Marshall University
Marshall Digital Scholar

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

2016

The Human Manager: Consent Deal, Informal Organization and Routinization

Jennifer Lynn Conrad
robison6@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/etd

Part of the Place and Environment Commons, and the Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons

THE HUMAN MANAGER: CONSENT DEAL, INFORMAL ORGANIZATION AND

ROUTINIZATION

A thesis submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
in
Sociology
by
Jennifer Lynn Conrad
Approved by
Dr. Martin Laubach, Committee Chairperson
Dr. Maggie Stone
Dr. Robin McCutcheon

Marshall University
July 2016

APPROVAL OF THESIS

We, the faculty supervising the work of Jennifer Lynn Conrad, affirm that the thesis, *The Human Manager: Consent Deal, Informal Organization and Routinization*, meets the high academic standards for original scholarship and creative work established by the Sociology Department and Marshall University. This work also conforms to the editorial standards of our discipline and the Graduate College of Marshall University. With our signatures, we approve the manuscript for publication.

Dr. Martin Laubach, Department of Sociology   Committee Chairperson   5/19/2016   Date

Dr. Robin McCutcheon, Department of Economics   Committee Member   5/19/2016   Date

Dr. Maggie Stone, Department of Sociology   Committee Member   5/19/16   Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is easy to say thank you but sometimes those words are just not strong enough. I literally would not be here without the help of the faculty at Marshall University, in particular, Marty Laubach. He spent more time with me on this project than I would have ever expected from any professor and I truly cannot thank him enough for all of his help. Without Marty, there would be no thesis. So as hollow and as simply weightless as these words are in comparison to how I really feel, thank you so much, Marty.

Two other faculty members stepped up to the plate very late in the process and not only enabled me to finish the thesis project, but also gave me unmeasurable advice and encouragement despite the hasty deadline. Thank you, Maggie Stone and Robin McCutcheon for being willing to help a student whose success would not have been possible without you.

I also want to say thank you to my husband, Raymond Conrad, for being patient with me as I yelled, screamed, and cried through this process. He was always there to lend an ear, even if he did not always understand what I was raving about, and his support is something that helped me get through many of my most discouraging days.

Of course, this acknowledgment would not be complete without mentioning Masterchief. He enabled me to study and take the time that I needed in order to compile my research and explore areas that could even possibly take me away from his employ. He truly understands what it means to be a leader and he will forever stand out in my mind as a confidant and mentor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

This study explores the quantitative and qualitative data relating to the consent deal, informal work organizations, and how job satisfaction links to both. Using a study done by Laubach and Wallace, I will replicate the results in a different industry and on a broader scale. I developed qualitative data through months of participant observation at the general manager level of fast casual restaurants as well as multiple interviews. I gathered quantitative information from the GSS on aspects of the consent deal and how it affects a worker's subjective response to their workplace in general and their job satisfaction in particular. The conclusion supports the theory that the consent deal, and its counterpart, a higher position in one of the informal workplace networks, specifically the administrative clan, has a positive effect on job satisfaction. My conclusions include how to foster a strong informal organization that benefits the team members and the business. The significance of this work is that it substantiates and broadens the discussion of the consent deal and subtleties of the informal organization.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it" - Karl Marx (1976, p. 65).

The purpose of this study is to develop data and theory on being a humane manager, replicate Burawoy (1979) and Laubach (2005) but with a different setting in fast-casual restaurants, and look at contemporary popular management literature to see whether it follows assumptions laid out by Taylor (2012) and Mayo (1933). I use both qualitative and quantitative methods for two reasons, the first being I wanted to compare both of these to Laubach's (2005) similar mixed methodology. The second reason was I wanted to be able to take the concepts from "a workplace" and see if I could apply them to "the workplace." This mixed methodology is in the sequential form as I explored this phenomenon in a smaller workplace and used the findings to create and develop a test for a larger group of people from other industries and occupations.

The purpose of the qualitative portion of this study was to determine if I could observe the phenomenon of the consent deal (defined later in this section) to the specific service industry of a fast casual restaurant. I observed all those who work in the same store I did and they were the participants as well as anyone I encountered on the job. The data I collected is in forms of participant observations over several years and of eight interviews. It is exploratory and descriptive. My samples came from those I encountered as well as those I have chosen for the interviews so it is a mix of convenience, and purposive samples.

The purpose of the quantitative portion of this study is to explore the consent deal and its components on a national level, varying in industries and occupations. My hypothesis is that the consent deal will have a much stronger influence on a positive subjective response of the worker, as well as their job satisfaction, more than any other factors of a job. The independent variables (details in the data dictionary and quantitative portion of this document) are the various characteristics of a job including individual characteristics of the workers: gender, age, race, religion, marital status, and education. I also include industry types as well as occupational types. The final set of factors are those of specific job characteristics including how the person is paid either by the hour or not, the prestige of the job, if the person works day shift, how often work interferes with family life, if the person has a second job, if the job requires a person to work fast, if a person does numerous things on the job, if they are part of a team, how often there are too few to work, income alone is enough money, if they were laid off last year, if threatened on the job in the last 12 months, and if they had back pain in the last 12 months. The independent variables are scales I created (also detailed in the data dictionary and quantitative portion of this document) for consent, job satisfaction, and subjective response of the worker.

It is important to note that this study is unique as most Sociological literature on the workplace has been solely from point of view of an academic, temporarily working while finishing a dissertation in preparation of a "real" job. Most ethnographies and case studies use this point of view as well, but this study uses the point of view of the general manager with a potential future in the organization. Some academics would even see me as a manager willing to participate in my own exploitation as a worker. I am not an owner, and I do not get a share of the profit. I am in the middle to negotiate between what the owners want and what the team members want, and it is my job to see that both parties are as pacified as possible. This is a

groundbreaking study because of the point of view, and I hope to explain many things that were either misunderstood or unknown about being a manager.

This thesis expands upon Laubach's (2005) research on the workplace, more specifically the consent deal. He conducted an ethnography in an office setting, and then applied it to a statewide survey. He was trying to identify some of the components, those that influence day-to-day workings of an organization, of the informal organization in "a workplace" to try to get a sense of what the actual variables were in "the workplace." My study replicates his as far as the content is concerned. It varies slightly, however, because I was unable to control the exact questions in the national survey, so those are not the same as his study. Also, as Laubach's (2005) study was limited in industry and size, my study expands to another industry and to a larger survey base.

In addition, I explored the recent popular management literature in comparison to Sociological theory. Management literature and Sociological literature do not often view each other as similar, but underneath it all, they often align quite nicely. The literature may even synthesize into helping each side find solutions for problems we all face as those who study the workplace.

My main research questions focus on the consent deal and the informal organization. I want to know how powerful the consent deal is in an actual business setting, and how it functions. As a follow-up to those questions, I query how best to facilitate the consent deal. In addition, to what extent is popular management literature now merging with the Sociological literature? I answered these questions through my ethnographic study of a fast-casual restaurant, interviews with the team members, and data from a national survey.

History of Zapata

In order to maximize confidentially, I am renaming the company for further reference throughout the thesis. We will call it Zapata, and in this section, give a brief history of the company as it may become important for later analysis. Zapata started when a few people decided to leave a different restaurant, referred to as Diaz, because they did not approve of some of the things Diaz was doing. Zapata was then created in the 1990s by those who left Diaz and for a long time, Zapata was considered a "me too" company, following on the coattails of Diaz. Recently, the company was bought out by a larger fast food chain that researched the trends and saw that Zapata really needed to make some changes in order to find their identity and niche in the market. The owners from the fast food company hired a new CEO who had previously worked for a very successful coffee company. The new CEO decided that for Zapata to be the successful powerhouse that this CEO wanted it to be, they needed to rebrand. The company held a conference in Denver last September in which they executed their new ideas, and it was so different from what business management had done before, so different from Taylor (2012) and Marx and Engels (2008/1848), that I have included the experience as its own chapter later in the thesis.

Zapata now spans the entire nation and includes some stores in Canada. There are nearly 700 operational stores, which either operate as corporate or franchise locations. I am less familiar with the corporate model of management since the stores I observed were solely those from a franchise, but I have an intimate knowledge of the latter. The particular franchise I observed owns and operates five stores that are Zapata but also have over 25 stores that sell pizza. There are two owners, one who does less of the operations and more of the financial and the Chief of Operations. Underneath them, there is a training director, three marketing directors, and then the

store level general managers. Each of the stores have between 15 – 40 members who are engaged in the daily operations. All of these five stores are contained in one state, and many team members have even worked in other stores.

Definitions of Jargons and Terms

Each industry and organization has their own set of words and terms, often referred to as jargon, which may not be completely understood by others. It is important to note these words so the concepts are clear within this text.

- Store- I use this word to denote a specific group of people that work in the same location. I cannot use the word company because that would include either all of the corporate and franchise stores, or only the franchise stores and not one particular store I choose to highlight. Each store has their own culture and set of team members and it is an important distinction to make.

- Guests- A term companies use to denote customers. They use the term as a sign of respect for those who pick their restaurant to eat in over the thousands of other restaurants and are willing to give them their patronage. The market is tight, and it is important to understand people do not have to eat at that particular store but that they choose to come there.

- Team member- Many companies also use this word as a term to refer to the workers who are usually not managers, although as a manager, I do think of myself as a team member. The effect of using these words instead of worker is an effort to encourage more teamwork, and a mentality that goes beyond just earning a paycheck.

- Administrative Clan- This term comes from Ouchi (1980) and Laubach's (2005) research for the informal group of team members who enjoy specific workplace rewards like

autonomy, schedule flexibility, participation, and organizational commitment. These team members often have close relationships, and while it is easy to move informally from inside this clan to outside, it is not always easy to determine who is in it at any given time.

- Consent deal- This also comes from Laubach's (2005) research and is the negotiations between the administrative clan and management. We often see it in the bending of some rules on management's side to help team members so that in turn, team members will demonstrate a higher quality of work.

Ethics

A social scientist needs to be as unbiased as possible, and I need to address the fact that I worked for this company before, during, and after this analysis. Additionally, I have worked in the industry of the restaurant workers for several more years. Prior to the interviews, I received IRB approval as long as I did not interview anyone from my store as they worked for me and could bias their answers. Each interviewee signed a consent form, which informed him/her about the interview, and how his/her answers would not affect the job in any way.

It is in the realm of possibility that my positon of a manager, despite not being their manager, has changed the responses of the interviewees but throughout the interview, I assured them that I would not repeat anything they mentioned to anyone else except as data for my study, and I would maintain confidentiality. I also admitted some of my faults and shortcomings as manager in order to help them realize it was a safe zone, and that I knew we all did not do our jobs perfectly. I feel these techniques helped to get answers that are more honest and reliable.

Throughout the thesis, I refer to several different team members I interviewed and observed, but all of them have pseudonyms and I have changed the sexes for some if I felt it was

prudent to disguise them further. Admittedly, I dealt with a small sample of people but I have disguised the participants as well as possible. I also have deidentified the fast casual restaurant by changing its name.

Personal Interest

I am a general manager at a fast-casual restaurant, working in the franchise for nearly five years. About 15 to 20 employees work for me in various positons. I have first assistant managers, shift runners, cooks, and line servers who all report to me. I am responsible for training, scheduling, rates of pay, behavior, and in general, all of the store's success or failures. There is only one person above me and he is the Chief of Operations, or as I call him, Masterchief.

Since this study uses myself as the primary observer and participant, it is important to give background to shed further light on my techniques and mentalities as a manager. I started out as a team member, or worker, in almost every place I have worked. However, in nearly every place I worked, they promoted me to a different position: once as a young supervisor at a shake and sandwich shop, an assistant manager at a truck stop, a general manager at a bowling alley, and a certified trainer at a full service restaurant. My experience has shown me both the team member side of the business and the management side. There were many times as a team member that I saw a manager doing something I did not agree with and promised myself I would not do if I ever became a manager. This point of view has helped me develop into the manager that I am now.

My father was always a restaurant person and warned me when I was fifteen about going into the business. He said it was an addicting lifestyle, and he wanted me to explore other options before becoming too engrossed in the business. I did not listen because I just really wanted a job, and the only place that would hire a fifteen year old was a shake and sandwich shop a few blocks

from my house. He was right: the restaurant place is addicting, and many who are outside of the industry do not understand the appeal. The business works for people who do not want to sit down or be stationary all day as well as those who enjoy accomplishing something difficult with a team of fellow workmates that are also good at what they do. Time goes by so fast because you are busy all day and when a rush hits, so does the adrenaline to move quickly and help pull your weight inside the team. It feels good to be a part of a group that works smoothly together, accomplishes something visible, and still have fun while performing the tasks. The industry does not have much prestige from the outside world, but this negative aspect does not outweigh the benefits many enjoy in the field.

Through personal connections, Zapata hired me. I was friends with the general manager's wife at the full service restaurant, and she sought me out as a person she would want supporting her husband. This allowed me to break into upper management without having to work through the ranks at yet another restaurant. However, since I had done so at other places, I had the mentality of the team member even while becoming a manager. Those team members that do become managers need to exhibit some specific qualities that clue managers in that they would be a good person to promote. These types of qualities some might criticize as "drinking the Kool-Aid" of the company and the position, but there is a careful balance between assimilating into the management culture while at the same time keeping perspective of where one started. Some examples of these qualities include upholding the company's desires all the time in areas like uniform compliance, standards, and specific cultural attitude the company is trying to achieve. Those who are trying to get promoted may be viewed by other team members as "suck-ups" or "brown nosers," but it is a careful game the team member needs to play for a while. Once the team member actually gets promoted, then they can relax on some of the rules and engage the

8

other team members on a more relatable level. Some, of course, just let the power go to their heads, and those give managers a bad name. Unfortunately, there are more who believe they are better than the team members than those managers who do not.

Actually, some corporations and upper managers want the middle managers to adopt this "better-than-them" mentality for a couple of reasons. The "mystique of management" includes viewing yourself as better than those who work for you and is part of the "Kool-Aid" upper management may want you to adopt. I give an example later in this paper of the difference between the corporate Zapata managers and the franchise managers where team members need to see managers as an "other" to curtail any kind of disrespect or questioning of any type: essentially complete obedience. Another reason is upper management may want the middle managers to feel no sympathy or concern for the team members. This mentality of management is especially true in settings like a factory where they place harsh demands on the team members and managers need to uphold those demands without feeling sorry for the team members. Thankfully, this is not true for the franchise I work for, but I have certainly seen my fair share of managers who simply feel they are better than the "peons" below them.

When I learned of Laubach's (2005) research and the consent deal, it immediately appealed to me as something I had always interacted with on the job but had never fully comprehended, often subconsciously negotiating my way through the informal structure of the workplace. Once I learned it was an actual documented phenomenon, I knew I could add to the discussion and bring in the restaurant business as a great example of those who encounter the consent deal on a daily basis. However, my position and predilection towards the restaurant business may make it more difficult for me to be an unbiased social observer. To combat this, throughout my thesis I try to separate myself as the social scientist from the manager and to

objectively record and observe what I saw and interacted with on a daily basis. When I do discuss my personal feelings, it is in an effort of full disclosure as a manager trying to be honest and human while still trying to run a successful business. In addition, I want to include anything I would get from an interview of the person in my position about their feelings and perceptions.

In my position, I endeavor every day to try to understand all sides of an issue and make the best choice considering both the human aspect of managing and the business aspect of it. I am a manager of humans, but I also endeavor to be a humane manager.

Outline for Chapters

In chapter 2, I discuss the literature and theory of workplace Sociology starting with Marx and Engels (2008/1848) and going through the many theorists to study the subject. I will also explore the informal organization theory development and end with where my study adds to the research. Not only do I look at Sociological literature, I will include some popular management literature that is relevant.

Chapter 3 is about my research methods, data, and qualitative portion, which includes an ethnography of my personal workplace experience. First, I did a qualitative study at a fast-casual restaurant during April 2014 until February 2016. Secondly, I turned to the GSS for quantitative data where I was able to take these theories and questions from "a workplace" to "the workplace."

Chapter 4 shows the results of my qualitative research, including my observations of the administrative clan, how the consent deal operates in my workplace, and how the different components of the consent deal occur. I also include the eight interviews I did with team members and managers alike, and how their responses compared to the consent deal and the administrative clan.

Chapter 5 is about Zapata and the rebranding process it went through during the past year. Using a manager-training workshop, the company moved away from Taylor's (2012) influences to more of those in the worker's interest, much like the consent deal strives to do.

Chapter 6 is the results of the quantitative study, which in some ways validates what Laubach (2005) found and in some ways challenges it. There are three regressions using the scales I constructed of the variables, which outline the consent deal in "the workplace" as opposed to "a workplace," and the results coincide with what I found in the observations.

Chapter 7 is the application and conclusions in which I discuss how a manager, using some ideas from popular management literature, can facilitate the consent deal in their own workplace. I also discuss some of the negative side effects of consent. Afterwards, I make a short note in how managing a restaurant may be different from managing other industries.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Foundational Work

When approaching a discussion of the workplace, starting with Karl Marx is prudent because he began the sociological study of the workplace. Writing in the early period of the rise of the proletariat in Europe, as industrialization in the early to mid-1800s brought workers off farms and into the factories in the growing cities, his work starts with the basics of the proletariat (the working class) and the bourgeoisie (the capitalists). These two groups are at odds with each other and, in Marx's view, have a negative relationship as the bourgeoisie are always trying to exploit the proletariat as much as they can. Because of this relationship, the working class people are not able to foster a helpful or symbiotic relationship with the upper class. "Not only are [the proletariat] slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overseer, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself" (Marx and Engels, 2008/1848, p. 44).

Wright (1978) felt the need to expand on Marx and Engels (2008/1848) for the twentieth century workplace. His scale extends from Marx and Engel's (2008/1848) work and gives a better sense of formal structural positions, as well as the concepts of social class, organizational power, and power derived from skills to power from ownership. According to Wright (1978), managers fall in between the proletariat and the bourgeois. This gives a duality to the position of manager as they can see both the point of view of the owner and that of the worker. It is a unique, and often frustrating, situation, for the manager is required to meet the needs of both parties.

12

Contrary to Marx and Engels (2008/1848), Frederick Taylor (2012) expresses the viewpoint of the owners that workers are going to do the minimum amount of work to avoid getting in trouble or attracting negative attention. He sees team members as those who try to get away with doing the least amount of work possible, so it is the manager's job to figure out how to motivate and inspire them to work harder. As a result, his work suggests structuring the workplace in such a way as to avoid worker discretion where they do not need to make decisions or even think at all.

