UC Santa Cruz

UC Santa Cruz Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Working on the Service Production Line: Integration and Mobility in Casino and Restaurant Work

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4f67z90t

Author

Hatcher, Christina

Publication Date

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SANTA CRUZ

WORKING ON THE SERVICE PRODUCTION LINE: OCCUPATIONAL INTEGRATION AND MOBILITY IN CASINO AND RESTAURANT WORK

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

SOCIOLOGY
with an emphasis in FEMINIST STUDIES

by

CHRISTINA J. HATCHER

June 2014

The Dissertation of Christina J. Hatcher is Approved:

_____

Professor Steve McKay, Chair

_____

Professor Candace West

_____

Professor Chris Tilly

_____

Tyrus Miller
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Table of Contents

WORKING ON THE SERVICE PRODUCTION LINE: OCCUPATIONAL INTEGRATION AND MOBILITY IN CASINO AND RESTAURANT WORK

by

CHRISTINA J. HATCHER

Abstract

My dissertation addresses a theoretical assertion in the literature that increasing the numbers of groups historically excluded from occupations will decrease inequality among workers at work (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Smith and Elliott 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2009). It is assumed that if groups of workers are nearly evenly represented in occupations (or in integrated occupations), the more equally the labor market rewards will be distributed across the work organization. Yet, scholars of work have not studied integrated occupations enough to test these assumptions (Gatta and Roos 2005; Kennelly 2002). In this dissertation, I investigate upwards mobility from entry-level, integrated occupations to advanced occupations, to evaluate if parity of numbers between groups of entry-level workers does result in equal opportunity of advancement to better jobs. My research tests the assumption that if groups can equally get hired into entry-level jobs within a job ladder, that they will have the same chances to move into better jobs.

The primary research questions of my dissertation include: Does increasing the representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in work organizations? Why do groups with similar educational backgrounds get their foot in the door but some are more likely to advance in one sector than the

other? To best examine why some groups have greater access to better quality jobs

than others, I chose to design a comparative case study of service occupations. I

selected the occupations by examining national service employment data to identify

internal job ladders that met the following criteria. First, the job ladder had to

provide advancement to better jobs for workers. Second, the job ladder had to be

integrated by gender and race-ethnicity in entry-level positions with nearly even

numbers of workers eligible for advancement. My analysis of data from these

selected cases described not just the larger patterns found within workers

advancement to better jobs, but also identified the mechanisms that explained why

these patterns exist within specific types of internal job ladders.

The two types of internal occupational ladders that met these criteria in the

service sector were backline kitchen work and frontline casino work, with almost the

same basic education and experience requirements for workers. My analysis revealed

that these internal ladders showed similar patterns of occupational integration at the

entry-level but different patterns of occupational segregation in advanced positions,

indicating that some have greater chances to advance from the entry-level occupation

to a better job. It's often assumed that integration of occupations is the solution to

reduce inequality in the labor market. Even though occupational integration has the

potential to reduce inequality, it isn't a simple solution to inequality.

To examine why, I conducted qualitative interviews with 46 people employed

as workers, supervisors, managers, owners, and executives in the restaurant and

casino industries and observed participants in one restaurant kitchen and one casino

gaming pit. From this research, I found that men are more likely to advance in restaurant kitchens, while women are more likely to advance in table dealing, and white workers are more likely to advance in casino management. Each workplace requires workers to be highly interactive with others but their interactive engagement at work is quite different. In restaurant kitchens, interaction largely takes place among kitchen workers engaging in intensive team work and rarely with customers — or *backline interactive work*. On casino floors, interaction largely takes place between customers and dealers and rarely among workers — or *frontline interactive work*. Access to better jobs varies across gender and race by the type of interaction in the workplace, either backline or frontline interactive work.

My dissertation looks into the workplace to examine workers' mobility once they are hired into jobs. I argue mobility is a central characteristic of job quality and connect it to the persistent segmentation of internal job ladders. In the entry-level service occupations that I selected, there is the potential to move up into good jobs. By comparing the service interactions of backline workers with frontline workers, my dissertation adds to the literature on service work, stratification and mobility. I argue that workplace banter is a key mechanism that shapes the mobility of workers differently, depending on the type of interaction and its character of banter. Organizational norms of banter and the degree to which they were followed by workers influenced their opportunities to advance into better jobs. Racial and gendered inequalities were reproduced in the workplace, shaping upwards mobility differently for groups of workers, depending on the type of service work and the

norms of banter. My dissertation adds to the stratification literature by drawing on

the theory of boundary work to contribute a new analysis of interactional norms in the

workplace that explains why groups have different access to mobility in internal job

ladders.

This dissertation is dedicated:

To my family

To my friends

&

To my advisors

Chapter One: Introduction

Particularly in the "new economy" and since the Great Recession of 2008, there's an increasing interest in growing economic inequality in the United States, particularly traced to jobs. Work and labor markets are a key way to generate or reduce inequality in different ways and thus are of great interest to sociologists (Treas 2010). Segmentation of the labor market and occupational segregation are two ways that inequality is produced between groups. Despite the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the establishment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1965, gender and racial desegregation of the labor market has proven to be uneven. Sociologists have used the theoretical framework of segmentation to understand how the labor market generates inequality for workers in the labor force by sorting them into good and bad jobs, often measured by monetary characteristics like income and benefits (Doeringer and Piore 1971; Fichtenbaum 2006; Kalleberg and Sorensen 1979; Peck 1996; Reid and Rubin 2003; Tilly 1996). The sorting of workers into jobs of different quality by gender and race-ethnicity and the resulting economic inequalities persist. The desegregation of the labor market would significantly reduce inequalities in the labor market and at work.

Sociologists have also researched inequalities in the workplace after workers are hired out of the labor market, to explain why some groups do better than others within internal job ladders. Some sociologists have argued that it is the lack of occupational integration (or the presence of occupation segregation) that produces inequality, suggesting that a numerical balance between groups could reduce unequal

labor market rewards (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Smith and Elliott 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2009). Based on this numerical argument, the more equal numbers of groups there are in the workplace, the less inequality there should be between groups. One assumption found in this literature is that inequality can be reduced if occupations are integrated with groups who have been historically excluded (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Smith and Elliott 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Reskin and Roos 1990; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2008; Waldinger and Lichter 2003).

But sociologists haven't studied integrated occupations very much to address if this assumption actually does reduce inequality in work and the labor market (Gatta and Roos 2005; Kennelly 2002). Even though the occupational segregation literature often notes the potential for reduced inequality through integrated occupations, (such as by women entering into men's occupations) the assumption that this integration will make men and women more equal at work and in the labor market has not been tested very well in the literature. When sociologists have studied integrated occupations, they have either focused on gender similarities and differences between men and women on the job (Kennelly 2002) or earnings differences between women and men (Gatta and Roos 2005). But no research on integrated occupations has investigated promotional opportunities, a key factor that could reduce inequality at work if groups historically excluded have equal opportunity of advancement to better jobs. Further sociological inquiry into occupations that are integrated across gender

and racial-ethnic groups could help test the assumption that a numerical balance between groups could reduce inequality at work.

My dissertation is centered on these research questions: "Does increasing the representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in work organizations?" and "Why do groups with similar educational backgrounds get their foot in the door but some are more likely to advance in one sector than the other?" To answer these research questions, I designed a research study that addresses the puzzle outlined above with a comparative case study between two similar internal occupational ladders that have integrated entry-level jobs and segregated mobility patterns to better jobs. I evaluate if internal job ladders provide an opportunity to advance for groups who normally get left out.

In this dissertation, my examination of mobility from entry-level integrated occupations shows that occupational integration is not enough to reduce inequality at work. It can change some degree of inequality in terms of who gets in the door, but it does not reduce inequality in terms of who moves into better jobs — and mobility is a key measure of inequality in work because research has found that privileged groups of workers are more likely to advance (Acker 1990, 2006; Moss and Tilly 2001; Waldinger and Lichter 2003). But no research has examined the puzzle of occupational ladders with similar entry-level jobs that are integrated compared with advanced jobs that show different patterns of segmentation. This research explains why some groups that have been historically excluded gain advancement from some types of entry-level jobs but not from others. In the context of reducing inequality

between groups and achieving better conditions for all workers, it's necessary to investigate upwards advancement to better jobs through the lens of workplace dynamics and employment relations.

In this dissertation, I argue that it's not enough to achieve occupational integration, but that equal access to mobility leading to better jobs is necessary for inequality to be reduced. To understand inequality at work, inequality should not just be measured by a group's representation in an occupation, but should also be measured by their representation in upwards mobility. There is a process of resegmentation in mobility within internal job ladders, meaning that some groups are more likely to advance than others, even from integrated entry-level jobs with similar skills and experience requirements. This dissertation project identifies the mechanisms that create and reduce inequality at work through employment relations on the job. I argue that if formally excluded groups can move up, it is a useful measure of how jobs can reduce inequality between workers.

I use the job quality framework of bad, better, and good to examine the reduction of inequality at work via equal opportunity to move into higher quality jobs. My dissertation helps to address the gap in the job quality literature that has identified opportunity to advance as a key measure of a job's quality, but hasn't empirically investigated how access to mobility opportunities is stratified between workers. While Kalleberg (2003) noted that promotional opportunities are important to determine job quality, his study doesn't empirically include that measure in the study of job quality. Part of the problem is that most job quality studies use quantitative

4

methods, limiting the research to available quantitative variables and mobility isn't easily captured by those types of variables. The research on job quality does a good job of identifying how monetary rewards from jobs are unevenly distributed among workers by race-ethnicity and gender. While valuable, this research is limited to large scale patterns in the labor market, measured by job quality characteristics like earnings and benefits through quantitative methods. This indicates that mixed methods research would be a stronger approach to the study of mobility by using qualitative methods to study quantitative patterns. I take this approach to bring an empirical examination of mobility to the job quality debate to develop a more robust framework to the debate of what counts as good and bad jobs.

A study of integrated entry- level occupations would be useful to examine if integration at the entry-level translates into reduced inequality at work between groups. One of the best approaches to investigating these questions is to design a comparative case study between two types of internal job ladders in the service industry that have similarly integrated entry-level jobs but dissimilar patterns of workers' mobility to advanced jobs. This enables an analysis of the social arrangement of workers into bad, better and good jobs, plus identify if groups historically excluded are able to move into the higher quality positions.

But what does workplace integration mean in relationship to stratification? Segmented internal labor markets stratify workers into groups that have access from entry-level jobs to better jobs and groups who get stuck at the bottom of the job ladder (Reich et. al 1973). For stratification to change, all groups should be equally

represented in occupations as compared with their representation in the labor market. In some occupations, groups can equally get their foot in the door at the entry-level (in cases of occupational integration) but not everyone can move into better jobs (in internal job ladders that show some groups move up and others don't). Why do some groups have more advantage than others?

Little is known about advancement from integrated occupations because research has consistently examined segregated occupations (Gatta and Roos 2005), which are overrepresented by a group of workers by race-ethnicity and/or gender. These occupations are widely studied to examine if workplace group composition has an effect on the hiring of employees and their upwards advancement (England 2010; Kmec et. al 2010; Reskin and Roos 1990; Wingfield 2008 Williams 1992). Men working in jobs predominately filled by women gain entry into higher paying, higher status positions; while women who work in jobs predominately filled by men are unlikely to gain upward job advancement. Even in occupations where women are the numerical majority, men experience considerable occupational advantage over women. Research has tended to overlook integrated occupations and neglected to develop sociological theory that identifies mechanisms that create "paths to equity" (Gatta and Roos 2005: 375). More research is needed to unpack why certain groups have more advantage in some occupations than others, to provide a specific explanation for stratification in the service sector and mobility to better jobs.

My dissertation takes up this empirical puzzle of why certain groups have greater access to advancement from entry-level jobs that have nearly equal

representation of groups by gender and race-ethnicity. This research is focused on

two aspects of work in the service sector. In service occupations that are integrated at

the entry-level, what are the patterns of workers' mobility from bad jobs to better jobs

and what explains the patterns? My study shows that despite the evidence of

occupational integration in the entry-level jobs, some groups are more likely to

advance to better jobs than others. What is the best explanation for differences in

occupational integration and job mobility? I sought to explain differences in worker

mobility by advancing the theory of boundary work and using the specific types of

interaction required at work to show why there are differences of mobility. In

interactive work in my two cases, banter is required of workers by either the

workplace group in restaurant kitchens or by management on casino floors. Banter

plays a key role in advancement from bad to better jobs in the service industry.

Because interaction in these types of service work is imperative for job success, either

among workers or between workers and customers, banter plays a key role in how

workers interact with others. Banter is an interactional strategy of exclusionary

closure or boundary making in restaurant kitchens and an interactional strategy of

crossing normative boundaries in casino gaming. Workers draw symbolic boundaries

along socially constructed characteristics that organize workers into groups by gender

and race-ethnicity via boundary work. Before I describe my study in greater detail, I

will give an overview of the service sector, and elaborate on the unique characteristics

of restaurant kitchens and casino gaming, the two internal occupational ladders that I

chose to examine.

The Service Sector

The landscape of jobs in the United States has dramatically changed since the end of World War II, shifting from a manufacturing-based to a service-based economy. As jobs in the manufacturing sector declined, millions of workers sought jobs in other sectors, with many of those workers finding jobs in the growing service sector. Today only a tenth of workers are employed in manufacturing and six out of every seven workers (86 percent of the U.S. workforce) are employed in the service sector (Duhigg and Bradsher 2012). The literature on the service sector has focused on the decline of job quality and often blames rising inequality on the service sector (Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Fuchs 1968; Esping-Anderson 1990; Nelson 1994). But because the service sector is such a large part of the market with over 34 million workers, the service sector is not a very useful category to capture the broad variation of jobs.

The service sector has an enormous number of occupations, making it impossible to generalize about the service sector's role in inequality growth in work and the labor market. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012) organizes all occupation into groups and includes six groups of service occupations. These are healthcare practitioners and technical occupations, healthcare support occupations, protective service occupations, food preparation and serving related occupations, building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations, and personal care and service occupations. The highest paid group was the 7.6 million healthcare practitioners and technical occupations earning a mean wage of $73,540. But within this occupational

category, recreational therapists were the worst paid at $44,280 and anesthesiologists were the highest paid at $232,830. Health care support occupations are paid considerably lower at a mean wage of $27,780 with 3.9 million workers. Or in the protective service occupations with 3.2 million workers, lifeguards are paid an average of $20,720 — considerably less than police supervisors earning an average of $82,060. The food preparation and service related occupations employ the most workers, with 11.5 million people earning a mean wage of $21,380. Of the 24 occupations in this category, only three earn more than $30,000 a year — supervisors, first-line supervisors, and chefs / head cooks. Chefs and head cooks are the most highly paid at a mean wage of $46,570, more than double compared with the other 21 occupations earning between $18,720 and $27,840 on average a year. Even though health occupations tend to pay more overall than food service jobs, it is not accurate that all health occupations pay more than those found in food service. Indeed, of the 23 health support occupations, nine pay less than $30,000 a year on average. And within each occupational group, some of the more poorly paid occupations have an upwards track to occupations that pay more, like prep cooks earning $21,890 securing upwards advancement to become a chef or head cook. Reviewing the diversity of jobs in the service sector shows that the focus on the service sector growth and the quality of its jobs is too broad of an analytical perspective to explain the growth of inequality in work and the labor market.

Interactive food, hospitality and personal service occupations are a useful entry point for examining processes of integration in the workplace. Different service

occupations historically have been gender-typed at alternating points either as "women's work" or "men's work" (Leidner 1991) and have had gender and racial variation among workers (Duffy 2005, 2007; Enarson 1993; Glenn 1992). Food, hospitality and personal service occupations, including cleaning, food preparation and service, and laundry, were dominated by white women over most of the 20th century but have become increasingly integrated by people of color and in particular, have an overrepresentation of Latino men and women (Duffy 2007). The casino industry largely employed white men over most of the 20th century. White women were first hired in the 1930s and increasingly entered into gaming service occupations over the second half of the 20th century, while men of color and women only entered into gaming service occupations in the early 1970s (Enarson 1993). Today, women are 55 percent of workers in food preparation and serving occupations and 51 percent of gaming service workers (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Service occupations are increasingly integrated, meaning that in certain occupations, the numbers of men and women workers are reaching nearly equal numbers.

Interaction is a central feature of food, hospitality, and personal service jobs in which the production of service by workers is nearly simultaneously consumed by customers. Similar to manufacturing work, some types of service are produced by team members on a line, where each member is responsible for an aspect of the service provided. These types of service work can involve direct interaction with customers by *frontline* workers (Hochschild 1983; Leidner 1991) or limited interaction with customers by *backline* workers. Much of the research on food,

hospitality and personal service workplace interactions is focused on frontline workers and examines how workers' emotions and bodies are controlled by management and their employers. This concentrated focus on types of service work involving interactions with the public has overlooked the significant level of interaction that takes place among backline service workers. The research on frontline service work has developed the theoretical framework of emotional labor by finding support for the managerial control of emotions and the consequences for workers required to display certain emotions on the job.

Overview of Restaurant Kitchens

In the United States, the restaurant industry employs over 10.1 million workers, making up 10 percent of the workforce at 980,000 locations, which is nearly 1 out of every 10 private sector employees (National Restaurant Association 2013). In fact, the restaurant industry is the largest private-sector employer in the country and employs the most service workers (Restaurant Opportunities United 2012). In 2012, there were a total of 2,967,380 restaurant kitchen jobs that included 785,370 food preparation jobs, 2,084,640 cook jobs, and 97,370 chef and head cook jobs (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2013b). In 2012, food preparation workers were 58 percent women and 45 percent people of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers), cooks were 38 percent women and 54 percent people of color, while head cooks and chefs were 22 percent women and 45 percent people of color (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). In August 2013, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that employment in food services continued to expand, adding 27,000 jobs that month and

354,000 jobs over the past year. But the job outlook varies according to the type of

position in food service. Compared with the expected 14 percent growth of all

occupations in the labor market by 2020, chefs and head cooks jobs are expected to

experience little to no change (-1 percent), cook jobs are expected to have slower than

average growth (+8 percent), and food preparation jobs are expected to have faster

than average growth (+10 percent) (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2013b). The worst

paid jobs are the fastest growing, negatively impacting the over ten million workers in

this sector.

Restaurant kitchen workers in the best jobs can earn more than the average

hourly pay of $13.39 in the leisure and hospitality industry (Bureau of Labor

Statistics 2013a). Good jobs and bad jobs based on earnings in restaurant kitchens

correlate closely with the pricing of their menus. There is a wide range of restaurants

from expensive fine-dining establishments, hotels and banquets with high price

points, casual dining with mid-range price points, to fast-food convenience chains

with low price points. The Restaurant Opportunities Center (2012) found in a

national survey that median wages in fine dining were 76 percent higher than in fast

food, which disproportionately affected the 61 percent of women employed in fast

food restaurants. Fast food workers have the worst jobs in the restaurant industry,

earning a median hourly wage of $8.80 (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2013b). In fine

dining, the food production line offers a range of income according to position. At

the top of the line, executive chefs earn an average of $75,000 yearly with twenty

years of experience, sous chefs earn an average of $41,000 yearly,[1] and line cooks earn $28,000 yearly with eight years of experience (Chef Salary Report 2011).

