could have or do anything he desired.

By contrast, influence was an intangible measure of power. The head of the housekeeping department once told me that his motivation was based on an interest in power. He wanted a job in a hospital administration even if he didn't make more money. It was noteworthy that he used the word power and not influence, status or any other

 privileges paid included free steak dinners at regular intervals, choice parking, separate dining facilities, but most important the power to give orders to any hospital employee including middle management and below.

There was an indication the various hospitals in the city competed for the favors of physicians sending patients to one hospital rather than another. It goes without saying, hospitals were economically dependent upon patients and it was generally the physician and not the patient who selected the hospital. One of the arguments raised in support of this (my) hospital constructing a new building at a different location was "doctors don't like to come here after dark," due to the area of the city in which the old structure was located.
term. Another member of middle management once said of two of his colleagues that they played "the power game." He said he had seen enough of this type of people in the military and did not want any part of it.

The quest for power in one form or another existed in a number of workers. It is difficult to locate an empirical referent as to why power was desired. One might speculate that the motivation for power grew out of a desire to be able to tell others what to do instead of being told what to do. As one worker put it, he wanted a job where he would be "paid for what (he) knew, not for what (he) did."

For the informally powerful person, power was a quality acquired through a series of trades with both other workers and with management. In many respects, power was a favor relationship involving deference and reciprocity.

Summary

Several types of authority existed in the hospital. There were two methods of acquiring authority. Though different, both were important. One method was through rational-legal authority, the other was charismatically based authority. A person who held a considerable amount of charismatic authority would tend to be given formal authority.

Workers who could achieve a degree of power were able to establish some independence from the demands of the organization. Employees who lacked a recognized basis of power often tried to present themselves as agents of authoritative persons acting as an agent of a
higher status person and of "borrowing prestige."

Chapters VI and VII will examine the effects of change upon the favor networks and arrangements of deference and power.
PART III

CHANGE
CHAPTER VI
CHANGE WITHIN NETWORKS

Change Through Interaction

Favor networks were not static but continually shifted in membership, interpersonal relations, and intensity of contacts. There were three general types of events facilitating the expansion of favor networks beyond one's co-workers. They were contacts with outsiders doing business inside the hospital, contact with members of one's own occupation in other institutions and contact with other persons in the hospital through transfer to another department.

There were a number of different persons from the outside making routine contact with hospital employees. Two general classifications were deliverymen and salesmen. The deliverymen were interested in the organization only to the extent that it was a designated point to unload their goods. The salesmen, by contrast, were seeking to impress certain persons and thereby gain sales.

The deliverymen would sometimes try to manipulate persons they came in contact with for personal favors, such as a free cup of coffee or assistance in unloading the truck. The deliverymen paid for these favors with small but useful return favors to the receiving clerk.

One trucker liked to take a coffee break when he arrived at the hospital. In exchange for this privilege, he would not try to "sneak" any defective goods past the receiving clerk. This allowed the
receiving clerk to relax and engage in conversation with the trucker without having to spend as much time inspecting the merchandise as he otherwise would. Another trucker dealing in perishable foods frequently gave the receiving clerk extra products off of his truck in return for the clerk's giving minor assistance in unloading his truck.

Some deliverymen also provided links for occupational networks among workers of different organizations. Many of the workers in the dietary department had been employed elsewhere in town and, likewise, many former employees of the hospital were currently employed elsewhere. Several of the routemen who had been working the same route for years knew many of these people. These routemen were often the source of information about how a former co-worker was "getting along" or what was happening at other places in town, including whether or not job openings existed.¹

The salesmen, on the other hand, were seeking sales and frequently seemed to operate on the assumption that the sales would come easier if they did favors for key persons in the organizational purchasing process. One salesman took one of the purchasing agents out to eat once a week; another took the same agent out to eat every month or so. Practically all companies distributed "free samples" which were often personally useful to persons involved in purchasing.

It was not unknown for purchasing agents and salesmen to get together

¹One of these "permanent" deliverymen was black and would frequently exchange news of the black community with one of the cooks, who was also black.
and sell the "free samples" to the organization for a profit to be divided between themselves.

Purchasing officials and management personnel often came to expect favors from the salesman as part of the sales pitch. A salesman who did not deliver favors was considered "a cheap skate" or to be representing a "tight" company. Juan once informed the department head that a particular coffee distributor would not provide free containers for the coffee grounds in the vending machines. The department head felt that the containers should be provided since all coffee used in the hospital was bought from this company. Juan was told to check with a competing company, that the department head thought provided free containers, to obtain a price quote for their coffee.

On another occasion, a district official of the food service management company told a salesman that if "you help us (the food service company), set up this account (referring to the transition from hospital control of dietary to control of dietary by the food service), we will remember your company for it." The official reminded the salesman that the food service managed several hospitals in the area.

Favors between members of the same occupations who were employed in different hospitals often occurred. There were many hints of these favors occurring in the medical area, but this researcher has no direct evidence. It was, however, known that a favor network existed among several of the purchasing agents at different hospitals in the city. If a particular hospital ran out of a needed item that
could not be gotten as needed from a local purveyor, the purchasing
agent could save himself the difficulty of telling a physician he
did not have the item by borrowing it from another hospital. The
usual understanding was that the receiving hospital would replace
the borrowed item with an equal amount of the same item as soon as it
acquired its own supply. In such an exchange, money was not involved
and only minimal paperwork was utilized. This paperwork was only to
keep everyone honest and it was doubtful if notice of the transaction
ever reached the desk of an administrator.

Contact with other persons in other departments occurred
naturally following a transfer of an employee from one department to
another. When a person was transferred, he seldom lost his contacts
in the former department, but merely added the contacts of workers in
his new department. Transfer would cause change in the former rela-
tionships by decreasing the number and intensity of interactions, but
the potential for interaction would continue as would gratitude for
former acts. This situation assumes that the transferee, as was the
typical case, was not transferring due to incompatibility with other
members of that department but was transferring in an attempt to
further his own career or to increase the desirability of his work or
income.

Juan transferred from the purchasing department to the dietary
department and frequently used contacts with former department members
to acquire goods and services for his new department. This placed
Juan in a "better light" with his new bosses. In return, Juan
arranged for lessening pressure upon his former co-workers since his
new position was one which could generate much of that pressure.

After the food service company took over the dietary department, Juan aided the new manager in acquiring a number of desired items from the purchasing department, including a set of shelving. The new production manager wanted additional shelves installed in dietary without waiting for a requisition to go through proper channels and to be approved by the administration. Juan contacted the purchasing agent who had been his former boss. The purchasing agent responded by having a set of shelves delivered to dietary in a matter of hours.