Clearly, there needs to be some type of structure and organization in the workplace. Edwards (1979), explains that as employers purchase labor power from workers, they must convert it to productive labor, which occurs by various means of control and coordination. He says this occurs in three forms, direct, technical, and bureaucratic and is the essence of the formal organization. Direct, or simple, control describes when the immediate supervisor (often a foreman) can dictate almost everything about a person's job in order to control their actions. This type of control can include how much they get paid based on subjective measures, when to take breaks, how much production they should be able to produce in a certain amount of time, and even how much they are allowed to talk to other workers. Technical control describes when the pace, content, and quality of employee work is dictated by the technology of the workplace (i.e. assembly line, computer monitored insurance claim or call center). Bureaucratic control is when pre-established, written rules, procedures, and social structures (e.g. hierarchical relationships) dictate the pace, content, and the quality of workplace production. The issue of how to structure an organization has influenced many theorists in organizational behavior and organizational theory all in an effort to find the best solution.

Later, Kunda (1992) extended Edward's (1979) work with his study of the high tech industry which emphasized "normative control" over bureaucratic control, in which team members "are driven by internal commitment, strong identification with company goals, [and] intrinsic satisfaction from work" (Kunda, p. 11). In this theorized workplace, workers understand and value the workplace goals and get genuine pleasure from doing the work and watching the organization succeed.

Three Conceptions of Workplace Dynamics

Much of the research on workplace organizations has reflected either Marx and Engels's (2008/1848) or Taylor's (2012) standpoints or some merging of them. Theorists and business management writers attempt to increase workplace productivity, as well as to understand the workers, both from a business viewpoint and the sociological viewpoint, respectively. Recently, a study by Laubach and Wallace (2013), organized many disparate ideas into three perspectives on workplace relations. The first perspective, starting with Mayo (1933), has become a kind of standard organizational theory that says you can manipulate the workplace in order to influence the workers and increase their productivity. The second, following Staw (1986), argues that work perceptions and responses and productivity depend on a worker's inherent disposition. The third perspective, which is more complex, argues that a worker's perception and behaviors are responses to informal workplace structures, specifically a "consent deal" informally negotiated between workers and front line managers of relaxed work rules in return for worker dedication.

Organizational Behavior. Mayo entered the discussion asserting "a happy worker is a productive worker" (1933). His focus was to steer the workplace into an environment that promoted workers' job satisfaction so as they felt the work they did was more meaningful, important, and even enjoyable, they would perform better. While this approach may sound like

14

favoring the workers, theorists argue that Mayo's approach was to tinker with the physical and structural aspects of the work but did not extend genuine voice or participation in the work process to the workers (Laubach & Wallace, 2013, p. 137). Since Mayo's focus on job satisfaction, there has been rich growth in researching various aspects of subjective experience workers have "including organizational commitment, organizational equity, and justice, and eventually a conception of organizations as systems of exchange, norms, and shared meanings constructed by management" (Laubach and Wallace, 2013, p. 137). In addition, this idea heavily influenced the development of organizational theory as taught in business schools to gain worker productivity, which suggests that managers can manipulate the workplace and the workers into being happier and more productive.

Much of the research following Mayo (1933) revolved around job satisfaction. From a sociological and business management perspective, theorists would like to provide direct and concrete answers as to how employers can foster higher job satisfaction in their own environments, as it has been linked to increased commitment and lower turnover rates (Choi, 2013).

Dispositions. The second line of research that Laubach and Wallace (2013) identified, primarily led by Staw (1986), argues that workers are not so easily affected by attempts at manipulation. Staw suggests that workplace attitudes are actually dispositions rather than responses. Research demonstrates that a worker's job satisfaction tends to be consistent across time and situations, even when the worker is in another job working for a different employer. This research led Staw to conclude that training will get you nowhere if the employees have the wrong disposition. Employees enter the workplace with who they are going to be, and how they are going to feel about their jobs (Staw, 1986). From Staw's perspective, hiring the right people

is the only thing a manager can do. Dispositional theorists propose that the best way to have a good team of workers is to use psychological tests to pick out those who are predisposed to be happy. This logic has led many companies to test applicants for the best dispositions and skills needed for certain jobs.

      Consent and Informal Organization. A third theoretical perspective that Laubach and Wallace (2013) propose utilizes the research on consent. Theorists are trying to understand this concept in many different ways. Consent fits here as a bridge between workers and managers. It is a subjective, though tacit, agreement that leads to a positive subjective response. This response trumps all structural factors of the workplace. Theoretical approaches to organizational issues start with objective structural factors, but change with informal subjective understandings. While Marx and Engels (2008/1848) says workers will never be peacefully able to coexist with managers, Taylor (2012) says managers just need to control the workers. How this all happens in the workplace is what this other research has been trying to parcel out.

      Williamson (1975) presented a theory of organizational evolution from markets, where all the interactions are through well-specified employment contracts, into bureaucracies, as the workplace gets more complex. He focuses on only structural factors but Ouchi (1980) brings in subjectivity. Ouchi took Williamson's work and extended it, theorizing that when working conditions in some organizations are too varying for formalized bureaucratic rules, the workplace evolves into clans, using intensive socialization and goal congruency as a means of workplace control. An unspoken agreement arises when leadership covenants with workers to do all in their power to help the organization succeed and in return, they will not fire the workers. In a sense, the manager is buying the worker's subjectivity.

Additionally, Graham and Organ (1993) "focused on conditions giving rise to 'clan' or 'covenantal' organizational forms that would elicit from workers 'any form of contribution, any reasonable exertion of effort, and any tolerable sacrifice'" (p. 494). Thus the convergence of management interests and worker motivations, infused with a desire for cooperation in tandem with worker subjectivity, "efficaciously supplied an appropriate rule to govern any possible decision, thus producing a very elegant and complete form of control" (Ouchi, 1980, p. 139). In a similar vein, Kunda's (1992) addition to labor control theory argues that "normative control" socializes workers to do anything and everything in the services of the company.

Others from the informal organizational perspective contend that underneath the formal and rational structures of management-controlled organizations lie deeper processes on which worker subjectivity depends (Laubach & Wallace, 2013). In between the workers and the formal structure of the organization is the informal organization, which although normally is overlooked by most theorists, is an important piece, as asserted by Laubach and Wallace. Roethlisberger and Dickson (1967) described informal organization as "the actually existing patterns of human interaction" that performs the work of the organization and declared it a "necessary prerequisite for effective collaboration" (p. 559). Through the famous Hawthorne (Landsberger, 1958) study, they demonstrated that informal organization rivals that of the formal organization in its impact on daily functions, either to enhance production or restrict it.

One prime factor influencing worker subjectivity is worker consent. Drawing on early research from Gouldner (1954), this line of informal organization theory argues that workers have the perception of "some measure of control over the initiation and administration of the rules" as an important aspect of consent (p. 221). Gouldner presented that this "measure of control" was found in an informal agreement with managers, and that team members understood

that "formal rules gave supervisors something with which they could 'bargain' in order to secure informal cooperation from workers" (p. 173).

Burawoy (1979) entered into the discussion of informal organization and consent with an ethnographic study to understand why workers did work as hard as they did instead of why they did not work harder. He admitted that while capitalism desires and requires management's ability to coerce team members, management could also develop an efficient and smooth workday through "an element of spontaneous consent" (p. xii). Burawoy's research explored "the machine shop game of 'making out' in which workers produced above quota levels to earn incentive pay and banked extra production into a kitty from which they would draw when their production lagged below quota levels" (Laubach & Wallace, 2013, p. 139). He discovered that worker engagement in playing a game facilitated a more positive informal status among each other and provided a distraction from the everyday grinds of the job. However, the informal game violated the formal rules of the workplace and supervisors were regularly subjected to pressure from upper management to prohibit workers holding back their product above the incentive levels. After a crackdown, supervisors would soon look the other way and allow the game to resume in an effort to avoid tension on the shop floor and to continue the smoothness they had achieved on the shop floor. Burawoy also explained that supervisors allow the informal organization's challenge of the formal work rules in order to maintain their success of production. He posited that their ability to participate in such a game enables the worker to transcend the base of their production jobs "and creates the illusion that workers have real choices in their day-to-day activities under capitalism" (Laubach & Wallace, 2013, p. 140). Burawoy argued, "it is participation in choosing that generates consent" (p. 27).

To understand this gap between the informal and formal aspects of the workplace and understand where subjectivity fits into all of this, Littler and Salaman (1984) explain that "the subjectivity of the employee is – and must be – an inevitable ingredient in the organization of work, the achievement of production at work, in relations between managers and workers" (p. 54). They also explain that because the fallacies of formal structures are unable to foresee all happenings that may occur during production, routinization of production cannot function without "some amount of give and take such as bending the rules to achieve extra effort." Conversely, there are those workers who disrupt production by exploiting the gap between formal and informal structures. Therefore, continual negotiations characterize real work actions as managers and supervisors navigate between their interpretations of formal rules. If successful, an exchange develops from these negotiations where employers, usually the immediate supervisors, are able to facilitate a humane and flexible workplace for workers as long as they continue with the needed levels of production. "Ultimately, they conceptualize consent as the exchange of relaxed enforcement of formal work rules for alignment of workers' motivations with the interest of management" (Laubach & Wallace, 2013, p. 140).

Contemporary popular management writings are coming around to a similar understanding of the workplace. Belasco and Stayer (1993) argue that to withstand the changing business world, it is imperative to have an organization that facilitates workers who want to give their best by giving them more responsibility and empowerment. Using a thought provoking metaphor, they assert managers need to be more like geese, rather than the lead buffalo. Buffalos rely on a leader to tell them where to go and when to do it, while geese rely on each other as a system whole to get where they want to go (p.17-18). Belasco and Stayer argue that a leader needs to transfer ownership of the work to those who are doing the work, create an environment

of ownership where each person wants to be responsible, coach personal capabilities development, and continuously learn while encouraging others to do the same (p. 19). With applications of their ideals, they implemented successful organizations that enabled all the players to work together.

        Structure in the Informal Organization. Laubach (2005) focused on the informal organization dynamic and the effects it can have on workplace rewards. Through an ethnographic study of an office environment, he found that while organizations often have informal groupings of employees, they also often have a consequential informal structure. Laubach observed three informal groupings, which he titled the informal periphery, the conventional core, and the administrative clan. In the periphery, the turnover rate is high, management is strict, and they usually have less commitment and loyalty. The conventional core consists of a majority of the population, who may have higher levels of autonomy but lesser levels of commitment or have higher levels of commitment but lesser of autonomy. The administrative clan started with higher levels of management and extended deep into the lower levels of the organizational hierarchies including professional and even hourly workers, all of whom exhibit higher levels of autonomy and loyalty. Laubach noted it crosscut the formal positions, as someone even in the lesser positions of the company could still be a member of the core. There did seem to be a tendency that the members of the clan participate in the cultural environment of the office and ensured that everything continued to work. Workers at the lower levels served as models for the other workers and tended to inform management of potential problems. Not necessarily as snitches, but they, in a broader way, were trusted to tell managers that things were not working correctly or that something was about to break (Laubach 2005).

Simultaneously with the ethnography, Laubach (2005) also engaged in a survey of workers across Indiana that covered a broad range of workplace issues. Since the administrative clan was so obvious in the workplace, he wondered if it could be observed in the data set. Reflecting on his ethnography, he recognized that the unifying element of the informal structure was the varying levels of what he came to call the "consent deal," defined as "an exchange of perceived autonomy, voice, and schedule flexibility for organizational commitment" (p. 1544). During his observations in the ethnography, the exchange happened nearly exclusively in the administrative clan whereas the other two groups did not engage in it at all. In fact, Laubach noted that consent and informal organization, in terms of measurement, are essentially synonymous as two sides of the same coin. These statistics supported what he was able to observe during his ethnography.

Management Literature

With the right culture, consent can lead to a strengthening of the administrative clan, which develops from those who have the most commitment and loyalty. Prenestini and Lega (2013), while talking about different cultures, identify a clan culture that sounds similar to what Laubach and Wallace (2013) provide: it "is internally focused, and its processes are based on relationships. It is cohesive and participatory, casting the organization as a second family. Leaders are viewed as mentors, and their actions support and facilitate teamwork and group interaction" (p. 355). In this sense, an employee might bond with the group so that the thought of leaving could invoke similar feelings of leaving one's family.

Management style should also be facilitating this type of culture. Choi (2013) conducted a study examining the effects of different kinds of management techniques and their effect on job satisfaction. The results showed that a collaborative conflict management style, where managers

21

work together with employees to handle conflicts, had much more positive outcomes than dominant or avoidant management cultures. His findings correspond to the consent deal in if the management is not willing to play into this idea, consent cannot happen and the administrative clan will not grow and promote the loyalty a business may require to foster long-standing, hard-working, and committed employees.

However, it may be important to note that Prenestini and Lega (2013) found that even though the clan culture is important, it functions better with small-scale businesses, like the one I am studying, than it does with larger corporations.

Management literature is now appearing to break away from Taylorism to work with subjectivity of the workers, adopting Kunda's (1992) normative control, but are taking it beyond his high tech setting to other industrial settings. As an example, Stephen R. Covey's (1990) writing can be used as a resource when one needs to make difficult decisions for every situation. By following Covey's (1990) guidelines, a manager can make sure to keep the store's culture going in the proper direction. His concepts apply to the clan and help to promote function of the consent deal.

Covey (1990) starts with these four levels: organizational, managerial, interpersonal, and personal. He cautions that "each level is 'necessary but insufficient,' meaning we have to work at all levels on the basis of certain master principles" (p. 31). A manager cannot expect productive results if he/she does not function on all of these levels.

The Subjective World of the Worker

Using Laubach's (2005) operationalization of the consent deal, Laubach and Wallace (2013) were able to test which of the three perspectives, Mayo (1933), Staw (1986), or consent, had the most accurate description of the workplace. The Indiana data set was sufficient to

develop a workplace model with measures of individual factors, organizational and industrial

factors, job factors, and formal structural factors, and a wide range of attitudes and perceptions

that they demonstrated were measures of an underlying "subjective response." They found that if

Mayo was right, any measures of subjective response should be heavily influenced by job

factors. If Staw was right, there should be a single united measure of subjective response, and it

should not be influenced by workplace factors. Laubach and Wallace (2013) were right;

whatever measures were found of subjective response should be heavily influenced by a measure

of the consent deal. Ultimately, they found that there was an underlying subjective response per

Staw, but that the consent deal had an overwhelming influence on the subjective response,

offering validation for the consent perspective. Laubach and Wallace concede that disposition

may have some effect but that there is another and more concrete answer about worker

subjectivity. Thus, they show worker subjectivity is not about tinkering with the minor job

characteristics of the workplace, but it is about this concept of the consent deal. Furthermore, the

ideas of consent and the clan tie into management literature like Covey's (1990) in order to get

some more real world application.

　　Laubach's (2005) study was limited to only the office industry level and a limitation to

Laubach and Wallace's (2013) study is that it was a very small data set using information and

research from only the State of Indiana. My study will add to theirs by placing my ethnography

in another type of industry, which is service, with fewer employees than the office that they

studied. I will also be taking the ethnography from the point of view of a general manager, which

will enable a wider scope of results. Next, I will be expanding the data set to the entire national

database spanning two different years instead of just one state.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

My ethnographic study consists of participant observations spanning from April 2014 until February 2016 but I am also drawing from several years of informal observations in the restaurant business. My participant observation involved many conversations and situations, which I recorded in my field notes. Since I recorded the notes later, I did not use direct quotations from the participants for fear of misquoting them. During this ethnographic study, I kept in mind the two most salient research questions: can I identify the consent deal in my workplace, and if so, how do I facilitate the consent deal? The search for the answers has led me to several examples and sightings of the consent deal in my particular workplace.

After IRB approval, I conducted eight ethnographic interviews of various team members from different stores. There were four women and four men, six of whom were managers or shift runners, one who was a marketing representative, and one who was a cook. The ages ranged from 19 to roughly 42. Each interview lasted thirty minutes to an hour, and I did not record them, as per my IRB. I took notes on my laptop but resisted directly quoting the interviewees because I did not want to run the risk of misquoting someone. None of these was a member of my team or worked in my store because I did not want there to be any conflicted feelings. The full list of questions is included as Appendix B and I divided them into questions for managers and questions for team members. Some of the highlighted points touch on their store's team specifics as to how many males, females, and the ages of the people that work there. I asked the managers how they communicated with their teams as far as how they phrased things when asking questions, and how that influences the team members' responses. I also asked them if they ever bend the rules for the team members, which rules they bend, which ones are okay to bend, and

which ones are completely off limits. For team members, I asked how they preferred managers to ask them to do things, if they had ever been fired and how the manager had handled that. I also asked them questions about the rules, if managers let them bend some rules, which ones, and if managers ever went out of their way to help the team members.

These questions relate to my research because they aimed at trying to find the administrative clan and the consent deal, without spelling out the whole concept to the person. I was trying to get them to talk about the clan without influencing their thoughts or giving them the answers I wanted to hear. I used this strategy on purpose to discover what I could from the person, and then in the end, I would discuss why I asked those questions and then revealed my research. The questions about how supervisors communicated to the team were an effort to see how formal or informal their interactions were with each other. The questions about bending rules were an effort to discover the consent deal as managers bend the rules in effort to get the team members to buy into more work.

As I went through this process, I did discover there were other questions I could have asked, including those more specific to the consent deal. For example, I could have asked them specifically about the components of the consent deal, autonomy, participation, schedule flexibility, and their commitment to the organization. Unfortunately, before the awareness arose for these types of questions, I already received IRB approval and was unable to change the interview guide. However, I did get into talking a bit about these ideas to those I interviewed at the end.

My goal was to interview at least 12 or so candidates but in the end, I ended up with eight. I had the added benefit of working with many of these people in the past as I had been to many different stores throughout my tenure with the company. Therefore, it was a bit amusing to

me as to how they answered the questions and discussed the ideas compared to what I actually knew of them and their workplace mannerisms.

Since the service industry is so fast-paced, many of the decisions and actions occur without much thought going into them. This makes a great place to study the consent deal and the administrative clan because they have their "natural" reactions to situations without having much time to think out the consequences of their words and actions. Other business settings may allow more time to think about things before the team members do them which may have consequences on the consent deal and may make it more difficult as an outside observer.

Data for the quantitative study comes from the General Social Survey (GSS) through the years of 2002 and 2006. This survey has operated since 1972 to non-institutionalized adults; they also typically interview 2-3000 people per year and are considered a "gold standard" for survey research. See the Data Dictionary for specific variable references. There are several questions from the GSS pertaining to the workplace in general, as well as groups of similar variables. These groupings I turned into scales for the consent deal, subjective response, and job satisfaction. Data and findings for this section are in chapter 4. After the scales, I then ran hierarchical regressions for all three scales. I took individual characteristics, industry and occupation types, and specific job characteristics and ran them on consent, subjective response, and job satisfaction. I wanted to be able to compare my larger survey results with Laubach's (2005) research and see if his findings held true to the whole nation or if not, what the differences were.