To advance, workers have to invest a considerable number of years into their career. The food production line holds promise for some workers to advance to higher salaries, but since there are fewer numbers of executive and sous chef positions than line cooks, most workers will stay at the lower end of the line and thus, earnings. Women are less likely than men to become executive chefs, being employed in only 22 percent of chef positions. Even if they do become chefs, they earn an average of $18,000 less than men (American Culinary Federation 2011).[2]

Restaurant workers are still largely threatened by weak job security, making turnover common in restaurant kitchens. And because many restaurants fail, restaurant workers are frequently forced to seek new work on a regular basis, making restaurant jobs unstable. Still, the large numbers of restaurants make it easier for workers to obtain work if necessary, even in times of recession. In 2012, of those seeking employment, only 3 percent of workers in the restaurant industry were unemployed, compared with the national unemployment rate of 8.3 percent (American Culinary Federation 2012).

Overview of Casino Gaming

Casino gaming employment is steadily growing in numbers. Since 1990, the casino workforce has more than doubled from 198,657 employees in 1990 to 332,075 in 2012 (American Gaming Association 2013). Casinos are steadily

---

[1] Their years of experience were not included in the report.
[2] This finding is unexplained in the report.

expanding into new geographical areas of the United States. In 2012, Ohio opened its first four casinos to become the 23rd U.S. state that is a commercial casino state (American Gaming Association 2013).

In 2012, there were 252,000 gaming service workers employed nationally, which included 106,000 table games dealers and 146,000 gaming supervisors (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2013b). Of the table games dealers, 51 percent were women and 47 percent were workers of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers) (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Of the gaming supervisors, 43 percent were women and 25 percent were workers of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers) (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Jobs are expected to grow at a rate of 13 percent until 2020, which matches the overall job growth rate in the United States. The Census Occupational Handbook (2013b) noted that table games dealer jobs will grow at an even faster rate of 17 percent because more states are legalizing gambling. The job growth rate for gaming supervisors and managers is slightly slower – supervisory jobs are expected to grow at a rate of 7 percent and manager jobs are expected to grow at a rate of 11 percent.

Significant educational attainment differences exist between casino gaming workers and the general U.S. workforce. Ninety percent of casino gaming workers have some college or less, compared with the fifty-eight percent of workers in the general workforce with some college or more (Kim et. al 2009). Holding education constant at the high school level or less, workers in casino gaming are more likely than the general workforce to have a higher median wage, more likely to receive

better job benefits, and less likely to live near or below the poverty line (Kim et. al 2009).

The Puzzle: Workplace Integration and Mobility

In this dissertation, I investigate occupational integration and mobility in casino gaming and restaurant kitchen work in three metropolitan areas: the Las Vegas area, the Detroit area and the San Francisco Bay area. I made this selection because jobs in these regions have higher yearly earnings on average than other comparable urban areas and a large number of residents are employed in these occupations. For gaming, the Detroit and Las Vegas areas are two of the top paying metropolitan areas and have two of the highest employment levels of gaming workers. In Detroit, gaming supervisors earn the most with an average of $57,980 and in Las Vegas, they earn the third highest salary at $54,750 (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012). For head cooks and chefs, San Francisco is one of the top paying urban areas for this occupation, with an average yearly salary of $62,220. My selection of these metropolitan areas helped to sample from a large number of workers in higher paying jobs.

In both types of work, entry-level jobs are integrated by gender and race-ethnicity. But in restaurant kitchens, men move into more advanced and better jobs, while it's harder for women who get stuck at the bottom. These groups have the same qualifications and yet why do men have a greater advantage than women in restaurant kitchens? In casino gaming, women are more likely to move into better table gaming positions than men and white men and white women are more likely to

move into better positions as gaming supervisors than workers of color. Why do women have a greater chance of advancing into better dealing positions than men? Why do white workers have a greater chance of becoming supervisors than workers of color? I sought to find a theoretical explanation by collecting qualitative data to explain these quantitative patterns found in national employment data.

The primary research questions of my dissertation include: Does increasing the representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in work organizations? Why do groups with similar educational backgrounds get their foot in the door but some are more likely to advance in one sector than the other? To answer these questions, I conducted a qualitative comparative case study by interviewing 46 participants (including workers, managers and executives) and conducted participant observation in each type of work. I looked beyond the labor market into the workplace to examine how workers fare once they're hired into jobs. By looking at the mechanisms that can explain these differences, I add to the sociological literature on mobility and stratification in service work by examining interpersonal dynamics in the workplace. I place mobility central into the definition of job quality and connect it to the internal segmentation of job ladders.

In service occupations, there is a potential to move up into better jobs. Yet, in kitchens men advance more than women and in casino dealing, women advance more than men, while in casino supervision, white workers advance more than workers of color — showing that internal job ladders are segmented. In integrated jobs with an internal job ladder to better jobs, with similar human capital requirements, why are

there distinct mobility pathways for different groups? I argue this piece of the puzzle can best be explained by workplace interaction and specifically how interpersonal banter contributes to inequality. Examining employment relations at work can help to better understand how inequality is produced and reduced in jobs.

My dissertation also helps to improve the sociological understanding of job advancement from bad, to better, to good jobs by paying attention to how workers define mobility in their work. While quantitative research about job pathways can note characteristics of good jobs with measures of income, my qualitative research showed complex measures of good jobs within these service industries. To explain paths of mobility within internal job ladders, I examine how workers are promoted not just based on their skills and abilities, but also on whether or not they are perceived to achieve in-group cohesion in restaurant kitchens or client satisfaction in casino gaming.

My dissertation adds to the extensive literature on service work by arguing that workplace banter is a key process of boundary work in the interactive service production lines. These jobs require a different degree of public interaction with customers — casino workers largely have face-to-face interactions customers, while restaurant kitchen workers usually do not.

On casino floors, interaction largely takes place between customers and dealers and rarely among workers — or *frontline interactive work*. In restaurant kitchens, interaction largely takes place among kitchen workers and rarely with customers — or *backline interactive work*. Frontline workers in casinos struggle for dignity and

power when interacting with customers in the gaming pits, while meeting the interactive requirements of the job. Backline workers in restaurants struggle for group inclusion and power when interacting with each other in kitchens. Each group of workers uses a distinct set of relational rules to protect themselves and gain status at work. In restaurants, coworker relations are important in shaping the social climate of the workplace, and in casinos worker-customer relations are important. I examine how these sets of strategies shape job advancement differently by race and gender between these two types of service production lines. I argue that the internal job ladders are regulated to achieve efficient teamwork in restaurants or efficient customer service in casinos. Because the interactions among the team or with customers are largely unregulated, acceptance into the work group in restaurants and power over the gaming table in casinos play an important role in gaining advancement. These key findings are the mechanisms that explain the differences of integration and mobility in each type of service production line.

Overview

Following the introduction, I review the literature in chapter two to discuss the contributions and limitations of existing studies in relationship to my research questions. I draw attention to the gaps in theory, the theoretical tools available and my theoretical contribution. In chapter three, I discuss my methodological design and case study selection. In chapter four, I describe occupational integration in entry-level casino and restaurant work, including job characteristics, who employers want to hire (the labor queue) and who wants these jobs (the job queue). But labor and job

queues don't explain mobility in internal job ladders after workers are hired into jobs. To understand mobility, I examine in chapter five the workplace dynamics and interaction in casino table gaming and in restaurant kitchens to explain differences in the segmentation of advanced jobs. In this chapter, I also examine strategies of workplace banter that shape access to advancement opportunities differently for racial-ethnic and gender groups of workers. I assess how the type of interaction influences workers' chances of advancement unevenly in different segmented internal job ladders. In the conclusion, I consider the implications of my study for service workers to navigate to the best jobs in complex, interactive workplaces.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Sociological scholarship has tended to examine segregated occupations and has overlooked integrated occupations ─ an important area of inquiry to study with the purpose of understanding the potential for reducing unequal labor market rewards and thus inequality of the labor market (Gatta and Roos 2005). When confronted with explaining why there are differences in segmentation and mobility, sociologists have often compared numerical majorities with numerical minorities (England 2010; Kmec et. al 2010; Reskin and Roos 1990; Wingfield 2008 Williams 1992). Sociologists frequently explained the differences in upward job advancement through the experiences of "token workers" in the workplace, suggesting that a numerical balance between groups could reduce unequal labor market rewards and workplace discrimination (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Elliott and Smith 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2008).

Sociological explanations of "top-down" segmentation theory that relies on comparing numerical majorities with numerical minorities are strong for understanding why occupations remain segregated (Kanter 1977) and how workers gain upward mobility if their ascribed characteristics match those in the numerical majority (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2008). Numerical explanations assume that even numbers of different groups of workers will reduce inequality at work by securing representativeness in the labor market. But this literature has failed to test the assumption that if occupational

integration is achieved, inequality at work will be reduced by workers gaining equivalent access to jobs they've historically been excluded from.

It is not enough to identify occupations that workers are equally represented within to achieve occupational integration because it ignores the quality of the occupations for workers and the rewards they receive from them. To build a complete framework of inequality at work, it is necessary to take into account not only occupational integration, but also the quality of jobs found in the integrated occupations. The literature on job quality can help to build this framework by drawing from its measures of monetary and nonmonetary rewards, but needs to be advanced by further research on promotional opportunities.

The debate in the job quality literature is largely on how to define good and bad jobs. Some scholarship on job quality defines it based on earnings (Acemoglu 2001; Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Fuchs 1968; Esping-Anderson 1990; Nelson 1994). Earlier research defined it based on job stability, arguing that flexible work indicated poor job quality (Doeringer and Piore 1971; Reich et.al 1973). But more recent research has argued that if workers have a degree of control over flexible work, job quality can be improved (Kalleberg 2003). And other researchers have used subjective or nonmonetary, intrinsic measures, like job satisfaction or the quality of work relationships, to assess job quality (Chamberlin and Hodson 2010). Job quality scholarship often notes that promotional opportunity is a key measure to incorporate into defining a job's quality, but often fails to investigate upwards mobility because its processes are not easily captured through quantitative variables (Kalleberg 2003).

Further research should empirically investigate promotional opportunity to see how if access to advancement is stratified across groups of workers.

The first section of this literature review discusses the literature on labor market segmentation (including race and gender queues) and occupational integration. Labor market segmentation research is largely limited to how the hiring process sorts workers into jobs at the point of hiring from the labor market. This focus in the literature misses the role of mobility in the segmentation of internal job ladders, which is fundamental to either reproducing or reducing inequality among workers.

The second section of this literature review discusses the debate over job quality to outline the main arguments over characteristics of "good" or "bad" jobs. Some define job quality with monetary characteristics (Acemoglu 2001; Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Fuchs 1968; Esping-Anderson 1990; Nelson 1994), while others have defined job quality with nonmonetary, intrinsic characteristics (Chamberlin and Hodson 2010). Most advance the stability of jobs as a primary measure of job quality (Barker and Christiensen 1998; Doeringer and Piore 1971; Kalleberg 2003; Kalleberg, Reskin and Hudson 2000; Rogers 2000; Segal and Sullivan 1997). And while scholarship on job quality agrees that promotional opportunities play a key role in measuring the quality of a job, this measure is an understudied area in the literature. My definition of job quality, which adds mobility within internal job ladders to the definition, is informed by this literature review, particularly as it relates to the service industry.

Occupational Integration and Inequality at Work

Does increasing the representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in work organizations? Or are white men advantaged in all occupations, regardless of gender or racial composition? One pathway to equality at work could be to balance the numbers of men and women in the composition of occupations and at the organizational level. Scholars have also sought to explain gender stratification by examining how inequality is produced by work organizations (Acker 1990, 2006; Martin 2003; Williams 1995). Empirical research that tests the gendered organizational theory is distinct from empirical research that tests sex segregation in the labor market (Britton 2000). Researchers testing the gendered organizational theory have explored how bureaucratic organizations value and evaluate gendered characteristics to produce status and material inequalities (Schilt 2006; Williams 1995). Researchers have also documented how organizations create and reproduce symbolism and ideology based on ideals of masculinity (Kanter 1977; Paap 2006). Sociologists study gender within organizations and institutions to identify barriers to equality (Acker 1990, 2006; Britton 1997, 2000; Kanter 1976, 1977; Kimmel 2000). Organizational gender theorists have put forth two main arguments: 1) upwards mobility for women is limited because men promote other men and 2) organizational rules and norms privilege men's occupational advancement.

One of the earliest examinations of gender and organizations was Kanter's *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977), an ethnography of an organization called

"Indsco," to explore why there were so few women managers. She argued that organizational structure shaped the placement of the men and women who worked at the organization. For example, managers were largely responsible for communication tasks in their work. The corporation evaluated managers for efficiency, accuracy and effectiveness in their communication tasks that required social and interpersonal skills. In making hiring decisions, the corporation gave management opportunities to workers who resembled current managers. Managers explained that communication with women was difficult and time-consuming. They expressed a preference to communicate with and hire others who were similar to themselves, in this case, white, educated, middle- to upper-class men. Since few women were managers, women were treated as tokens in the workplace.

Kanter argued that the numbers of men and women in the workplace do matter. In the office social network, women who became "token" managers experienced resentment and resistance from their coworkers. Token employees were "…often treated as representatives of their category, as symbols rather than individuals" (1977: 208). As an out-group member, women integrated into management were negatively evaluated. Token managers were highly visible in contrast to the dominant group and often were stereotyped. In the work organization, tokenism reinforced the low numbers of women in managerial positions and kept women in the position of the token.

Subsequent studies have supported Kanter's idea of top-down "homosocial reproduction" in which those in positions of authority reproduce workplace

segregation by selecting subordinates with similar group characteristics (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Williams 1992) or by matching supervisors to work groups from the same racial group (Elliott and Smith 2001, 2002). The social closure perspective compares numerical majorities with numerical minorities to explain inequality in work organizations and in particular, organizational segregation. The key similarity among the empirical evidence supporting the social closure perspective is that workers are part of networks of exclusion or networks of inclusion because of their racial and gender group membership. Within segregated organizations, workers gain advancement if their gender and racial group membership match those in positions of authority (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2008). Kanter suggested that a more balanced ratio of men to women in the workplace hierarchy to avoid tokenism and workplace discrimination against women.

The incorporation of token workers into the workplace has gained considerable attention since Kanter's original study. Other research has studied the experiences of token workers in segregated organizations that employed mostly white men by interviewing African-American women firefighters (Yoder and Aniakudo 1997), African-American policewomen (Martin 1994; Texeria 2002), Chicana women attorneys (Garciá-López 2008), and women West Point military cadets (Kimmel 2000). Token workers were excluded from the dominant group of men and experienced negative career consequences. Women felt invisible as individual workers and hypervisible as members of their gender group. Kimmel wrote, "As

tokens in a gendered institution, women cadets were constantly negotiating sameness and difference with each other, with male cadets, with faculty and staff, and with themselves" (p. 505). Exclusion from the dominant group was embedded in workplace dynamics through hostile interactions, hyper-critical supervision, and negative stereotyping. Garciá-López (2008) found that Chicana women attorneys were frequently assigned low-profile caseloads and misidentified by others as secretaries, court reporters and janitorial staff. This organizational oversight made the attorneys feel invisible in their workplaces. Social exclusion from the dominant group negatively impacted the advancement of token workers but at the same time, can be one of the most difficult types of discrimination to document.

Building on Kanter's work on gender and organizations, Acker (1990) identified an absence of a systematic feminist theory of organizations. She developed a theory of gendered organizations that has five interacting processes indicating that organizations are not gender neutral but rather are structured around socially constructed gender differences. The five gendered interacting processes are: 1) the construction of divisions along lines of gender, 2) the construction of symbols and images that explain, express, reinforce, or sometimes oppose these divisions, 3) interactions between women and men, women and women, men and men, including patterns that enact dominance and submission, 4) the production of gendered components of individual identity, and 5) the ongoing gendered processes of creating and conceptualizing social structures (1990: 146-147). Acker's theory highlighted the relationship between masculinity and advantage in the workplace to explain

gender inequality in organizations. The general requirements of work are organized based on the white "family man" who is primarily responsible for supporting his family financially and has few responsibilities for providing care.

Acker applied the five gendered interactive processes to job evaluations to conclude that jobs and hierarchies are gendered. Job evaluations were created in bureaucratic organizations with the intention of having a neutral evaluation of jobs to determine the value and rewards of a job. Acker pointed out job evaluations reproduced gender divisions at work by more highly rewarding work that was usually performed by men, such as managing money skills than work that is usually performed by women, such as human relations skills. Acker wrote, "Such rankings would not deviate substantially from rankings already in place that contain gender typing and gender segregation of jobs and the clustering of women workers in the lowest and worst-paid jobs" (1990:150). Skills that were seen as unique to men were valued more highly than skills perceived as unique to women. The gendered organizational logic of job evaluations rewarded men more than women, while at the same time, appeared to be gender-neutral. Acker's theory revealed how "gender-neutral" work policies and procedures in fact created and reproduced gender segregation and inequality.

To test Acker's theory of gendered organizational policies and practices, Britton (1997) interviewed men and women who worked as officers in men's and women's prisons. She found that "gender-neutral" policies and practices were explicitly and implicitly gendered. All of the prison officers received the same

27

training for working in either the men's or women's prisons. The training focused on

the threat of violence from inmates on the job, illustrated through storytelling and

visual examples of violent outbreaks in the men's prison, but the training left out a

consideration of potential violence in the women's prison. Britton pointed out, "So,

in referring to "the prison" as a generic institution, it seems clear that training actually

assumes the men's prison as model, and an exaggerated version at that" (p.

805). Similarly, the training of prison officers assumed the gender-neutral "officer"

to be a man working in a men-dominated institution. The training encouraged

"occupational masculinity" in which the ideal man prison officer is able to work in a

dangerous work environment. The emphasis on potential situations glossed over the

work environment in women's prisons, giving a disadvantage to the majority of

women prison officers working there. Because of the gendered training, men prison

officers gained advantage over women prison officers in their workplaces — they

were more likely to be perceived by co-workers as competent, they were better

prepared and they saw their workplace in men's prisons as normative. Women prison

officers were disadvantaged by the training. They were not given training on

situations that are unique to their workplace experiences, such as witnessing men's

sexual activity on the job and they were not given training on interpersonal skills of

dealing with inmates, only training on physical skills of dealing with inmate

violence. Women were less likely to be viewed as competent workers and were less

likely to be promoted to a supervisor position in men's prisons. Britton demonstrated

that gender inequality was structured by gendered organizational rules and norms,

supporting Acker's theory of inequality regimes within gendered organizations. In her conclusion, Britton wrote, "…it is hard to imagine a context in which "gendered" organizational logic would benefit women" (p. 814).

Almost two decades later, Acker (2006) addressed the theoretical omission of race in her theory of gendered organizations by developing the concept of "inequality regimes" to analyze the interrelated production and reproduction of gender, race and class inequalities in work organizations. She suggested studying inequality within specific organizations to understand the "the local, ongoing practical activities of organizing work that, at the same time, reproduce complex inequalities" (P. 442). Acker argued that organizations are characterized by an unequal share of power and control over organizational decision-making, resources and outcomes. Complex inequality is deeply embedded in the situated and everyday practices of individuals within institutional social structures. West and Fenstermaker (1995) suggest that "…depending on how race, gender and class are accomplished, what looks to be the same activity may have different meanings for those engaged in it" (P. 32). For example, white female-to-male transsexuals were more richly rewarded for their work after their transition than before, not from an improvement in their skills or abilities but rather from gendered organizational advantage (Schilt 2006). Many agree that research should observe the practices that reproduce gender inequality and difference at work (Martin 2003; Schilt 2006) and note that the gendered organizational approach is theoretically and empirically underdeveloped (Britton 2000).