On other occasions Juan returned favors to purchasing. For example, before the arrival of the food service company, all purchases for dietary had to go through purchasing. Occasionally, a shipment of products to dietary would be delayed for various reasons, in such case Juan could choose not to report the delay to F____. When F____ was aware of a delay, she sometimes applied pressure to purchasing either by calling purchasing on the telephone or dropping hints to administrators that the service provided by purchasing was less than satisfactory.2 Several other workers transferred departments while retaining contacts with their former department members.

2"To be able to make a person wait is to possess the capacity to modify his conduct in a manner congruent with one's own interests. To be delayed is . . . to be dependent . . . ." By virtue of this dependency, the person who can force another to wait finds himself confirmed in his position of power. However, the server had better decide to serve the waiting person before the latter decides to leave or take some other action in which case the server has not confirmed his power (Schwartz, 1974: 844-5).
Expansion and Contraction of Networks

Transfer could result in an expansion of the number of personal relationships a person was involved in, providing him with increased opportunities for favors. The transfers could result in a changed relationship with various goods being exchanged by the bond being retained.

The effect of expanding favor relationships beyond the worker's department provided a broader network upon which to draw. This situation was not one that occurred immediately but developed over time until it was recognizable. Such an expansion allowed the worker a number of options, not the least of which was the dispensing with favor relationships which were the least rewarding. The expansion of relationships allowed the employee additional latitude in his interactions as well as an opportunity to be increasingly selective of recipients of favors without removing himself from the active favor system. Bill after transferring out of dietary severed most of the favor relationships he had held with members of the department. However, he maintained a favor relationship with the morning cooks who could provide him with a 6:00 A.M. breakfast. Bill was able to provide the cooks with information as to the location of certain items in the dietary storeroom before the storeroom personnel came to work since he had once worked there.

Contraction of favor networks in particular areas could be considered in two categories. The first was appropriately described in exchange theory terms in that a relationship dissolved when there was
no longer sufficient gain to justify a continuation. The second was best described as the result of conflict between individuals.

Insufficient gains from favors were usually the result of either organizational promotion or promotion in the informal system by one's associates. Both types of promotion had the result of moving an actor into a position, thus affording greater control of goods plus larger returns in terms of both deference and material favors. Promotion tended to increase the number of possible contacts allowing newly promoted workers an opportunity to obtain the same favor from several other persons. Furthermore, the employee was apt to feel that a favor given to a person at his level or a higher level could initiate a favor relationship which could be beneficial to his chances of further recognition by higher status persons. This produced a dilemma for the charismatic leader. While charismatic authority was generated from workers beneath the leader, formalization of that authority lay with higher status persons.

Anna needed to maintain favor relations with workers below her to maintain a power base, at the same time in order for her power to be legitimized she needed to provide management with favors. Such a position left her extremely vulnerable to attacks by workers who suspected that the loyalty of Anna was directed more toward management than themselves. One worker bluntly stated, "She shits on you, so I'm going to shit on her." To my knowledge, such statements were never made to Anna's face and in fact, this particular disaffected worker was quite affable in personal contacts with Anna,
Status Change

Promotion itself could produce changes in quality of former relations. As a person moved from one status to another, his perception of the situation changed because he viewed the situation differently and associated with others in different role relationships. A relationship between equals may become one of superordinate to subordinate or a superordinate to subordinate relationship may become one of near equals. The exchange of a subordinate role for a superordinate role seemed to make an actor more sympathetic to the problems of management and less sympathetic to those of the workers. In a sense, his identity shifted to one of decision maker or at least involved in the process. The input into an organization in terms of helping to develop a policy appeared to increase identification with and defense of that policy.

Glaser and Strauss present status change in the imagery of status passage with a passagee and an agent directing the passage. Usually the passage is charted by duly authorized people acting as agents of an organization, group, or institution. In the course of a passage both competition and cooperation can arise among passagees, between passagee and agent, or between passagees and others. The status change may be either voluntary or forced. The direction and time span of the passage defines its pattern. Whether the direction continues in one way depends on perceptions of the situation by both agent and passagee and respective decisions from their respective perceptions and mutual interaction. Either the agent or the passagee may cause the reversal of the direction of a passage (within their powers) if their perception of the situation changes. Other actors around the passagee change their behaviors toward the passagee as the passage progresses through a status passage. The change of status is a process of interaction, changing perceptions of the respective actors effected directly or indirectly, and changing behavior by the passagee as well as those interacting with the passagee (Glaser and Strauss, 1971: 27-123).
An example of favor relations changing with status change was demonstrated when Kathy rose in status. Kathy had associated strictly with trayline workers and had been critical of management until she received a clerical job in the office. After this, her association revolved largely around Donna, an office worker, Paula a dietitian, and a few selected workers who were her friends. Her critical comments became more specific and were largely directed at K____ and Sue. When the food service company arrived, Kathy like many other employees, directed criticism at the newcomers. This lasted slightly over two months and ceased about the time she told me that she preferred the food service company to F____, as a boss. After this shift, Kathy directed her criticism at F____, K____, and Sue, while she defended the management company. Several months later, the food service company again raised Kathy's status to a position which could be described as statistical clerk and receptionist, enabling her to work directly with the new department head and the manager. After this promotion, she very much identified with the food service company and tended to see departmental problems from their perspective and was critical of opponents to or critics of the new management.

Kathy's shift of support to the food service company was largely a result of favors rendered for her which she returned in the form of deference and support. Kathy was a smoker, while F____ objected to cigarettes and especially smoking in the office. Under F____, Kathy would periodically go to the "back porch" or the dining room to smoke. After the management company took over operations, smoking in the office was initiated by both the new department head and the manager.
who were not inclined to pay deference to F____ by smoking elsewhere. The new manager discovered Kathy’s smoking habit and began placing an ashtray on her desk. Kathy took the hint and began smoking in the office. F____ retaliated by removing the ashtray when Kathy was not at her desk. The ashtray battle continued for several days before F____ gave up losing not only the ban on smoking but Kathy as a supporter.

Kathy, however, was undoubtedly influenced by other factors in addition to being allowed to smoke in the office. Approximately two weeks earlier, Paula had publicly declared her support for the food service company. Paula’s announcement was followed closely by an indication from Donna that she could "live with" the food service company. The shift of these two significant others probably hastened and reinforced Kathy’s perspective.

When I arrived in the dietary department, I associated with the workers, but very little with Anna. As time went on, I began interacting more with Anna and less with the other workers in the same work context. After the food service company reorganized the department, I interacted almost entirely with Anna and the new manager while dealing with work problems. With my increase in status, I had acquired an assistant who interacted largely with the workers. This assistant interacted with Anna and the new manager through myself. In essence, I had begun by having favor relations with the workers. These were gradually replaced with favor relations with higher status persons. Since my position was dependent largely on Anna at first and the food service company later, I did not need to maintain favor
relations with the workers to secure my position as Anna did. After
the arrival of the food service and reorganization of the department,
I needed only to deal with a half dozen key people. Thus my former
favor relationships could be phased down. However, I did not sever
these relations, but retained them as potential bonds for future
favors, particularly in the area of communication. Anna, on the other
hand supervised a number of other employees and based her claim for
authority upon their acceptance of her as holding authority. My
assistant tended to establish favor relations with the same people
with whom I had decreased relations.