Constructing Scales

Consent. Using the data from the GSS, I created a scale for the consent deal based on Laubach's (2005) research with eight variables listed in the data dictionary under consent,

26

specifically those that were in strong evidence of autonomy, schedule flexibility, participation

and commitment. He notes that the first three characteristics are often considered structural and

lead towards a subjective state like the fourth characteristic. However, all of the characteristics

"are in reality self-reported subjective perceptions of an individual worker's situation" (p. 1547).

I conducted a factor analysis that validated using these variables.

The variables in this scale for organizational commitment are:

"I trust management at the place where I work."

"I am proud to work for my employer."

For autonomy the variables are:

"I am given a lot of freedom to decide how to do my own work."

"My job lets me use my skills and abilities."

"I have a lot of say about what happens on my job."

For schedule flexibility the variables are:

"How often is it mandatory that you must work extra hours?"

"How hard is it to take time off during your work to take care of personal or family

matters?"

"How often are you allowed to change the schedule?"

Finally, for participation the variables are:

"In your job, how often do you take part with others in making decisions that affect

you?"

"How often do you participate with others in helping set the way things are done on your

job?"

Since the questions of the GSS and the Indiana survey were different, I was unable to exactly duplicate Laubach's (2005) specific scale but found variables that aligned as closely as possible. The Cronbach alpha coefficient ($\alpha= .74$) shows the scale is reliable as it targets and measures the underlying concepts of the consent deal. Also, the Heise and Bohrnstedt (1970) invalidity statistic ($\Psi= 0.02$) indicates there is only one factor tying these variables together while the validity statistic ($\rho= .89$) verifies a high correlation between these variables as a scale with the underlying factor.

Subjective Response. I created a second scale for the subjective response using 25 of the variables, inspired by Laubach and Wallace's (2013) research. It should be noted, "we do not claim that the particular configuration of the subjective response scale in our analysis is fixed or static. Rather, the subjective response scale should be viewed as a fluid and dynamic concept subject to change over time" (Laubach & Wallace, 2013, pp. 162-163). The variables I chose for this study for subjective response were limited to those questions that the GSS used, but another scale using similar and different variables may still make a subjective response scale. These variables measured some very different aspects of the workplace (safety and health, employee-management relations, discrimination), but the strong correlations of these as measured by the reliability alpha mean that they emerge from a single unified response we call the subjective response.

These variables are:

"The safety and health conditions where I work are good."

"Where I work, employees and management work together to ensure the safest possible working conditions."

"There are no significant compromises or shortcuts taken when worker safety is at stake."

"The safety of workers is a high priority with management where I work."

"In general, how would you describe relations in your work place between management and employees?"

"My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him or her."

"My supervisor is helpful to me in getting the job done."

"Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your race or ethnic origin?"

"Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your gender?"

"Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your age?"

"In the last 12 months, were you sexually harassed by anyone while you were on the job?"

"At the place where I work, I am treated with respect."

"How fair is what you earn on your job in comparison to others doing the same type of work you do?"

"The people I work with take a personal interest in me."

"How often during the past month, have you felt used up at the end of the day?"

"Promotions are handled fairly."

"I am free from the conflicting demands that other people make of me."

"I have enough information to get the job done."

"I receive enough help and equipment to get the job done."

"Workers need strong trade unions to protect their interests."

"Conditions on my job allow me to be about as productive as I could be."

"My fringe benefits are good."

"The people I work with can be relied on when I need help."

"The chances for promotion are good."

"The place where I work is run in a smooth and effective manner."

The Cronbach alpha coefficient (α= .850) shows that the scale is reliable. Also, the Heise and Bohrnstedt (1970) invalidity statistic (Ψ= 0.01) indicates there is only one factor tying these variables together while the validity statistic (ρ= .94) verifies these variables correlate to the one factor in a nice scale.

Job Satisfaction. I created a third scale for job satisfaction that included five variables based on the survey questions.
The variables for his scale are:

"All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?"

"My main satisfaction in life comes from work."

"Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer within the next year?"

"The job security is good."

"I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities."

The Cronbach alpha coefficient (α = .636) indicates these variables are a reliable measure for job satisfaction.

There is some skewness and kurtosis, but they were all within the standard parameters of acceptability -1 to =1. Since most of the questions are Likert scales with strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree, they skewed towards the right or negatively skewed. The scale for job satisfaction is negatively skewed at -.754 with kurtosis at .450. The scale for consent is the

same skewness at -.754, but the kurtosis is .720. Scale of subjective response had a skewness of

-.606 with the kurtosis at .567.

CHAPTER 4

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Qualitative Research

The data for this section will include the participant observations and interviews I conducted throughout my ethnography. I was able to gather much information, and after gathering the data, I analyzed it in terms of themes and patterns looking for the consent deal and how the components interact in a real workplace setting. The first section examines the inside working of a manager's mind and how some may combat the difficulties of the position. After that, I discuss the administrative clan, and the consent deal which is made up of participation, schedule flexibility, autonomy, and organizational commitment.

Managerial Face. In regards to making humane choices, it helps to start out with a company that holds up moral and ethical standards. Many times my boss has said that he would rather we lose money than risk making anyone sick, serve a lower quality of food for any reason, work with tools that are not up to code or standards, or jeopardize any team member's safety or wellbeing. In fact, Masterchief fired past general managers over violating one or more of these firm standards (personal communication, January 20, 2015). This commitment makes me feel proud to be working for this company. However, we still run a business that needs to make money, so there are situations where one cannot completely adhere to all the needs of everyone.

Since I am still a human, there are many problems to combat as a person who works too many hours, has too many things to do, and yet needs to listen to everyone else's complaints. It is very important to keep up a good strong and positive demeanor no matter what else is going on around me. One of our favorite sayings is "a manager needs to be a thermostat, not a thermometer." This means that I, as the manager, always need to have a positive and upbeat

manner about me no matter what is going on. If I start to lose it, the rest of the team then has permission to lose it, which may mean bad customer service and a negative atmosphere. Guests are extremely sensitive to atmosphere and can notice through nonverbal cues and the actions the team members exhibit if there is something upsetting occurring. This type of atmosphere does not help with retention or building sales.

In order to handle my own shortcomings, I have developed a type of shell, or manager identity, that I retreat into each day as I go to work. This shell enables me to have a perpetual smile on my face, happy or sympathetic as the case may warrant, no matter what a guest is yelling at me, or whatever team member is crying in an emotional breakdown.

This shell also helps me, as a manager, in regards to making decisions no matter how unsure I am about it: "Of course, one must never betray such uncertainty to others. Here the premium on self-control comes into play and many a manager's life becomes a struggle to keep one's nerves and appear calm and cool in the bargain" (Jackall 1988, p. 84). Once I make a decision, it is important to remain solid and show confidence in it until the results are in.

Often, I have made choices that can have a negative consequence for someone else such as firing a person or cutting a person's hours. In times such as these, it helps to adhere to moral principles, so I can maintain a certain level of confidence. I will discuss and apply these principles later in this paper.

If, however, I do make a wrong decision, it is then important to admit fault and apologize. Corporate managers who have others breathing down their necks just waiting for them to mess up may not have the luxury in admitting fault or wrong doing. Luckily, in my position, I am free to do so and feel that it helps the team look at me, not just as a manager but also as a person who keeps going even if I make mistakes. In addition, they perceive I am humble enough to admit

33

when I do something wrong, which appeals to them to help me fix the problem as a team, instead of placing the blame on someone else. If others see me as a human being who works hard, knows how to run the store, but also realizes I make mistakes, they will be better able to come to me when they have problems with my actions instead of just muttering behind my back, causing discord among the rest of the team members.

If, however, team members talk badly about me, as they all do at some point, I put in place my shell once again. Another important saying I tell myself is "I'm not here to make friends. They already have plenty of friends but the store does not have plenty of GMs." Unfortunately, despite my best efforts, I cannot make everyone happy all the time. In fact, I often make someone angry or disgruntled, often because I do not let them leave at the exact time it says on the schedule or even a little early. I make decisions based on the store's needs and not on the one person's needs because I want to do a good job as a manager and represent all the needs in the store instead of just one person's. I remind myself of this saying frequently when I feel alone or the object of derision, and it helps remind me of my purpose and to keep my resolve strong. My manager shell is strengthened by this saying as well, and I am able to hide my hurt behind it and understand why I am doing what I am doing.

Underneath this shell, sometimes I carry much worry and doubt. "Managers' sense of organizational contingency, of authoritative capriciousness, and of the lack of firm connections between work and reward lead many to doubt whatever abilities they may actually have. Many managers live in constant fear, in one manager's words, of 'being found out,' of not measuring up to the expectations in their social world" (Jackall, 1988, p. 83). Luckily, the Masterchief rewards me well for my hard work. I am paid a salary, plus a bonus based on various components like sales, our survey scores, if we make food cost, catering goals, and other

considerations. He also compliments me when he comes into my store and gives shout-outs in emails about which stores are doing well for the week. I do see a connection between my hard work and the rewards; however, as a manager, I do harbor one secret that I hope the team never learns from me: I do not really have that much power, and that I, in all actuality, may not be able to handle this job. When I ask them to do something, they have the freedom to say no. If they refuse just right, I might not even be able to correct them. When I was a first assistant, it was even scarier to think that someday someone might flat out refuse to do something. As GM, I can control who gets a raise, who gets hours, who has a job, and who does not, but there is not much past that. Logically laying it out like this, it would seem that there is power behind the GM title, but it is also important to keep in mind outside of the store, I am just the same as everyone else. The other fear I have is one not quite as logical as I still doubt my abilities to run a good store. I've been with the company longer than anyone else in my store and have been fairly successful in the last several months, but still I wonder as I assume my role walking through the door if I can actually do it. As the numbers roll in each week, and I see that we are strong, I once again have resolve to keep going but I am always afraid of being found "unworthy." This insight underneath a manager's identity and shell is something not often talked about because it reveals inadequacies managers usually cannot afford to expose. Team members can sometimes act like sharks, ready to pounce on any manager who appears to waver or give in.

Administrative Clan. The first assumption we need to establish is that there will always be a solid group, sometimes called a clique, in any organization. We like to think we are all beyond the high school years, and that no one does this kind of exclusivity anymore as adults, but that would be faulty. Perhaps it stems from our hominid formative years of being tribal groups warring with each other in order to survive, and we desire and crave that kind of

association in order to feel we are really handling our human existence, or perhaps humans are mean and like to push others away just because they can. Whatever the reason, every organization has an administrative clan and those businesses that understand this aspect of the workplace and use it to their advantage have the potential to be the most successful.

This clan is part of a broader network inside the informal organization of a workplace which operates as Roethlisberger and Dickson ([1939] 1967, p. 559) describes and includes "coalitions" explored by Thompson (1967), Pfeffer and Salanick (1978), and Selznick (1949, 1996). The clan typically tends to include management but does not include all the managers. The clan also includes many people that have been working at the store for several years but can also include very new people or those who have worked there longer but remain outside (Laubach, 2005).

In Laubach's (2005) study, he found that "identifying members of the network in practice was generally not difficult- managers and key enterprise partners are seen to know them as people to go to for critical tasks- but specifying characteristics of membership was difficult." He explains that he did eventually find the keys to identifying the members, but I also found this to be generally true for my experience. It was easy for people to name those who were in the administrative clan as I discovered while doing interviews with them. After the main questions, I would tell them where my research was headed, and what I was looking at specifically. At this point, their eyes would light up and a sudden understanding of the informal organization would be brought to their conscious mind. Through our further discussion, it was clear that all of them knew about this characteristic of the workplace and interacted with it daily but did not necessarily have a conscious grasp of what was going on until I outlined it for them. Once I did, they quickly started speculating who was in the group, and who was not. During my interview

with Angie, a manager, she insisted she was not in the group and, later, another verified the same opinion, which was a surprise to me since I had assumed she was a star member. It became clear that their view of who was in the group and who was not was based on what that person did for the group, and how often they did it. Since the manager in question often put school first and would not work extra hours if it were to come into conflict with her schooling, she was considered not inside the clan while the other manager who would always drop everything for the store was definitely part of the clan.

It was definitely easier for me to pick out who were clan members in my own store than it was for me to pick them out for other stores. As a member of the clan myself and watching their interactions day by day, I had an acute understanding of those who were active participants whereas my mere observations of another store were not always correct. This is due partly to the nature of the clan as the lines can seem quite "fuzzy" (Laubach, 2005). Throughout my experience with this research, I would attribute the "fuzziness" to two reasons: the administrative clan is mostly subconscious and the needs of the organization can change so quickly that the lines need to be altered sometimes based on those needs.

The clan is a very fluid group. A person can navigate inside and outside of this group several times even in one day. Those who do this are obviously not as counted on but may still be a member of the clan on days when they happen to come in and bail out the other managers. Laubach's (2005) analysis referred to this as a "star" or "stock" which could rise or fall with the various situations and is a succinct way of explaining how people move in and out of the clan.

In general, as noted by Laubach (2005), clan members are trusted individuals who are reliable and have the organization's goals in mind more than their own personal goals. These corresponding interests coincide with Ouchi's (1979, 1980) conception of the workplace clan.

His assertion is that the network is composed of subgroups of the organization rather than the organization as a whole unit.

This administrative clan can also be quite powerful, as especially seen when there is a "crew-run" store. A new GM can have a lot trouble with this type of store. We use this term in the business to indicate a group of team members whose managers have essentially checked out, letting the team members run the store in any direction they see fit. I took over two stores like this during my observations, and both times, it was an overwhelming struggle. In one of the two stores, I had to hire a completely new team. In the other, I had to parcel through the team to see which of them would adhere to the standards and which would not. The administrative clan can easily ostracize specific people, even perhaps without verbally agreeing to do it but somehow understanding what needs to be done for the benefit, as they see it of course, of the group.

As a manager who is not part of the administrative clan (as I was not when changing the crew-run store), it can often feel alone and frustrating as you get resistance from every angle and every shift. As a GM with a clear vision, however, it does not matter how strong the clan is or what they are trying to do because I understood I was doing the right things, according to the companies desires and standards, and that I was going to come out the "winner." The store was going to be changed, and it became clear to the clan members that they needed either to get on board with the new changes or go find another job. In both instances, I never fired anyone. I wanted them to see and choose for themselves if they were going to stay or not. I made it clear what the standards and expectations were, and those who supported and followed them got hours while those who fought me did not. Eventually, the ones who were not on board with the changes, realized they were no longer in the clan and left on their own. I never made the choice

for them, as they were able to decide how much they were going to adhere to the new orientation of the clan or not (personal communication, June 23, 2015).

The clan can also easily push out new team members, especially if they are not in management, for whatever whim they may discover. Clans that are oriented with the manager's direction and have the company's improvement and interests at heart are less likely to be so aggressive. If a new person is hired and someone decides they do not fit in for whatever reason, the clan can work together to push them out by not including the person in conversations or outside events and even being verbally or physically rude to the new team member. It is definitely interesting how they do not even need to tell each other they want to push a person out, but rather they just come to a nonverbal consensus and begin to work on the "project" together. In fact, when I first was hired and training in the first store, one clan member decided she really did not like me, mostly because I took a position she wanted, and was trying to get the others to hate me as well. Unfortunately for her, I proved to be too stable as it was quickly obvious how the team members would treat me differently when she was there, but when she was not there, we actually had a good time. It is possible that her role in the clan was not as strong as she thought it was but it is also possible that the clan was changing based on other considerations as well.

It is clear that tapping into the power of the clan is a tool that can really help propel a business in one direction or another. My entire management style and technique relies on the ability to identify the key players, understand how to get their priorities aligned with the company's interests, and support the team members as much as possible.

Another aspect of the clan is the way the team members come together to help each other out. While it is very easy to lose position in the group among themselves, once a person is in the

group, the members combine against forces that cause an issue for individual members or the group as a whole. My first real conscious understanding of this tendency was a story I heard after I returned to the first store I helped open. This story was so fascinating to the team members that they made it a point to tell me about it months after it had happened. A customer was being very rude to a line server who was struggling to prepare his food. This particular team member, called Pam, was a quiet woman who had been the subject of a lot of derision over her life and was not likely to stand up for herself. The customer was calling her names and said statements to the effect of "You are worthless as you can't even prepare the food and that's what you get paid for" and other negative expressions. Fortunately, for Pam, another team member, Alice, who had a reputation of being outspoken, was working that day. Pam asked the guest if he was to be eating inside or for takeout and he responded that he was dining in. At this point, Alice was so angry with the man, but essentially unable to tell him off without getting in trouble, she abruptly put the man's food in a bag and told him he was actually taking it to go. This story was afterwards told in awe of Alice, and how she was not going to take any crap from anyone who was putting down someone Alice saw as a member of her group and slightly defenseless. Alice did indeed commit a faux pas of being rude to a guest, but because everyone felt the guest deserved the treatment, she did not get into any trouble - thus demonstrating a higher level of autonomy in how she was able to perform her job and a closeness of the group.

Angie, a manager, provided key insight about the administrative clan. She complained that some team members in her store were violating rules without consequence. One person was consistently late, a "no-call, no-show," which means they would not call off for a shift, would not arrive, and then later still expect to have a job. Usually, this is something that gets a person quickly terminated. However, in this case, a person was getting away with it because they

brought other qualities to the table that the GM must have felt were worth the issue. Certainly, this is an example of someone enjoying schedule flexibility as part of being in the administrative clan.

Hannah, a manager, referred to the clan in terms of a "prison culture" in which team members were very close, a product of long-term association within the workplace. Those who were part of that clan spoke to each other more harshly, even using curse words in their instructions. Unfortunately, a new hire was put off by their communication style. Hannah lamented that it was difficult to bring in new people to this setting for this reason. Additionally, she explained the usual team members were also very critical of the new person, either comparing the new person to their seasoned abilities, or judging whether the person would fit in with the team or not. This is a strong example of the team having the mentality of being able to influence the way the store should run, thus indicating a strong sense of participation.

A helpful aspect of the interviews I performed was after I had finished all the questions, I would let them know what I was studying. Nearly all of the interviewees, when I mentioned the administrative clan, suddenly realized they understood something that had previously been mostly subconscious beforehand. Everyone had at least some interaction and knowledge of this group, which I would sometimes refer to as "the in-group" for him or her to better conceptualize. This led to many other conversations that helped provide the answers I was looking for.

One of the aspects of the clan we discussed was how to be a member. Alex described team members "stepping up their game" and showing interest beyond their regular duties. Kyle discussed disparities in the disciplinary actions in response to rule violations, speculating that a person belonging to the clan is able to get away with more. He gave an example of a team member who was late to an important meeting due to the power being out and his alarm not

going off. Instead of being fired, as the manager had previously said anyone late would be, he was able to keep his job being he was so crucial to the store. Also, someone else was allowed to drink on the job but keep their position because they were perceived as crucial.