Studies overwhelmingly examine men working in women-dominated occupations or women working in men-dominated occupations (Cotter et. al 2004), with few exceptions (Gatta and Roos 2005). Some research has shown processes within occupations that move women into lower-paying, low authority job positions within men-dominated occupations (Roth 2004). Other research has shown the opposite for men gaining advantage over women into better positions in schools and hospitals that employ mostly women (Williams 1992). At the national level, workers who are the numerical minority of any given occupation are "occupational minorities" and research shows this is advantageous for men but not for women (Taylor 2010). Most of the studies on segregated occupations ignore the simultaneous, lived experience of race and gender in workers — implicitly assuming that their findings about white men and white women can be generalized to workers of color (Budig 2002; Pierce 1995; Roth 2004; Williams 1992).

In segregated occupations, workplace social closure supports majority group members and excludes minority group members. If a particular occupation is integrated by gender or race (in occupations with 45 percent to 55 percent women or people of color), then do workers still participate in processes of workplace social closure? If the overall workplace is integrated does strength in numbers still matter? Research has yet to address how informal social networks influence both the hiring process and the distribution of skill and social support after workers are hired (Vallas 2003). Thus, the degree to which workers are integrated by race or gender could influence how they engage with informal networks through their ability to: gain

upwards mobility through shared knowledge; increase the perception that their skills are valued; gain access to network contacts; and foster between-group ties of loyalty; among other aspects of informal networks.

Yet, others have suggested that more than just a numerical balance between groups needs to be secured in the workplace for minority groups' advancement (Williams 1992; Wingfield 2009). Williams and Wingfield each studied women-dominated occupations and argued that barriers existed in the workplace for white women and minority men. In her study of men working as teachers, social workers, nurses and librarians, Williams identified the "glass escalator" that facilitated men's upward mobility from feminine-typed positions into masculine-typed specialties within their field of work that paid more and held higher prestige. Even though women displaying masculine qualities can benefit from gendered organizations, they are most likely to be placed in a token status. Men experienced negative perceptions of their work in women-dominated professions from others outside of their workplace and countered these perceptions by moving into managerial and supervisory positions. Their upward mobility was enabled by beliefs among coworkers that managers and supervisors should embody masculine characteristics like aggression, rationality and decisiveness. Men supervisors often facilitated other men's upwards occupational advancement into managerial positions because they believed these masculine-typed positions more closely matched the men nurses' masculinity. Williams noted, "The crucial factor is the social status of the token's group — not their numerical rarity — that determines whether the token encounters a 'glass

ceiling' or a 'glass escalator'" (p. 263). Similar to Kanter's (1977) findings that

managers promoted others similar to themselves, Williams found that men made

hiring and promotional decisions to seek out applicants with masculine qualities. Yet,

dissimilar to Kanter's argument that low numbers of women in positions of authority

keep women from occupational advancement, was Williams' suggestion that the

social status of the token's race and gender group and the matching of workers to

"gender-appropriate" jobs matters more. The lack of evidence supporting Kanter's

theory suggests that a change in numbers is not enough to transform work inequality.

Others have shown the negative consequences for the feminization of occupations or

the increasing numbers of women in any given occupation (Huffman and Cohen

2004).

In a study of Black and white men working in the field of nursing, Wingfield

found that Black nurses encountered glass barriers that limited their upward mobility,

while white nurses advanced. While Williams found that white men nurses were

often assumed by patients to be doctors and thus seen as fully capable, Wingfield

found that Black men nurses were frequently assumed to be janitors or housekeeping

staff and thus seen as less than capable. Black men nurses were also excluded from

internal networks of women nurses in their workplaces.   The glass escalator effect

was not equally available to black men nurses as it was to white men nurses,

supporting the argument that the social status of tokens can limit occupational

mobility for those in the minority. Whether or not co-workers had the same racial

background influenced the degree of men nurses' inclusion. In Williams' study,

white men nurses described how white women nurses welcomed them and supported their advancement into leadership positions. Conversely, the black men nurses in Wingfield's study described how white women seemed to be reluctant to work with them and unlikely to support their advancement. Shared racial status among men and women workers played a significant role in the advancement of men token workers in women-dominated occupations.

Women and minority groups are underrepresented in advanced occupational and organizational positions that confer higher levels of work authority. Within work organizations, the degree to which employees can exercise authority over the work process and others is one measure of power in the workplace. Studies have shown that numerical majorities play a significant role in maintaining their workplace dominance from the "top down" (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Elliott and Smith 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2008). Workers are included, promoted and matched to their supervisors if they are part of the same social group. Social networks play a significant role in workplace inclusion or exclusion of particular groups. Powerful groups can create hostile workplaces for minority groups of workers, contributing to their workplace exclusion. Network members informally divide up resources to help some, while excluding others (McGuire 2002). Informal workplace networks are gendered by offering more career support to men than women, contributing to the glass ceiling effect. Women are less likely than men to receive quality job leads that can help secure upwards mobility

(Huffman and Torres 2002; Kmec et. al 2010; McDonald et al. 2009; Stainback 2008), even in women-dominated occupations (Huffman and Torres 2002).

If the labor market is the most significant site of segregation, then can changes in the queuing process explain why certain occupations have become integrated by gender or race? Little is known about integrated occupations because research has consistently studied segregated occupations (Gatta and Roos 2005), such as women's entry into occupations dominated by men (England 2010; Kmec et. al 2010; Reskin and Roos 1990) or men's entry into occupations dominated by women (Wingfield 2008; Williams 1992). Women are more likely to enter into men-dominated occupations than men are to enter into women-dominated occupations (England 2010). Men working in jobs predominately filled by women gain entry into higher paying, higher status positions; women who work in jobs predominately filled by men are unlikely to gain upward job advancement and on average earn less than men. Even in occupations where women are the numerical majority, men experience considerable occupational advantage over women.

Workers are stratified by gender in blue-collar occupations (dominated by men) or in service and clerical occupations (dominated by women) (Gabriel and Schmitz 2007). In part, scholars explain occupations are segregated because of the cultural typing of jobs as appropriate for different groups of employees based on their race, gender, or both. Hiring and promotions are influenced by bias and stereotyping to create occupational niches or ghettos. Job mobility is limited by tokenism (Kanter 1977) and by social closure — both of which rely on an explanation of why

numerical majorities at the top of organizational hierarchies are motivated to award groups differently. If an employee is in the minority, he or she is seen as a "token worker" and unlikely to be incorporated into the higher levels of the organizational workplace through exclusionary practices. Workers are more likely to be promoted if he or she is similar to the majority at the top. Thus, majority group individuals allocate promotions and rewards in employment based on their motivations to maintain in-group advantage against out-group integration.

Very little sociological research has compared integrated and segregated occupations and the existing research has only studied gender (Kennelly 2002). Kennelly studied women in secretarial work (a women-dominated occupation) and furniture sales (a gender-integrated occupation) to compare women's worker identity across workplace context. She found that furniture saleswomen set themselves apart from women secretaries by asserting their equal capabilities compared to men. Kennelly wrote, "Women can simultaneously devalue women and value themselves — but they value themselves despite the fact that they are women, not because of it. They see themselves as exceptions to their gender, and they judge themselves by standards for men" (p. 610). The women in gender-integrated occupations, because they weren't doing "typical" women's work, aligned themselves more closely with men to make themselves out to be exceptional.

The Debate over Good and Bad Jobs

Social scientists have consistently interpreted the shift from a manufacturing to services-based economy to negatively impact job quality (Bluestone and Harrison

1982; Fuchs 1968; Esping-Anderson 1990; Nelson 1994). They argue that job quality has degraded because average wages are lower in the service sector than in the manufacturing sector. But what counts as a good and bad job is widely debated in the research literature. Especially considering the complexity of job arrangements in the labor market, there is disagreement over the characteristics and definitions of job quality, which is defined in the literature by employment earnings, job stability, and intrinsic rewards from work.

The debate is largely about what job outcomes should be taken into account when defining "good" and "bad" jobs. Some take into account earnings and define high-wage jobs as good and low-wage jobs as bad (Acemoglu 2001; Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Fuchs 1968; Esping-Anderson 1990; Nelson 1994). Any benefits workers receive in addition to earnings, like health insurance or retirement contributions, are also factored in to defining job quality. These social scientists argue that monetary outcomes from jobs determine job quality. Other social scientists argue that nonmonetary, intrinsic characteristics are equally as important to earnings. Intrinsic characteristics include the degree of autonomy at work, job satisfaction, job commitment, the meaning of work, and interpersonal relations among workers, among others (Chamberlin and Hodson 2010). And some define secure jobs as better and insecure jobs as worse ― making a job's level of precariousness as the primary measure of job quality (Barker and Christiensen 1998; Doeringer and Piore 1971; Kalleberg 2003; Kalleberg, Reskin and Hudson 2000; Rogers 2000; Segal and Sullivan 1997). The three most typical measures used to

assess job quality in the literature is pay, health insurance and pension benefits (Kalleberg et. al 2000). But an empirical assessment of job mobility is largely missing from the literature's debate over job quality, a surprising omission considering the importance of mobility in securing a better job for workers and its role in the stratification of the labor market overall. Access to promotional opportunities is often discussed in the context of types of jobs that have varying degrees of flexibility as either the absence of mobility (as in contract and temporary work) or the presence of mobility (as in full-time positions). For example, Kalleberg et. al (2000) wrote about nonstandard employment, 'Contract and temporary employees are subject to the demands of their de facto employers, but without the hope of security and advancement with these employers that "real" employees can entertain' (P. 274). But a deeper assessment of the stratification of mobility between different groups of workers is left out of the job quality literature.

Most studies have evaluated job quality with widely available quantitative data on stratification, like earnings and employer-provided benefits (Kalleberg et. al 2000). Even less research has included monetary and nonmonetary measures in their study of job quality (Jencks et al. 1988) or investigated workers' perception of job quality (Handel 2005). A shortcoming of the literature is that the quality of jobs is generalized to the labor market or to the type of work arrangement, leaving out how the measure of mobility in segmented internal job ladders.

Some social scientists argue that the type of work arrangement (standard or nonstandard) determines job quality in the labor market (Kalleberg et al. 2000).

Standard work arrangements are permanent positions that award workers a set of rights, benefits and protections from their employment. Nonstandard work arrangements are temporary, contracted positions that offer limited rights, benefits, and protections from their employment. Kalleberg (2009) tracks the growth of nonstandard work arrangements since the 1970s to provide evidence that precarious work (meaning the work is uncertain or unpredictable) has become more widespread in the United States. These scholars argue that the temporality of work marks the difference between good and bad jobs and that less stable employment arrangements create an underclass of workers in low-wage jobs that offer no benefits, little training and no advancement opportunities.

Job stability is often used to differentiate between good and bad jobs by using the theory of labor market segmentation. Doeringer and Piore's (1971) dual labor market theory contended that the labor market is divided between the more stable primary segment and the less stable secondary segment. They argued that the primary segment offers standard employment that includes the most desirable, highest paying and long-term jobs with health and retirement benefits and opportunities for advancement from job ladders. Primary sector jobs reward workers' investments in education and prior work experience (or their human capital). The secondary segment offers nonstandard employment that includes less desirable jobs because: they often are unpredictable, flexible or short-term contracts; offer less pay, limited health and retirement benefits; and have few opportunities for advancement (Tilly 1996). Put simply, the dual market theory's basic argument is that the "good jobs" are found in

the primary labor market and the "bad jobs" are found in the secondary-periphery labor market. In theory, workers should be able to secure job success from their investments in education and training to gain the "good" primary sector jobs. But because the labor market is socially regulated, some workers in labor markets are more likely to get the risky or "bad" jobs than others (Peck 1996) and job instability is becoming a key feature of the entire labor market, from low-wage to high-wage jobs.

More recent research that examines labor market segmentation suggests that jobs and workers don't fit quite so neatly into the dual market framework (Kalleberg 2003). Employers' need for workforce flexibility and the subsequent restructuring of employment relations has made the arrangements of work more complex. Kalleberg examined the consequences of the reorganization of work in the United States by comparing labor market outcomes in standard and nonstandard employment arrangements. Drawing on Doeringer and Piore's theory of primary and secondary labor markets, he argued that firms employ "organizational insiders" or an internal workforce with strong organizational ties and strong job security, and "organizational outsiders" or an external workforce with weak organizational ties and weak job security. Work organizations want to retain organizational insiders (e.g. long-term, stable employees) while hiring organizational outsiders when needed (e.g. temporary, contracted employees). Despite the assumption that all jobs in the secondary labor market are bad, Kalleberg shows that in fact, some secondary jobs are good for workers.

One key factor that determines good or bad outcomes for workers in the secondary segment is the degree of control workers have over their work, which increases their ability to navigate flexible work arrangements to their advantage (Kalleberg 2003). Workers with a high degree of control over their work in the periphery have highly portable skills, effective occupational association and high security within an occupation. Workers with a low degree of control over their work in the periphery have nontransferable skills, weak occupational association, and low security with employer or occupation. Kalleberg argued that, "Employers' search for flexibility has resulted in a more diverse set of employment relations…this diversity in employment relations has implications for inequality in labor market outcomes" (P. 168). Kalleberg argued that not only are workers stratified in labor markets and within work organizations, but they are also stratified within the organizational outsiders group (in nonstandard employment arrangements). Organizational outsiders with a higher degree of individual control over their skills (e.g. highly portable) are more likely to find steady employment within an occupation, even though they have weak organizational ties and are in nonstandard employment.

Central to Kalleberg's definition of job quality is that organizational outsiders with a high degree of control can find relatively stable employment, either with one employer or within occupational internal labor markets — complicating the earlier dualism model that identified good and bad jobs simply based on the type of employment arrangement. Kalleberg concluded that more research is needed on inequalities within work organizations, of patterns of mobility and of differences

among nonstandard workers (P. 172). Indeed, his quantitative analysis of occupational categories (e.g. food service) makes broad generalizations about the degree of skill within an occupational category and the ability of workers in that occupation to move to a different or better job — glossing over the significant variation of skill and advancement or mobility opportunities within an occupational category. A more complex model of job quality would take into account the proximity of workers to the work organization, the flexibility of work, and the degree of control a worker has over his or her skills, plus include an analysis of variation across specific occupations (e.g. food preparation workers, cooks, head cooks and chefs in full-service restaurants) within a broader occupational category (e.g. food service).

Some research does offer support to the theory that jobs are paid better in the primary labor market than the secondary-periphery labor markets. Two studies compared the average real wages between the labor market segments and found that workers in the primary segment did earn higher wages than workers in the secondary segment across all racial-ethnic and gender groups (Fichtenbaum 2006; Reid and Rubin 2003). Research also found that there are significant economic costs experienced by workers in the secondary labor market. In a study that compared employment data from 1974-2000, Reid and Rubin showed that by 2000, primary sector workers (those in long-term and stable employment arrangements) earned $13,340 more than periphery-secondary workers (those in precarious employment arrangements of contractual or temporary work). Others argue that the accessibility

of the standard employment arrangement (or "organizational career") is overstated and only functioned as an unattainable model of a career narrative for most (Arthur and Rousseau 2001; Hollister 2011). A new employment narrative is emerging that Hollister (2011) called a "boundary-less career" that has a limited employer role in providing a stable career with advancement opportunities. This type of career trajectory leaves workers with the responsibility for their own career success. If so, social and cultural capital plays a crucial role in securing better jobs and profitable job changes, such as having better connections and an ability to navigate informal interactions (Arthur and Rousseau 2001; Cappelli 1999).

Low-wage service work takes a significant negative toll on workers but does offer some intrinsic rewards to them. In service work, emotional labor is a crucial aspect of performing one's job in producing a service for consumption. It's a common practice for companies to standardize the production of service and the delivery of the service encounter to achieve its goals of efficiency and productivity (Leidner 1991). The requirements for emotional labor are frequently scripted into how to do a job well and taught to employees in employee training and written into a work manual. But research has largely overlooked how the type of interaction and the ways that workers perform emotional labor has influenced job quality.

To exhibit emotions appropriately, workers do a type of labor that is as important as the physical labor demanded by the job. Hochschild (1983) in *The Managed Heart* brought attention to service workers' laboring of emotion that was crucial for their employment by studying the work of flight attendants. In this

research, she defined emotional labor as "the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labor is sold for a wage and therefore has exchange value" (P. 7). Emotional labor in service work involves routinized, interactive labor between the customer, management and workers. Employers require their workers to produce emotional feelings in the labor process — to be cheerful, to smile and to generate feelings of emotion in a display for customers in the purchasing of services. Workers are alienated from their emotional labor if they are "surface acting" or having feelings of inauthenticity. Inauthenticity could be described as contributing negatively to job quality, meaning, the more a worker is inauthentic at work, the worse the job.

Workers are controlled on the job through scripting and feeling rules that are standardized by management. Their autonomy and decision-making are minimized by the routinization of providing service in an encounter with customers. The scripting of interactive service work encounters encourages consistency of workers engagement at work. "Feeling rules" (Hochschild 1979) instruct workers in self-presentation (such as facial expressions, tone of voice) and retaining self-control through surface acting (such as absorbing insult or anger from customers without retaliation) to ensure that the "customer is always right." Studies that compared men-dominated occupations with women-dominated occupations found that women consistently practice a type of emotional labor called deference in low-status jobs (Hochschild 1983; Leidner 1991; Pierce 1999). For example, Pierce found that women paralegals practiced deference in their work by playing a nurturing and

mothering role to men lawyers, reinforcing the "naturalness" of sex categories

through the doing of gender (West and Fenstermaker 1995). Conversely, lawyers

were expected to be "Rambo litigators," displaying masculine behavior on the job,

like aggression or toughness. Low-status jobs offer workers little protection against

customer abuse, whereas higher status jobs offer workers more protection. The

consequences for workers are seen as internal — inflicting psychological damage that

includes alienation — but ignores consequences on the quality of these jobs for

service workers.

An intriguing question is whether or not they type of interaction (either with

co-workers, customers, or clients) influences feelings of inauthenticity. A

quantitative study that examined predictors of inauthenticity with a survey of hospital

and bank employees found higher levels of coworker interaction was associated with

fewer feelings of inauthenticity, while higher levels of interactions with customers or

clients was associated with more feelings of inauthenticity (Bulan, Erickson, and

Wharton 1997). These findings suggest that the degree to which there is interaction

among co-workers has a significant relationship to how much workers feel

inauthentic at work. In contrast to the majority of research studies on emotional labor

that treats it as a uniform process at work, this study uniquely examined if workers'

patterns of interaction shape their feelings of inauthenticity differently. Yet, because

Hochshild's original study included jobs if they included employees' display of

emotions to the public and not among their workgroup, subsequent research has

mostly studied frontline workers. The complexity of the service industry begs the

question of if there are indeed further differences between frontline and backline workers' emotional labor at work and how the type of interaction could influence job quality.