Conflict

Favor relationships were severed in the case of open conflict
between employees. Most conflicts, however, were minor and did not
have lasting effects. Thus the break up of favor exchange was
usually temporary. But in the rare case of serious and protracted
conflict, the cessation of favors was permanent. Bill and Sue fre-
quently came into conflict as to whether or not Sue had jurisdiction
over Bill. During these periods of conflict, favors between them
ceased. A more permanent cessation came between Kathy and F____.
When Kathy sided with the management company against F____ as noted
earlier, she ceased providing F____ with any favors, whereas prior,
Kathy had performed occasional favors for F____.

Contraction of the favor network occurred in both qualitative
terms of decreasing the importance of a relationship and quantitative
reduction of the intensity of a relationship. Contraction usually
meant the shift of attention from one set of persons to another while retaining the bonds with the former largely on the basis of gratitude. As I shifted my attention first toward Anna and later toward both Anna and the new manager, I decreased my favor ties with the dining room. When favors occurred between the dining room and myself, they were less frequent and involving less effort. Occasional gratitude favors occurred, but they were done only at the convenience of the giver, neither of us went out of our way to perform a favor for the other.

Changes in favor relationships were not necessarily a rational pattern of action seeking to aid in personal advancement. Changing relationships were frequently the result of changing statuses. A changed status tended to effect the direction of change in a favor relationship.

Summary

Favor networks change through expansion and contraction, while different actors shift into and out of endpoints of social links. These processes are particularly effected by changes in the makeup of one's favor network, by shifts in the status one holds, and by transfers from one department to another. Favor relationships can also change as a result of conflict or an awareness of insufficient rewards returned to an actor for efforts exerted by him.

Chapter VII considers change that is caused by outside forces which result in a remolded situation.
Change Through External Forces

Important in the idea of change in the discussion of favors is the dependency of favor networks upon the situation and the perspective from which members view that situation. The kind of change discussed in the previous chapter was largely in terms of change in status and perception. This chapter views the effects of change imposed on the work setting by new elements imposed on that setting.

The simplest change came in the form of a new management person who attempted to impose her views on the dietary department and to produce change. In early 1973, two new dietitians were hired, the first, D__, in January and the second, E__ in April after D__ left. D__ was "just out" of college and had a number of ideas about how food should be served to patients. E__, on the other hand, was middle aged and had worked on several jobs. She did not see herself so much as a "professional" as D__ did. E__ tended to go along with prior management policy in her interaction with workers, while D__ tended toward more autonomy. For the workers, D__'s attempts to change, caused confusion as to what should be done. Most tended to favor conservative approaches in continuing the old routines without change. They were familiar with past
expectations. One trayline supervisor reported that she had not liked D___. "She was going to change the whole hospital and the people too. V____ (a former dietitian) changed a lot of things, but she did it differently, she would say 'Now I think it would be better this way' and everybody would go along with her. E____ is older and more secure, she's not trying to change everything. I like her."

D____ was not accepted by the employees whereas E____ received much better acceptance. Involved were the different attitudes toward change and the different ages of the dietitians. Age frequently carried status with it, and apparently the workers felt that an older person should be more knowledgeable. One might suggest that change imposed on workers was more apt to receive a favorable response from an older person than a younger one. This was due to the workers emphasizing experience over education as a vehicle to status. A reason for this was that their own status possibilities were tied to experience because most of them did not have education beyond high school.

Food Service

During the course of this research, two major forces of change were introduced into the situation. The first largely effected the purchasing and dietary departments and was produced by the bringing in of a food service company to manage the dietary department. There were two outsiders who came as full-time personnel, a director who was designated department head, and a manager. In addition, six other managerial persons spent considerable time aiding in the reorganization
of the dietary department. The first major change was to shift F___ from department head to assistant department head.

Following the arrival of the food service there were a number of revisions in departmental organization, of job descriptions as well as patterns of who interacted with whom and in what particular order. The revision of interaction patterns effected many of the favor relations and their resulting power positions. Many people had difficulty readjusting to the changed situation and everyone required time to make the necessary new adjustments. The most apparent was F___, undoubtedly due to the lowering of her status and to her transfer to a different organizational arrangement of the department.

F___ had been in the habit of giving orders. After the arrival of the food service management she was no longer the organizational superior in the department. She still tended to issue orders as had been her right and responsibility in the past. Many of F___'s orders were followed under the new system, but many were not. Sue followed F___ because her power was dependent upon her favor relationship with F___.

A few others followed F___, the data show that these people continued their loyalty for a combination of factors: they were familiar with the expectations of F___, they were in the habit of taking orders from F___, held favor relationships with F___, as Sue had, or they felt sorry for F___ having to take a demotion.

While F___ was attempting to continue the role of department head, giving orders from a desk in the office, the experienced food service outsiders were working with the employees, teaching them the new system as well as "providing an extra pair of hands." As time
passed, F became a gradually receding figure and it became apparent that the food service company, not F, had to be satisfied by employees. The new management established the effectiveness of distance between F and the employees and sought to formalize this distance by assigning F to oversee only the trayline, while defining the kitchen and dining room as off limits to her. The new food service manager even tried to prevent F from talking to these workers. The food service company then directed efforts toward winning the good will of the personnel in the kitchen and dining room. F was then assigned to work certain days on the trayline, a task she had never performed as department head. The effects of status degradation produced a personality change in F, and she reacted to her new trayline assignment by shouting at the other workers on the trayline, producing an alienation. 1

The food service had chosen the kitchen and the dining room

1Gouldner found in a case study of miners that a new manager was caught in a tangle of interrelated problems: 1) To increase efficiency. 2) As a necessary condition for the first, he needed to control or eliminate inherited supervisors. 3) He needed, also to solve the first, to handle resistance among rank and file workers. 4) He had to cope with mounting tension arising out of the situational definition of his test in increasing efficiency. The new manager could solve these four problems either by acting upon and through the informal system of relations or by utilizing the formal system of organization. The informal system is often closed to the manager since he does not have the interpersonal contacts among the employees, nor was he aware of the background and networks of relationships, nor did he share the same goals with the workers. The workers often preferred indulgence while the manager had to seek efficiency (Gouldner, 1954: 83-85). In this hospital, the new manager often attempted to use the informal system while the new department head used the formal organization system to move F out of power and reorganize the department.
workers as crucial to their establishment of effective control over the department. Support by the kitchen workers was necessary in order to achieve the goals of quality food in enough quantity at the right time (see pages 137-8). Support of the dining room personnel was needed because it was these people who met the hospital administrators and physicians. Administrators' opinions of the job the food service company was performing could be shaped by the public image presented to them.