One manager stated that she felt not being included in the group made her not enjoy the job as much. She puts school as priority so her teammates just felt she came in, got the job done, and left. She said this was not fun for her. Her story is an example of how being in the administrative clan and participating in consent can help you feel a better sense of job satisfaction or not being in the clan can lower your sense of job satisfaction.

Another manager, Harold, cited an example from a previous job at another restaurant. Harold was working the line as a grill cook, got upset at something and had a huge fit. He threw things, kicked open the manager's door, walked out the back, and went home. A little while later, Harold called the manager who let him come back, finish his shift, and keep his job. Harold felt this was only possible because he was in the core as a crucial member. His experience is an example of organizational commitment, autonomy, and schedule flexibility. Harold's manager realized they needed him back at the store and Harold came back despite being angry because he was committed to the organization. Harold also had autonomy because he was able to perform his job however he felt necessary, including yelling and treating the other team members poorly. For schedule flexibility, Harold was able to leave the store and come back when he felt like it, definitely not restricted by the schedule.

It is important here to discuss the difference between a clique and a clan. The distinction between these two groups can be ambiguous. A clique is a group of friends or people who may have similar interests or goals. The administrative clan is a group who may consist of friends but also has other qualities as a functioning group inside the business. They are able to enjoy

42

autonomy, participation, schedule flexibility, and organizational commitment. It is possible that if a clan member loses one of these aspects, he/she is no longer in the clan. He/she may still, however, remain a member of the clique and enjoy his/her time with the other members but he/she does not belong to the functioning clan. For example, the second time I stepped in as a new GM, I had to weed through the team members to find out who was going to be able to function as a clan member with the store's real interests at heart. They were a functioning clan before I got there, enjoying all the perks of being a clan, but once I started putting restrictions on them to guide their decisions in a different way, they were no longer a clan but were still a clique. Those who understood what I was doing and were willing to follow the new rules, still remained in the clan and those who did not, were out of the clan but could still have been part of the clique of friends. Therefore, a clique can evolve into a clan, and a clan can devolve into a clique. A clique can exist inside of a clan and a clan can exist inside of a clique but the important distinction is the ability the members have of engaging in autonomy, schedule flexibly, participation, and organizational commitment.

      Consent. Throughout my ethnography, I encountered several aspects of the consent deal and the administrative clan. I will go through each aspect and discuss how it applies in the real life workplace and how these elements might work with each other to foster a better sense of job satisfaction. As explained earlier, the consent deal forms by a few characteristics of the workplace that the administrative clan usually exhibits: participation, schedule flexibility, autonomy, and organizational commitment.

      Before discussing each of these components, I will review the notion of trust without which the consent deal could not function. Covey's (1990) writings in the business literature do not link trust to the consent deal, but in this analysis that relationship is crucial. Some managers

have a hard time with this idea since many are under the false assumption that being able to do the job, even being so great your skills are unparalleled in the business, means you can do whatever you want. However, this assumption is definitely not true. If team members cannot trust you as a manager, you cannot get very far with them. Managers are able to train people to become competent at their jobs, but training managers to be trustworthy is much more difficult and abstract.

A specific shift runner whom I worked with struggled with this immensely. He was great at his job in that he could open the restaurant under extreme duress like having many catering orders or having a call-off. He was great at the line in always pushing out orders quickly but also making guest connections. In addition, he had a sense of humor that many team members responded to well. However, there was a lot of gossip and resentful feelings toward this manager, which most noticed after this manager transferred to another store (personal communication, January 1, 2015). The discord came from many reasons but the heart of it was the team had a hard time trusting him. When there was a break in the line, he was always the first to go outside for a smoke break, regardless of the other team members and their needs. When it came time for him to leave, he would leave quickly, often leaving things undone that made other team members have to stay later than their end time or make others work harder. After lunch, this manager would also be the first to take a food break. Another difficulty team members had was this person liked to gossip in a mean and nasty way so while he seemed very approachable on a one-on-one discussion, words would then be later said to someone else which would twist the story horribly. He was encountering the conundrum of being competent but not trustworthy. Interestingly enough, this type of mistrust came back to this person as many team members

would be pleasant and agreeable to his face but often talk so badly about him behind his back that he became a common topic of mockery (personal communication, November 16, 2014).

On a personal note and in the spirit of full disclosure, I, as a manager, struggle with this principle a lot. This is not because I am not trustworthy. In fact, team members often perceive that I am so moral, they hide things from me thinking that I will judge them in a certain way. I also tell them all the time in reviews and other conversations that they need to call me out if they see that I am not being fair. I plainly admit I do not do all that is perfect and that sometimes I do or say things that they may not understand the reasoning for which sometimes shakes the trust between us.

For example, we have a policy regarding catering tips. All team members are to split the tips equally if they are working during the tip the catering leaves. Managers are not to receive any part of these tips unless they are the delivery driver because we feel they receive wages in other ways and for other things. We do this in hopes that team members will encourage more catering orders and instead of resenting the extra work, they will look forward to it. I promoted a team member to shift runner but he was currently in training and having had no raise. In fact, some of the team members working that shift made more than he did. The trainee did have a manager shirt on but that was all that distinguished him from the other team members. They did not know he had not received a raise yet because that was his personal business in his training program. I delivered this particular catering order and instead of taking 60% of the tip as is customary, I only took 50% of the sizable tip to allow the team members to get more money. I also included the shift runner in the split of cash since he was making less than some of the other team members who were getting part of the tip. No one complained to me or questioned why I did this that day, but a couple of days later, a person came to me and filled me in on the fact that

45

two of the line servers (one of which had made more money than the shift runner trainee) were complaining about me for letting him in on the tip. Obviously, this frustrated me because I consider myself a trustworthy and fair manager. It further frustrated me because no one thought to ask me at the time if there was a particular reason I did include the shift runner (personal communication, August 9, 2015). This example illustrates how decisions happen that some team members do not completely understand but the decision can still affect the team in a negative way.

Unfortunately, this has not been my only struggle with trust since sometimes I come upon a team member with whom I really have difficulty communicating. As I learn more about myself, as a manager, and continue to analyze my styles and choices, I do understand that the root of these issues is trust, on either their part not trusting what I am saying, or my part, not trusting what they are saying. As my learning and training is never complete, this is an area I am trying to understand and correct. It is also certain that if trust is not present, the consent deal cannot function at full capacity.

During the interviews, I was trying to find the consent deal without straight up explaining and asking about it. One of the questions I asked was about bending rules in the workplace. Many of the respondents did not want to fess up to this. Often, I would get a response that they do not bend any rules. Then, I would prod with examples of rules bent in my store, giving myself as an example so they did not feel they would get in trouble, or that I would judge them in any way for their transgressions. After I would do this, many would agree that they would sometimes bend those rules as well. The rules that managers bent or allowed to bend, were usually little things that were company standard but would not necessarily harm someone. For example, we are supposed to have recipe cards out every time we perform food preparation. At first, this is

great because new team members need this for a reference and it enables them to make fewer mistakes. However, if a cook has prepared the same item nearly every day for two years, it is a little more difficult to require him/her to have a recipe card in front of him/her. Essentially, any rule that would not hurt anyone, but that would save time, would be a candidate to bend.

Nearly all of the interviewees agreed that there were, however, some very strong rules that team members cannot ever bend. Those rules are anything that can hurt someone or compromise food safety like using a cut glove when cutting meat, or making sure chicken gets to a specific temperature before serving it. Most interviewees agreed that it just is a matter of what battles you want to pick. As a manager, there are so many little things all day long that you could get mad about, but that is too exhausting and everyone would be miserable.

It would seem, then, that there are two sets of rules a manager encounters every day. The first set the government mandates in the form of the Board of Health, which are the bare minimum to keeping food healthy in order to prevent illness and harm to guests or team members. The other set the company gives to uphold the brand identity, be consistent across all stores, and represent the company. Obviously, if anyone wants to be in the restaurant business for more than a few months, then they need to follow the first set or no one will return to the establishment. The second set, however, is more flexible and are the types of rules managers use to negotiate within the consent deal. Often team members see this as a manager's willingness to understand their point of view and will give more to the manager, or immediate supervisor, in return.

Participation. This component of the consent deal involves the broader organization's decisions. It includes figuring out how the business should run, what the priorities are, who gets the most hours, and who gets and feels empowered. Participation extends beyond their personal

job tasks but involves all the workers, not just individuals. Participation becomes something like a group project and is especially apparent when looking at what the employees give to the organization.

Some examples of participation in my workplace include the upper management interactions as well as inside the store team member interactions. As so often with aspects of a business's culture, the attitudes start at the top and tend to trickle down into the rest of the groups. Masterchief desires that we have a good sense of participation in our stores and among our teams, so he wants the GMs to feel they are able to run their stores as they see fit instead of him making the rules for all the stores. Masterchief understands each store has different wants and needs, starting with the mere basis of the location. He also understands that each store has its own makeup of team members, some whom have been there for several years or some teams that are comprised of all relatively new team members, and thus, it is important to understand that not one rule will work for all stores. For example, in our recent GM meeting, he was addressing the issues we have with our guest surveys. He felt they were not being used enough, and that we were capable of doing more with them, but instead of telling us how to fix this issue, he gave us some examples and told us to figure out which works best for our own stores. He is not as concerned with our results but rather that we are working to get better results than we had in the past.

In my store, we post our scores on the team member community board and talk about them. We also address any negative comments we get with a personal phone call if the phone number is available. We talk about the survey results in pre-shift meetings, and two of my managers are to watch the different shifts on surveys and report to the store how they are going. In contrast, one store divided into two teams and made it a contest to see who could get the most

responses and name mentions. I decided a technique like this would not work in my store because I did not want to have such a division but obviously, the GM of the location felt it would work for her store (personal communication, September 30, 2015). Being able to delegate these kinds of details may seem simple to Masterchief, but to the managers and teams they represent, it is an important aspect of being able to have participation in the business.

An example of participation on the store level includes an incident I had with my chicken food cost. We were wasting more chicken than we should have, and I was determined to fix it because I knew that we could. First, I went to Masterchief and asked him about the specific factors that could be affecting my chicken costs. We discussed the whole process from when chicken arrives at the store until it goes into the guest's mouth, and how each step of the way can influence the chicken cost. I then turned to my team members who had been there long-term, and we discussed the different areas that chicken cost could go wrong and together we figured out where our specific store may be falling short. They brought ideas to the table I had not considered and some that I had. However, because the team members came up with the solutions "on their own," they were more apt to follow them. The team members had more motivation to follow these new ideas because it helped prove that the team members were right and knew their information. This discussion actually became quite passionate as it was obvious people wanted to do the right things - they just needed to discuss what those right things should be. We have made chicken cost ever since this incident, which was over a year ago, and the team has learned how to work on a total store issue together and fix it without having to feel threatened with consequences if they do not fix it. It also benefitted me because they became responsible for the loss and they, in turn, helped police each other so there was minimal work on my end.

Schedule Flexibility. The simplest of the three aspects of consent is schedule flexibility, but it can be quite complicated to earn, especially in the restaurant business. The basics of this type of work is that we are busiest when everyone else is off and trying to eat, including lunchtime, dinnertime, and definitely weekends. However, most people want to work the ideal schedule of Monday through Friday day shifts. I refer to this schedule as the "Holy Grail" of the restaurant business, and while we do need people to work these shifts, we need more people to work the less desirable shifts.

There are a few ways to earn schedule flexibility but the easiest way is just to have a type of tenure at the store. Strictly speaking, Masterchief does not want me operating based solely on tenure, so we try to make sure the best team members get the best hours. However, if many of the team members work well, those who have worked there the longest usually get their preferred hours. As team members get hired, we schedule them where we need them the most; however, I do like to at least know their preference so I can work up to giving them more of what they want. We also have a request off sheet hanging in the back office where team members are to write their requests for off dates. So far, I have yet to deny any person a day they have requested off, although I have been known to post a notice blocking out specific dates if it seems too many people will ask them off. I will even work outside of my own preferred schedule or work more hours (despite being on salary) just to help make sure the team members get their needs met. This is unusual in the workplace as most managers are not as generous and mostly I feel my team understands and appreciates this, based on my observations.

Throughout my observations, those who were able to choose more freely about what schedule they worked, especially those who are given their preferred schedule every week, are those who are strong administrative clan members. They are usually those who have worked in

50

the store for quite a while, have earned through their hard work the best hours, and are usually completely willing to work other hours if they know we need them. They understand that I will not ask them to work more or a different schedule than what they usually work unless I, or the store, really needs the shift filled. This understanding enables us to provide them with the shifts they desire most, as well as keeping the store staffed in times where the schedule may be harder to make than other times.

Another aspect of schedule flexibility is often when the schedule is difficult to complete, I carry it around with me and talk to different team members about solutions they have. Sometimes it means they work an extra day or that they work part of a day that they had requested off previously. Because I involve the team in my schedule making process, they typically understand what amount of struggle it can be so often when people need specific dates off, they will volunteer to work a double on a different day or perhaps work on either the day or the night, depending on their needs. It means a lot to me when team members say I need this day off, but I will be done by four so I can work after that or I will not need to leave until this time so I can work until then. In return, I always try to explain why I may need a person to work something they usually do not and let them know I appreciate their help.

Autonomy. Autonomy is probably the vaguest and most complicated aspect of the consent deal that carries much with it. Autonomy becomes clearer by the scaled together variables in the statistics section. Autonomy does include the feelings of team members that they are able to better take part in decisions with the store and have more freedom within the organization. Part of this concept does coincide with schedule flexibility as team members have autonomy to help choose what they work as well as participation in the organization, but the two concepts are not completely the same.

Whereas participation is what the team members give, autonomy is the other end of it as what the managers give, what they allow the team members to do on their own, how they let them establish priorities, and basically how much say the team members can have in making decisions. The participation examples cited earlier could also apply here as to be seen in the light of what the leaders did to help facilitate such participation. I try to give my team members as much responsibility and freedom as I can give them. I want them to feel like they have a part in running the store and that we can celebrate the good growth together and take the problems together as well.

A poignant example of this is when I train people on the systems and ways to run a shift, I give them the tasks that need to be done but I tell them it is up to them how they get done. Every shift runner needs something called a "travel path," where they walk the area of the store, checking various "hot spots" and things that often need observation. Each manager has their own routine, and there is no wrong way of doing it, as long as those spots are checked and running as they should. This example also includes delegations and shift cards. A manager is to fill out a shift card at the beginning of each shift in order to place people where they should be and have a good game plan for their shift. They know that this task needs to be done but they also know that as it is their shift, they are able to place people where they choose and delegate different tasks to them, as they feel appropriate. As the GM, I try to work mostly mid-shifts so that I am not actually in charge of the shift but enable my managers to get lots of experience opening and closing the store. This also means that I can focus my time with the guests or specific team member needs instead of the daily operations. Not to mention, I am in the building for both lunch and dinner rushes as to have the best possible impact. When I am working such a shift, if team members ask me questions about when they can leave or what they should do before they leave, I

always make a conscious effort to defer to the manager running the actual shift. I want them to realize I am standing behind them and supporting them, not trying to show I know what is best, or that what they are doing does not matter if I am there. My end goal really is to have the store run just as well when I am there as when I am not there.

Another example is how I handle wages. At first, everyone is hired in at minimum wage ($8.75 for our state) but everyone is also told in the interview before they are hired, that they can easily get raises. To me, it is absurd to give money to team members based solely on time in the company. Yes, that does have some bearing but what is more important to me is their ambition, initiative, and performance. I base my raises on clear intervals that I lay out for every new team member. They all know exactly how my raise system operates, and that is it up to them when and how fast they get a raise. First, they must finish the portion in their training book for their position. I give a raise at this point and it is not hard to accomplish this. Those who bring their books to managers during down time are those who get their training completed first. In fact, if a team member brings their book to me I will even stay over my allotted shift to help them train. I do this because I am looking at everyone as a potential manager. Those people who care about their training really stand out because I know that those who do not care about their own training will certainly not care about training others if they do become managers.

The next step for a person to get a raise is to cross-train. This may be difficult for some team members as the different tasks can be quite overwhelming but I do not require that a team member switch positions permanently, just that they know the other positions well enough to understand the experience of those who work them and can help as needed. Cross training allows me to pay the team members more because they are more valuable as I can use them in more than just one position. My goal is to have everyone in my store cross-trained. Cross training

affords me the opportunity to pay team members higher wages, and it makes scheduling much easier. I also appericate considering team members' perspectives. They are less likely to put the other people down and judge them for their weaknesses if they understand how difficult the other job can actually be.

After that, team members can then become certified trainers where they attend a class by the director of training for our franchise, and they are then able to train new team members in applications as well as in their bookwork. The next step is to become a shift runner, which is quite a bit harder than the other three steps, but it also carries a lot more accountability with the position.

One specific team member comes to mind as I review these steps to raises. He entered the store's payroll on the lowest level but pushed so hard for his bookwork to be done, to get cross-trained, to become a certified trainer, that by the time I promoted him to shift runner, he had only been with us for about five months and had already received four raises (personal communication, August 9, 2015).

Team members have the autonomy to determine how much money they make with this system. It is not arbitrary, nor is it based on random periods. Rather, I base it on performance and ambition. Each raise, except the last one, I give a set amount. Therefore, they are supplied with the necessary information to predict their pay futures. I do need to add that those who do not want to change their positions or move up to the next step, will still continue to get semi-annual raises if they continue to perform well in their respective positions.

It is a commonly held belief that managers only want to pay the team members as little as possible, but that is not my philosophy. I want to pay them as much as possible because I understand the sacrifices they are making to help the store do well, and I know how hard life can

be trying to pay bills and take care of families. Not to mention, those who get paid well are less likely to go find another job.

Organizational Commitment. Lastly, organizational commitment is crucial for clan members to possess. If a clan is properly led with business's needs in mind, they may exhibit important qualities:

> Administrative clan members act as if their interests are fully aligned with the enterprise, and give much of themselves to it, often to the detriment of their families. Workers in the periphery, as mentioned earlier, are often as disdainful of the enterprise as they are disdained by it. (Laubach, 2005, p. 21)

When you tend to spend forty hours or more in a place, it can become close to your heart as you may spend more time there than you do with your actual families. In the restaurant business, this is especially apparent as we become very close to each other. Many people date and marry those they work with, while others find solid friends that they spend more time with outside of the actual working hours. In addition, people want to feel that where they invest their time is doing something worthwhile and in order for people to feel their jobs are worthwhile, they have to buy into it a little more. The more sacrifice and time a person spends with an organization, the more they are likely to have a stronger sense of organizational commitment. This sense can become even stronger if they feel they are part of a group, perhaps a clan, that they have influence in and feel supported by.