Much of the research on emotional labor is concerned with the emotional labor performed by frontline workers in interactions with customers and how management controls these interactions. Studies of frontline workers, such as flight attendants (Hochschild 1983), fast food window workers (Leidner 1991) and women card dealers (Enarson 1993) have shown that emotional labor requires displaying positive emotions on the job, such as by maintaining eye contact, smiling and speaking in a friendly tone. Performing emotional labor by the rules in turn creates positive emotional reactions by others in a service exchange. A successful exchange between service worker and customer meets performance goals of customer service, such as creating a memorable experience, securing repeat business and influencing favorable public opinion. Employers have a significant stake in managing the emotional labor of employees because of self-interest in profits. At the same time, employees have a significant stake in managing their own emotional labor because of self-interest in their jobs. The customer is also a core player in the service exchange, having the opportunity to make a complaint about the service interaction to management. Interactive emotional labor in frontline jobs illustrates this interplay between worker, customer and management in the struggle for power.

Performing emotional labor according to the rules of the workplace is not a given. Depending on the context, workers can and do fail to perform emotional labor

as expected by management. Even in workplaces where workers are under high levels of scrutiny, workers do emotional labor in a way that benefits themselves more than their employers. In the gambling industry, gaming service workers are highly monitored by a complex surveillance system. Even so, Sallaz (2006) found that dealers frequently broke management's rules about how they should interact with the customers. If the players were tipping, dealers gave them hints about how to play the game and if they weren't tipping, then dealers limited their talk or emotional responses during the game. Dealers were able to gain autonomy on the gaming floor for their best interests by taking control over how they interacted with customers by giving or withholding their emotional labor. Even though emotional labor is expected according to company rules, workers have a considerable degree of control over how they perform emotional labor on the job. If workers break more rules at work, do they feel more authentic and have a perception that their job is of higher quality?

Strategies that limit workers' autonomy may include customer evaluations of the service, video surveillance, and secret shoppers. Employers codify expectations about how workers look, act, feel and do tasks during the service labor process by using a range of human resource tools, like uniforms, appearance rules, scripts, and training sessions. The presence of customers complicates managerial efforts to organize and control the labor process and limits immediate discipline if a worker isn't performing the job according to the rules. In a study of airline crew by Curley and Royle (2013), senior crew members found satisfaction in doing emotional labor and saw it as highly skilled work, but disliked the recent changes that required shift

flexibility from them. Newly hired crew members did not share these workplace

values but nonetheless, were incorporated into the crew because they willingly were

flexible in their hour, suggesting a "re-manufacturing" of emotional labor

requirements from workers to secure more flexibility from workers.

In constructed routines of providing service, workers are expected to enact an

authentic performance of their role. To follow these employer expectations and do

their jobs well, workers may have to compromise their ethics or alter their usual

norms of interacting with others. If a worker's role and working identity are closely

matched, the authenticity of their performance can be more believable and even seem

natural or spontaneous. Scholars of service work have argued that jobs require

workers to adopt an attitude of deference, eagerness to please and friendliness

(Hochschild 1983; Leidner 1991). If the traits required on the job clash with workers'

identity, workers rename the traits to be make their performance more palatable to

their self-identity. For example, Leidner (1991) found that men working in insurance

sales took a script that required a nonthreatening, pleasant and placid performance

with clients and renamed it to be a contest of will that involved skills of determination

and toughness to perform the script well. Workers' tolerance of the way they're

expected to act on the job is necessary for them to continue in their jobs. But if

workers are asked to participate in work routines that are dissimilar to their gender

identity, they may act off-script and harm their employers' goals. Often, employers

will hire men or women based on the assumption of who will like and do the job

better and on the basis of client preference for men or women in the service

interaction. Workers' acceptance of their work identity provided by employers is central to retain control over workers in the labor process. Still, the research has mainly examined worker to customer or client interaction, ignoring co-worker relations among the work group.

Interactional boundary work is one process in which individuals conceptually define themselves relative to others, based on perceived similarities and differences. Boundary work involves producing, reproducing and challenging social boundaries between "us" and "them" (Lamont 2000). In the workplace, the more powerful dominant group and the less powerful subordinate group engage in different types of boundary work, depending on their specific goals (such as power, status and economic success) and group dynamics (how workers informally organize themselves into distinct workgroups). Workers use strategies of boundary work to protect their dominant status in the workplace, including "othering" and "boundary maintenance." At the same time workers use other strategies of boundary work to cope with their subordinate status in the workplace, including "subordinate adaptation."

Newman (1999) found that fast food workers in urban areas constructed a boundary between themselves and other unemployed urban residents, in a context where the community valued black market work more highly than legal, paid work. Newman wrote, "Although scraping the bottom of the barrel is no pleasure, Burger Barn workers can look down at all the people who aren't even in the barrel and feel superior to them. Drug dealers, welfare recipients, the hustlers…these are the people whom the working poor see as occupying the lower rungs of ghetto social

48

organization. Working men and women, no matter how lowly their jobs, can hold

their heads up in this company and know that American culture "validates" their

claim to social rank above them" (p.113). Groups mobilize typification systems to

define who they are by interpreting similarities and differences between themselves

and other groups (Lamont and Molnar 2002: 171).

Much of the research on boundary work has theorized that boundary work is

constructed between the membership group (or the "us") and the comparison group

(or the "them") (Lamont 2000; Newman 1999; Voss and Silva 2013). In her study of

Black and white working men, Lamont drew on boundary work theory to analyze

race and class boundaries between working class men. She found that Black and

white workers created intergroup boundaries based on the culture values they held

and the cultural values they perceived lacking in the opposing group. White workers

valued discipline, while Black workers valued care — two different sets of moral

hierarchies that supported race boundaries. Her analysis depended on the "us" and

"them" dichotomy that is supported by other scholars of boundary work who have

argued that dichotomous categories such as male and female, and Black and white,

are central to how dominant groups make boundaries between themselves and others

(Epstein 1992; Tilly 1996).

Boundaries in the workplace are permeable and can be violated or "crossed

over." Dellinger and Williams (2002) compared two work environments between a

feminist magazine and a pornographic magazine to show what constituted violating

boundaries of acceptable or unacceptable sexual behaviors in the workplace. They

wrote, "The boundary between acceptable and unacceptable sexual behavior is the result of a complex interplay between the characteristics of individual workers, the structural features of an organization, and the cultural norms in any given workplace" (p. 254). Meanings of sexual harassment differed between the two publishing workplaces — a "dorm room" culture prevailed in the feminist magazine and a "locker room" culture at the pornographic magazine — but a sexual culture existed at both magazines. If spatial-boundaries are conceptualized as the spaces of the workplace that workers inhabit, then how do workers violate or cross-over boundaries that could lead to a change in job title or earnings?

Organizational researchers have widely studied how flexible work arrangements change the relationship between workers and management but in turn, have overlooked its impacts on the relationship among the work group (Hodson and Roscigno 2004), and have failed to connect intergroup relations to job quality. In contexts where employees have transitioned from standard work arrangements to more flexible forms of work, research has shown considerable levels of conflict between workers and management that have negative consequences for both parties (Curley and Royle 2013). Workplace conflict can decrease the organization's effectiveness of productivity and profit and reduce the level of commitment workers feel towards their employers. Hodson and Roscigno analyzed sociological ethnographies of work to examine the relationship between organizational effectiveness, measured by "employee citizenship" and good management-employee relations and worker dignity, measured by meaningful work and positive coworker

relations. The dimensions of employee citizenship included "extra effort, extra time, cooperation, pride in work, commitment, and effort bargaining" (P. 691). They found that the feeling of belonging among employees increased their sense of meaning and accomplishment in their work and created positive and supportive coworker relations. "Within-group conflict and gossip at work can be extremely destructive of workplace relations" (P. 681). The degree of interaction among a work group had the potential to both create more conflict as well as more cooperation, depending on whether or not management cultivated employee citizenship and peaceful relations with employees. They concluded, "In short, workers want to work effectively and to be productive. When they are allowed the opportunity to do so by coherent organizational practices and by the solicitation of employee involvement, organizations prosper and dignity at work is maximized" (P. 701). Their research on workplace relations could be taken further and be applied to intrinsic measures of job quality, to more fully theorize about the impact of workplace interaction and co-worker relationships on "bad" and "good" jobs.

The service work literature focuses mainly on the triangulation between management, workers and customers, ignoring a crucial type of interaction at work *among* workers on a service production line. This implies that what takes place on the service production line is irrelevant to considerations of workplace power. Workers are assumed to share an even balance of power among themselves, taking for granted that divisions of power exist only between workers and management, or between workers and customers. Considering that a considerable volume of research

51

shows the importance of workplace dynamics of power among workers, this oversight limits our understanding of how micro-interactions between workers shape job quality and even stratification of internal job ladders. Moreover, even though previous research recognizes the importance of variation across workplace contexts, very few studies have sought to identify the mechanisms that shape different forms of emotional or interactive labor and its effects on inequality in work organizations.

The Social Arrangement of Workers into Good and Bad Jobs

How do different groups of individuals become organized into good and bad jobs? Hiring, job assignment, promotion, transfer, and separation (Tilly and Tilly 1998: 170-171) all play a role in workers' labor market placement. Employers sort workers into jobs based on assessments of educational background and prior work experience (or the workers' human capital characteristics) and weigh these assessments with an estimation of the labor cost, to assign higher wages to some workers and lower wages to others. Employers are generally seeking more flexibility from its workforce and cheaper labor costs to drive profit up but will in certain circumstances incur higher labor costs. Bonacich (1972) suggested that the labor market is split between workers with high wages and status and workers with lower wages and status. Employers and highly paid workers use strategies to "ration" the best jobs. If there are workers who are willing to do the same job for less money, higher waged workers can feel competitive or even antagonistic toward lower waged workers whom they see as a threat to their jobs. Employers often exploit tensions between these two groups to gain advantage over workers and to weaken their group

solidarity. Highly paid workers use effective strategies to exclude lower paid workers and secure their position in the split labor market. If exclusionary strategies fail and cheaper labor is available to employers, highly paid workers rely on a strategy of exclusiveness, such as by retaining control over resources, hoarding valuable skills, and restricting access to training and education. The better jobs are retained for a smaller subsection of the labor force and in turn, limit mobility for many workers stuck in the secondary labor market.

Some have looked to the inside of work organizations to study stratification and have mapped out how good and bad jobs are organized into an internally segmented hierarchy. These "internal labor markets," are characterized by job ladders with entry-level jobs at the lowest rungs and the more advanced jobs at the top. Internal segmentation maintains a pool of workers in the lower rung of jobs, who often accept authority and inequality within the work organization (Reich, Gordon, and Edwards 1973). Human capital theory suggests that limited experience, skills, and education limit workers to the low-wage secondary market because they are less likely to be highly productive. To improve workers' life chances and address the consequences of low-wage work, human capital theorists argue that more human capital will increase workers' upwards mobility. In contrast, dual labor market theorists argue that improving individual characteristics will do very little to improve low wages or poverty. But both dual labor market theory and human capital theory agree that there are significant barriers to mobility from worse to better jobs, even though there is disagreement over how and why. Indeed, stratification research has

shown that human capital characteristics do little to explain wage differences by gender and racial-ethnic groups (McCall 2001), suggesting the need for further research to investigate stratification.

Employers and managers take action based on their stereotypes and preferences at the point of hiring and in the workplace. These actions can contribute to workplace discrimination against groups of workers and the unequal allocation of labor market rewards, a longstanding and significant problem facing labor market equality that could potentially secure equal opportunity and pay. Labor queuing is one type of motive-based theory that explains the exclusion of particular groups from workplaces. Queuing processes are influenced by stereotypes that shape employers' perceptions of suitable workers for jobs (Acker 1990, 2006; Moss and Tilly 2001; Waldinger and Lichter 2003). Employers use preferences and beliefs about the skills and experiences of potential employees to make decisions about hiring workers based on the type of worker who usually fills a certain job (Kennelly 1999; Moss and Tilly 2001). In the process of matching workers to jobs, employers and managers are informed by perceptions of "appropriate" workers for particular types of jobs (Acker 1990, 2006). The queuing perspective is largely concerned with explaining how hiring shapes workplace segregation and includes research on gender segregation from job queues and gender queues (Reskin and Roos 1990) and racial segregation from hiring queues (Waldinger and Lichter 2003).

The labor queuing perspective (Reskin and Roos 1990) helps to explain inequality in work organizations, measured by the degree of gender segregation, by

looking to the labor market. This perspective argues that groups do different kinds of

work in the labor market because of the matching process between workers and

employers. This process is influenced by: employers' perceptions of workers'

suitability for jobs; the typing of occupations as appropriate for certain groups of

workers; discriminatory preferences for some groups of workers over others; and the

ranking of jobs by workers. Yet, these aspects of matching in the labor market

assume that gender segregation within the workplace is organized by employers

outside of the workplace in the hiring process. Reskin and Roos wrote (1990), "The

most fruitful model sees occupational composition as the result of a dual-queuing

process: labor queues order groups of workers in terms of their attractiveness to

employers, and job queues rank jobs in terms of their attractiveness to workers" (p.

29). In labor queues, job seekers don't obtain entry into work organizations because

of employers' preference for certain groups of workers for particular types of jobs

based on perceptions of suitability and employers' bias against hiring certain groups

of workers based on discriminatory attitudes. In job queues, the gender composition

of occupations changes when groups become less likely to apply for hiring in

occupations that become less desirable due to losing characteristics of "good jobs"

(such as earnings capacity and employment stability). From this perspective, the

composition of labor queues change over time when employers or workers change

their preferences. Women make inroads into men's occupations either when men are

less likely to seek employment in those occupations or employers come to prefer

hiring women over men.

In a study of employers' perceptions of immigrant workers in low-wage work, Waldinger and Lichter (2003) argue that in a hiring queue, workers and jobs get ranked into a hierarchy. They write, "…entire ethnic groups are ranked according to sets of socially meaningful but arbitrary traits; these rankings determine fitness for broad categories of jobs. All other qualifications equal, members of the top-ranked group are picked first when employers decide whom to hire; the rest follow in order of rank" (p. 8). Employers preferred white workers in jobs with an upwards career ladder but in jobs with little upward mobility, preferred workers of color — showing that immigrants (and in particular, Latino immigrants) in certain contexts, such as low-level jobs, were preferred by employers over white workers. Their findings also showed that employers did not perceive immigrant workers as suitable for entry into positions of higher authority and prestige but they did consider white workers to be.

One shortcoming of these theoretical frameworks is the primary focus on matching processes between: 1) workers and jobs and 2) employers and workers. Researchers have explained that occupations are segregated because of the gender-typing of occupations by employers and workers, a process of labeling jobs as women's or men's work. (Reskin 1993). Employers draw on this characterization of work to determine appropriate and inappropriate workers for particular jobs based on stereotypes and thus create a "labor queue" that orders groups of workers in terms of their attractiveness to employers. Workers organize jobs into a "job queue" based on their perception of the most attractive employment. These matching processes have made important progress in explaining discrimination in the demand-side of the labor

market and worker preference in the supply-side of the labor market. Employment is segregated by gender when the labor queue contains a gender queue. Employers hire men from the top of the gender queue for the best jobs (Roos and Reskin 1992).

Queuing theories are inadequate when applied to occupational integration to explain differences in job entry and mobility across race and gender, while considering that the achievement of gender and racial parity shouldn't be taken for granted as an outcome of occupational integration. Earlier research found no evidence of genuine integration (defined as men and women holding equivalent occupational positions) when women made in-roads into occupations historically dominated by men (Roos and Reskin 1992). The queuing explanation relies on individual-level motivation for how jobs are ordered in the job queue and how people are ranked in the gender queue. If men reject a particular occupational specialty, then employers are forced to move down the gender queue to hire women for that particular specialty and it becomes feminized. The gender composition of an occupational specialty changes when the job rewards are diminished – such as full-time work becoming part-time work and the resulting decline in wages.

In sum, a great deal of research has evaluated inequality produced by occupational segregation to argue that workplace integration could reduce inequalities between workers at work. But little research has actually examined if integrated occupations do in fact make the workplace more equal for different groups of workers. Research should investigate if there is less inequality between workers in internal job ladders that have integrated entry-level jobs. Is mobility in these internal

job ladders stratified? Do some groups of workers have more advantage than others to advance, and if so why?

Do mixed-group dynamics in integrated workplaces support or preclude diminished occupational segregation? I examine full-service restaurant kitchen work and casino gaming work that show significant differences in job mobility by race and gender from entry-level positions to advanced positions. How do service workers achieve upward mobility within internal job ladders? A closer look at theoretical approaches to mobility across job ladders would add to the literature on occupational stratification. To do so, I examine networks of inclusion and exclusion within the work organization. This approach moves beyond purely numerical or queuing explanations to explain different patterns of workplace integration. In this dissertation, I consider these key research questions: Does increasing the representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in work organizations? Why do groups with similar educational backgrounds get their foot in the door but some are more likely to advance in one sector than the other?

Chapter 3: Methodology and Case Selection

My dissertation's primary research questions include: Does increasing the representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in work organizations? Why do groups with similar educational backgrounds get their foot in the door but some are more likely to advance in one sector than the other? To answer these questions, I conducted a qualitative comparative case study by interviewing 46 participants (including workers, managers and executives) and conducted participant observation in each type of work. I looked beyond the labor market into the workplace to examine how workers fare once they're hired into jobs.

My research design is a comparative case method with the purpose of matching the most appropriate methodology to my research questions and with the goal of gathering empirically rich qualitative data that compliments the quantitative labor market data. By employing a mixed methods model of quantitative analysis with a comparative case study, I am first identifying macro patterns of segmentation, integration, and mobility at the national level — to answer the "who, what, where, how many and how much" questions (Royster 2003: 38). Secondly, I collected qualitative interview and participant observation data to explain the mechanisms and the processes that emerge within workplaces. The mixed methods approach combines the strengths of positive science of quantitative analysis with the strengths of the reflexive science of the extended case method (Burawoy 2009). A mixed methods approach helps to address the inadequacy of relying only on demographic and survey data that treats race-ethnicity and gender as variables, rather than lived,

relational experiences shaped by social constructions of race-ethnicity and gender. While national demographic patterns in labor market data are important for identifying broad characteristics of occupations and sectors, it does not extend to understanding the underlying processes and mechanisms that can explain the "how and why" behind the quantitative data (Royster 2003).

I designed my study to explain how and why certain entry-level positions with similar formal requirements show similar patterns of integration but the internal job ladders show differential mobility to advanced positions, even though they require similar levels of human capital. I selected my methods of data collection, including my choice of comparative cases, selection of participants, construction of my interview guide, and participation observation sites to allow for an examination of workers' unequal mobility within segmented internal job ladders.

Case Studies

I chose a comparative case study approach to examine a theoretically relevant subsection of service occupations in the labor market. By combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies, I was able to first identify patterns of integration and mobility by gender and race across service industries in U.S. Census data. To determine whether or not an occupation is segregated or integrated, Gatta and Roos (2005) considered an occupation to be integrated if it is between 45% and 55% women. I used a slightly less conservative measure to identify occupations that had a moderate to high degree of integration of between 40% and 55% women. Since workers of color make up 36% of the labor force (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

2012b), I considered an occupation to have racial integration if between 35% and 50% workers of color. I summarized in Table 1 and Table 2 the degree of integration within each occupation at the national level (see Appendix A).