Those workers who quickly moved to support the food service company as legitimate managers were rewarded with increased authority. Juan, Anna, and Gail were three who did. Juan's support was rewarded with an eventual fifty percent wage increase and a supervisory position. Anna was reaffirmed as head cook and became the unofficial chief advisor to the manager on matters involving cooking. Gail was officially named dining room supervisor. An exception was Jane who

\(^2\)One method of attempting to sway workers away from F___ was through monetary offers by the new management. The former department head tended to give raises haltingly. The new food service manager on several occasions expressed dismay at the low wages being paid. He began requesting maximum raises (see Chapter I on the wage rating system) for most employees as their "anniversary date" came up. He expected this to improve the morale, but the result of the liberalized raises was to encourage more discontent over wages and cause an increase in threats and complaints. When Anna's job description was rewritten to give her more money, she conducted negotiations over the question of how much more by turning in her resignation. The resignation was withdrawn only after her salary demands had been sufficiently met. Another worker had two promotions (change of job descriptions) in as many months, but reacted by wanting more; this worker had not complained a great deal about wages previously. This seemed to be a demonstration of the theory of rising expectations by Crane Brinton, Alexis de Tocqueville, and others.
expressed support of the food service company prior to Anna. However, Jane was rewarded only minimally and with no increase in status. The reasons appeared to center around the relations Jane had with other co-workers and the lack of an image of competence in the eyes of the new management. Concerning the former, as mentioned earlier, Jane occasionally had problems giving directives that would be accepted to other workers. When Anna moved to support the food service company, she made a point to tell Jane to follow the directives of the food service company rather than F____. This action by Anna was representative of the approach she took after her change, attempting to demonstrate her loyalty to the new management and willingness to "bring" other workers to a position of support for the food service management. Anna began to limit her complaints about the food service company to (see page 137) private discussions rather than public statements.

Anna reported that F____ had been "cool to her, she wants me to give them (the food service company) more static than I have been." F____ undoubtedly was aware of Anna's new efforts to marshal support for the new management. Anna one time told a worker who was complaining of the food service company, "Mr. ____ (the manager) is our boss, we're supposed to do what he says."

Two-and-one-half months after the food service company's arrival, one employee of four years who had supported F____ told me, "I don't feel sorry for F____ anymore. It doesn't matter whether I work for [the food service company] or not. At first I thought that it was going to be bad, but I had just let people put that idea in my mind."
The term "to be bad" was heard often in the early months of the food service's new management. Translated, it expressed the workers anxiety and apprehension about having to learn the expectations of new managers and a new system.

This same worker also summed up the past feelings of many of the workers in regard to F___. They had felt sorry for her, but after awhile they could no longer afford to feel sorry, at least not overtly, as it became apparent that the food service company was not going to relinquish control of the scene.

The statement, "I had just let people put that in my mind," was not usual. A worker had shifted support from F___ to the food service company and did not want to be associated with prior lack of support for the food service company. The workers frequently tended to rationalize their first response in this manner.

Furthermore, these workers needed time to accept the different ways of achieving goals that the food service presented and of getting used to taking orders from people other than F___. Many of them, as noted earlier, tended to resist change and new ideas. It was easier to continue the habits of behavior and thought they had developed under the former system. There had to be a certain amount of pressure applied to change patterns which were in existence, especially when the patterns had been well-integrated into the interactions of the persons concerned.

At this hospital, many of the people who accepted the food service company quickly were relative newcomers. The exceptions were Anna and Gail who shortly realized the probable outcome of the contest
between the food service and F____ and lent their respective support to that probable winner. Their support contributed greatly to the objectives of the food service company to wrest control. However, most of the highly integrated employees who, under F____, had placed the heaviest side-bets in the department were the slowest to accept the new management. In fact, many of this latter group never really did support the food service, but opted for transfers to other departments e.g. the nursing home kitchen which was also under the hospital but independent of the food service company, or resigned.\(^3\)

At the time of the arrival of the food service company, nine workers could be identified as having invested heavily of themselves in the previous organization form and method. After one year, five remained, but of these only two, Anna and Gail, were receiving more returns on their investments than prior to the arrival of the food service company. Two had transferred, one had supported the food service but quit due to a power struggle with Anna. One quit who had remained loyal to F____. Of the five who remained, three were supporters of the food service company, one was neutral, and one remained

\(^3\)Schatzman and Bucher (1969) in research on a psychiatric hospital that underwent administrative and ideological change found that the transition of power from the old order to a new order was not a situation of power "given," but rather a process of negotiated shifting, producing a variety of possible outcomes. "Negotiations are most intense and persistent when new ideas are offered in a context of institutional expansion and experimentation, and when they appear to spell progress" (245). Frequently operational leaders became important power brokers in the negotiating process siding with one or the other of the competing parties. Alliances formed around key organizational persons (Schatzman and Bucher, 1969: 231-246).
loyal to F____. 4

Physical Change

Four of the nine persons who had large investments in the old system in the dietary department left within one year of the food service's arrival. However, the food service was not the only stimulant for leaving. It was only the first of two major changes. The second change also stimulated transfers and resignations. It occurred seven months after the arrival of the management service and involved a physical move to a newly constructed hospital structure for most of the hospital employees. The nursing home did not move. These two changes were closely intertwined since preparations for the move, one of which was the change in the dietary department, 5 began about a

4 The arrival of the food service company meant a shake-up in the established system of employee advancement. Several long-time employees were either halted in status increase or suffered degradation of status. Glaser and Strauss (1971: 166) note that blockage of a status passage is likely to result in an "immediate reaction that may include temporary withdrawal of effort, and hostility, apathy, and moroseness." These writers also state that even though status passage may have occurred in a setting with a collective, each individual was concerned with his own passage and tried to obtain the best outcome for himself. The individual's outcome, however, was closely linked to the outcome of his collective (Glaser and Strauss, 1971: 128-140). Thus, Anna and Gail who joined the group supporting the food service early, had a more successful status passage than those who remained with F____. Sue who had enjoyed a great deal of prestige under F____, remained loyal to F____ too long and found her power severely restricted by the food service even though she was allowed to keep the formal title of supervisor. Sue resigned about ten months after the arrival of the new management company. F____, herself left after twelve and a half months under the new management.

5 Glaser and Strauss (1971) found that status passages into relatively unknown areas are difficult to control with routinized prescriptions. When routinized prescriptions cannot be well fitted to the passage, problems develop easily and rumors of trouble spread, and
year prior to the move to the new structure.