Throughout my years of observations, I have seen commitment that went to astronomical heights and have seen a lack of commitment in others where it would seem logical that they should invest more. When I took over the store I currently manage, one of the shift runners there shocked me with her stories. The GM really took advantage of her as he would often come in

late, and then even if he did show up, would spend hours in the backroom getting high with the door locked. This shift runner ran the store like a tight ship despite her GM's absence and even sometimes when he would be angry with her. Inventory was due Monday mornings and the GM was supposed to come in at six and have it all done by eight to start the regular process of the day to get open. The GM would not show up until way later so this shift runner would go above her job description, count the inventory, enter it, and send in all the paperwork on time so the GM would not get in trouble. When the GM did finally show up, close to eleven o'clock, he yelled and screamed at her because of what she had done. The shift runner had no idea as to what she had done wrong but it took her understanding the corruptness of the GM to realize he was upset because she submitted the real numbers that he was unable to fudge. He never apologized to her and still made other quite frustrating demands such as this and she never quit. She supported him and even when the Masterchief came around asking questions about the GM's behavior, she always had his back and would never disclose hurtful things about him (personal communication, November 27, 2014). This shift runner's commitment to the informal organization and to this specific manager was so much that she was willing to risk ridicule, personal time, family life, and reputation. The loyalty to the clan can be very strong indeed.

Negative Side Effects of Consent. Unfortunately, there can be negative side effects of the consent deal that most managers do not want to admit. However, it is important to acknowledge and understand these occurrences to prevent them or fix them as the need may warrant, as well as give as much information about the consent deal as possible.

I have already established that a clan will nearly always exist in an organization and this very well may include a clan that does not have the GM participation, or any management participation for that matter, and may have priorities that are not helpful for the store to grow and

improve. The restaurant business refers to this as "a crew-run store." Small groups of people dictate the informal rules of the organization, which can often include pushing other team members to quit for whatever reason. These reasons can include something as simple as a personality issue and something as important as a failure to work with the team. A "crew-run store" may also engage in ostracizing guests because they do not play by the rules the group thinks they should adhere to, and make certain silly issues turn into big deals that really should be avoided. These types of groups typically have a high level of drama and do not work well with growth or change because they feel their way is best and there should be as little change as possible. While these groups do have autonomy, schedule flexibility, and participation, it is in negative direction for the store's needs in being successful. The administrative clan and the consent deal just do not work properly if the GM and the management staff are not there to guide the efforts in the correct direction.

In the crew-run type of situation, a new GM will usually need to fix the issue and will need to lay down some specific behaviors. The team members can agree and work with the new rules or be encouraged to find other employment. As a GM, having a team that is behind you all the way is the first step to working into a culture conducive to consent.

On the other hand, even if you do have a good solid team with management working together, another side effect of having too much autonomy is team members being harsher on each other than they should be. Not everyone understands how to communicate with each other in a positive and constructive way, so sometimes when team members work hard, they perceive that another team member may not be working as hard as they are and start to notice more and more negative things about the other worker. This tension especially happens between night shift and day shift more often than not because it is easy to pick on the other team members since you

were not there to see how busy it was. As a manager who wants to facilitate the team into

holding each other accountable, it becomes difficult to parcel out what is an issue that really

needs to be talked about and what is just someone dwelling on the negative and picking on the

other team member. I have one particular cook who gets so upset if the night team members miss

something because he feels like he has to do it and feels resentful. It frustrates me though,

because I cannot see or correct the issue if the morning person fixes the issue before management

can see it.

In lieu of this kind of conflict, I try to maintain a few policies to help team members not

become so hard on each other. First, I only want to hear issues in a positive and uplifting way as

an avenue to help the store and the team improve. I do not want negative nitpicking and anger as

people put others down in a gossiping way. Second, I tell the person to quit covering for the

other team member if it is going to make them resentful. I try to get them to understand they

need to hold the other person accountable for their duties and doing them instead will only

enable them to continue the behavior. Third, I try to get the frustrated team member to discuss it

with the other team member directly, instead of doing it myself. This helps prevent gossip, puts

the frustrated team member on the spot to be able to provide evidence for the offending issues,

and helps to cool them down since it is a little bit more difficult to be rude when you are actually

facing the person instead of just talking about them. Nonetheless, it is still something that can

happen as team members feel they are responsible together but others do not work as hard as

they think they should. I caution that everyone must exercise patience, do their part, and

remember to be a positive support for those who cannot always do what everyone else can do.

One of my worst fears when trying to facilitate the consent deal is something that I am

not sure is factual, but to me seems like a logical progression. If the team sees me delegating so

much and giving away all the duties of operations to the assistant managers or other team members, are they going to think I am lazy? When issues arise, I try to get the team to solve them together instead of coming up with the solution myself and I worry that they will see this as an element of me being either lazy or weak. I try to make up for the work they do by doing other things in order to give them the time to do the operations but this consequently ends up with me doing something more mundane like sweeping the dining room or making food prep items myself.

When we went to a rebranding conference, I ran into several GMs who were from corporate. They explained how they were rarely on the line and rarely did any prep. This just floored me as one of my teachings to my managers is that they should be spending at least ninety percent of their shifts on the line. I asked them how they spent their time, and they said things like watching the line from a distance to make sure all were doing their job and working on paperwork. This was baffling to me as to how these managers gain respect from their team members. As a GM, I am always trying to show I will never ask a team member to do something I would not to myself, including cleaning drains, scrubbing baseboards on my hands and knees, as well as garbage cans. It is my effort to prove that even if I require my shift runners to do all the important things, I can support them by helping get the prep done for the day or work a spot on the line so they can do the invoicing or put truck orders away. I feel this is an important aspect of team respect and understanding. There is a fine line between having the store feel like they are a part of the business, and having a team who resents you because they do all the work but you get all the credit when all you do is stand around.

CHAPTER 5

REBRANDING

The Conference

The new CEO and the new parent fast food company decided they needed to change the whole image and idea of the company due to their research and vision to where they felt Zapata could go. They wanted to find our place in the marketing niche. As Masterchief likes to say, we do not want to be part of the conversation. What he means is when a group of people is thinking about where to eat, they have a conversation where each of them throws out places they would like to go. However, when a group wants to go out for coffee, there is only one clear choice and there is not even a conversation about where to go. This is what they wanted for Zapata; to be so different and rise above the competition that we are not even included in the conversation. Instead, it is a matter of course about where the group will go; no discussion needed.

This is quite an ambitious challenge, and there were many people and much research that went into the solution. They formed committees and pulled the best people in their field that worked for the company. The research and development committee recruited several of the corporate regional managers who had done really well with their areas, but they knew they also needed a voice from the franchise groups. They recruited Masterchief, from the small franchise in Appalachia that has more pizza restaurants than those of Zapata, to be that voice for the franchisees. They knew of his caliber of person and the success of his franchise. More importantly, they knew his mindset was already in the same direction they were hoping to go. The committee meets every few months and gives Masterchief an added benefit of seeing "what is coming down the pipeline" before anyone else learns about it. This also gives him the

advantage of sharing his views and attitudes about how managers should run a business and how workers need to be treated.

Masterchief has been in the business a long time and has worked on his management techniques for several years. His style is very different from what Taylor (2012) says in how to manage an organization and follows a lot closer to the consent deal. A year before the conference arrived, he gave me copies of Belasco and Stayer (1993) and Covey (1990), both which have approaches closer to the consent deal than most popular business literature. It should also be noted when they were written, demonstrating that these ideas are not new to the business literature but are clearly different to how Sociologists still see managers. Business academics have long understood the concept of including workers and are now incorporating ways to help the workers, as I will demonstrate with material and data from the conference, in order to profit while understanding the view of the worker.

The conference convened in a luxurious hotel in downtown Denver. It was a full workweek of classes, workshops, and discussions. The company of Zapata was so convinced this was a crucial step that they paid for all of the corporate general managers to fly in from all over the country to participate and learn the concepts presented. Franchises were given the choice of whether to come or not and of course, Masterchief knew we all needed to go and paid over $20,000 for all of us to attend. If profits were really what these owners and upper level managers were after, they would not have invested in such a major cost. They knew many of these ideas were going to be hard for some to understand and buy into as change can often be painful and that this conference needed to show care and effort on their parts to facilitate the growth as much as possible.

The first section of the conference was about Zapata's history. The company hired a performing arts theatre troupe who wrote and performed a rock opera making light of the history and the "me too" mentality. They warned us all to have open minds and that there were going to be many changes coming up that we needed to embrace. It was much different from the boring business meeting we were all expecting. For the next few days, they divided us up into different groups, mostly with all people we did not know, and took us through workshops of a training course. Zapata paid another company that specialized in management training to present their classes and workbook to all the general managers. It was a very interactive course, and I will discuss it further later in this chapter.

One lesser goal of the conference was to network and meet follow general managers who were running up against the same problems. The CEO and Masterchief advised the managers to make contacts, share ideas as to how we solved certain problems that could plague all of the stores from Zapata, and even make some friends. It so happened that in one of my groups there were many corporate general managers and only a few franchise managers. I did not understand that the two groups were so different until I got into a heated debate with two corporate managers about how they should be helping the team members do their daily mundane tasks like work on the line while it was busy and help with prep. They insisted it was a manager's job to just sit back and watch the team work the store and then offer feedback to the team members. This upset me because I could not fathom just standing around while a line of guests were waiting to get food and I was certainly able bodied enough to help my team with the guests.

Later, others explained to me that the corporate stores manage their restaurants a little different from how Masterchief has structured our stores. The managers are not part of the "labor matrix," which essentially means they are extra and their hours do not count against labor costs

thus they are not accountable to actually perform any labor. For our franchise, however, the managers do count and so we need to be productive or we will not make our labor costs. At first glance, this can seem very odd as managers are not typically considered workers but after interacting with both models, I have to agree with Masterchief. It is unfathomable to me how team members would have any respect for a manager who just stood around staring at them all day, especially in the heat of the moment in a restaurant when things are spiraling out of control. I enjoy interacting with the guests and taking time to help the team members with prep items and cleaning enables us to connect better and to communicate better. Perhaps it stems from the fact that I worked my way up and understand how the team members feel, or perhaps it is because I truly do not feel I am any better than the team members but that I merely just have a different set of skills. Whatever it is, I know I will never be able to work in a place that does not allow managers to pull the weight just as well as the team members.

Changes. Among the first of the changes for our rebranding was uniforms. Beforehand, uniform standards were pretty strict and detailed. There was only one team shirt and managers wore polos. Shirts were required to be tucked in while wearing jeans, black pants, or khakis. If there were belt loops on the pants, they must wear a belt. They had to wear a Zapata issued hat, were unable to have any facial hair except a modest goatee and even had inch restrictions on sideburns. No one was allowed to wear any kind of jewelry except one ring on each hand. Hair was to be put up neatly off the collar and to be only "normal" colors. Black shoes were to be worn at all times and managers were expected to enforce all of these requirements. I cannot explain how many times I had to tell various team members to tuck in their shirts, mostly because they would come out when bending over, but some were just rebellious.

The rebranding conference changed nearly all of those standards, and the managers rejoiced to learn of the change. First, they came out with ten to 12 different shirts with many different styles such as button up, a sweater, or t-shirts with many different pictures on them and all were able to be worn by the whole team. They completely dissolved managers wearing different shirts than the team as if to say managers are no better than anyone else. Some managers were frustrated with this change, but I personally believe a guest should be able to tell you are a manager because of how you carry yourself and run your shift, regardless of what type of shirt you are wearing. Shirts were no longer required to be tucked in, and belts were no longer required.

Another change they instituted was embracing everyone's style. Facial hair restrictions were completely lifted so anyone could have any type of style they wanted. These changes were done by corporate, but our franchise has yet to completely allow full beards. Masterchief is on board with the idea, but the owner is a little old fashioned and feels beards are not necessarily hygienic. However, this is one of a very few examples where our company has not embraced or led the changes.

Hair is also now allowed to be any color and style. We still have to adhere to local food codes, of course, so it needs to be up, but it can be in any style and color the person feels they want to wear. Hats are also completely open as well. We still have Zapata hats if someone wants to wear one, but we do not require a specific hat. In fact, team members are encouraged to wear their favorite sports teams or brand logos so they can feel more like themselves. If a team member does not want to wear a hat at all, they can opt for any type and color of bandana. This choice has been popular with many of the women as it is easier to wear a bandana as a headband when having to deal with longer hair.

The new CEO explained all of these changes because he wants individuals in the stores. Enabling the team to dress how they want aims to do two things: encourage them to act more freely like themselves, and enable guests to have points of conversation and interaction they were unable to achieve completely beforehand. The CEO and Masterchief are focusing on not having scripts on the line and not having a robotic type of transaction. Instead, they want the team to be able to interact with the guests, get to know them, even chat with them about things that have nothing to do with the food they are preparing at that same moment. This emphasis has really enabled Zapata to stand apart from the competition and for the team to enjoy the actual job instead of feeling like locked-in robots.

Another change the company enacted while at the conference was in the menu and food. They wanted to go outside the little box Zapata had been operating in for years and try something new to stand out from the others in the same line of food. They did this by introducing new entrees and flavors, including bacon and upcoming brisket. Their focus was to get food that was "instagramable" as well as "raveable" and "craveable."

Response to Changes. The changes enacted by the upper management do not really matter if the response to them does not go over well. This reason is partly why they did the conference so the managers would be in a setting and mindset to accept the changes more easily. The uniform change was the first to roll out, and it hit before the conference. The response from the team members was very positive. They were excited to order their shirts and looked over the selections multiple times. The managers were also excited for the new choices until the shirts actually came in and they realized they would only have about one polo and have to wear t-shirts the rest of the time. Before the change, managers only could wear polos and team members only the t-shirts. Now, both parties can wear both and while the team members thought that was

awesome, the managers felt frustration because in their eyes, they had worked so hard to get to be a manager and deserved some kind of visible distinction. Some weeks later, I walked into a different store to pick up supplies and noticed a manager wearing the old shirts, which was then a uniform violation. I made a teasing comment about it and he responded rather rudely that he did not wear t-shirts, and he was waiting for more polos to arrive before he would wear the new uniform. He said this in front of the team members, and I was surprised at how strongly he felt about it. Not all the managers felt this way, however, as some did not really care about the visible distinction and agreed with my mentality, which was that a guest should be able to tell the manager apart from the team members by the way they act and interact, not by the shirt they wear.

The other changes were more subtle, but because Masterchief was on the committee, he often communicated things to us before they officially changed so his stores did not get surprised very often. The team members did respond well to the focus on wanting them to be individuals instead of robots as they all have their different ways with interacting with the guests. Some go pretty far telling personal stories about their kids or teasing guests in some happy way. These interactions occur especially with regular guests who are in the store sometimes four to five times a week.

The food changes were not particularly difficult to pick up, as team members were accustomed to menu changes quite often. The guests responded a lot more negatively because with one of the recent changes, they updated the menu boards, taking off items that were beloved by guests. Zapata still serves these items but in an effort to simplify the menu, they removed them. There are many guests who still come in asking for the items and the team members respond with a positive affirmative. However, for a moment, the guest has a negative feeling

towards the company. As far as the new food goes, the guests seem to enjoy it. The company is pulling in new people as the dishes appeal to a slightly different crowd.

Another huge change Zapata made was to go to a one-price model. One item used to be an extra cost and team members had to tell guests repetitively every time a guest asked for some. In addition, team members had to add charges for other items as well but with the new change, they made it all one price. Consequently, the base price rose so there are mixed reactions of our food being too expensive but how it is great that Zapata does not upcharge for those other items. The team members like it because it makes them less of a policeperson on the line and more of a "flavor liberator" enabling the guests to try anything they want for no extra charge. Unless, however, a guest takes too much advantage of the offer and makes the food difficult to prepare.

The last response I want to highlight is that of the corporate managers with whom I had gotten into that discussion. We never resolved the conversation as they were running their stores how they thought best, and I was running mine how I thought best. The whole conversation served to open my eyes to the differences even within my own company. Ironically, however, I did find out from the awards ceremony that one of the managers engaged in this conversation was the regional director of the highest grossing store in all the company, pulling in a huge $4 million a year. I plan to follow up with Masterchief and see if the corporate system has changed in the regard of the managers if they are helping the team members more or not. The model from the Roots training suggests going in that direction but could be used for both models at the same time. However, I should also point out that a general manager and those above the position, the company pays them for a different set of skills than what they pay for the team members. Masterchief even commented to me a couple weeks ago that even if I were unable to work the position as physically as I was doing before, it was okay because they pay me more for my

mental skills than for my physical labor. Therefore, while managers should be helping the team members perform those tasks of the company, they also have to perform the mental tasks of coaching and evaluating. In this sense, they play a double duty position, which inherently requires they be good at both the physical and mental tasks to manage effectively.

Training Workshops. The premise of the training modules we spent two days working on is a compass. It is divided into four sections: know my role, know my business, connect my team, and deliver results. Each section has a series of exercises and discussion points that we went through as groups facilitated by coaches. They aimed the whole experience at self-evaluation for each manager and they gave us a journal to answer the questions for our specific needs and organizations.

The first section we went over was know my role. The description for this section is "great managers see people as their top priority. They know that if they focus on developing a great team, the business results they want will follow" (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 7). We analyzed how we spend our time as managers and if we were doing the right things. The workshop then emphasized in all caps, "MANAGING IS ABOUT PEOPLE" (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 14). We discussed delegating and coaching and then wrote down for our own development different personal areas where we could be better.

The next section is about knowing my business. "Great managers recognize that being knowledgeable about the company's big picture prepares them to lead their team to deliver great results" (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 20). We then went over Zapata's new approaches to business and team standards: "we care for the person in front of us so that they have the freedom to be at their best" (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 22). There were six different statements about how we want to be as

managers and members of Zapata and all of them are great examples of focusing on the worker's

world instead of profit.

> We serve the people that serve the people that serve the guest. We care forward and caring forward is a powerful chain reaction that ultimately results in providing our guest with an extraordinary experience. We are living proof of what we believe and want to encourage in our workplaces and communities. Our team members and guests can count on us. We know the little things matter, so we pay attention to the details. We are servants in every sense and we INSPIRE (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 22).

> We see what can be. We challenge the status quo, aspiring to be the version of our very best self, each and every day (without comparing ourselves to others). Innovation is at our core… it's in our DNA. We're leaders of the movement and we are always striving to contribute in heartfelt and meaningful ways (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 22).

> We have the courage to do what's right. And, we help others to do the same. We realize being right isn't what matters most… it's *doing right* that matters (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 22).