Based on these patterns, I then chose two cases for the purpose of explaining *how* and *why* the differences in these patterns exist. My rationale for the case selection was to choose occupational sectors that showed significant differences of race and gender integration and mobility at the national level (see Tables 3 - 8 in Appendix A). The gaming industry is one of the few service industries where mostly white workers move up from entry-level positions on the casino floor into supervisory positions and women are more likely to obtain the better dealing positions. In 2012, gaming workers were 51% women and 47% people of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers), while gaming supervisors were 43% women and 25% people of color (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Even though entry-level jobs are integrated by gender and race-ethnicity, few workers of color gain upward mobility into supervisory positions and men are less likely than women to gain better dealing positions. In restaurants, there is a high degree of racial-ethnic and gender integration in entry-level kitchen work; yet, white men and men of color are more likely to advance to head cook and chef positions. In 2012, food preparation workers were 58 percent women and 45 percent people of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers), cooks were 38 percent women and 54 percent people of color, while head cooks and chefs were 22 percent women and 45 percent people of color (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). From these statistical patterns in casino gaming and

restaurant kitchens emerged a theoretical puzzle that is overlooked in the current

literature on occupational segmentation and mobility. By collecting data from

qualitative, in-depth interviews and participant observation in my comparative case

study, I made a theoretical explanation for why these patterns exist.

Criteria for Case Selection

I selected two internal job ladders for an in-depth examination — casino table

gaming and restaurant kitchens — and made this case selection based on several

criteria. First, I looked to the service industry because of the large number of workers

employed in this sector. Second, the service industry has entry-level jobs that require

a high school diploma or less. Third, in food services and gaming services, there are

internal job ladders that provide upwards advancement opportunities without

requiring a higher level of education (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012)[3]. In the

restaurant industry, chefs and head cooks ($46,000 per year or $19.53 per hour) earn

nearly double the median yearly earnings of cooks ($20,260 per year or $9.74 per

hour) and more than double of the median yearly earnings of food preparation

workers ($19,100 per year or $9.18 per hour). Similarly, in the casino industry, floor

supervisors of gaming workers ($49,540) earn more than double the median yearly

earnings as gaming dealers ($17.86) ($21,930)[4]. For comparison, the median wage of

non-college educated workers in the general workforce is $13.51 (Kim et. al 2009).

---

[3] I also compared each food service occupation by industry but found no difference between them. Instead, I chose the food service industry by the number of people it employed. 76.5% of Chefs and Head Cooks, 79.1% of cooks and 83.2% of Food Preparation Workers work in the restaurant industry.

[4] Median wages in casino gaming include tips.

Fourth, I wanted to compare occupational sectors that showed similar occupational integration by race-ethnicity and gender at the entry-level but showed different occupational segregation patterns at advanced positions.

The Qualitative Interviews

My comparative case study design includes data collection from 46 in-depth, open-ended, qualitative interviews with women and men employed as workers, supervisors/managers and owners/executives in the food service and gaming service industries[5]. The interviews with restaurant kitchen workers took place in the San Francisco Bay Area of California and Detroit, while the interviews with casino floor workers were conducted in Las Vegas, Nevada and Detroit. My sample includes: 1) executive chefs, head cooks, food preparation workers, managers, restaurant owners and corporate executives and 2) gaming service workers, gaming supervisors/managers, and gaming executives. The interview guide is located in Appendix B and consists of questions related to workplace entry, workplace experiences and workplace advancement. I located participants primarily through snowball sampling by asking participants if they could suggest others who would be appropriate participants for the study. I also recruited participants by working with industry and workers' associations and posting advertisements on relevant posting boards online.

Participant Observation

---

[5] My dissertation research was approved by the University of California, Santa Cruz's Institutional Review Board with Human Subjects Protocol #1625.

To gather data on workplace interaction, I conducted participant observation at one restaurant kitchen and one casino gaming pit. I took detailed notes about my observations and interviewed most of the workers in each site. I informally interviewed workers during my participant observation, recorded informal interactions and conversations that I observed, noted employment relations between workers, managers, and owners and logged the complex labor process in each type of occupational work site. Participant observation produced empirical data from within the workplace for my dissertation project, an important methodological tool to employ for observing interpersonal dynamics and interactions at work.

For three weeks, I observed and worked in a fine-dining restaurant kitchen that was split into a back kitchen (where workers did food preparation) and a front kitchen that was open to the dining room (where workers prepared the final dishes of food). The restaurant had a small staff of fifteen kitchen workers and had six people working during a shift. On the service production line during dinner service, there was a head chef, two sous chefs, two line workers and a food prep worker. During my participant observation, I participated in prepping food components in the back kitchen and worked on the cold line alongside the two other line workers. While I was working, I had ample opportunity to observe other workers in the labor process, talk to different workers, and listen to workers conversations. Additionally, I talked with most of the kitchen workers outside of the restaurant in one-on-one interviews.

Also for three weeks, I observed (alongside a pit supervisor) party dealers working in a poker gaming pit in a casino on Fremont Street in Las Vegas. I gained

access to this participant observation site by interviewing the co-owners of a dealer entertainment temp agency. They provided temporary, contract dealers to all of the major strip casinos on Las Vegas Boulevard and to the minor strip casinos on Fremont Street for black and white dealing and party pit dealing in black jack. They ran weekly training classes for new dealers and employed fifty to seventy-five workers throughout the year. I observed at the Gold Spike Casino in one gaming pit with three dealers at tables and one table games supervisor. The tables held anywhere from zero to fifteen players, depending on how busy the casino was during any given evening. All of the poker dealers were women and were party pit dealers, which meant there was a theme every evening to which they matched their attire. There was no particular dress code but the women were expected to wear clothing that exposed their skin. The dealers ranged in experience from a few months to a few years but all of the women said they preferred to deal at the Gold Spike because of the clientele and their good relationship with the table manager. From my vantage point inside of the dealing pit, I was able to observe all of the interactions on the black jack tables between the dealers and the players, as well as informally talk to the dealers on their breaks. I also stood next to the table manager during the shift and had ample time to talk to the manager, plus observe the manager's interactions with the dealers and customers. Additionally, I talked with most of the dealers outside of the casino in one-on-one interviews. The participant observation yielded rich data about interactions between dealers, their supervisor and the customers.

Chapter Four:
Integration in Frontline and Backline Service Work

In this chapter, I will first describe the labor process found in the service production lines within full-service restaurants and casino table gaming to explain the workplace integration of entry-level jobs. Integrated occupations have a moderate to high degree of integration if they are composed of between 40% and 55% of women and 30% and 45% people of color. Entry-level jobs in gaming were 51% women and 47% people of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers) (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Entry-level jobs in restaurant kitchens were 58% women and 45% people of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers) (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Even though the service lines appear to be different in kitchens and casino gaming, the labor process within each type of workplace is actually quite similar. Both labor processes involve fast, stressful and demanding work. Another important similarity between restaurant kitchens and casino gaming is the interactive practice of banter.

Then, I will discuss why the entry-level jobs found in these two types of workplaces are integrated by examining the job queues and labor queues. I first explain the demands of the jobs found in restaurant kitchens and casino gaming and the perspectives of employers on the kinds of workers best to fill those jobs. Employers seek out the same kinds of skills and experience from workers for entry-level positions. Entry-level jobs found in either type of workplace are integrated and offer opportunities to move up into a better job, even without a high school degree. Workers with similar educational and work backgrounds seek out the entry-level

positions in kitchens and casinos. I examine the motivations of workers to enter into

these types of entry-level jobs, despite the poorer quality of these jobs. Given the

similarities of integration at the entry-level, it could be expected that more advanced

positions in the internal job ladders would show the same numerical balance of

groups of workers. Yet, the quantitative patterns show there is actually a divergence

in the pattern of mobility, with advanced positions that are segmented in different

ways.

I next show that those with hiring decision capacities in these workplaces

perceive the ideal worker for entry-level jobs similarly, based on their understanding

of the demands of the labor process in the workplace. In previous research by

Waldinger and Lichter (2003), they examined the labor market to account for who

gets what types of positions by examining employers' decisions about who to hire.

Their work specifically focused on the role of immigrant networks and organizational

bureaucracy (recruitment, screening and hiring) in low-wage work (e.g. hotels,

hospitals, furniture making, and restaurants) within Los Angeles by utilizing a

quantitative analysis of employment data and qualitative interviews with employers.

They explained that employers have some understanding of workers' job queues and

take into account workers' preferences for hiring to achieve efficiency of production.

And while their research did uncover evidence for why employers made hiring

decisions, their research did not uncover evidence drawn from workers' experiences

in the labor process at work. Relevant to the inside of the work organization,

Waldinger and Lichter did show that group cohesion matters from the perspective of

management, to hire workers they believe will fit in. They found that network hiring played a key role in exclusionary closure within the workplace in which core employees helped to bring in new employees of their own race and gender group. And while they examine job entry, their analysis did not also include job mobility within internal job ladders. Similar to Waldinger and Lichter's research, in these cases, management did hire workers they perceived could handle the demands of the labor process, and also evaluated the labor relations among workers and supervisors to ensure that their employees could work efficiently together (in kitchen work) or work efficiently with customers (in casino work) for productive and profitable labor. I examine management and workers within the context of the labor process, to understand how the similar job and labor queues create the conditions for the integration of entry-level jobs. In the next chapter, I extend Waldinger and Lichter's research by showing that the labor relations among workers and management in the labor process and the interaction that takes place during work explains why more advanced jobs are segmented, despite the integration of entry-level jobs.

The findings of my research showed that there are differences between casinos and restaurants in the types of employees responsible for hiring workers into entry-level jobs and promoting workers into better jobs, and even between sizes of establishments. In corporate restaurants, managers not working on the service line are responsible to hire and promote workers into the kitchen. In independent, full-service restaurants, executive chefs and sometimes sous chefs are responsible for hiring and promoting workers. In larger casinos, management often has limited

contact with dealers, relying on auditions to hire workers and performance stats to promote workers. In smaller casinos, manager has more contact with dealers, relying on auditions and personal contacts to hire and promote workers. In this chapter, I will discuss the hiring of workers into entry-level jobs and in the next chapter, I will discuss the hiring and the promotion of workers into advanced positions.

Based on the findings of my research, I will be arguing that in restaurant kitchens, employers want workers who are compliant with the backline culture of the kitchen and are included socially in the work group. Employers and managers often prefer workers who they perceive as more likely to achieve social cohesion with the other workers. In casinos, employers and managers want workers who are able to handle compliance with the rules of dealing, while effectively managing the players at their table to ensure efficiency of play. For entry-level positions, employer preferences are largely the same — wanting workers who can manage working well in interaction with others, who can work efficiently and fast, and who can handle the stresses of the demanding work environments.

Workers are motivated to enter into entry-level casino and restaurant kitchen work even though the jobs have poor job quality characteristics like no job security, often part-time work, low to moderate pay and no benefits. They believe that the entry-level jobs are worth it because the jobs offer opportunity to move into better jobs (and maybe even good jobs) up the internal job ladders within restaurants and kitchens. Workers self-select what type of position they perceive themselves to be suitable for in the workplace and the type of job they perceive to be better for their

careers — and in these cases, entry-level jobs in restaurant kitchens or casinos. Because the workplace is team-intensive in restaurant kitchens, workers select positions in which they believe they will be accepted by the work group. Because the workplace is customer-intensive in casino gaming, workers select position in which they believe they will best retain control over the players on their tables. And in both types of work, workers' skills in interacting with others (either co-workers in restaurant kitchens or players in casino gaming) proved to be important to securing employment in entry-level work.

In this chapter, I explain that the labor process of the occupations in each internal job ladder to show how workers are organized into service line teams in kitchens and in gaming pits. Service line teams in kitchens are team-intensive, backline work that requires a high degree of intergroup cohesion among the workers. Service line teams in casinos are customer-intensive, frontline work that requires workers to exert a high degree of control over the players at their table to manage speed of play. Backline and frontline work is not unique to restaurant kitchens or casino gaming but the distinction is important to understand the differences in how the workplaces are organized. The organization of the labor process in these two production lines increases the speed of work, achieving the employer's goal of efficiency and productivity.

In my comparative case study, both sites of work can be characterized as service production lines. Why are these two types of service work characterized as part of a production line? In manufacturing, management focused their efforts on

increasing the speed and efficiency of work on the production line to increase worker productivity. The organization of work on the production line and the system of incentives influenced worker productivity. A worker's dissatisfaction with his working conditions on the line could slow his productivity and negatively impact the profit margin for the company. Yet reduced productivity had little to no effect on the finished product because of quality control measures, with no direct influence on consumer satisfaction. The finished manufactured product ended up in the hands of a consumer, who judged the quality of the product and the company, with no knowledge of the workers on the production line.

When purchasing a service, customers evaluate their satisfaction with the service encounter based on the quality of service delivery. Customer satisfaction is important to ensure repeat business and to increase the customer base. Employers standardize the delivery of customer service to ensure it is consistent and efficient, to increase the chances of return business (Leidner 1991). Service workers are the key players in the delivery of service in customer interactions. Frontline service interactions are in the forefront of the literature that largely argues that workers do emotional labor that requires the performance of a certain set of facial and bodily displays, such as a friendly smile or repeating a script that is part of a standard model of customer service (Hochschild 1979). A positive employee demeanor increases customer satisfaction and thus profits. How well a business performs is based not only on profit but also on consumer evaluations of the company, which are often synonymous with the customer evaluation of the service worker. This makes quality

service performance tied directly to the success of a company and indicates why managerial influence over workers' attitudes and how they behave toward customers is important to employers.

Some types of service workplaces resemble the production line in manufacturing, with workers producing one part that is contributed to the final service the customer buys or experiences. In restaurant kitchens and on casino gaming floors, producing the service (food or a game) for customers requires a team of workers to contribute different components of the final product by working on a "service production line." In terms of job quality, bad and better jobs are organized on the service production line similarly by: placement on the service line queue, spatial location in the workplace, and prestige of establishment. Placement on the service line queue determines the degree of hierarchical power and control over jobs, but also one of spatial organization (of food station or casino game). In restaurant kitchens, jobs of poorer quality are at the bottom of the line and jobs of higher quality are at the top of the line, based on the degree of control a worker has over his or her work. Job quality is also based on the type of food station they are assigned (e.g. cold assembly of dishes or the grill), with workers seeking the more complex jobs that require higher levels of skill. Type of establishment also matters in restaurant work, with a range of job quality based on the kind of service being produced in a restaurant (e.g. fast food versus full service dining) and the size of establishment (e.g. a small family style restaurant versus a hotel restaurant). In casinos, jobs of poorer quality

are also found at the bottom of the service production line and higher quality jobs found at the top.

The literature on interactive service work overlooks two important variations in service work (Hochschild 1979; Leidner 1991; Pierce 1999). One, not all workers in service jobs are on the frontline of interaction with customers — workers are also in the backline of service, interacting primarily with each other. My study compares one type of frontline work in casino gaming with another type of backline service work in restaurant kitchens to identify key differences that can help explain why these types of work show contrasting patterns of mobility among workers. Two, some types of service require facial and bodily displays that are different than the standard model of customer service. In contrast to earlier research that has argued employers require workers to control their feelings through surface acting by practicing deference to others (Hochschild 1979; Leidner 1991; Pierce 1999), employers in the two sites of interactive service work in this study informally encourage workers to be noncompliant with standard service rules to practice banter and joking that often skirts employment rules with each other in restaurants and with customers in casinos (and will be discussed in more detail in chapter five).

Service Line Jobs in Restaurant Kitchens

In restaurants, the food service production line consists of different service stations that are hierarchically organized by authority, prestige and pay. Kitchen workers are assigned to jobs at specific service stations, such as food prep, cold line (salads and appetizers), and the hot line. Every restaurant kitchen is composed of

service stations — each responsible for particular aspects of the menu. Workers assigned to the better paid jobs make the more expensive items on the menu, often assemble the components on the plate, and have supervisory responsibilities over the other workers down the line. Workers assigned to the lesser paid jobs prepare the ingredients and components for the cold and hot lines and make the less expensive items on the menu. The better jobs are found at the top of the line, because they offer workers more autonomy, job security, control over their work, and pay. Workers at the top of the line, head chefs and sous chefs, take a stronger role in setting the tone for the workplace dynamics of the kitchen. They have this power because they are given supervisory and managerial capacities over the workers below them on the line. Head chefs and sous chefs have the authority to hire and fire other workers in the kitchen.

The hierarchy of the kitchen can change according to the type of restaurant and price point. How kitchens are staffed varies based on the size of the restaurant and whether or not one of the kitchen workers at the top of the line is officially assigned managerial duties. For example, in corporate restaurants, it is less likely for there to be a kitchen manager who works in the kitchen with the rest of the workers on the service line. "Because it was corporate, pretty much everyone, we all were pretty much cooks. There was a manager, but there wasn't a kitchen manager" (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining). As the price point decreases, the service production line flattens, with the kitchen workers as one group of cooks and with a manager outside of the kitchen. In smaller, higher priced restaurants, workers at the

top of the line are more likely to manage those underneath them, changing the

dynamics of the work group. These kitchen workers often explained that their

kitchens are organized in a pronounced hierarchy of authority and role assignment.

> We're tough. Chefs are tough. It's a hard life, and existence.
> Kitchens are set up around the brigade system. The hierarchy of a
> kitchen. That was set up because there needs to be a chain of
> command. Too many cooks spoil the broth. If there's too many heads
> going around, there's no focus, there's no direction, there's no
> discipline. That's why you need to have that one person who makes
> all of the decisions. Everything else is secondary to what he says.
> You say, yes Chef and you do it, no question. It's exactly like the
> army. You get an order, you don't question it, you carry it out, you
> don't talk back, you say, yes Chef, sorry Chef, those are the only
> words that come out of your mouth. There's a reason for it. Because
> it stops mistakes. Cooking in the kitchen is like the army in a number
> of ways. (Seth, white sous chef, fine dining)

And,

> Most kitchens are based off a military structure. Pretty much have
> your ranks, the more qualified, more experienced people are at the top.
> I've worked with chefs who've had a lot of expectations of me and ran
> things a certain way, where it was you do what I want, you do what I
> say, and if not, screw you, that's it. That's the standard in a lot of
> kitchens and chefs have different ways of approaching it but when it
> comes down to the bottom line, you do what the chef says, no matter
> what and what's expected of you is what he wants. (Brad, white cook,
> fine dining)

Kitchens are not egalitarian workplaces but are organized specifically to make clear

to the kitchen staff that there is an authority that is ordered from the top to the bottom

of the food production line. In full-service kitchens, executive or head chefs are

responsible for managing staff, running the kitchen, menu planning, product ordering,

quality and taste control, expediting service, and putting the finishing touches on

dishes. Sous chefs are second in command on the line. They assist the chef with his

or her tasks and usually cook the fish or meat. Depending on the size of the kitchen,

there may also be a second sous chef who helps with the hot line doing the sauté. Next are the kitchen workers on the cold line responsible for salads, appetizers and arranging additional components on plates for the hot plates. At the bottom of the line are the workers responsible for food preparation, which involves cleaning, chopping and cooking components of the dishes.

There is also a chain of communication on the line. The executive chef gives orders to the sous chef, who then directs orders to the line workers, who view everyone above them on the line as their supervisors. There is little communication between the bottom of the line with the executive chef at the top. The chain of command puts more pressure on workers at the bottom of the line, who are expected to follow direction and orders from the top, setting the level of expectations and scrutiny of line cooks at a high level.

In restaurant kitchens, the degree of control over one's work largely influences workers' perceptions of job quality. Workers at the top of the line have higher quality jobs because they have more control over their role in the labor process. Workers at the bottom of the line have poorer quality of jobs because they have less control. Food preparation workers also view the opportunity to advance up the line as another good quality of their job.