The move presented several problems which could have discouraged any number of workers. First, the hospital moved to a site several miles away. This was not convenient for those workers without cars who lived near the old hospital site. Second, and probably more important, the new hospital was built incorporating some of the most modern technological concepts for hospital operation. In many respects, the work was shifting from a largely manual operation to a mechanized one.

With the change in the nature of work came a change in departmental functions and changes in almost every job description. Workers who had been working together no longer saw each other except for an occasional glimpse. Members of two departments who had come to know each other through physical proximity of the departments, found their respective departments widely separated in the new hospital and opportunities for contact correspondingly low.

The result of the changed system of contact resulted in changes in the favor system and other interpersonal understandings. Without opportunities to meet each other frequently, relationships among persons dwindled. Without working together anymore, there was little need
for cooperation between workers and, in fact, there was little chance
that cooperation could occur because of the new equipment, mechanized
techniques, and automated procedures.

A major form of favor at the old hospital was to be able to offer
advice to others on how to perform a task. After the move, the workers
were too busy learning their own jobs to offer anybody advice much less
really be sure of the validity of any advice given. Employees who had
offered much advice at the old hospital were no longer able to do so,
undermining their claim to deference. 6

One may predict that as time goes on, the workers who were
employed in the hospital at the time of the move will come to know
the general procedures of the revised departments. These people that
remain will acquire seniority and valuable experience and become the
high status workers of a few years from now. In many cases, they will
not be the same individuals as the ones who held the high status at
the time of this research. Many of the former elite throughout the
hospital resigned rather than try to learn a new job. Others were
unable to make the transition easily and lost their leadership. It is

6 "Sometimes a passagee and an agent must discover the passage
together" (Glaser and Strauss, 1971: 85). Even though the food
service was supposed to have had knowledge about operating the new
system, many problems developed which had to be worked out from scratch.
In such a situation several of the passagees, myself included, took
advantage of the situation to integrate ourselves into a closer posi-
tion to the agent role held by the food service. "The emergent pass-
age [was] an . . . innovative one . . . both passagee and agent dis-
covering each other's and their own capacities for controlling the
shape of the passage—as they decide on its shape" (Glaser and Strauss,
1971: 85).
a prediction that status in the near future will be measured by
length of employment after the move and overall knowledge of the
department.

One may mention the instance of the cook who had been at the old
hospital for about five years and knew the inner workings of the system
quite well. This cook, after the transfer, was very unsure of handling
the new equipment, not to mention the problems lingering in the after-
math of the transfer of operations to the food service company. Where-

as she had given directives to several people at the old hospital, she
gave directions to no one at the new site and took all orders from
Anna or the manager and advisors brought in temporarily for the
hospital move. In essence, she became equal to the other workers.

Summary

The ways in which the favor system at this hospital were
dependent upon the situation have been shown in this chapter. The
situation could be changed either by internal factors as demonstrated
in Chapter VI or by external decisions as demonstrated in Chapter VII.
Two major external decisions made by the administration were the shift
of management in the dietary department to a food service company and
the decision to move the hospital to a new location. Regardless of
the changes in the situation, the favor networks continued to exist
in only slightly altered form.
CHAPTER VIII
SUMMARY AND PROPOSITIONAL CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This paper has emphasized the interaction processes integral to developing relationships based on favors, deference, and reciprocity in a work setting. The setting was among non-medical workers in a private urban hospital. The perspective of the research and taken by me as observer was that of the lower echelon workers. Therefore, the reader has been presented a view of the hospital social organization from the bottom, the inverse of many organizational studies.

Data were collected by participant observation from which was constructed a model through the use of grounded theory. This model was built from the patterns of interaction and social bonds observed to exist in the hospital. It became useful for understanding the network of social bonds based on the exchange of favors and deference. The model could have served as a device for organizing other data from this setting and further as a suggestion for organization of data from similar situations in other settings.

Favors were acts performed by a person or group of persons for the ostensible benefit of another person or group of persons. Favors were justified on several bases. First, they were practical ways of aiding in the accomplishment of work tasks. Second, they were seen
as ways of compensating for the perceived monetary disadvantages of the lower echelon workers. The latter view of favors were given additional support by generalized perceptions of the actions of status superiors in taking advantage of their superior positions. Regardless of justification, favors developed between workers, not as scattered gifts from one worker to any of various other workers, but as an important aspect of a relationship between actors. This relationship, embedded in favors, emerged as a result of the exchange of favors among actors. Thus, individual relationships were part of favor networks. An actor entering a network adjusted to a normative pattern of expectations which developed out of that relationship. The most important expectation to develop was that of reciprocity. Over time, meaningful gestures, signs, and symbols developed between actors characterizing the expectations and obligations of a specific relationship or set of relationships. Through these relationships any or all of three types of favors—goods, services, or deference—were transmitted.

The development of favor relationships was dependent upon organizational position and the social characteristics of each person in the relationship. Position determined the realm of possible favors and potential interpersonal contact in the normal course of work. Social characteristics included both formal and secondary status as well as personal images of trustworthiness and competence.

The hospital which was the setting of this research had both a formal and informal arrangement of status grounded in patient contact, technical training, personal investment, and the position of information
collector or gatekeeper. Status was rewarded with deference. Some persons were able to develop a deference identity which formed a basis for power and prestige. Persons who accumulated a large amount of informal power tended to be included in the organizational system of authority.

Favor networks were not static, but shifted with changes in the situation. Changes in the history of actors effected favor networks. Such processes as status change, departmental transfer, interpersonal conflict, or an awareness of insufficient rewards returned to an actor for efforts exerted by him were important in this respect. Favor networks were also effected by situational changes produced by external forces. These included administrative decisions to introduce new management in the dietary department and to move the hospital to a new location.

The favor networks appeared to be a result of interaction among employees of this hospital, not the product of a unique situation. This was indicated by the continued but changed networks after situational changes had occurred. The networks were, however, dependent for form upon the situation by virtue of who was apt to interact with which others, which services would be sought, and from definitions of informal status.
Propositions

The use of grounded theory generated a number of patterns concerning the favor networks in this hospital and the resulting relationships of deference, power, and authority. These patterns were the skeletal structure of the model which emerged from this research. These patterns have been converted into propositional statements. The first group of propositions refers to interaction among persons holding different levels of status and power, reflecting the importance of position and perceived situation.

1. Subordinates became sensitized to many signs made by the superordinates which were perceived as being degrading to the subordinates. This was particularly true of the relations between lower echelon workers and physicians.