> We help others succeed. We have each other's backs. We respect personal time and life outside the workplace. We empathize with each other, we look for opportunities to help each other, and we care for each other. We support and are useful to each other. We lead with our hearts in all aspects of our life. Ego has no place at our table. We activate decision making with the people closest to our guests. We all have the power to make the call and we place our trust in our team member's abilities. We make it right for our guests and take action (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 22).

> We laugh often… especially at ourselves. We tell the truth, even when it's not easy. We put others first. We listen before we speak; give credit and take blame; we share what we do and don't know. We make ourselves vulnerable and we commend others when they do the same (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 23).

> We embrace individuality and fly our own flags. We are inclusive. We welcome diversity and seek out unique perspectives. We speak from the heart. We let our personalities shine. We go unscripted while at the same time are sensitive to the needs of those with whom we are interacting (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 23).

At this point we were introduced to "3D Flavor" where they highlighted three areas we are to

focus on: our people, our place, and our food.

> Our people. We celebrate each person's individuality resulting in one big, flavor-packed family. Working at Zapata is about more than just food. It's about launching conversations, working with people we dig, and serving up awesome in everything we do. It's a place where coworkers become compadres and guests feel the love as soon as they walk in the door.

Together, we create great experiences; bringing a contagious level of energy and enthusiasm to work, to life, to everything we encounter (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 23).

Our place. Our place reflects our people – unique, bright, and surging with energy. We think food tastes better in a place like that, so we pay attention to all the little details: the lighting, sounds, colors, textures… This is the home we invite you to enjoy, and we're thrilled to welcome everyone to our table (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 23).

Our food. Food should be an experience – an exploration. We chase the frontiers of flavor, break down the walls of convention, and boldly leap into the unexpected with everything we create. Most importantly, we're ready to guide you along our flavor adventure and share the joy of flavor discovery (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 23).

The third section of the compass is about connecting the team. We discussed how different perspectives happen in the same conversations and how to be engaging during conversations. They coached us to get team members to connect with the organization's priorities in a three-step process: offer perspective to see the bigger picture, inspire purpose with a team story, and connect your people by showing them how Zapata's success can help them as well.

The last section is divided again into four more sections all underneath deliver results: build effective working relationships, set clear expectations, coach and develop, and follow up. The first step in building effective working relationships is to build emotional capital. They had us list a few questions we could ask those we work with to get to know them better and understand them better. Then we focused on actions as communications, which can often speak louder than words. The messages we give through our actions can also upset the delicate balance of trust we have if we say one thing and do another. We did a "working relationships assessment" to see where we currently felt we were with our team members. We picked two team members to do a test with and the results were interesting. Usually if someone is having trouble communicating with a team member, it can be traced back to trust. They gave us a key list of behaviors in actions that will help us build better relationships: "get connected, communicate clearly, be open, listen

and understand, respect others, be accountable, deal with mistakes, and be competent" (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 53).

The next subsection is set clear expectations. The workshops taught us to ask open-ended and confirming questions to make sure the team member understood the direction given. It is also important to let the person know of impacts, good or bad, that could happen if he/she completes the task. They gave us six steps to driving clarity: when saying your expectation use an acronym SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time-bound), be sure you were clear, offer support, discuss any impacts in advance, follow up, and repeat yourself (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 60).

The third subsection is coach and develop. First we discussed the impacts of good coaching and development and they are powerful:

> Team members will have a greater willingness to go the extra mile for the company, there will be increased levels of team members reporting that the company is a good place to work, more than double the number of team members who were inspired to work hard every day, increased team member satisfaction with decisions affecting their work, and increased team member perception that managers are doing a good job and increased feelings of being valued as a team member for the company (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 70).

The way to achieve all of these great things is to have conversations that drive performance and development. One of the most difficult tasks a manager has to do is having these kinds of conversations. Countless times Masterchief has put me in uncomfortable situations so I know how to work effectively while still being uncomfortable. It is nerve-wracking to sit in front of a team member and tell them something is seriously impacting their position with the company, but as the workshop taught us, it is better to have those conversations than not because the consequences of not having it will be worse than having it.

In order to be successful in these conversations, the workshop gave us another acronym about how to handle them, GROW.

Goal of the conversation, making sure to start on a positive note. Realities of what you are seeing, specific and balanced feedback and listen to their response. Options by asking open-ended questions to prompt solutions, provide additional solutions, explore and identify options together. Way forward is you agree on the next steps, give specific timing, and discuss support and follow-up. They also coached us in how to find the underlying cause of a performance issue, which could include these factors: environment, skills and training, placement, management, and motivation (Root, Inc., 2014, p.76).

The last subsection is follow-up. The first discussion we had was why we should follow up as it provides the chance to add more clarity and development, creates a culture of accountability, keeps some pressure on, avoid major re-dos, and to celebrate wins. Next we discussed four key responsibilities for following up: check in, give feedback and coaching, take corrective action if needed, and celebrate wins (Root, Inc., 2014, p.86).

Throughout all of these workshops, we role-played and practiced the various strategies and ideas to help us be better managers. It was fun and definitely informative. I certainly walked away from these classes feeling like I was better equipped to run a store and that I could do it in a positive way where all would be learning and growing.

Covey's Literature. Going through the workshops and the conference rebranding experience, it is clear that this company is steering strongly away from Taylorism (2012) like Leidner's (1993) McDonald's and more towards Mayo (1933), except the company is giving more voice that is genuine to the workers. Covey (1990) wrote at least twenty years before this workshop, but he highlights many of the same concepts we discussed in the workshop, which also happen to coincide with the consent deal's principles. I insert some of his literature as data of what managers teach and options of how they can interact with their team members. In addition, this was a book that Masterchief gave me during my observations as how he wanted me to approach my position.

According to Covey (1990), leaders who are principle centered have certain characteristics. Zapata teaches much of these and some are even in the GM level review as competencies they seek to cultivate. The first one Covey discusses is that leaders are continually learning. "They discover that the more they know, the more they realize they don't know; that as their circle of knowledge grows, so does its outside edge of ignorance" (Root, Inc., 2014, p. 33). This philosophy is absolutely and fundamentally true. Covey goes on to explain that a good place to start is making promises to yourself and then following through with them. As you do follow through repeatedly, you gain confidence and a good relationship with yourself. This experience enables you to have better self-esteem and the ability to keep more promises.

Each time Masterchief visits my store, he likes to teach me something. We talk about different details of running a store, keeping food fresh, giving team members perspective, and other issues that arise throughout the day.

The second characteristic is that leaders are service-oriented. This is the characteristic most dear to my heart as Covey explains about life: "we may attempt to do it as a kind of intellectual or moral exercise, but if we don't have a sense of responsibility, of service, of contribution, something we need to pull or push, it becomes a futile endeavor" (p. 34). Many who are unhappy people are those that focus on themselves to be happy when the real secret is to get lost in helping other people.

Servant leadership is another competency in the GM review. In one of our many conversations, Masterchief candidly told me that the servant leadership area is one of my best. Unfortunately, as I have discovered, it is difficult for me to understand other managers who do not practice the servant leadership philosophy. For an example, I allude back to the shift runner of a previous section who was not adept at practicing servant leadership. We engaged in several

73

conversations where I tried to explain how important it was to be a servant leader. Oddly, it is a difficult competency to get others to buy into if they do not understand the value of it. I explained that team members are always watching managers, and all the little things we do add up. When there is a break and he is the first one to leave for a smoke break, it means more to the team than the words he speaks later about being a team player. The fact that this person spoke poorly of others so often and then was nice to their face in front of the other team members who he was just badmouthing, teaches the other team members not to trust him, no matter what words of loyalty he speaks later. Masterchief has a saying that "people don't care how much you know, until they know how much you care" (personal communication, November 22, 2014). The truth of this statement is powerful but it is astounding how many managers cannot understand this one thing. At the heart of all my research and learning, it always comes back to being a servant leader.

Covey's third characteristic is that leaders radiate positive energy. They are "cheerful, pleasant, happy… optimistic, positive, upbeat… enthusiastic, hopeful, believing. This positive energy is like an energy field or an aura that surrounds them and that similarly charges or changes weaker, negative energy fields around them" (pp. 34-35). He explains that positive people do a type of battle against negative energy where they can help get rid of it, neutralize it, or walk away from it if it is too strong.

Positive energy is another competency from the GM review where Masterchief likes to say, "Managers should be a thermostat, not a thermometer." This means a manager needs to set the pace for the atmosphere, not let the atmosphere or other attitudes of the team members affect him or her. When I walk into the store every day, I try to bring a smile to my face, greet everyone and bring the air up with my presence. Some days a positive demeanor is super easy.

Other days, I struggle to be positive, but showing I at least am trying to make an effort is good modeling for my staff. I wish I were better at positivity but I would like to say I am decent. I also try to hire people who have strong positive energies and work with those that have negative ones. Part of my testing for those who are future shift runners is to see how they do under stress, and if they are able to keep up a generally positive attitude nearly all the time. As odd as it may sound, it is a trainable characteristic that gets easier with practice, but it definitely helps to start with someone who is already positive.

Next, Covey explains that leaders believe in other people. "They realize that behavior and potential are two different things… believing is seeing… Self-centered people believe the key lies in them, in their techniques, in doing 'their thing' to others. This works only temporarily. If you believe it's 'in' them, not 'in' you, you relax, accept, affirm, and let it happen" (p. 35). Principle-centered leaders know that people have potential but that they also have accountability. When team members do show their weaknesses and make mistakes, this type of leaders do not hold grudges but realize there is a process to growth.

Many of these characteristics are difficult, and this one is no exception. It is very easy to get angry or hold something against a person when they do something frustrating or even harmful. There are many times someone has called off on a crucial shift or got a complaint from a customer, and it is very easy to get mad and want to get rid of them immediately or schedule them fewer hours but that is not principle-centered. Time and experience have taught me that one day someone might make me angry but another day, they come to help when I need them to stay over later or something. In addition, it is easy to go around firing everyone for their first mistake, but it is difficult to run a store all by yourself as well. Humans make mistakes. It is not all about the mistakes, but it is the progress and the lessons we learn. Thankfully, having the positive

energy from the characteristic before allows me to have the fortitude and attitude to handle the

mistakes separately from the team members.

CHAPTER 6

QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

Now that I have reproduced Laubach's (2005) ethnography in a different setting, the next task is to validate the presence of the consent deal from inside "a workplace" to "the workplace" as Laubach did. As I can, I want to replicate his findings, but on a broader and more applicable scale. In Laubach's workplace models, he restricted the analysis to respondents who worked for organizations with ten or more employees because he thought his theory only applied to larger organizations. My ethnographic results, however, do not lead me to that same restriction so I am including all workers in my analysis. I have replicated three analyses from Laubach (2005) and Laubach and Wallace (2013) regressing consent on the workplace, then subjective response, and finally job satisfaction on the same workplace model including consent.

Regressions

The data set I used was the GSS national survey and I first conduct a hierarchical regression of consent onto individual, industrial, occupational, and job characteristics (Table 1). I am reporting standardized coefficients to be able to compare the effects. I omit manufacturing from industry and laborers from occupation to use as the comparisons.

Model 1 includes only the base individual characteristics. They are all significant with education having the strongest effect on consent with a $\beta = 0.17$ that is double than most of the other factors. In this model, the $R^2 = 0.06$ which indicates these factors do very little to explain consent. These are different results from Laubach's findings. In general, it shows that older, married, higher educated white men have higher levels of consent.

For model 2, I add the industry categories, and find that individual characteristics stay significant but their effects drop slightly. Industries that foster higher levels of consent (over

manufacturing) are agriculture, construction, finance and real estate, business and repair, personal services, entertainment and recreation, and professional services. The factor that has the highest effect on consent is construction with a $\beta = 0.10$ but the other factors are not far behind it. However, the $R^2 = 0.08$, which is not enough to explain consent.

In model 3, the individual characteristics all remain significant still. Gender actually shows a stronger effect in this model while most of the others stay the same, except education, which has a lesser effect to almost half from the previous model. Some of the industry factors are no longer significant but construction, finance and real estate, and personal services remain significant. Their effects on consent do drop slightly but not very much. All of the occupation factors are significant with professionals having the strongest effect on consent with a $\beta = 0.41$. The factor with the next highest effect on consent is technical sales and administrative support with a $\beta = 0.25$. This model has an $R^2 = 0.13$, which is almost double from the last model but still not as high as I can get.

Lastly, in model 4, I add job characteristics to the regression. Most of the individual characteristics remain significant except education. Those that are significant do drop in their effect on consent except married, which stays the same as the previous model with a $\beta = 0.09$. The only industry factors that are still significant are construction and entertainment and recreation but their effects on consent drop slightly with $\beta = 0.05$ and 0.06 respectively. Occupations all remain significant in this model but their effects on consent drop. Professionals drop nearly in half to $\beta = 0.22$ while technical sales and administrative support drops to $\beta = 0.14$. The other factors drop as well but not as drastically. All of the job characteristics are significant except prestige. "Person does numerous things on job" has a $\beta = 31$ and has the highest effect on consent. I have seen this applied in my own workplace because I often delegate different tasks to

those who I know will be able to handle them the best. Those people are usually in the administrative clan while those who I do not see as capable of doing their own base job assignments do not get extra tasks assigned to them. In fact, the more versatile a person is in the day-to-day functions, the more valuable they are to the organization.

The factor with the second most effect on consent is "if paid by the hour" with a $\beta = -0.13$ which indicates that those who are paid by the hour have a negative effect on consent. The factor "paid not by the hour" has a $\beta = 0.08$ indicating not as strong an effect on consent but it is positive. Two other factors with higher effects on consent are "if part of a team" and "does make enough money with income alone" with $\beta = 0.09$ and $\beta = 0.10$, respectively. These make applicable sense in my workplace as well. Obviously, a person would not be in the administrative clan if they did not feel as part of a team. Conversely, those who are in the clan operate with each other in mind and try to help each other out in a teamwork mentality. I try to facilitate this attitude as often as I can, even by singing a little teamwork song and emphasizing how their helpful actions can aid another team member, not just the managers. In addition, those who are more comfortable with the income they make are more likely to be committed to the store and not out looking for another job. These types of team members are also in the administrative clan because their long-term goals include helping the store out and getting promotions.

The $R^2 = 0.29$ for model 4 which is a much better explanation for consent than the other models. It is important to note that the job characteristics with the highest positive effects on consent are those types of people that are possibly in the administrative clan.

Model 4 effectually outlines the type of people more likely to be engaged in the consent deal and the data corresponds with what I observed during my ethnography. Most of those who

were core clan members, especially in the upper management were male (although not all were male as some of the key members were females), married or paired with long-time significant others, were older than thirty, were in the personal services industry (since that is where restaurant business is classified), were in professional positions or service positions, were paid a salary, worked day shift and usually got weekends off, did various and numerous tasks for their jobs, had little physical effort resulting in less back pain, and were not typically in a position that got threatened. All of these factors were significant on consent and the data both from the quantitative and qualitative research support each other.

Table 1. Hierarchical Regression of Individual, Industrial, Occupational, and Job Characteristics on Consent (standardized coefficients)

	Individual		Industry		Occupation		Jobs	
Gender (female)	-0.04	*	-0.04	*	-0.07	**	-0.03	
Race (white)	0.08	**	0.06	**	0.06	**	0.05	**
Age	0.08	**	0.08	**	0.07	**	0.04	*
Married	0.09	**	0.09	**	0.09	**	0.09	**
Education	0.17	**	0.16	**	0.07	**	0.02	
Agriculture[1]			0.08	**	0.02		0.01	
Mining			-0.01		0.00		0.01	
Construction			0.10	**	0.08	**	0.05	**
Transportation, Communications, Utilities			-0.01		-0.02		-0.01	
Wholesale Trade			0.03		0.02		0.00	
Retail Trade			0.03		-0.01		0.01	
Finance and Real Estate			0.09	**	0.05	**	0.02	
Business and Repair			0.07	**	0.03		0.03	
Personal Services			0.07	**	0.07	**	0.06	**
Entertainment and Recreation			0.05	**	0.02		0.02	
Professional Services			0.08	**	0.00		-0.01	
Public Administration			0.02		-0.02		-0.03	
Professionals[2]					0.41	**	0.22	**
Technical Sales and Administrative Support					0.25	**	0.14	**
Service Occupations					0.15	**	0.09	**
Farming, Forestry, Fishing					0.12	**	0.07	**
Precision, Production, Craft and Repairs					0.14	**	0.07	**
If paid by the hour							-0.13	**
Paid not by the hour (salary, tips)							0.08	**
Prestige							0.02	
If works day shift							0.03	**
How often work interferes with family life							-0.07	**
If has a second job							-0.03	*
Job requires person to work fast							-0.04	**
Person does numerous things on job							0.31	**
If part of a team							0.09	**
How often too few to work							-0.07	**
Does make enough money with income alone							0.10	**
If was laid off last year							-0.04	**
If threatened at job in last 12 months							-0.10	**
If had back pain in the last 12 months							-0.06	**
R^2	0.06		0.08		0.13		0.29	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
[1] Omitted Manufacturing
[2] Omitted Laborers

I next ran a hierarchical regression (Table 2) of subjective response on the same workplace models but include consent as a fifth step. Once again, I omit manufacturing from industry and laborers from occupation. Model 1 is the individual characteristics, only two of which were significant: age and married. The $R^2 = 0.01$ for model 1 which is a very poor explanation of subjective response. While some of these factors are significant at first, subjective response is not about these types of characteristics like sex, race, age, education, or marital status.

In model 2, I added industry. The individual characteristics of age and married stay significant with virtually no change on the effect of subjective response. Gender is significant in this model as a negative effect with $\beta = -0.04$ which indicates that being female has a negative effect on subjective response. There are three industry factors that were significant in model 2: finance and real estate, personal services, and public administration. The last factor actually has a negative effect on subjective response with a $\beta = -0.04$. The $R^2 = 0.02$ for model 2 indicates that these factors are inadequate explanations of subjective response.

For model 3, I added occupation. The individual characteristics that are significant in this model are gender, age, and married but the β on those factors did not change many points so their effect on the subjective response remains nearly the same as in model 2. Significant industry factors are finance and real estate and public administration but personal services is no longer significant as it was from the previous model. Finance and real estate declines in its effect on subjective response as the $\beta = 0.07$ in model 2 and $\beta = 0.04$ in model 3. Conversely, public administration gains added negative effect on subjective response as the $\beta = -0.04$ in model 2 but $\beta = -0.06$ in model 3. The occupations with high levels of subjective response (compared to laborers) are professionals, technical sales and administrative support, service occupations, and

82

farming, forestry and fishing. The factor with the most effect on subjective response is professionals with $\beta = 0.15$ and the second highest effect is technical sales and administrative support with $\beta = 0.12$. The R² for model 3 is only 0.03 which is only 0.01 more than the last model and is an inadequate explanation of subjective response.