Restaurant kitchen work is highly skilled and requires incredible physical stamina. "When preparing for a busy service, it does feel like you're preparing for battle" (Dennis, Asian line cook, fine dining). Service requires a high level of communication and timing between team members to get the tickets out by

coordinating the preparation and finishing of a dish among the stations. Kitchen

workers feel a great deal of pressure to perform at high levels and are under a

considerable amount of stress. Kitchen work is hazardous, which is a significant

problem considering that most kitchen workers don't receive health insurance or paid

sick days.

> Burns are the number one from fire, hot oil. Back aches. You're in a lot of pain because you're on your feet for 12 or 13 hours. The mental stress once service starts can be epic. It's tough. Particularly where we work because we have a one ticket system that uses just one ticket. The chef calls it out and then everyone repeats the order back. Everyone starts cooking it and then there's all this communication between them because it all has to come out at the same time. And it is immense mental stress. And sometimes you wonder how the hell am I going to get through it. Because in the middle of it, when it's really going off, there's so much going on, and you think, we're going to drown, we're going to go under. It can spiral out of control. It is kitchen madness. And it's always balanced on a knife's edge, at my restaurant and every other restaurant out there. It's so high energy, it's so frantic, there's no time for, oh could you please possibly do that for me, that would be great. No, it's like I need you to get that done now. Why haven't you done it already. You have to push people like that. And a lot of people can't take it. I can handle people yelling at me, just say yes chef, yes chef, yes chef. 85% of success in kitchens in developing a thick skin. You have to understand that you're going to get yelled at and it's nothing personal. I'm the sous chef where I work and it's my job to get up people's asses. That is what I do. I make sure everyone is moving as fast and as productively as possible and if they're not, it's my job to be the ramrod of the kitchen and get them moving. Line cooking, in the trenches cooking, is hard work. It's stressful and it's long. Finally, I'm off that and I can expedite the orders. It's more mentally challenging but less physically challenging. It's easier on my knees, on my back, on my wrists (Seth, white sous chef, fine dining).

Physical burnout is a challenge to kitchen workers' career longevity. One sous chef

estimated the burnout point to be thirty years working on the line.

If you start cooking on the line out of high school every day, you're going to be done by the time you're fifty, really start to feel it. I'm here sixty hours a week, but sometimes I'm sitting at the bar, writing the menu. Not a very physically demanding job. We also get breaks. One of the important things about being a cook is you need to know when not to over stress yourself. You're going to have problems with your back, feet and legs and you need to know when your body needs to rest. You have to take the time to rest. (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining)

The pace of kitchen work is fast and hectic, while the kitchen workspace is frequently organized in small spaces. "You're supposed to work your ass off in the kitchen. If you don't measure up, you did a bad job that day" (Tessa, white line cook, fine dining). Or,

It's always said that you can teach anybody to cook but there's a certain kind of person to keep up with a fast pace. Someone who can focus, multitask and do multiple things at once. You can teach somebody how to cook a burger but you can't teach them how to do thirty at a time. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

The most important aspect of cooking on the line is consistency, with every person on the line cooking exactly the same way every time, with little room for error.

In this business, it's all about timing and about seasoning. When you're working on the line and it's a busy night, you have to make sure that you have your timing down. If you have pasta and meat or seafood that goes with it, you only have thirty seconds to cook the shrimp, or it's overcooked. You have to have all those basics down and when you have that, it really shows what you're made of. All the dishes that I was told to prepare, it was perfectly prepared. All of my seasoning was correct. When you have those skills, you can really show that you have what it takes. How fast you pick things up matters. If someone tells me to make a dish, I know the basics and all I need to know is how they make it their own. That's how they test your ability, see how good you are. (Laura, white sous chef, fine dining).

I'm always the hardest working person in the kitchen, I'm always the fastest, I'm always moving the most. And that's what gets me to the

top. And that is something that the owner of the hotel where I once worked.   He was the one when I'd burn myself, he'd hit me across the back of the head and say don't cry. Cooks are tough. Carry on. At times, I should have had medical attention but I just had to keep going. The diners are waiting, a room of people to serve. (Seth, white sous chef, fine dining)

You need to be able to multitask like crazy, you have five different things cooking and in a kitchen like this, we prep during service. We're open from 4 until midnight for food, which is the paid shift for the line cooks. You need to do all your prep, manage your station and clean the kitchen during your paid shift while the kitchen is open. It makes for tough line cooks. (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining)

When speaking about their work, participants emphasized that skills of speed and efficiency were important for them to be good at their jobs and that they were often tested on these skills by other workers higher on the production line who were responsible for managing them. And employers repeated this preference for workers with skills of speed and efficiency.

The labor process in restaurant kitchens is tightly organized in a hierarchical arrangement of workers in relationship to each other. The work is fast paced and demanding, and requires workers to coordinate the work tasks with each other on the service production line. The demands of the labor process and the organization of work create the conditions for intensive teamwork among the kitchen staff.

In one study of the introduction of teamwork initiatives at four paper manufacturing plants, Vallas (2003) found that existing social hierarchies were incorporated into the newly formed teams, making it unlikely for teams of workers to cooperate and coordinate with each other. Similar to service production lines in restaurant kitchens, Vallas found "lines of progression" or job ladders from less

79

skilled jobs at the bottom to more skilled jobs at the top (P. 235). The job ladders

were segregated by gender, with the more skilled jobs filled by men and the less

skilled jobs filled by women, which Vallas explained is because of the more

physically demanding labor process at the top of the job ladders. These gender

boundaries were then incorporated into the newly formed teams, suggesting that

worker created boundaries along socially constructed lines retained salience, despite

managerial efforts to foster cooperation and coordination among workers, women's

and men's tasks in the labor process remained separate.

Similar to the research by Vallas, the more skilled jobs at the top of the line

were filled by men in restaurant kitchens, and the less skilled jobs at the bottom of the

line were filled by women. Men in the more advanced positions created gender

boundaries between themselves and women in the entry-level jobs within kitchens.

Distinct from Vallas' study is that even though the restaurant service line is composed

of distinct stations, these stations are each responsible for components that are

combined onto one dish. Thus, workers are required to coordinate and cooperate with

each other — making the teamwork highly interactive. Consistent with

Findings from the employers and management's perspective are discussed in further

detail next, to elaborate on the screening of applicants and hiring of workers into

restaurant kitchens.

Labor Queues in Restaurant Kitchens

In full-service restaurants, applicants are frequently asked to audition for the

job by working at the work site in real situations. In full-service restaurants, potential

employees often work for free during a trial period, ranging from a few nights of service to a few months. In fine dining, it is a common practice for kitchen workers to get their start in an unpaid apprenticeship role, called "stodging" or a working interview.

> I was brought in by somebody that I knew and I had to stodge, which is what he called a working interview and I did that for a couple of months. I worked for free from 2 pm to 11 pm a night Thursday through Sunday. For free. (Tessa, white line cook, fine dining)

And,

> Most of the jobs I've gotten have never been off a resume. It's been me speaking to them, letting them know I can do it and being able to show them. These last two months, I probably had about five working interviews. That's what a lot of food service people love to do, even if your resume looks great, they want to see if you can physically do it. (Jerome, Black line cook, casual dining)

Or Laura, a white sous chef, described getting hired in San Francisco as cutthroat, having taken a stodge position to gain entry into a higher-end restaurant. The position was advertised and she put in an application. Even though she had three years of experience in New York City, she was asked to take part in a formal process that involved a two night working audition, where she worked for free, as a trial by fire. The restaurant hired her after the audition period. Experienced kitchen workers will also take short-term internships to develop their resume and cooking skills, to gain experience at a higher price point restaurant, or to make inroads into a restaurant.

Participants entered into restaurant kitchen work seeking a job that doesn't require a degree. There are low barriers to entry into restaurant work generally based on experience and education, but it is harder to move into the better jobs in kitchens.

> Without schooling or anything, cooking is one of those jobs where you don't need, I've worked with a lot of people who've never graduated

81

from high school and are doing really well. It's just hard to do anything else. It's one of your best bets if you didn't finish schooling because restaurants will hire anybody. It's not what you know, it's how hard of a worker you are. You don't have to have schooling to do it. You don't have to have anything to do it. As long as you're good at it, you'll be fine. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

It's just like a stepping stone to get to the next level. It's a lot of work first. It has a lot to do with the choices you make, the moves you make, where you decide to work. After a while, if you do the right things, it pays off. In fine dining and nice restaurants, you're working there more for the reward of learning and doing something that you feel good about and progressing in your career, compared with lower-end restaurants. (Brad, white sous chef, fine dining)

Hiring practices in restaurant kitchens vary according to the type of establishment. Corporate chain restaurants, whether fast food or casual dining, are more likely to use a formal recruiting and application process, such as by advertising or posting job opportunities.

What we find in the actual scheduling and that's all done in the units [restaurants], a manager may have more of a like group working together so you'll find some restaurants where you might find three cooks on schedule and they'll all be Hispanic and sometimes they may even be family members actually, relatives of each other. But you find which employees kind of click, can work more in sync together, and they're going to run a better shift than people who might have differing ways of doing things. So that just sort of naturally happens but there's nothing that we put in place that says out of your population, you have to have on each shift, you have to have two male cooks and one female or two Hispanic cooks and one African-American or anything like that. (Allison, white executive in a national restaurant chain)

From this executive's perspective, finding employees who can work together as a team is necessary for a shift to be run fast and efficiently and that workers of the same background are more likely to form a socially cohesive group together. Employers wanted to hire workers who they perceived to be able to fit into the group and be

82

socially accepted. This finding is similar to Walding and Lichter (2003), who found

that employers were more likely to hire workers similarly matched by categorical

characteristics and that workers were more likely to succeed if they were socially

accepted by others at work because learning skills was not done alone, but within the

social context of work.

Applicants don't necessarily have to have experience or any specific level of

education or training.

> I was at the same store for almost four years and I started building this team when I was the co-manager, doing the hiring and training. When I first started doing the hiring, I was looking for people who were friendly and nice and seemed like they'd get along with the other people, to fit that culture of the store. It didn't matter what they were ethnically but their behavior, their temperance. Friendly people. At one point, I'd hire a good person and I'd try to get them to bring in their friends. Sometimes it worked out, sometimes it didn't. But I could tell when someone came in to get an application whether they were going to work, whether they'd fit in or not. If they were still smiling, no matter what I asked them. Eye contact is important, I wouldn't hire someone who was shifting their eyes back and forth. How they're dressed and appearance is important, as long as they're not dressed outrageously. (Zachary, white manager, fast food chain)

It is easier for job seekers to find jobs in restaurants if they've already accomplished

social acceptance into a work group in a previous job.

> Whenever something doesn't work for one us, we just call the other one and work with them for a while until we find something else. Once you've been doing it long enough you know everyone. The last restaurant I worked at went out of business and when that happened, I had owners of other restaurants calling me, offering me jobs. You don't have a job, come work for us. Once you know everyone, it makes it a lot easier. Establishing a reputation and a network is important. There's always another better opportunity. Especially as your reputation grows, people are willing to pay you more and give you more responsibility. And restaurants have such a high turnover rate and go out of business. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

> Where I work now, I've worked there three months and it's a new experience for me. I knew the sous chef and I worked with him before, so he asked me to come in to the kitchen, working in one of the best restaurants in town. It's really important that I have this contact. He knows me. To be honest, these days, in a restaurant, if you don't know someone who's working there, you're not going to get the job. Because I applied to so many jobs when I didn't have a job, I applied to so many places, and I tell them all my experience in restaurants, and I was just waiting for them to call me. I started working at [my current restaurant] because I knew the sous chef. If I applied, you see how they were working with Sam [in the stodge position], he was working for free, for about three months. And now that there's the opportunity, he's working now. But if there wasn't an opportunity, he wouldn't have been hired. (Juan, Mexican line cook, fine dining)

Unemployed and seeking work, Juan relied on a former co-worker to help him gain entry immediately into a paid kitchen position. He had expected to be hired into the least desirable position of dishwasher, but he was hired into food prep, a higher paid position on the line, because the sous chef thought he had a strong work ethic and good kitchen skills based on their previous working experience together. Career longevity, not surprisingly, secures a larger network for kitchen workers to draw from for employment. "I find that my network just keeps getting bigger. The more I move around, the more people that I know. I know people that I could go work with any day all over the country" (Isaac, white executive chef, hotel restaurant). Or,

> I'm going to say that it's reliable. With the recession and job fluctuation, food service is always going to be there. People are gonna eat, not everybody can cook. So there's always going to be restaurants and McDonalds, food service period. It's been reliable through the recession, it's my go to job. I know that if I need a job, I can go anywhere in the world and cook. In that aspect, it's been very helpful to me and my family. I'm happy with where I'm at and my accomplishments. I chose this career when I was young and I'm still cooking. (Jerome, Black line cook, casual dining)

Securing social acceptance into the work group in previous jobs gives restaurant workers a sense of confidence in their career chances and ability to move between restaurants by securing employment.

A formal culinary education is not usually required by employers and can even be a reason to not hire a candidate. "I have prep cooks, people who can make sauces, I have people who can do it. I need somebody who's fast paced, and if you went to culinary school, it's because you weren't confident in your abilities. You didn't move up through reputation, you didn't move up from doing it" (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining). Experience on the line is more valued than cooking taught at school. In contrast, a degree helps workers to move into management in the hotel industry. Isaac, an executive chef at a hotel kitchen, explained that he would hire a worker with more experience over a worker with a culinary degree for the line, but vice versa for the sous chef position. He believes that his degree helped him get his position as head of the kitchen. For prep and line cooks, he said, "I prefer to bring someone in that I can teach and train and they'll repeat the way that you want them to. It's okay if they're green." Or,

> Someone might have studied for five years and still don't have the experience. They get into a kitchen and it's so overwhelming, even though they've spent five years training for it. It's different in the kitchen, when it's 90 degrees, and orders are being constantly thrown at you. You weed out the paperwork people and keep the experienced people. (Jerome, Black line cook, casual dining)

And,

> I don't care if you're capable or not, I'll find you something to do. If you're trying, I'll find you a position in the kitchen that you can do. I might hire you to be a grill cook, but if I find out that it's not for you,

I'll find something for you to do. You can be my prep cook, you can be my dishwasher. I hired you a lot on your personality. As long as you click, I'll find something for you. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

There is a general consensus that culinary school is useful to learn basic professional skills but that many aspects of a formal education don't actually have a practical application to working kitchens. "As soon as you get into a kitchen, they say, okay, forget everything that they've taught you in school. That's not how we do stuff here" (Seth, white sous chef, fine dining). Kitchen work experience is perceived as more valuable than formal education.

In restaurant kitchens, group dynamics play out among co-workers on the service production line. The teamwork necessary to produce the food is intensive because each ticket that comes from a dining table requires multiple components from several service stations. The service production line is a carefully orchestrated labor process with a distinct hierarchy and chain of command. Even though workers in the kitchen understand their positioning in the hierarchy of service stations, many workers contest their place among themselves. "In the culinary world, there's a lot of rivalry and shit talking and being assholes about it." (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining). The teamwork among co-workers is intensive not only because they rely on each other to produce the food, but also because there is a high level of competition to move up the line. Since restaurant kitchens often run with a skeleton crew, the chances for advancement are irregular and the competition is stiff. Because the food production line has more jobs at the bottom than at the top, workers compete with

each other for promotions. "The newest person always does all of the bitch work. That's something you just have to get over" (Tessa, white line cook, fine dining).

Teamwork among the service stations is essential for a successful service, enabled by cohesive timing and the coordination of producing dishes. At one hotel with four restaurants,

> There tended to be, well, I don't want to do that. If the banquet was slow and there was a wine dinner for 100 people at the Italian restaurant, the banquet guys would say why do we have to prep it, why can't they prep their stuff. But we're one team, we're one hotel, there's one goal, so we all have to work together and do it. (Isaac, white executive chef, hotel kitchen)

Allison, an executive at a national chain restaurant, was forthcoming that manager's needed to handle conflict between workers of different backgrounds in her restaurant chain.

> We try to make more of a behavioral interviewing kind of process. There would be, asking questions like how would you handle it if you have an African-American cook and a white server who don't get along on a particular shift, how would you hand that. Trying to understand how they [potential managers] think, how they process, how they make decisions. Those are good questions that managers should be asking their employees, taking true situations that happen in the stores on a regular basis and asking them how they would handle that or their experience in successfully dealing with something like that in the past. (Allison, white executive in a national restaurant chain)

From a manager's perspective, a team that works together holds the kitchen together. If kitchen workers divide themselves into subgroups or aren't cohesive as a group, it hinders the productivity of the kitchen.

The low barriers of entry to restaurant kitchen work make it easier for workers without a college degree to find work. Workers are often hired into restaurant

kitchens with or without previous experience into the entry-level positions largely in food preparation or line cook. There is a considerable degree of competition among workers to advance into the better jobs in the kitchen. Because of the large supply of job seekers, those with hiring and promotion decision making in restaurant kitchens have more control over labor. To get into the better entry-level jobs within independent, full-service restaurants, workers often have to invest their own time and sacrifice pay to "stodge" or have a working interview. Once in restaurant work, networks formed among workers can help to secure jobs through personal contacts. Since teamwork is an important part of doing kitchen work efficiently, hiring managers (dedicated staff in corporate restaurants or executive chefs in full service restaurants) use the working interview or personal recommendations in their hiring decisions. My findings are similar to Waldinger and Lichter's finding that in jobs that involved working on things (or backline work), similarity among co-workers mattered more to employers than skills or education. They wrote, 'Even when employers wanted the "hard skills" required to make or transform a thing, the ability to successfully interact with co-workers was valued as means to an end' (P. 223). In restaurant kitchens, it was important for employers that kitchen workers could work efficiently and were skilled in preparing food as part of a team of workers. To do this work productively, employers evaluated the potential of applicants to get along with their co-workers equally to their skill and working efficiently. Next, I will discuss the perspectives of workers on bad and better jobs in restaurant kitchen work, to outline

the job queues in restaurant work and workers motivations for accepting employment

in kitchens.

Job Queues in Restaurant Work

Bad and better jobs in restaurant kitchens correspond closely with the type of

service provided by price point. The cheaper the food costs to consumers, the worse

the job is for workers. The higher price points on menus correspond to a more

complex labor process and higher levels of skills, which translates to more pay for

workers.

> At the time I was paid minimum wage at $5.15, so that's why I left, I
> needed to make more money. I went to another restaurant, a higher
> scale restaurant, a quite a bit higher price point. We made $9 there an
> hour. We made everything from scratch. That's where I learned all of
> the skills that I have now. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

The more standardized the menu, the less the position will pay a worker. Whereas

the more independent and creative the work is, the more the position will pay a

worker.