1 The scope of this thesis was limited to a particular hospital, therefore no statement can be made about the ability of these propositions to be generalized. However, these propositions are capable of being tested in other situations to determine the extent of their generalization. An effort to test these propositions must occur in an organization with some type of bureaucratic structure and must take the viewpoint of the lower echelon worker. Testing could be conducted either through participant observation, interview, or questionnaire techniques. Participant observation of a non-hospital setting would be most valuable providing comparative case studies which could delineate similarities and differences in favor exchange and deference patterns in a hospital setting opposed to a non-hospital setting. An interview schedule or questionnaire could be developed from the model and propositions generated from research in this particular hospital. The interview or questionnaire would be most valuable in considering other hospital settings and as an aid to determine the extent that favor exchange and deference patterns are effected by variations in formal organization and hospital size. Usage of interviews and questionnaires would serve to establish the universality of these propositions. Studies of other settings could provide limitations for these propositions while allowing the nature of the relationship between positions, favors, deference, and power to be specified.
2. Given two status groups widely separated by social distance and social power and authority, there was a lack of knowledge of the identities of individuals in one group by members of the other group. Therefore, perception by an actor of behavior by members of a group other than the actor's own was based on generalized images of that other group. These images determined how actions by members of the other group would be understood and the intentions that would be attributed to those actions. This was shown in the relationship between lower echelon workers and members of the administration and physicians. This fact was invoked by the food service management company to separate F____ from the dietary employees.

3. As social distance increased and power differential became greater and knowledge of personal identities became vague between two actors, the less the chance of a favor relationship forming. The less powerful person would fear being taken advantage of while the more powerful person would tend to feel the rewards insufficient for the continuation of the exchange of favors.

4. When an exchange did develop between persons of divergent status, it was often in terms of an exchange of deference for a favor. The lower status actor gave deference to the higher status actor in return for favors of either goods or services.

5. When persons of divergent status wanted to exchange favors, they tended to try to equalize their status by seeking some basis for raising the status of the lower person. Status could be raised through several techniques: by prestige borrowing, by emphasizing a secondary status, or by allowing the lower status person to act as
an agent for a superordinate who was equal in prestige to the higher status person in the proposed exchange.

6. The employee tended to rationalize participation in favors by pointing to the actions of superiors using their power for personal advantage or emphasizing perceived injustices, such as low wages.

The second group of propositions identify the mechanics of favor relationships in terms of obligations and expectations placed upon the actor engaged in favor exchange.

7. There was a norm of reciprocity that a favor received by an actor had to be repaid in some way to the giver.

8. When the costs of a favor relationship became too high for a particular actor, he might signal a desire to change the relationship by breaking the norm of reciprocity.

9. The receiver of a favor owed the giver a debt of gratitude which remained after the repayment of a favor by another favor.

10. Gratitude could be repaid by deference.

11. The debt of gratitude remained as a residue after a favor relationship was disbanded. This gratitude served as a basis for continued contact between former participants in a favor relationship as well as justifying possible future favors.

The third group of propositions consider favor exchange in the context of social networks. The use of networks combines the elements of formal position, informal status, and the changeable nature of favor relationships.

12. Favors occurred between individuals developing social bonds between these actors.
13. The various social bonds between actors based on favors served as links in favor networks.

14. Favor networks may be viewed from perspectives, as personal networks considering only social links directly involving a particular actor or as a "macro-perspective," with actors occupying endpoints of numerous interconnected social links as members of the same network.

15. Social networks were constantly changing as situations changed and as individual actors broke or established social bonds with other actors.

16. Social networks served to define the situation in which exchanges occurred and to develop the rules for those exchanges. Obligations were internalized by an actor and expectations were placed on others through interaction in favor networks.

17. Social networks served also to transmit information and images among employees. Images could serve as an information base if two workers who did not know the identities of each other found it necessary to exchange a favor.

The fourth group of propositions construct the relationship between deference as a type of favor and power. The elements contributing to power and its resulting formalization were identified.

18. Deference developed as a form of exchange for favors.

19. Deference was a reward for the perception of competence of a worker in a particular activity.

20. Informal status could be developed into prestige and power which could be rewarded by additional deference.
21. Informal power was seen in terms of charismatic leadership which tended to require formal recognition by including the holder of charismatic authority into the organizational authority system.

22. The perception of prestige which required deference served to make organizational officials who could claim such an attribute more powerful than their colleagues who lacked prestige.

23. Workers who managed to develop power might profit not only from the rewards of deference favors from other workers, but may be able to require some deference from superordinates. This deference from organizational superiors tends to provide the employees with some independence in their jobs.

24. Workers were more apt to give deference on the basis of seniority and/or experience than education. It was probable that this was because their own claims to status would be based on the same factors of seniority and/or experience.

The fifth set of propositions deal with the expansion and contraction of favor networks effected by the situation.

25. Personal favor networks may change as a result of departmental transfers of employees, promotion, or interpersonal conflict.

26. Favor networks frequently expanded beyond the boundary of the organization, often involving occupational colleagues at other establishments or business contacts.

27. Favor networks were effected by external changes in management or a physical change in the location of the organization.

28. Favor networks could become important in helping to define status relations in new situations. The case of the change in
management in dietary illustrated how favor networks could be motivated by individual actors to increase the status of the initiating actors.

29. Despite the changed situation and the changed shape of favor networks, the exchange of favors continued as an important pattern of interaction. However, the changed situation produced a redefinition of informal status to meet the needs in a new setting with a new management.

This hospital had several strands of social organization linking the employees together. One of the more important of these strands was the favor network. The patterns of favors, including deference, illustrated the informal status system based upon perceptions and assessments by employees of their co-workers. The patterns of deference illustrated the patterns of work association and prestige. The flexibility of these favor and deference networks demonstrated the emergent nature of social organization and the responsiveness of social organization to situational change.

This paper does not seek to generalize its findings to other settings than the hospital in which the study was done. However, it should be reiterated that favor relationships were found to exist not only among employees of this hospital, but also among employees of the food service management company. Favor relationships were also found to exist in interaction between hospital employees and outsiders, such as with salesmen and deliverymen. There were strong indications of favor networks existing within occupations crossing organizational boundaries such as among the hospital purchasing agents of this city.
and physicians. Interaction involving favors also occurred between organizations or organizations and individuals. The data support the general sociological proposition that networks producing both favor exchange and relations of deference and power are a general phenomenon of social organization.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

Methodology

This research project was conducted over a twenty-three month period beginning five months after my employment at the hospital. All data were gathered and the vast part of analysis was completed during this tenure. This paper as a description of my data and analysis was written immediately following my voluntary resignation. Neither the seeking of employment in the hospital nor its conclusion were related to the goals or purposes of this research project.

For the first several months of employment there was no conscious attempt to link sociological theory with the events occurring in the work setting. I was as any other worker, caught up in a work routine and thinking in departmental terms, and largely because this was the encouraged way of survival, holding the job and getting along with co-workers. A new employee found himself in a process of selective socialization to the new situation confronting him. The new employee was expected to interact largely with other members of his department and especially those departmental members who held statuses similar to his own. It was through this interaction process that the new employee learned the expectations of his role, learned the generalized departmental opinions of other departments, learned who were the acceptable scapegoats for mistakes, and learned what outside groups held power
over the actions of the department. The new employee learned what was classified information to be discussed only among other departmental members. Generally classified information was that which involved an error made in the work task of the department. Gradually I became aware of patterns of interaction and situational meanings which became of sociological interest to me.