In model 4, I added job characteristics. The individual characteristics that are significant in this model are married and education. Gender is no long significant and neither is age. Education is significant with a $\beta = -0.05$ which indicates a negative effect on subjective response. There is only one significant factor from industry which is public administration with a $\beta = -0.06$ which is the same for the previous model 3. The occupation factors are all no longer significant which indicates the significance from the previous model is based on their specific job characteristics.

Many of the job characteristics for model 4 are significant. The factors with a positive effect on subjective response are: "person does numerous things on job," "if part of a team," and "does make enough money with income alone." The factors with a negative subjective response are: "if paid by the hour", "how often work interferes with family life," "job requires person to work fast," "how often too few to work," "if threatened at job in the last 12 months," and "if had back pain in the last 12 months." Those with negative effects indicate that if a person experiences these characteristics in the job place, there is a negative effect on subjective response, which may mean they perceive their workplace as something they feel negative about.

The factor with the highest effect on subjective response is "how often too few to work" and is actually a negative effect with a $\beta = -0.24$. This indicates that people who experience this at work will feel a negative subjective response. At my workplace, I have seen this have an extremely negative impact on team members. If there are not enough team members then

everyone feels immense pressure trying to get all the tasks done, on time, and still wait on the guests. This tension often makes the team members anxious and unable to focus on good customer service, which frustrates the managers and then in turn, makes the team members feel bad and sometimes even quit. One of the first things I did when I took over my store was make sure I had enough people hired and on the schedule so this pressure goes away and the focus is able to be better placed on guest service. Interestingly, having enough people on the schedule actually enables the store to achieve labor goals better than having less people than you need. It is a paradoxical rule of the restaurant business that not all managers understand.

The factor with the next highest effect on subjective response is "person does numerous things on job" with a $\beta = 0.23$. This characteristic of the job can help a person feel needed and wanted at work, which is a good feeling for most people. The next highest factor is "does make enough money with income alone" with a $\beta = 0.14$ and is significant. However, the R^2 for model 4 is 0.28, which is a huge increase from the model previous but I wanted to see how consent fit into this regression.

I added consent in model 5. The individual characteristics of married and education remain significant but their amount of effect on the subjective response decreases. The industry factors that are significant in this model are construction and public administration but neither have very high effects as the $\beta = -0.05$ and $\beta = -0.04$ respectively. Two occupation factors are significant in this model as in professionals and precision, production, craft, and repairs.

Many of the job characteristics remain significant but they all have a lesser effect on subjective response as the β decreases for all of them. The biggest change is "person does numerous things on job" from a previous $\beta = 0.23$ to $\beta = 0.03$ in model 5. The change is drastic, as consent must account for much of this factor's effect.

84

Consent's $\beta = 0.59$ which is the largest effect on subjective response from anywhere in this regression. The R² = 52 which indicates a very reliable amount of explanation for subjective response.

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression of Worker Subjective Response on Individual, Industrial, Occupational, and Job Characteristics, and Consent (standardized coefficients)

	Individual		Industry		Occupation		Jobs		Consent	
Gender (female)	-0.03		-0.04	*	-0.06	**	-0.02		0.01	
Race (white)	0.02		0.02		0.01		0.03		0.00	
Age	0.05	**	0.05	**	0.05	**	0.02		-0.01	
Married	0.07	**	0.08	**	0.07	**	0.09	**	0.04	**
Education	0.03		0.03		-0.01		-0.05	*	-0.05	**
Agriculture[1]			0.04		0.00		-0.02		-0.03	
Mining			-0.01		-0.01		-0.01		-0.01	
Construction			0.00		0.00		-0.02		-0.05	**
Transportation, Communications, Utilities			-0.01		-0.02		0.00		0.00	
Wholesale Trade			-0.02		-0.03		-0.03		-0.02	
Retail Trade			0.00		-0.02		0.01		-0.02	
Finance and Real Estate			0.07	**	0.04	*	0.02		0.02	
Business and Repair			0.01		-0.01		0.00		-0.01	
Personal Services			0.04	*	0.03		0.02		-0.01	
Entertainment and Recreation			0.03		0.01		0.01		0.00	
Professional Services			0.01		-0.03		-0.01		-0.01	
Public Administration			-0.04	*	-0.06	**	-0.06	**	-0.04	*
Professionals[2]					0.15	**	0.03		-0.08	**
Technical Sales and Administrative Support					0.12	**	0.05		-0.03	
Service Occupations					0.07	*	0.03		-0.01	
Farming, Forestry, Fishing					0.06	*	0.03		0.00	
Precision, Production, Craft and Repairs					0.02		-0.02		-0.06	**
If paid by the hour							-0.07	**	-0.01	
Paid not by the hour (salary, tips)							0.02		-0.03	
Prestige							0.02		0.00	
If works day shift							0.01		-0.02	
How often work interferes with family life							-0.12	**	-0.07	**
If has a second job							0.01		0.01	
Job requires person to work fast							-0.05	**	-0.03	*
Person does numerous things on job							0.23	**	0.03	*
If part of a team							0.13	**	0.07	**
How often too few to work							-0.24	**	-0.19	**
Does make enough money with income alone							0.14	**	0.09	**
If was laid off last year							-0.02		0.00	
If threatened at job in last 12 months							-0.19	**	-013	**
If had back pain in the last 12 months							-0.12	**	-0.08	**
Consent									0.59	**
R^2	0.01		0.02		0.03		0.28		0.52	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
[1] Omitted Manufacturing
[2] Omitted Laborers

My third regression (Table 3) is a hierarchal regression of job satisfaction on the same workplace models. The individual characteristics in model 1 are all significant. The factor with the highest effect on job satisfaction is age with a $\beta = 0.17$. However, the R^2 is only 0.06 which is an inadequate explanation of job satisfaction.

For model 2, I added industry factors, some of which are significant. Those are agriculture, construction, finance and real estate, personal services, professional services, and public administration. The factor with the highest effect on job satisfaction is professional services with a $\beta = 0.16$ and it is more than double than the rest of the factors. The $R^2 = 0.08$ which is an inadequate explanation for job satisfaction so I added more factors to see what else could effect it.

In Model 3 I add occupations. The individual characteristics all remain significant except for one. Education is not significant in this model, and the β for the other factors does not change very much. Less of the industry factors are significant for this model, and there are only three that are: personal services, professional services, and public administration. All of the occupation factors are significant with professionals having the most effect on job satisfaction with a $\beta = 0.23$ which is quite a bit higher than any of the other factors.

For model 4, I added the job characteristics. The individual characteristics change as gender and race are no longer significant but age, married, and education are. Education now has a $\beta = -0.04$ which has a negative effect on job satisfaction, indicating that those who have a higher education, have less job satisfaction. In this model, one more of the industry factors becomes insignificant so we keep personal services and professional services. There is a large change in occupation as only one factor out of the five remains significant and that is farming, forestry, and fishing. For this model, $R^2 = 0.10$, which is not an adequate explanation.

Several of the job characteristics are significant with some having positive effects and some having negative effects. Those that have significant positive effects are: "paid not by the hour," "person does numerous things on job," "if part of a team," and "does make enough money with income alone." Those factors with negative effects are: "if paid by the hour," "how often too few to work," "if person was laid off last year," "if threatened at job in the last 12 months," and "if had back pain in the last 12 months." Once again, the factor with the highest effect on job satisfaction is "person does numerous things on job" with a $\beta = 0.24$. Thus we can see that this factor in the workplace is an important one, affecting consent, subjective response, and consent. R^2 for this model is 0.24, which is better than the previous models but I wanted to see if I could get even a better explanation for job satisfaction.

In the final model, model 5, I added consent. The three individual characteristics from the previous model are still significant but they have a little less effect as the β decreased. The industry factors only have two significant ones again but one is a different one than the previous model. Professional services has exactly the same $\beta = 0.12$ in both of the last two models but public administration is now significant with a $\beta = 0.05$. Occupation now has two factors that are significant, professionals and farming, forestry, and fishing. The β for professionals goes from 0.23 in the first model to -0.07 in the second model. The difference is large and indicates many of the factors that were causing the first β to be so high, are in consent.

Many of the job characteristics remain significant in this model but the effect they have decreases. For example, person does numerous things on job drops from $\beta = 0.24$ to $\beta = 0.08$, which is a large change. This indicates that consent explains much of the effect of doing numerous tasks on the job. The other factors decrease as well but none of them as drastically.

Consent has a $\beta = 0.49$ and is significant on job satisfaction. This is quite a large amount of effect and the $R^2 = 0.41$, which explains a lot more about job satisfaction than the other factors.

Consent definitely explains job satisfaction more than any other workplace or personal characteristics thus indicating how important consent really is. These numbers alone show it is important to at least understand the consent deal and the administrative clan, if not completely use the consent deal.

Table 3. Hierarchical Regression of Job Satisfaction on Individual, Industrial, Occupational, and Job Characteristics, and Consent (standardized coefficients)

	Individual		Industry		Occupation		Jobs		Consent	
Gender (female)	-0.03		-0.06	**	-0.07	**	-0.02		0.00	
Race (white)	0.05	**	0.05	**	0.04	*	0.03		0.00	
Age	0.17	**	0.16	**	0.16	**	0.13	**	0.12	***
Married	0.06	**	0.06	**	0.06	**	0.07	**	0.02	*
Education	0.09	**	0.06	**	0.01		-0.04	*	-0.05	**
Agriculture[1]			0.06	**	0.00		-0.02		-0.02	
Mining			0.00		0.01		0.01		0.00	
Construction			0.05	**	0.04		0.03		0.00	
Transportation, Communications, Utilities			0.01		0.01		0.02		0.02	
Wholesale Trade			0.03		0.03		0.20		0.02	
Retail Trade			0.00		0.00		0.02		0.01	
Finance and Real Estate			0.06	**	0.04		0.02		0.01	
Business and Repair			0.02		0.00		0.01		-0.01	
Personal Services			0.05	**	0.05	*	0.05	**	0.02	
Entertainment and Recreation			0.01		0.00		0.00		-0.01	
Professional Services			0.16	**	0.11	**	0.12	**	0.12	**
Public Administration			0.06	**	0.04	*	0.03		0.05	**
Professionals[2]					0.23	**	0.04		-0.07	*
Technical Sales and Administrative Support					0.11	**	0.01		-0.07	
Service Occupations					0.07	**	0.01		-0.04	
Farming, Forestry, Fishing					0.11	**	0.08	**	0.04	*
Precision, Production, Craft and Repairs					0.10	**	0.03		0.00	
If paid by the hour							-0.09	**	-0.03	
Paid not by the hour (salary, tips)							0.04	*	0.00	
Prestige							0.05		0.04	*
If works day shift							0.00		-0.02	
How often work interferes with family life							-0.03		0.01	
If has a second job							-0.01		0.00	
Job requires person to work fast							-0.02		0.00	
Person does numerous things on job							0.24	**	0.08	**
If part of a team							0.08	**	0.03	**
How often too few to work							-0.12	**	-0.08	**
Does make enough money with income alone							0.16	**	0.11	**
If was laid off last year							-0.09	**	-0.07	**
If threatened at job in last 12 months							-0.08	**	-0.03	
If had back pain in the last 12 months							-0.08	*	-0.05	**
Consent									0.49	**
R²	0.06		0.08		0.10		0.24		0.41	

* p < .05, ** p <.01
[1] Omitted Manufacturing
[2] Omitted Laborers

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

While there were some differences in Laubach's (2005) research compared to mine, I was able to replicate successfully his study both qualitatively and quantitatively, first through the ethnography in observing the consent deal and the intricacies of the administrative clan in a different industry, as well as see the consent deal through a national survey. The main focus I had was if I could see the consent deal in another industry and business size, how to facilitate the consent deal, and if business management literature could work in tandem with Sociology of the workplace literature.

The ethnography consisted of participant observation and interviews, which supported consent and the idea of the administrative clan inside the service industry. The administrative clan is a powerful informal group that is fluid and makes daily negotiations called the consent deal.

The quantitative data gives validity to the existence of consent by using the survey questions and turning them into a scale. The data further demonstrates which workplace factors come together in a way that has a remarkable influence on how workers subjectively respond to the workplace. The data also outlines what types of people are more likely to be participators in the consent deal, which my qualitative data is able to support.

The results supported my thesis, and by extension, Laubach and Wallace's (2013) findings. They ran an OLS regression of subjective response on individual characteristics, industry, occupation, job characteristics, and consent. Their findings for consent had a $\beta = 0.64$ and an $R^2 = 0.45$. In comparison, my consent variable had a $\beta = 0.63$ but the $R^2 = 0.57$ which is quite a bit higher than their results. The consent deal has a much larger impact on subjective

response and job satisfaction than any other variable, including even how much a person is paid or how prestigious their job may be

Thus, what leaders and employers need to take away is the acknowledgement that the consent deal can help facilitate higher job satisfaction. In order to lower the turnover rate, keep good and hardworking employees longer, and provide higher productivity, managers need to understand how to identify the consent deal and how to use it properly

Main Functions of the Consent Deal

The components of the administrative clan are often very similar and even bleed over into each other as in the case with schedule flexibility and participation in making the schedule, but it also shows how they add up together and join into making the consent deal.

The main function of the consent deal is when a problem arises in the store, the deal offers a way to solve the problem in flexible ways that become a group effort. In Chapter 4, examples regarding schedule issues and food costs are provided as illustrations. As a team, they come together to conquer the problems, growing as teammates who have a deeper understanding of how difficult running a store can really be and learning how to lift each other up to make more progress than they could alone. Sometimes managers have a tendency, just through human nature, to take the power to their heads and decide everything for the store, take on all the responsibility, and thereby take all the heat when things go wrong. This mentality hurts the manager, perhaps not right away, but definitely over time as they feel used up and worn out, bitter and jaded about the business. It also hurts the team members as they become robots and alienated from the process of growth and improvement.

The consent deal serves to help a manager shoulder the troubles with the store, prevents team members from feeling alienated and arbitrary, and relieves pressure on the manager to

completely solve and handle all the problems that happen every day. The consent deal is definitely a better way to approach management than doing it all by yourself and provides a better sense of job satisfaction for both team members and managers.

The consent deal also helps the team members have a better organizational alignment. An example of this principle found in my ethnography may illustrate this point. Our store cooks food as close to order as possible. We want it to be the freshest possible and have systems in place as an effort to help the cooks know when to put more chicken on the grill or more rice in the rethermalizer. A hot box holds food items with labels on them at cook time so we can keep careful track of what is fresh and what is not. Corporate establishes these guidelines and sometimes it is difficult to follow them as a cook because of the other rigorous demands of the job. One of the conversations Masterchief has had with the GMs includes how to handle this delicate balance of trying to make sure the food we serve is fresh and delicious, yet we do not run out of any product, as well as trying not to alienate or anger the cook (personal communication, July 4, 2014).

In order to do handle the balance of cook and guest, we work towards a "win-win agreement" (Covey, 1990). Masterchief explained how to get the cooks to understand the importance of fresh food by pulling out a small sample of chicken and steak pulled fresh off the grill versus chicken and steak that was very near the expiration time. He had all of us sample the difference between fresh meat and meat that was not actually expired but was older. There was a clear difference. Then he analogized the amount a person works for an hour, the cooks make between nine and ten dollars an hour and how a meal and a drink costs about that so they should think about that when a guest spends money on a meal. It might not be an hour of work for everyone who comes into the door but for some of the guests, it really is. Another statement

Masterchief likes to make is to stop the cook while there is a line and point out all the guests to the cook and tell them that they are all here to eat his/her food. That is quite a humbling moment to see many people waiting in line just to eat something you made. These mentalities helped put in perspective for the cooks that it is important how fresh and good the food is and enabled them to orient their priorities. It also brought home the point of how much their effort influences the guests and then they are encouraged to invest in the process.

How can a manager Facilitate the Consent Deal?

Some of the answers to this potent question have been addressed in the ethnography section as I highlight different techniques and situations I encountered, but each place of business is different. The industry, the occupation, the creation of the team, and many other considerations come into play. However, all leaders can apply some definite mentalities and principles as discussed by Belasco and Stayer (1993) and Covey (1990). In addition, by understanding the components of the consent deal (autonomy, participation, schedule flexibility, and organizational commitment) as I explored during my ethnography, a manager should be able to employ those techniques into building up a culture where the consent deal can flourish.

The very first step begins with hiring the right people who are going to be able to understand the teamwork and morale building culture. The consent deal works for many team members but not all. As I observed over the years, those who were more selfish, were unwilling to constantly try to improve themselves, and did not want to adhere to company rules and standards, did not engage in the consent deal and were usually informally pushed out by those who did.

Conclusion

Marx and Engels (2008/1848) saw the workplace as a black and white arena where neither party was able to get exactly what they want without the other party losing something, while Taylor (2012) viewed workers as being as lazy as possible without getting in trouble. Throughout my research, I have found both of these things to be true but not in a broader sense, only on individual levels. Yes, there are team members who see managers and owners as the bad people and there are owners and managers who see team members as just expendable people who only do what they can to get a paycheck. Moreover, of course, there are definitely people who go to work and do just enough to get away while keeping their job but I do not believe these kinds of relationships and attitudes will produce a successful business organization. Being successful is the whole point of a business, and the majority of people need to have a positive fulfillment about what they are doing every day or at least some type of positivity to continue in any way that will make money.

The consent deal, conversely, works much better on a larger scale to get organizations to work well together and make money. I can apply these theory conceptions into a metaphor of marriage or any close relationship. There are two sides to the relationship where they may feel quite frustrated and one sided like Marx and Engels (2008/1848) and Taylor (2012) present and the consent deal is the compromise everyone has to do in personal relationships like those. After all, we sometimes spend more time at work than we do at home, so it makes complete sense for workers to have such relationships.

The limitations of this study include one of the same from Laubach's (2005) in that it is contained in only one industry but a further limitation of this study is it is done from the point of view of only one occupation. The next step would be to observe how the consent deal works for

someone in the administrative clan that was in the lowest formal level as possible or perhaps someone from the periphery or conventional core as they are sure to have a different subjective response.

In conclusion, unless you are fortunate enough to be independently wealthy, it is safe to say you will have to work for your living. We spend many hours every day at work and it is a part of who we are. The amount of time invested in work makes it very important to enjoy our jobs and having a clear way to facilitate the best of job satisfaction is ideal. The consent deal and understanding how to use it is definitely a powerful key that many underestimate. With the concepts and ideals I have outlined in this thesis, a manager may better be able to understand how the consent deal works, why it is important, and how to facilitate it in his/her own store. If the style of a manager did not matter, then their actions would not matter, and if that is true, then we do not need managers at all. However, since it is not true and managers are huge components of why people quit their jobs, all of them need this information. I am sure that we can all agree that making the workplace a better experience would help make life better all around.