> Most places, as a decent line cook, you're going to be starting at $11
> or $12 an hour. That's pretty standard for nice restaurants. You'll get
> a higher start in pay at a hotel that's corporate. Moving around, the
> pay is pretty standard for the sous chef and head chef positions that
> I've had, paying about exactly the same. It was pretty low, it wasn't
> standard pay for the chef. It was ridiculous looking at the paycheck
> compared to the number of hours I was working. You're working so
> much that your hourly wage is much less than the line cooks. Even if
> you're making $3,000 a month or $3600 a month, your hourly wage
> makes out to be $7 to $9 an hour because you're working 12 or 14
> hours a day and you don't have regular days off, especially when
> you're still working out. When I first started at one restaurant that I
> was running, I was there 45 days in a row, at least for twelve hours
> every day, trying to get it started. I felt that if I left for a day, things
> were going to fall apart. I had to take a day off eventually but it all fell
> apart. You try to keep things together, train people, but if you're not

there making sure it's happening, people just don't care. The pay is
not really good until you're in a place where you're well rounded.
(Brad, white sous chef, fine dining)

Restaurant workers can be paid by the hour or by salary and work anywhere from

part-time to over forty hours a week. Corporate restaurants do offer consistent,

although small pay raises, in contrast to independent restaurants that offer irregular

pay raises. As a crewmember at a fast food chain restaurant, Zachary started working

at $6.25 per hour. After one year, he started receiving incremental raises to $7.25 to

8.25 until he was assistant manager and was paid $9.50 and then eventually earned

$10.50. At one point he was working 80 hours a week and was paid time and a half,

so was taking home $1400 a week. When he became manager, he only took home

$900 biweekly. Even though he earned less money, management was appealing

because he saw it as a leadership position, building a team and being a mentor. For

his management positions, he did receive benefits. He said, "One of the good reasons

to work in a chain, is being able to move up, and make a career out of it. Which is

one of the reasons why I do it" (Zachary, white fast food chain manager). The

potential to move into a better job made him want to move into a position that paid

him less money. Zachary used both monetary and nonmonetary measures to evaluate

a job's quality and even though he didn't see it as a good job, he did evaluate it as a

better job than his previous one. Even though being in management paid him less, he

viewed it as a career, compared with working in the kitchen. Restaurant kitchen

workers often viewed bad jobs as a gateway to better jobs, evaluating the potential

upwards mobility a job could offer as part of their perception on job quality. This

finding is in contrast to the job quality literature that tends to define good and bad

jobs using monetary characteristics

(Acemoglu 2001; Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Fuchs 1968; Esping-Anderson 1990;

Nelson 1994).

Entry-level jobs in kitchens start are the most work-intensive positions on the

food line. These often include doing food prep work at first, or even starting as the

dishwasher. Because kitchen work doesn't require a high school degree, many

kitchen workers started when they could first legally work. Restaurants are

everywhere, so jobs are readily available. But the better jobs can be hard to find. On

one end of the jobs spectrum is hotel kitchen management and workers. Even the

hourly employees at hotels get benefits, such as paid time off that accumulates, that

can be cashed in or have time off. When Isaac started working in the hotel kitchen,

he was hourly and it was common for him to work 100 hour weeks, making

significant pay. When he took the management position, he earned less but wanted to

make the cut "in order to grow." As cook I, he made $11.50 an hour and as the

manager, his salary was mid-30,000s and he made a 10% bonus. Six months after

college, he was made manager and he views that as a good career decision. Kitchen

workers also take into account skill development when making career decisions.

"The advantages of working on the hot line are overall it's a good skill to learn, it

makes you more versatile because cooking proteins are a part of every restaurant."

(Tessa, white line cook, fine dining). For kitchen workers who want to advance, the

instability of the staff may work to their advantage.

Because it's the next step towards the next position where there is a bigger pay increase. There's somewhat of a pay increase with a sous chef, but you're working a lot as a sous chef, probably as much as the head chef but the work's more intense, more physically challenging. With the chef, there's a lot of executive stuff, business stuff, desk stuff, paperwork, scheduling, costing, being on the phone with people. Which is not necessarily fun but it's not as straining as the sous chef position. You work your way up. There's always turnaround in kitchens. There's some places that lock people down and keep people there but for the most part there's always people leaving or moving around. You have to be at the right place at the right time and when the person ahead of you leaves, you can take their spot. (Brad, white sous chef, fine dining)

Another strategy to get a better job is to move from a lower priced restaurant to a higher priced one).

Depending on where you're at, you can only go so high in a restaurant. You max out eventually, you can only be a kitchen manager. But a kitchen manager at one restaurant could make as much money as a fry cook at a different restaurant. If you start at a low pay scale, they bring you up to a kitchen manager, you've only bumped up a little bit. Whereas you could start a lot higher at another place and have a higher ceiling. I know of another restaurant where the kitchen manager makes $9 because everyone starts at minimum wage. Whereas I just started my job as the sous chef at $14 and I know my chef is making $18. So, you might be stepping down in the role but getting a pay increase. But at corporate restaurants, you will get paid more over the long run, if you stick around, because they offer consistent pay raises, even if you start at a lower rate. But I prefer working at the independent restaurants because the food's better, you get to do more, you're with good people in the kitchen, you're with chefs who are really good at what they do. You can learn stuff. At a corporate restaurant, no one's going to teach me anything, I'm not going to learn anything after a certain point, it gets boring. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

Overall, the best position for kitchen workers to advance to is the executive chef position that offers the best pay, the most authority, and the least amount of physical labor on the line. A career goal for many kitchen workers is to become the executive

chef (or even own a restaurant), to become not only be the highest paid person in the

kitchen, but also to do the least amount of pure physical labor. Executive chefs run

kitchens, make the hiring and firing decisions, run payroll, create menus and

breakdown tasks among the staff. During service, they do the less physical tasks of

expediting, tasting and finishing dishes. They are often the public face of the kitchen,

even if they don't have a hand in the actual preparation of the food. The further up

the line a worker is, the more administrative the job becomes. Executive chefs have

administrative responsibilities and spend a great deal of time in their offices. But the

positions at the top still require over a forty hour work week. One hotel restaurant

executive chef, Isaac said that he regularly works 70 hours, often six days a week.

> I look at it as I gotta do what I gotta do. Such as, I unfortunately came
> back early after my daughter was born for a health inspection by the
> hotel company. If they find one thing, you fail. It's pass or fail. It
> goes to ownership and there's financial penalties for franchise fees.
> It's intense and tough. I had to come back in and make sure
> everything was in order. It stinks and sometimes it's hard. Everything
> falls on you, when you're in this position. You gotta work for the
> higher salary.

The long hours pay off — the median salary of executive chefs at hotel restaurants is

$81,000 a year (Chef Salary Report 2010). Kitchen work is highly demanding on

workers' bodies, causing many workers to want to advance to the executive chef

level.

Some food stations in the kitchen are more highly valued than others in the

kitchen, indicating that where a worker is positioned influences their perception of

job quality.

A kitchen manager is in a corporate restaurant where you buy things premade, you have a very structured environment. Every restaurant you go to has the same food. To be considered a head chef there, you don't have any leeway, you just order out the food from the tickets, that's why you would have a kitchen manager. As opposed to where I'm at now, this weekend, my boss is going to come to me and my head chef and ask what we're running on special, what do you want to make, what should we order. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

The most highly prized positions in fine dining restaurants are the grill station and the sautéing, which have the most status among kitchen workers and the most recognition from diners. Following the sous chef, the line cooks occupy the middle status position in the food production line that involves cooking and preparing the food. Line cooks prepare the other dishes on the menu (often appetizers, salads and sides), make entrée components, and prep food for service. Not usually involved in the hot preparation, food prep workers occupy the lowest status place on the service production line. These workers are responsible for preparing the components needed for service, such as dicing and chopping vegetables, making sauces and broths, among other prep tasks.

Many restaurant kitchen workers started working before they were the age of 18 in the lowest paid positions, usually as dishwashers or food prep workers. It's common for restaurant kitchen workers to have worked in many restaurants over their careers. For those who started off washing dishes, it's ideal to gain some experience prepping food to develop their skills and advance up the food production line. For example, Seth, a white sous chef at a fine-dining restaurant, started working as a dishwasher illegally when he was eleven. His older friend worked at a restaurant and offered him a job to help out during a busy period. Seth accepted to earn some extra

money, three days a week. When he was fifteen, the restaurant chef asked him if he

wanted to learn how to cook properly because he was doing "crappy jobs anyways,"

such as cleaning fish, and should be getting an education out of it. Seth fought it

because it wasn't what he wanted to do and then one day, he was cleaning a salmon

and it drenched him in fish eggs. The chef looked at him and said "You're doing all

the crap jobs anyway," and so Seth agreed to get formal education. His job paid for

him to go to culinary school for one day a week and he also worked five days a week

in the restaurant. Seth was already far more advanced than his culinary classmates,

because of his four years of experience earned in the kitchen. Yet, he doesn't view

his culinary education as essential or even related to his career success.

> Nothing that I consider my skill set or why I'm a valuable asset to the
> kitchen was what I got in culinary school. Everything that makes me
> an asset in the kitchen is my skill level but my biggest asset to offer is
> my work ethic and my dedication. I understand that some days I'm
> going to need to work a fifteen hour day without a break. I know what
> it takes to make a kitchen work and to succeed. That's the reason why
> I always end up at the top end of any kitchen I'm working in. Because
> of that work ethic, because every day I'll always bring 100%. Without
> sounding arrogant, there's no one who can match me in the kitchen.

But assessment of skill, dedication and work ethic is only one part of the story

considering job placement and advancement.

> I feel like it [disrespect] happened the most at this one place, it was, I
> could say racist. The Spanish guys in the back were typically the prep
> and they did all the dirty work. They call them ""the guys." They have
> just as much talent as the young white guys. And some of them even
> have the education. But they always make them do the dirty work, the
> prep work. During the day, everyone has to come in at the same time
> and do some prep for their stations. You do, what you need to do for
> your area. Then the prep chefs, the Spanish guys, do the prep on a
> bigger scale. So, throughout the night, they do all the backup prep.
> They're basically the glue that holds everything together. They get the

95

least amount of recognition, they're usually Spanish and usually underpaid. They can speak English and are legal workers. They guys who are illegal and can't really understand English are usually the dishwashers and do some prep stuff. For the most part, they aren't illegal. I've spoken to these guys before and they tell me that they don't understand, they say, I was trying to get that position and I've been here for five years and they've hired this new white guy for it. I do feel like it is a racist thing, but I can't say that exactly. And those are the guys that are holding a million dollar meal together. When these other guys and people like myself, the sous chef, do a lot of work, but less work than the prep guys and we get paid more. (Laura, white sous chef, fine dining)

There are significant tensions among workers on the line if the allocation of work is perceived as unfair.

People higher on the line have a power play because they are different from you. They give the worst kinds of work to the bottom. They only do the easy stuff, they don't do the hardest cleaning, like mopping. Doing mopping is gross, with all of the dirty water. They don't mess with that. Why? Because the dishwasher will do it. They'd never do it. They have the dishwasher. I don't think that's fair. At my other job, with all Mexican workers, if we decide to clean, we all clean. We take the time, and we all together clean up because it's a hard job. But here, they don't do that. The chef, he would never do it. I can't explain it, other than he has more power than us. If the chef doesn't like someone, he gets fired. (Juan, Mexican line cook, fine dining).

Group cohesion is important for work to get done, but it's also important for those at the top of the food production line, the executive chef and sous chefs, to accept the workers at the bottom of the line. As will be discussed in chapter five, workers use the strategy of banter in interaction with others on the food line to gain acceptance into the group and a greater likelihood of keeping their jobs. Group cohesion can help to protect workers against termination. If a kitchen worker is not part of the group, they can be vulnerable to being fired. "I have fired workers because they

couldn't get along with anybody" (Isaac, white executive chef, hotel restaurant). Or, "There was another person we hired and we were mean to him and he didn't make it" (Tessa, white line cook, fine dining). In a team-intensive interactive workplace, social closure plays a key role in workers' retaining their jobs and as I will explain in the next chapter, advancement to better jobs in the internal job ladder.

In restaurant kitchens, workers' entry into restaurant kitchens is encouraged by the low barriers to entry of education and experience requirements, but also by a shared perspective among workers that accepting entry-level jobs could award them with a chance to move into a better job. Entry-level kitchen workers are also highly dependent on others in the work group to learn the labor process and the skills necessary to be successful in their jobs. Shared knowledge among co-workers is facilitated through informal interactions on the job. If workers are socially excluded from the team, it negatively impacts their skill development. Because more advanced jobs in kitchens are often filled with workers lower on the line, entry-level workers are deeply aware that their opportunities to advance are dependent on workers higher on the line. For example, in full service restaurant kitchens, executive chefs work alongside entry-level workers on the line. There is a high degree of interaction among workers in advanced positions with workers in entry-level positions making the ability to achieve social cohesion with the team important to job success and advancement. In the next section, I discuss the organization of the service line jobs on casino gaming floors, the job queues and labor queues found in casino gaming. I also show how similar the demands of labor process are between casino gaming and

restaurant kitchens, shaping similar preferences of employers' decision making to fill

entry-level jobs.

Service Line Jobs on Casino Gaming Floors

In casinos, gaming pits are composed of dealers, pit clerks, supervisors and pit

bosses. Of these employees, dealers are viewed as the front of the service production

line because they interact with customers the most during their work day.

> We deal with so much money, coming in and going out, they
> [customers] just assume that it's ours. They think that money in that
> rack is mine, cause they're trying to beat me. Ultimately, they're
> trying to beat the house and I'm just the go between. I am the front
> line in the casino. (Jacob, white table games dealer, West Michigan)

And,

> A casino license is nothing more than…well, what are the real assets
> of the casino? You've got a building, some tables, some cards, some
> chairs, there's really not much. The real culture, the face of your
> casino is your employees (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

Workers and management agree that casino workers are on the frontline of the

casino's production of service to the customers and that the quality of this interaction

is the most valuable asset of the casino.

Casino workers are stationed across different areas on casino gaming floors,

which are zoned for specific types of games, divided into slot machines and table

games. Slot machines are clustered together in rows and are interspersed between

table games. Table games are organized into gaming pits that are composed of

individual gaming tables staffed by casino dealers, formed into groups around a

central station for the supervisor (pit boss) and pit clerk. Poker is its own department

with several different types of games and is separate from the other table games like

craps and black jack. Some table games are easier to manage than others, based on

the number of players and the types of payouts needed to be calculated.

> Black jack is the easiest game to deal, that's why all the party pits deal
> black jack. The supervisor position is experienced based. You have to
> have had some supervising experience or if you're the right person and
> you've been working for us for a while, we may train you. We've
> done that several times. We usually do that with the temp dealers.
> They've had years and years of dealing experience. So now we train
> them to do all the paperwork…Generally the going rate for managers
> is $15 and up. (Karen, white casino employer, Las Vegas)

One dealer, William, explained that there is a range of job quality on the casino floor

based on the type of casino game.

> As far as a hierarchy goes on the gaming floor, there's black jack
> dealers, carnival games like 3 card, Texas hold 'em and crazy four, let
> it ride. Those are all carni games, just your basic games. Then there's
> roulette and craps, craps is the upper echelon of the dealers. There
> really isn't a hierarchy other than the dealers are the monkeys and the
> suits are the bosses. (William, white table games dealer, Detroit)

Craps (or dice) is the most difficult game to run because of the number of players at

the table, the complicated math involved, and the quick pace of the game. Craps is

continuous play, unless no one is playing or the money is being replenished. There

are three dealers and one floor supervisor sitting at the craps table (the box man) and

one floor supervisor watching the entire table for a total of four employees. Dealers

who can run a craps table are seen as highly skilled and are desirable hires. "Craps is

the holy grail to at least get your application noticed and to be considered" (Jenny,

white table games dealer, West Michigan). And, "The easiest way to get hired as a

floor or a dealer is learn the game of craps." (Adam, white table games dealer,

Detroit). If a dealer knows the game of craps, it's much easier to find employment at

a casino because that knowledge indicates a high level of skill and mastery of casino work.

Dealers, supervisors and pit clerks are the main positions in the gaming pit. The dealer is responsible for running the table game, handling the chips, providing customer service, regulating play and communicating to the supervisor new players to the table, plus any issues that may occur. Supervisors oversee several gaming pits simultaneously. "Floor supervisors watch six games. Pit managers, they watch thirty games and they're watching all the supervisors. Pit bosses make $70 to 80,000 a year on salary. But they can lose their job. They're fired if they don't bring in enough money." (Adam, white table games dealer, Detroit). The pit boss is responsible for maximizing the casino's profits by regulating the pace of play and the management of the tables. The pit clerk's job is to handle the data entry into the casino's computer system of the transactions that take place at each gaming pit, such as loss or profit, customers' names, gaming outcomes and duration of play, and any bonuses earned from played money, such as free drinks or meals. Barbara, a director of pit operations at one of the strip casinos, explained that pit clerks are mixed gender, mostly part-time positions with few full-time opportunities. Shifts start at 2-3 a week and pay $13 an hour. Pit clerks mainly interacted with floor and pit managers who she said can act "like real bears when it gets busy and stressful." She suggested that that a good pit clerk can handle the pressure of busy nights and the emotional outbursts of managers.

Floor supervisors (or pit bosses) "make the big bucks because they have to provide excellent customer service with gambling guests and deal with conflict well" (Barbara, director of pit operations, strip casino). Floor supervisors (also referred to as managers) have to know multiple games on the casino floor and oversee several groupings of tables. "My floor manager is the big guy for the shift" (Jacob, white table games dealer, West Michigan). Floor managers can earn between $52,000 and $70,000 a year. Their role is to log the table players, monitor the dealer's handling of the table, track the money exchanges and deal with any conflicts or issues between the dealer and customers. At a larger casino, dealers may work with seven different floor managers in a week and each one has a different way of doing things.

> It may be a whole different set of rules that they go by. In a day, you may work with two or three different floor managers and one may tell you to do something. When that floor manager gets relieved, another one will ask you where the hell you learned that from, no do it this way. So now you'll do it a completely different way. (Darryl, Black black jack dealer, Detroit)

Supervisors have a large amount of discretionary power to decide how the games are run and how to deal with situations and disagreements that may come up on the tables. Dealers are expected to follow the lead of the supervisors and follow their unique set of rules.

Not all dealers want to move into management because supervisory positions are seen as more difficult, while paying no more or not much more than dealing, depending on where the position is held.

> Mid-level supervisors are one rung up from dealers and are typically referred to as the casino floor man. The person who stands there with their arms folded and watches the dealers. It was my least favorite job

because you have to take…you know with a dealer there's absolutely no ambiguity in any move that you make on the table. None of your bosses need to give you any instruction. You just get on the table and deal. While the supervisors, we are constantly under scrutiny by the shift managers and the casino managers. And a lot of people who are in those positions are in those positions more because they're trusted, rather than particularly qualified. In those positions, to be good at it, you have to be a good communicator, level-headed, can't lose your temper. But that's not the case with a lot of mid-level, from floor manager, to casino manager, to shift manager especially. It's not particularly the case with them but they're there because they're trusted. (Scott, white casino employer, Las Vegas)

Supervisors have more discretionary power than dealers. If supervisors make a decision, the dealers have to abide by it. Dealers can't tell the floor supervisor what to do or what decision to make about a situation on the table. "You can't tell the supervisor what to do. You can tell the supervisor what's going on and then they do what they want. Leave him on the table or kick him out, it's not my call about what to do. You can't say get this guy off my table" (Andy, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Dealers will often behave on a table differently depending on who the supervisor is at the time. For example, if a dealer knows a supervisor is there who will take her side over the player's, the dealer acts more aggressively outside of the norms of interactive service set by the casino. If the table gets out of hand, the dealer can call the supervisor over and know that the supervisor's decision will be in her favor, not the players. Andrea, a Latina dual rate (an employee working as a dealer and a supervisor) in Las Vegas spoke about her initial training to be supervisor. She said,

At the station, they put me in the different shifts, first into the graveyard shift, because they all work differently. The days shifts, the swing shifts and the graveyard, they all run their shifts differently. I

don't understand, because it's all the same poker. But every shift person will run it differently. So you learn different techniques from everybody. I learned supervising which is a lot to learn because you have to know the rules more so than dealing. Dealing you go in and you're kind of like a robot. You just push the pots, you know the hands, you don't have to make any decisions, because the floor people come over and do something. If you have to make a decision, and you make the wrong decision, you're going to make ten people mad. But they have to abide by your decision and they can complain later. It's a lot higher stress because you want to be able to protect your dealers, you've got to listen to them but you've also got ten voices, all saying something different. So you have to be able to sort it out. You have to listen to your dealer, because they're the ones in the box, you have to rely on them , so you have to have a lot of trust with them. But yet, you have to appease both. You have to know the rules but there's a lot of grey areas in poker.