Grounded Theory

The technique employed was that called participant observation dealing with qualitative data.

The participant observer gathers data by participating in the group or organization he studies. He watches people he is studying to see what situations they ordinarily meet and how they behave in them. He enters into conversation with some or all of the participants in these situations and discovers their interpretations of the events he has observed (Becker, 1972: 189).

As I shifted from participant to participant observer, I concentrated more on the situations and events effecting others, rather than those concentrated exclusively on "me." The interpretations that others made and the meanings that others gave to events were more sought after, while tending to restrict more the public expressions of my own interpretations. My interpretations involving first-hand experience of many of the events observed provided additional information to be considered with observed data. It was out of first-hand experience and observation of interaction that the research sought to convey a particular type of reality.

\footnote{For a detailed discussion of this process, see Erving Goffman, \emph{Presentation of Self in Everyday Life}, 1959, especially the section on Teams.}
The strong suit of the qualitative researcher is his ability to provide an orderly presentation of rich, descriptive detail . . . an accurate picture of patterns and phenomenological reality as they are experienced by human beings in social capacities (Lofland, 1971: 59).

Through active participation the observer may become immersed in the entire situation and become aware of the many factors and pressures effecting behavioral patterns. At the same time, behavior patterns become a part of a continual scheme of development and interaction.

In turning to participation, we focus directly upon the person as a unit, upon holistic patterns of involvement they have in a social setting . . . elements of actors' personal styles can enter the sociological picture (Lofland, 1971: 31).

The goal, then, was to understand relationships among actors, events, and situations.

The implication of seeking an understanding was an unstructured process of data gathering. Which data were important was determined by the context of the situation and the interworking of events which produced natural themes around which to organize the data. By allowing the research to follow the natural course of events "the broadly cast net of observations and interviews of participant observation maximizes the possibility of finding unexpected facts which in turn suggest new interpretations of human behavior" (Pearsall, 1972: 347).

The possibility of creativeness and serendipity occurring in the research project was maximized. When themes were allowed to develop from the data, relationships the researcher could not imagine prior to entry into the field developed. The potential for new ideas was maximized.
Participant observation by necessity avoids tightly structured theories and conventional hypotheses based on preconceived theory:

... we shall regard qualitative research ... as a strategy concerned with the discovery of substantive theory ... observation is quickly accompanied by hypothesizing ... these integrated hypotheses immediately provide a central core of theorizing which helps the researcher to develop related hypotheses as well as to prune away those not related (Glaser and Strauss, 1972: 289-290).

Glaser and Strauss have applied the term "grounded theory" to the process used for building theory empirical data. The researcher took to the field ideas inherent in his training to guide the early collection of data. However, all presumptions defining categories and classifications were considered tentative. The research sought gradually to develop categories and classes out of the setting itself based upon the data. Inherent was a lengthy process of seeking classes and links between classes until an "ever increasing density of linkages" developed an indication of a key linkage (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973: 110). This key linkage was a "metaphor, model, overriding pattern" which provided a "grounded key upon which to build the theory" (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973: 111).

Classes were organized around the key linkage and the data collection process reorganized to concentrate upon the propositions set forth by the grounded key. As more data were collected it became apparent that new categories had to be formed and old ones redefined around a shifted ground.

We can anticipate the researcher will continue shifting his grounds as he creates or changes his classes, until all his presumed classes are displaced by those based upon observation, whether his presumptions
were essentially correct or not. He will then have a set or sets of theoretical classes, tested in experience and amenable to linking and to theory construction (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973: 113).

The validity of these classes was their grounding in the data of the setting and ability to explain and organize logically that came data. Therefore,

... the analytic processes are grounded in the data—where 'grounded' means both interpretation of the data and checking upon that interpretation by the gathering of more data (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973: 117).

The result termed substantive theory was based upon the "concepts and their interrelation into a set of hypotheses for a given substantive area" (Glaser and Strauss, 1972: 288), in this case reciprocity, deference and power relations. The substantive theory determined what formal theories were applicable to the setting. These formal theories proved useful for their sensitizing value in suggesting additional implications of observed relationships to investigate. At the same time the substantive theory was reformulating the formal theory rendering it more applicable to the data and closing the gap between research and theory. The resulting reformulation has been termed "grounded formal theory" (Glaser and Strauss, 1972: 300).

Formal theory further provided useful concepts to be integrated with concepts developed from the linkages. Two other researchers found formal theory useful in a similar manner. Arthur Vidich and Joseph Bensman commented about their work which resulted in Small Town in Mass Society:

Existing theory gave our field work a focus, and we could conduct it along the lines thereby suggested. Theories were helpful in opening our eyes to specific
facts about our problem . . . (Vidich and Bensman, 1968: 388).

To use theory as a guide in suggesting where to look for hypotheses rather than using theory as a source for hypotheses implied the use of many theories that were not carefully connected into an overriding theoretical design. Theories were used unsystematically as they proved useful for explaining the data. Connections between theories were suggested by the data to determine its own theoretical model:

... the functions that unsystematic theory can serve and the conditions under which it can be employed in research: 1) The specifications of possible areas of field work as the researcher leans upon the educated perspective of his predecessors to guide him to important and significant areas of investigation. 2) The criticism of field work while doing it. Alternative perspectives in theory yield alternative perspectives in field observation. 3) The discovery of the limitations of one's original statement of the problem; the continuous discovery of new data compels new formulations of the problem. 4) The discovery of the limitations of one's own theory by its continuous confrontation with empirical observation. 5) The discovery of new dimensions of the problem. 6) The reconstruction of one's problem, field work, and past theory into a further limited and discrete theory to handle the problem (Vidich and Bensman, 1968: 392).

Qualitative analysis attempts to answer "what are the characteristics of a social phenomenon, the forms it assumes, the variations it displays?" (Lofland, 1971: 13). There are four stages of analysis:

1) The selection and definition of problems, concepts, and indices; 2) the check on the frequency and distribution of phenomena; 3) the incorporation of individual findings into a model of the organization under study; 4) The fourth stage . . . involves problems of presentation of evidence and proof (Becker, 1972: 190-1).
As a result of the analysis process, a systematic model was produced which was capable of containing and relating all observed data. The model was acceptable only to the extent that it explained observed data. A model serves to provide a guide for understanding the setting in question and has validity to the extent it accurately conveys the social meanings of actions to outsiders desiring to understand the setting in question.

The analytic framework which emerges from the researcher's collection and scrutiny of qualitative data is 'equivalent to what he knows systematically about his own data. . . . This conviction does not mean that his analysis is the only plausible one that might be based on this data, but only that the researcher himself has high confidence in its credibility. What he has confidence in is not a scattered series of analyses, but a systematic ordering of them into an integrated theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1972: 294).