REFERENCES

Belasco, J., & Stayer, R. (1993). *Flight of the Buffalo*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process under Monopoly Capitalism*. City: Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Choi, Y. (2013). The Influence of Conflict Management Culture on Job Satisfaction. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal,* 41(4), 687-692.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Edwards, R. (1979). *Contested Terrain*. USA: Basic Books, Inc.

Graham, J. W., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Commitment and the Convenantal Organization. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 5, 482-502.

Gouldner, A. W. (1954). *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Heise, D. R., & Bohrnstedt, G. W. (1970). Validity, invalidity, and reliability. In E. F. Borgatta (Ed.) *Sociological methodology,* 104-129. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kunda, G. (1992) *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Jackall, R. (1988). *Moral Mazes*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Landsberger, H. (1958). *Hawthorne Revisited*, Ithaca.

Laubach, M. (2005). Consent, Informal Organization and Job Rewards: a Mixed Methods Analysis. *Social Forces* 83(4), 1535-1565.

Laubach, M., & Wallace, M. (2013). Consent and the Subjective World of the Worker. *Networks, Work and Inequality Research in the Sociology of Work*, 24, 135–175

Leidner, R. (1993). *Fast Food, Fast Talk*. London: University of California Press, Ltd.

Littler, C., & Salaman, G. (1984). *Class at Work: The Design, Allocation, and Control of Jobs.* London: Batsford.

Marx, K. (1976/1845). *Theses on Feuerbach.* Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2008/1848). *The Communist Manifesto.* London: Pluto Press.

Mayo, E. (1933). *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization.* New York, NY: Macmillian.

Ouchi, W. G. (1979). A Conceptual Framework for the Design of Organizational Control Mechanisms. *Management Science* 25,833–48.

Ouchi, W. G. (1980). Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 25,129–41.

Pfeffer, J., & Salanick, G. R.. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective.* New York: Harper and Row.

Prenestini, A., & Lega, F. (2013). Do Senior Management Cultures Affect Performance? Evidence From Italian Public Healthcare Organizations. *Journal Of Healthcare Management,* 58(5), 336-351.

Roethlisberger, F., & Dickson, W. J. (1967 (1939)). *Management and the Worker.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Root, Inc. (2014). *Root Compass Journal.* Ohio.

Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the Grass Roots.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Selznick, P. (1996). Institutionalism "Old" and "New." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 41, 270– 77.

Staw, B. M. (1986). Organizational Psychology and the Pursuit of the Happy/Productive Worker. *California Management Review,* 27, 40-53.

Taylor, F. W. (2012). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. Auckland: The Floating Press.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York: The Free Press.

Wright, E. O. (1978). Class, Crisis, and the State. Verso Editions/NLB

APPENDIX A: LETTER FROM INSITUTIONAL REASEARCH BOARD

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY®
www.marshall.edu

Office of Research Integrity	FWA 00002704
Institutional Review Board	
One John Marshall Drive	IRB1 #00002205
Huntington, WV 25755	IRB2 #00003206

July 13, 2015

Marty Laubach, PhD
Sociology Department

RE: IRBNet ID# 737072-1
At: Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral)

Dear Dr. Laubach:

Protocol Title: [737072-1] The Human Manager

Expiration Date: July 13, 2016
Site Location: MU
Submission Type: New Project   APPROVED
Review Type: Expedited Review

In accordance with 45CFR46.101(b)(2), the above study and informed consent were granted Exempted approval today by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Designee for the period of 12 months. The approval will expire July 13, 2016. A continuing review request for this study must be submitted no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date.

This study is for student Jennifer Young.

If you have any questions, please contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Coordinator Bruce Day, ThD, CIP at 304-696-4303 or day50@marshall.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW GUIDE

For managers:

What is the makeup of your store? Managers female or male? How many? What are the ages?

How do you communicate to your team?

How would you describe your team?

How do you ask team members to do things?

Does it matter how you phrase your requests as to how the team members might respond to you?

How do males/females react when you ask them to do things?

Do you ever bend the rules a little bit? Why do you do that? Is there ever a valid reason to bend any rule?

What types of rules might you bend?

What types of rules are okay to bend? What types are not okay to bend?

For Team Members:

What is the makeup of your store? Managers female or male? How many? What the ages of them and the other team members?

How do you feel when your superior asks you to do things? Are they male or female?

Does it matter how your superior asks you to do things? Would you respond differently?

Have you ever been fired? How did the boss handle it? If you were the supervisor, how would you have handled it?

What kind of supervision do you like? How would you like to be asked to do things?

Do managers ever bend the rules to help you out? What types of rules?

Can you think of a time when a manager went out of his/her way to help you?

APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH PROJECT
Marshall University

<u>Principal Investigator Name</u>: Marty Laubach
<u>Study Title</u>: The Human Manager

Invitation to Participate: You are being asked to take part in a research study by Professor Marty Laubach from the Sociology department of Marshall University. We hope to learn how authority figures handle communicating with their teams and some of the techniques they may use to get the company's needs met without alienating the workers. We are asking you to take part because you hold a significant role in the company. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

What the study is about: The purpose of this study is to explore how different managers might communicate with their team members. Also, some of the specifics of this study have to do with male and female differences in authority as well as how managers might give or take on rules in order to get more done.

What we will ask you to do: If you agree to be in this study, we will conduct an interview with you. The interview will include questions about your job, the people you work with, where your position is in the company, how you communicate with those in your store, the rules of the store, and other workplace considerations. The interview will take about 30 minutes to complete.

Risks and benefits: There is the risk that you may find some of the questions about your job conditions to be sensitive. There is also the risk that you may be uncomfortable discussing some of these workplace topics with the interviewer.

There are no direct benefits.

Compensation: There is no compensation.

Confidentiality. While we cannot guarantee confidentiality, we will work to maintain the privacy of all information we collect about members of the group by using pseudonyms in field notes and reports. All data will be maintained by the principal investigator in a locked office and will only be accessible to the investigators and to the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Office of Research Compliance, if they choose to inspect study records.

Taking part is voluntary: Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide not to take part or to skip some of the questions, it will not affect your current or future relationship with the interviewer or the company. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time.

Questions: Take as long as you like before you make a decision. We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the principal investigator, Marty Laubach, at (304) 696-2798. You can also call contact the Jami Hughes, the secretary of the Marshall University Sociology Department at (304) 696-6700 for any problems. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (304) 696-7320.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent: I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

_____   _____
Signature of Primary Investigator   Phone

          or

_____   _____
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent   Phone

Category	Variable question	Variable Code name	Mean/Std. Dev.
Controls	Gender Education Income Marital Status Race Religion	Gender Age Educ Income Marital Race Reltrad	 46.8/17 13.3/3.13 30607/38742 2.5/1.65 1.35//661 2.21/2.11

Consent			
Organizational Commitment	I trust the management at the place where I work: "strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Trustman	3.03/.842
	I am proud to work for my employer: "strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Proudemp	3.25/.678
	I am treated with respect at work: "strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Respect	3.24/.693
Autonomy	I am given a lot of freedom do decide how to do my own work: "very true" - "somewhat true" -"not too true"- "not at all true."	Wkfreedom	3.39/.815
	My job lets me use my skills and abilities: "strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Myskills	3.27/.703
		Lotofsay	

	I have a lot of say about what happens on my job: "strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."		2.05/.882
Schedule Flexibility	How often is it mandatory that you must work extra hours? "Often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" -"never."	Mustwork	1.76/.43
	How hard is it to take time off during your work to take care of personal or family matters? "Not at all hard" - "not too hard" - "somewhat hard" - "very hard."	Famwkoff	3.07/1.01
	How often are you allowed to change the schedule? "Often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never."	Chngtme	2.55/1.23
Participation	In your job, how often do you take part with others in making decisions that affect you? "Often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never."	Wkdecide	3.09/.946
	How often do you participate with others in helping set the way things are done on your job? "Often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never."	Setthngs	3.15/.937

Job Satisfaction			
	All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job? "Very satisfied" - "somewhat satisfied" - "not too satisfied" - "not at all satisfied."	Satjob1	3.33/.750
	My main satisfaction in life comes from work. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Wktopsat	2.12/.829
	Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer within the next year? "Very likely" - "somewhat likely" - "not at all likely."	Trynewjb	1.55/.774
	The job security is good. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Jobsecok	3.33/.864
	I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Opdevel	3.13/.890

Subjective Response			
	The safety and health conditions where I work are good. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Safehlth	3.25/.632
	Where I work, employees and management work together to ensure the safest possible working conditions. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Teamsafe	3.25/.686
	There are no significant compromises or shortcuts taken when worker safety is a stake. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Safefrst	3.28/.718
	The safety of workers is a high priority with management where I work. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Safetywk	3.33/.695
	In general, how would you describe relations in your work place between management and employees? "Very good" - "quite good" - "neither good nor bad" - "quite bad" - "very bad."	Manvsemp	3.96/.989
	My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him or her. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Supcares	3.26/.910
	My supervisor is helpful to me in getting the job done. "Very true", "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Suphelp	3.25/.896
	Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your race or ethnic origin? "Yes" or "no."	Wkracism	1.95/.221
			1.93/.258

	Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your gender? "Yes" or "no."	Wksexism	
			1.91/.282
	Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your age? "Yes" or "no."	Wkageism	
			1.96/.196
	In the last 12 months, were you sexually harassed by anyone while you were on the job? "Yes" or "no."	Wkharsex	
			3.30/.666
	At the place where I work, I am treated with respect. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Respect	
			3.44/.866
	How fair is what you earn on your job in comparison to others doing the same type of work you do? "Much less than you deserve" - "somewhat less than you deserve" - "about as much as you deserve" - "somewhat more than you deserve" - "much more than you deserve."	Fairearn	
			3.24/.815
	The people I work with take a personal interest in me. "Very true"- "somewhat true"- "not too true"- "not at all true."	Cowrkint	
			3.30/1.16
	How often during the past month, have you felt used up at the end of the day? "Very often" - "often"- "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never."	Usedup	
			2.85/1.01
	Promotions are handled fairly. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Promtefr	
			2.87/.914
	I am free from the conflicting demands that other people make of me. "Very true"- "somewhat true"- "not too true"- "not at all true."	Condemnd	
			3.49/.659
	I have enough information to get the job done. "Very true"- "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Haveinfo	
			3.27/.810

I receive enough help and equipment to get the job done. "Very true"- "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Hlpequip	2.43/.854
Workers need strong trade unions to protect their interests. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Trdunoin	3.09/.710
Conditions on my job allow me to be about as productive as I could be. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Prodctiv	2.91/1.09
My fringe benefits are good. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Fringeok	
The people I work with can be relied on when I need help. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Cowrkhlp	3.39/.746
The chances for promotion are good. "Very true" - "somewhat true"- "not too true" - "not at all true."	Promteok	2.54/1.03
The place where I work is run in a smooth and effective manner. "Strongly agree" – "agree" – "disagree" – "strongly disagree."	Wksmooth	2.91/.780

Job Characteristics			
	I have the training opportunities I need to perform my job safely and competently. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" - "not at all true."	Trainops	3.50/.731
	In your main job, are you salaried, paid by the hour, or what? "Salaried" - "paid by the hour" - "other."	Waypaid	1.77/.645
	When you work extra hours on your main job, is it mandatory (required by your employer)? "Yes" or "no."	Mustwork	.125/.331 .348/.476
	Do you have any jobs besides your main job or do any other work for pay? "Yes" or "no."	Secondwk	1.83/.375
	Is it usually because you want to (work at home), you have to in order to keep up with your job, or for some other reason? "Worker wants to work at home" - "worker has to work at home to keep up" - "other."	Whywkhme	1.93/.817
	In your job, do you normally work as part of a team? "Yes" or "no."	Partteam	1.46/.499
	Does your job require you to do repeated lifting, pushing, pulling, or bending? "Yes" or "no."	Hvylift	1.54/.499
	Does your job regularly require you to perform repetitive or forceful hand movements or involve awkward postures? "Yes" or "no."	Handmove	1.5/.500

Do you feel that the income from your job alone is enough to meet your family's usual monthly expenses and bills? "Yes" or "no."	Rincblls	4.45/.499
Were you laid off your main job at any time in the last year? "Yes" or "no."	Laidoff	1.93/.256
When you do your job well, are you likely to be praised by your supervisor or employer? "Yes" - "maybe" - "no."	Wkpraise	1.64/.778
When you do your job well, are you likely to get a bonus or pay increase? "Yes" - "maybe" - "no."	Wkbonus	2.36/.844
In the last 12 months, were you threatened or harassed in any other way by anyone while you were on the job? "Yes" or "no."	Wkharoth	1.90/.302
In the past 12 months, have you had back pain every day for a week or more? "Yes" or "no."	Backpain	1.72/.449
In the past 12 months, have you had pain in the hands, wrists, arms, or shoulders every day for a week or more? "Yes" or "no."	Painarms	1.72/.449
On my job, I know exactly what is expected of me. "Strongly agree" - "agree" - "disagree" - "strongly disagree."	Knowwhat	3.34/.642
I have too much work to do everything well. "Strongly agree" - "agree" - "disagree" - "strongly disagree."	Overwork	2.1/.719
I get to do a number of different things on my job. "Strongly agree" - "agree" - "disagree" - "strongly disagree."	Workdiff	3.29/.704
My job requires that I work very fast. "Strongly agree" - "agree" - "disagree" - "strongly disagree."	Workfast	2.81/.812

My job requires that I keep learning new things. "Strongly agree" - "agree" - "disagree" - "strongly disagree."	Learnnew	3.23/.796
How often are you allowed to change your starting and quitting times on a daily basis? "Often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never."	Chngtme	2.56/1.25
How would you describe your work arrangement in your main job? "Independent contractor/consultant/freelance worker" - "on-call, work only when called to work" - "paid by a temporary agency" - "work for contractor who provides workers/services" - "regular, permanent employee."	Wrktype	1.67/1.43 .169/.374 .254/.435 .056/.231
Which of the following best describes your usual work schedule? "Day shift" - "afternoon shift" - "night shift" - "split shift" - "irregular shift/on-call" - "rotating shifts."	Wrksched	5.12/1.58
How often do you work at home as part of your job? "Never" - "a few times a year" - "about once a month" - "about once a week" - "more than once a week" - "worker works mainly at home."	Wrkhome	4.82/1.70 .070/.255 .061/.240
How often do the demands of your family interfere with your work on the job? "Often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never."	Famvswk	2.00/.878
I have enough time to get the job done. "Very true" - "somewhat true" - "not too true" – "not at all true."	Wrktime	3.19/.857
How often are there not enough people or staff to get all the work done? "Often" - "sometimes" -"rarely" - "never."	Toofewwk	2.75/.988
How often do the demands of your job interfere with your family life? "Often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never."	Wkvsfam	2.25/.995
	Health1	3.63/1.07

	Would you say that in general your health is excellent - very good – good - fair - poor?		
		Hurtatwk	.21/.790
	In the past 12 months, how many times have you been injured on the job?		
		Hlthdays	1.35/4.42
	During the past 30 days, for about how many days did your poor physical or mental health keep you from doing your usual activities, such as self-care, work, or recreation?		
	Now thinking about your mental health, which includes stress, depression, and problems with emotions, for how many days during the past 30 days was your mental health not good?	Mntlhlth	3.46/7.21
	Now thinking about your physical health, which includes physical illness and injury, for how many days during the past 30 days was your physical health not good?	Physhth	2.49/6.03
	How easy would it be for you to find a job with another employer with approximately the same income and fringe benefits as you have now? "Very easy to find similar job" - "somewhat easy to find similar job" - "not at all easy to find similar job."	Jobfind1	1.90/.790
	After an average workday, about how many hours to you have to relax or pursue activities that you enjoy?	Hrsrelax	3.75/2.79
	How long have you worked in your present job for your current employer?	Yearsjob	7.21/8.42
	How many days per month do you work extra hours beyond your usual schedule?	Moredays	5.77/7.78

Many variables were transformed in order to get them to be the most compatible direction for correlation and regression comparisons. Most of the transformations were reflections but some made the variables dichotomous. The variables with four values of "strongly agree" - "agree" - "disagree" - "strongly disagree" were reversed: lotofsay, trdunion, prodctiv, safehlth, teamsafe, safefrst, myskills, knowwhat, overwork, wktopsat, workdiff, workfast, learnnew, wksmooth, wkdecide, supcares, suphelp, satjob1, respect, trustman, and proudemp. A variable was reversed (chngtme) "listing often" - "sometimes" - "rarely" - "never." Manvsemp was also reversed listing "very bad" - "quite bad" - "neither good nor bad" - "quite good" - "very good." Fairearn was transformed listing values as "much more than you deserve" - "somewhat more than you deserve" - "about as much as you deserve" - "much less than you deserve." Usedup was reversed using values as "never" - "rarely" - "sometimes" - "often" - "very often." Wrktype was reversed listing values as "regular, permanent employee" - "work for contractor who provides worker/services" - "paid by a temporary agency" - "on-call, work only when called to work" - "independent contractor/consultant/freelance worker." Wrksched was reversed listing variables as "rotating shifts" - "irregular shift/on-call" - "split shift" - "night shift" - "afternoon shift" - "day shift." Wrkhome was reversed listing values as "worker works mainly at home" - "more than once a week" - "about once a week" - "about once a month" - "a few times a year" - "never." Famwkoff was reversed listing values as "very hard" - "somewhat hard" - "not too hard" - "not at all hard." Trainops, cowrkhlp, wrktime, jobsecok, cowrkint, promtefr, condemnd, fringeok, wkfreedm, haveinfo, hlpequip, opdevel, and promteok were reversed listing values as "not at all true" - "not too true" - "somewhat true" - "very true." Toofewwk, setthngs, wkvsfam, and famvswk were reversed listing values as "never" - "rarely" - "sometimes" - "often." Jobfind1 was reversed listing variables as "not easy at all to find similar job" - "somewhat easy

to find similar job" - "very easy to find similar job." Trynewjb was reversed listing variables as "not at all likely" - "somewhat likely" - "very likely". Health1 was reversed listing variables as "poor" - "fair" - "good" - "very good" - "excellent."

Waypaid, wkracsim, mustwork, secondwk, whywkhme, partteam, hvylift, handmove, rincblls, laidoff, wkpraise, wkbonus, wkageism, wksexism, wkharsex, wkharoth, backpain, and painarms were made dichotomous.

I also combined the IAP value into the missing variables category for how likely a person is going to get a bonus at work (wkbonus) but none of the others seemed to have a problem with it as I transformed them.