This "systematic ordering" carries the burden of demonstrating the credibility of the model developed by the research. Any credibility must be based upon a coherent description of the setting and an understanding of the definition of the situation held by the actors in that same setting which is conveyed to any reader.

The problem of conveying credibility is divided into two sub-problems. . . . The first . . . is that of getting readers to understand the theoretical framework . . . second sub-problem is how to describe the social world studied so vividly that the reader can almost literally see and hear its people--but see and hear in relation to the theoretical framework (Glaser and Strauss, 1972: 296).

A problem with all research is that of demonstrating proof. In the use of participant observation where the object is to seek an understanding, one apparent way of offering proof would be to present the data to any interested person in a brief well organized manner
which allows that person to understand the social event under examination. Any interested person could therefore examine the basis of the model as well as the model itself and draw his own conclusions as to whether the data fits the model.

... The problem of how to present proof ... a possible solution ... is a description of the natural history of our conclusions, presenting the evidence as it came to the attention of the observer during the successive stages of his conceptualization of the problem. The term natural history implies not the presentation of every datum, but only the characteristic forms data took at each stage of the research. ... In this way, evidence is assessed as the substantive analysis is presented. ... This would give the reader ... opportunity to make his own judgment as to the adequacy of the proof and the degree of confidence to be assigned the conclusion (Becker, 1972: 199-200).

The Unknown Observer

There are a number of ways in which participant observation can be used; this research was of the type typically referred to as unknown observation. This type, like all other types of research alternatives, has certain peculiar disadvantages, but there are also important advantages. Concerning disadvantages or objections were ethical questions of covert collection of data. But the principle disadvantage would be limitations placed upon the researcher's time spent in actual data collection as well as location. There is

... the matter of the morality of observing and analyzing people without telling them. ... Among observational limitations is the structural constriction of occupying an existing role ... he must necessarily use a good part of his time playing out that role. One is restricted in his time and place location by the terms of his setting-role. ... The range of matters into which one can openly inquire is restricted to those things that members seem appropriate for someone in his role to ask about (Lofland, 1971: §4).
Among advantages were more complete knowledge of a narrow scope of activities, the actual first-hand experience of what it meant to be a part of this situation. Primary was the unmeasurable advantage of continuous contact with respondents providing unobtrusive checks and counter-checks of hypotheses through normal interaction. The unknown observer can be assured that what he has observed was typical behavior, there need be no concern that respondents have adjusted their behavior for the benefit of outside eyes.

Advantages . . . in occupying a particular role, one becomes intimately acquainted with it, providing richer material on that particular role and its involvements that one would have obtained simply as a known observer. . . . Such an observer is more likely to become quite intimate with at least some participants, because he and they will share problems in the terms fixed by the setting itself. . . . Often, occupying an extant role will be the only way in which a setting can be observed (Lofland, 1971: 94).

A comparison of known observation compared to unknown observation was provided by the appearance of a hospital-approved observer in the dietary department. For three days a young female was escorted around the department by the department head's assistants, granted interviews by the managerial elements of the department, shown typed copies of departmental job descriptions, and allowed to inspect selected portions of the departmental files.

On her occasional forays into the work areas of the department, she was given little opportunity to speak with any of the workers; instead, her escort told her about the worker and the position of the worker. It was not known whether the escort's summary of the worker's position was critical to her research, but it was known that the escort
frequently was only vaguely aware of the position and responsibilities of the worker in question. The workers were not introduced to the observer or told of the identity of the observer; they were instead forced to speculate on her identity. She was by association labeled as part of management which inclined workers to modify behavior to make it appropriate for the eyes of management.

On the second day, I managed to find her unescorted and inquired as to the nature of her interest in the department. She explained that she was involved in a research project. Taking a guess, I mentioned that I was a sociology student and asked if her research was related to the same field. Her first reaction was one of surprise followed by an explanation of her project, university that it was connected with, and identity of the project director. The thrust of her research was toward roles and the interrelations of roles. I never knew what resulted from her research.

The question of ethics has been the one most hurled at the unknown observer. But is the unknown observer any less ethical than researchers who misrepresent the implications of their questions or the certainty of their findings?

All research is secret in some ways and to some degree—we never tell the subjects "everything."...the gathering of information will inevitably have some hidden aspects even if one is an openly declared observer. ... 1) The researcher usually does not know everything he is looking for himself when he first starts out and structures his study to some extent as he goes along. 2) The researcher does not want the subjects' behavior influenced by his knowledge of what the observer is interested in. 3) The subjects will not understand all the terms of the research in the same way that the investigator does...social science research cannot be divided into the secret and the non-secret. The
question is rather how much secrecy shall there be with
which people in which circumstances? . . . When we are
carrying out a piece of social science research involving
the behavior of other people, what do we tell whom under

The major question of ethics does not hinge on whether the sub-
jects were aware of being observed, but on the accuracy of reporting
facts about them while not intentionally misleading the respondents
with false information that could modify behavior. Especially in
participant observation, we deal with individuals and their reputa-
tions, even though thinly veiled by name changes. It becomes necessary
to allow these individuals to present themselves as fairly and accurately
as possible, not only due to possible effects on the sociological con-
clusions but for the potential reflective efforts on the individuals
involved. These persons have involuntarily loaned parts of their
lives to a research project. It has to be the responsibility of the
researcher that they have been dealt with fairly and that their actual
identity was concealed as much as possible.

I made every effort not to intentionally provide informants and
subjects with misleading information. Not only would this have been
questionable, but in this case would have produced contaminated data
through disruption of normal behavior. Juan was not a disrupting
element since Juan was an integrated part of the setting and performed
according to expectations. As indicated by the previous instance, a
known observer in this setting was considered foreign and produced
marked variations in behavior resulting from the manner in which the
workers defined the situation. Under their definition, outsiders were
seen as potentially dangerous and connected to management since it was
only with the permission of managerial personnel that an outsider could enter the work area.

Most workers who knew me were aware that I was a student, but only three or four were ever interested enough actually to ask any details about my situation. Others in the setting dealt with me in my situational role and were not interested in my activities outside of work. Probably involved in this lack of interest was the inability on the part of most workers to identify with me as a student. The workers preferred to talk about topics which they had in common. The three or four persons who were interested knew I was working on a thesis and they knew that the thesis was to deal with interaction and they knew that I was going to "use some examples from work." The conversation never went past this point and details were never asked. Instead they would tend to start talking about what interested them or discussing their own academic projects, past or present. The only time a question was ever dodged was at a party following the announcement of my resignation when a slightly inebriated person asked what my thesis was going to be about. This did not seem to be an appropriate moment to respond in detail.
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