The supervisor more heavily oversees the dialogue and interactions on the table than anything else, including the surveillance cameras, which captures visuals but not audio.

Participants observed that the supervisory positions were often filled by women, matching the national patterns in employment data (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). "I see a lot of women supervisors, even table games, HR, sales, everything, in restaurants. It's diverse, there aren't just men. They always let women do it too. And I think women are starting to realize that they can do it too. They're not being held back (Andrea, Latina dual rate in Las Vegas poker room). And Kate, an Asian casino executive in Las Vegas, said, "I know on the gender, we have a good story to tell because we have a lot of women in management positions, especially in gaming." There is also a perception that women are better at management than men.

Women like to have more control and are more detail-oriented and are striving to get ahead in the workplace. Men are happy coming in with

103

no headaches, you're responsible for no one but yourself, you make your money and you leave (Marissa, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Another participant in management perceived that hiring men to be dealers and women to be supervisors improved the speed of play and thus the casino's goals of maximizing profit.

> In one casino where I managed, there were mostly male dealers and female supervisors. What I've seen is with female dealers, because the clientele is so male, the men slow the game down because they want to talk to that female dealer. But if you put a man in that role and a female supervisor, she can come over and talk to everybody and keep the pace of the game going and flirt and have a good time and make everybody feel comfortable. But the guy in the box is still cranking away, pumping out the cards, keeping the hands going. Their staffing technique was a little different, they're trying to fix that male to female balance in the casino but they did it in a different way. Where a lot of companies first step has been to put in attractive female dealers. To get the men's attention, get them in to play and break up the dealer ratio a little bit (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

Many workers perceive moving into management as a move to a better job, even if their earnings decrease. Katie also said that she earned a good salary as a dealer but saw value in working as a supervisor even though she earned less in that role.

> My salary increased from working as a restaurant waitress to becoming a dealer. As a dual rate, I now make $40,000 to $50,000. This year, I was able to buy a house because I'm a supervisor. On my pay checks, I have the higher hourly rate, so I was able to qualify for a home that way. I told my manager that I wanted to buy a house for me and my girls, and he had always said to put your money to good use. So, for a period of time, I was a straight supervisor and stayed in that position for quite some time in order to qualify for a home. If you're a dealer, you're at the lower hourly rate, which is $7.25 to 8.25 an hour, plus tips. If the tips go on to the paycheck, it's not as much of an issue. But if it's straight cash, you have no way to prove that. With tips, it varies so much, you can't ever count on that. As a supervisor, my salary went down, because I wasn't getting the tips. I made $12.50 an hour. We just started splitting out 10% of the tips from the pit to

the supervisor. It's a little bit of cash, but it's no $100. We're lucky if it's $20, gas money. (Katie, white dual rate party pits, Las Vegas)

As Katie explained, there are some exceptions where supervisors receive a cut of the tips. If a supervisor is employed at a casino where tips can be shared by the dealers with the supervisors, the position is an advancement of income. It is also better for earnings to be a supervisor in a poker tournament than a dealer, because the supervisor earns a percentage of the tips, while dealers have to divide their share among themselves. But supervising is a salaried, full-time position with benefits, which is appealing to many dealers, even if the pay is generally less because management does not usually receive a share of the tips from general play.

Every dealer that works in a 24-hour period gets a share of the tips earned for that day. In most casinos, dealers are tipped out daily and in some casinos, dealers are tipped out weekly. One poker dealer explained, "Tips are very consistent in the overall big picture. If you work ten days, you're going to make $120 to $180 easily every day. We make on average between twelve and twenty dollars every thirty minutes in cash tips" (Matt, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Another dealer reported that she makes between $400 and $500 in tips for a forty hour week. Yet, dealers can't count on their tips on a day-to-day basis.

> I save all of the money I make in the first part of the year. The Fremont Street casino, it's a hole in a wall, keep your own money, it's a hit and miss. You can have one day where you only make a $100 and then the next day turn around and make $600 the next day. For the first three months, you save, save, save because you don't know what will happen the rest of the year. Last night, there was one good group but without them, they maybe would have walked out with $20, for a whole week, maybe earn a $100. But at the beginning of the

year, you're making several thousand dollars a month and have to save it. (Katie, dual rate party pits, Las Vegas)

Because tipping varies considerably over the year, the quality of a job is evaluated by dealers on the yearly potential of tips. Dealers earn more money than supervisors but are less likely to receive benefits. To receive benefits, they have to work a required number of hours over a certain time period. "July, August and September is the big summer series tournament. We make enough hours in those three months to qualify for the insurance over the next year. It's 300 hours over ninety days roughly" (Matt, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Poker dealers are more likely to receive benefits than other types of card dealers if they work in the poker tournament.

Tipping is unpredictable on the gaming table and depends on who's sitting at the table. A good day at the table for dealers ranges from $100 in the "toke box" or "toke pool" in a six to eight hour day – called a 24 hour split. The tips are pooled and then divided by the number of people working and number of hours worked.

> Customers can tip a dealer outright or they can bet a tip for the dealer. A good casino craps dealer on a table will know the proper way to call attention to a bet made on behalf of the dealer, so the rest of the table knows hey this guy over here bet for us, did you guys know you could do that? In a subtle way that draws attention. Hopefully that will get the rest of the table tipping. So, a $5 tip that was bet and wins along with the hand would double into a $10 tip. It's in the best interest of the casino for the customer to bet tips, because it's increasing the size of the bet. The casino can't control how much is won or lost, but the more that's bet against the house, the better it is for the house. It's advantageous for the house. It works if it's set up that way from the beginning and everybody kind of knows. I think it definitely affects customer service. The downside of keeping your own tips, from the casino's perspective, is that people are more likely to try to hustle the customers, soft hustle as we call it. It's where you almost suggestively sell to them that they tip you. So, you might say, oh you think you're doing good, oh why not bet for me. Or maybe something even more

subtle than that. But the dealers will sometimes pressure the customers into betting for them. Hey, if I make $10 bucks it goes into my pocket. While in Vegas, if $10 goes into the pool, I might get another nine cents in my paycheck next month. It's not really worth losing your job over (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

Even though it's against the house rules to solicit tips, many dealers in fact do so using subtle techniques that are not allowed by protocol (Sallaz 2009). Even though dealers shouldn't directly ask for tips, they can for example, make a show of receiving a tip from a customer. Once a tip is given, the dealer will bang the tip on the table and yell out that there's a tip for the crew. The aim is to show customers who don't know about tipping what is required of them in the service transaction – to pay the dealer, just like any other service provider, like a waitress or a hairdresser. "You keep your tips. You work for it, you gotta hustle for it" (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas). Interestingly, the floor can tell customers to tip the dealer. For example, the pit boss will tell customers that the pink chip, worth $2.50, is for tipping the dealer or to place a bet on behalf of the dealer. "Now you got a sucker who's going to tip us every time he gets a pink chip. Good for us" (Jacob, white table games dealer, West Michigan). Dealers in their interactions with customers used strategies to increase their earnings from tips.

Dealers tended to perceive dealing jobs as better if the tips they can earn from them are higher. They evaluated jobs at different casinos based on the earnings potential from customers — bad jobs were at places that had poor tippers, better jobs had good tippers. But good jobs had a combination of consistency of tips, often places where dealers could expect $1 a pot. These jobs were often found in

neighborhood casinos with regulars in the greater Las Vegas area, or in Detroit with largely a local customer base. Dealers balanced their evaluation of job quality between tips or earnings potential with reliability of income. They also evaluated job quality on the degree of control they had over their tables to manage the players and speed of play.

Good times of the year for tipping are major holidays, sports championships, and gaming championships. "Last year during March Madness, one girl made $2000 that day and I made $1200. That was my ultimate high, I've never marked out that high" (Katie, dual rate party pits, Las Vegas). Or at the World Series of Poker Championship, poker dealers can make $12,000 to 15,000 in six weeks. Because poker is one of the more coveted table games, it can be difficult to secure a poker dealing position, with the exception of the World Series, which hires a large number of dealers for temporary work.

The kinds of jobs casinos offered varied across geographical location. For example, one advantage of working in the Michigan casinos is that full-time work with benefits is more available to the dealers because of the unionization of the casinos. In some areas with high unemployment, such as in rural California, many people were looking for work that paid $8 an hour plus tips that offered training that could be found at card rooms. With an average of $5 an hour in tips, potential employees saw the position as a good job. In Michigan, there are also significant differences between unionized and nonunionized jobs. Adam, a white table games dealer, started his career working at a nonunionzed job in West Michigan, earning

$5.25 an hour with a toke rate was $10 to $11 an hour, for a total of $15-16 an hour.

Later working in a unionized Detroit casino, he earned $10.71 an hour with a toke

rate of $14 to $17 an hour for a total of 24.71 to $27.71 an hour. He explained,

> I'll tell you why there's a huge difference, the union. I'm a union worker. I have noticed that here in Detroit, there's union workers who've been here since it's opened. You have a lot of people who've been here ten or eleven years. We get benefits, everything. For health insurance, I pay $18 a pay check, so $36 a month for myself. I get paid $55,000 to do absolutely nothing, with full benefits. I'm okay with that. Without a college degree. I'm okay with that. Not many people can say that. Pretty much all you're doing is standing there, putting out cards and doing pay outs using basic math. I don't find it difficult. I could do it every day of the week.

Dealers can often earn more than floor managers because they work in a tipped

position and can often earn a higher salary if they work in casinos with high or

consistently tipping players.

> In Las Vegas, floor managers and pit bosses were actually jealous of how much dealers were making and they would go to upper management and complain about it. For instance, I had found out that at one of the strip casinos, when they first opened the casino up, the dealers were making a whole lot more than the floor managers. The typical floor manager was making something around $70,000 a year, salaried. The typical dealer was making anywhere from $80,000 to $100,000 a year. Making major money on the strip. The entry-level pit bosses and floor managers went to the top and complained that, you gotta do something about it, how do you expect us to be managers and our workers are making more than us. How are they supposed to respect us when they're making more than us. The owner of the casino came up with a new payment scale for the dealers and set up it so that the floor managers would get a cut of the tips, plus their salary. It allowed the floor managers to make more than the dealers and the dealers were now the ones complaining about it. (Darryl, Black black jack dealer, Detroit).

Among the game tables, dealers constantly shift from one table to the next during

their shifts and usually are at one table for thirty minutes. According to casino labor

rules, dealers frequently rotate between tables and take frequent 15 minute breaks at least once every 60-90 minutes.

> You have a rotation where you go from one table to the next table to the next and you really don't take dealers out of that rotation. So whether you're a beginner or an expert, you're going to whatever table is next on the line. There's some tables where you'll make a lot more money, like those high stakes tables. In theory, those people tip more. If you push a pot that has $50,000, they might not tip at all, but they might tip a lot, tip $25 a pot or more, who knows?" (Andy, white Las Vegas poker dealer).

The floor supervisor dictates who goes to what table and is expected to be neutral by not putting their favorites or friends on the best tables. Supervisors are not allowed to take bribes to change the line-up but many dealers reported giving their supervisors a cut of their tips to gain a favorable position in the line-up.

Pit bosses, floor supervisors and pit clerks work for the duration of their shift, usually eight hours. If there aren't enough players to fill the games, some dealers will go home early. Full-time dealers can choose to stay the entire eight hour shift and have more work protection than on-call dealers (who don't have seniority). The quick pace of the game is interrupted each time a new player joins, the money is changed out to a player, the dealer turns over or the chips have to be restocked. Depending on the type of game, tips are either shared evenly among dealers each day or are kept individually. Poker dealers and party pit dealers keep their own tips, while other games dealers like in black jack or roulette pool their tips.

My research showed that the demands of the labor process in casino gaming were remarkably similar to the demands in restaurant kitchens. Both required physical stamina, dexterity, efficiency and speed from workers, whether in preparing

food or dealing cards. Doing emotional labor in interaction on the job, either with customers or with co-workers, was also required by employers but the kind of emotional labor differed from the emotional deference often described in the literature (Hochschild 1979; Leidner 1991; Pierce 1999). In casino gaming, workers are asked to provide good customer service but not at the expense of profits for the casino. Workers were expected to control the players at their tables, and to manage any player slowing the speed of game. Similarly in restaurant kitchens, employers sought workers who could hold their own in the kitchen and be accepted into the work group, to improve efficiency and productivity. These findings are similar to Waldinger and Lichter's (2003) findings that it was more important to employers that workers were similar to the work group (in backline work) or to customers (in frontline work), than pure hands-on or customer skills. I will discuss these findings in greater detail in the next section on employers preferences for hiring table games dealers in casino gaming.

Labor Queues on Casino Floors

On casino floors, applicants are frequently asked to audition for the job by working at the work site in real situations. In casinos, potential employees perform dealing in auditions that usually take a few hours of their time. The hiring process for entry into casinos is a formalized process that requires applicants to audition for a dealing position.

> Each casino as a dealer, you have to come in and audition. In an audition, you go into the casino or into their training area, they have mock games in the training area but in certain casinos, like out in Vegas, they like you to do an audition on live games. They like you to

111

come into a live pit, the normal pit with customers and show what you can do. Tap out one of their dealers and show what you can do. They jump you around from different games, showing what you can do. After showing that I could deal three to four games, I made one mistake out of nervousness, out of pressure. The shift manager told me it wasn't a big deal. (Darryl, Black table games dealer, Detroit)

The audition is a job interview. Not only do you have to look good, sound good and physically perform and act. You have to pitch the cards out right, read the hands correctly. It's a little different than a normal job interview, the audition. Now I think, can't you just look at my resume and see that I've been doing this for 25 years and not make me audition. When I started at [a major strip casino] three years ago, you could add up their experience in the room and it didn't add up to me. (Sharon, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

In the audition, I was sitting next to the dealer coordinator. He wanted us to show our personality, so I sat there and joked with him. And I made him laugh. I did make two mistakes in my audition but I was hired. (Jessica, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Casinos are looking for applicants who have strong skills in game protection, game procedures, and speed of dealing. The speed of play is important to casinos because the more games that are dealt, the higher the profits. Faster dealers are more valuable to casinos than slower dealers, so casinos are more likely to retain and promote dealers who can handle dealing more games per hour. Casinos have implemented a tracking system, called game pace audits, where a dealer swipes his or her card into the system. The tracking system monitors how fast workers deal the cards per hour, or how many hands and to also track exactly when a chip goes down a hole into the box.

Casinos are a living, breathing, mathematics laboratory. If no one's cheating, than it's simply an exercise in math. For every dollar that comes across the table, we're going to keep a certain percentage of it. So we set up this math laboratory and the only thing mid-level supervisors need to make sure to do is that nobody is cheating. And

there's not a lot of decisions that they need to make as far as productivity goes. So many people are put there only because they're trusted. There's not many other skills, in a lot of cases, that are needed to make a profit. Making sure everybody is doing what they're supposed to be doing is their job. Now to maximize, I think every little detail needs to be there. (Jacob, white black jack dealer, West Michigan)

Efficiency is a very big deal. If we have to fire someone, we're going to keep who is ever more profitable for us. We do a lot of evaluations, such as game pace audits. Customer service might be 15 or 20% of your total evaluation, but 60% will be your speed and the last 20% if are you following procedures and are you doing the techniques correctly. The Vegas casinos are how many trials can we get in during the shortest amount of time, so that the odds are in our favor. Without rushing the customers, but speed and efficiency are important. We try to set a bar, with this many hands minimum. We look over averages over three months. If we're overstaffed, that might be the determining factor about who gets terminated. (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

Gaming play is constantly monitored by electronic surveillance with the purpose of

ensuring dealer compliance with casino rules and to prevent theft or loss of chips.

Casino management will assign points to dealers for violations of procedures or house

rules of play.

It's easy to get written up in table games. You can get written up really for any type of mistake. Just recently, a supervisor and I were closing a game and did a closing slip where you write down the totals. There was an error and the money in the rack was right and the sheet was wrong. It was just a clerical error and no money was missing, it was still a write up because it's policy. It's easy to be written up for a mistake. But after six months, it falls off. Same with points for being late or being sick. Unless you do something awful with the guests and it's validated or stealing or cash mistake that was negligence. (Marissa, white black jack dealer, Las Vegas)

Even though the tables are closely monitored remotely, the cameras are primarily

observing the chips and cards passing between the dealer and the players, to make

sure that no one at the table is stealing from the casino and that the rules of play are

being followed. Applicants' personality is also very important to the casino because

customer service is a large part of the job. "I've seen people with great skills but no

personality not get hired." (Adam, white games dealer in Detroit).

If a dealer has a room manager in his or her personal network and apply for a job,

often the audition can be bypassed.

> In February 2007, the Venetian started a poker tournament
> series and I got hired to deal that tournament, it was maybe
> three weeks long. At that point, I had been here and knew
> people. The day shift manager was somebody who I knew
> because he managed the room at the Hilton and I used to play
> at the Hilton. The job at Bally's I got because a friend I met
> who was dealing another room where I played was now
> working there and I got hired. All of these jobs I got from
> knowing people. The World Series job I got hired without an
> audition because I knew the manager. (Robert, white poker
> dealer, Las Vegas)

What qualities and abilities are hiring managers at casinos looking for when they

interview potential employees and observe them in the audition? One casino manager

said,

> Personality was definitely the biggest factor. Ability to pass the
> background check. In interviewing employees for me it's very much
> like a hand of poker. I start off with a couple of base questions and
> read their reactions. Factual things. But then I ask other questions
> like, tell me about a customer service experience where you had to
> deal with an unhappy customer. And gauging their reactions to it, on
> the fly, in the moment. Because they are really the front line. They've
> got nine customers where yeah, this guy won a huge pot but this guy
> lost. He's going to give you your dollar tip but how do you deal with
> this other guy who may be mumbling something under his breath at
> the other end of the table. You have to learn how to deal with it. It's
> an adult game but dealing with players who are abusive to the players,
> especially when somebody speaks the same language other than
> English that the dealer may speak. So they can harass them without

anyone else really knowing. It can get pretty ugly" (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

If you're a pretty woman, or a very good looking man, you'll have a very good chance of getting hired if you have a good skill set. Most of the girls get hired as a pool of girls for one property. The girls who've worked for us longer and have a lot more experience dealing, they get the opportunity to go different places. Because when you first start to work somewhere, you have to learn all new house rules. What we teach the girls in training, because actually take totally inexperienced people and teach them how to deal black jack first. Whereas women in this town have an unusual advantage, if you're young, cute and pretty, you don't need experience. Whereas the male counterparts, it's very hard for them to get a job out of dealer school. It's very hard for anybody who's not a party pit dealer to get a job out of dealing school. Nobody wants to hire a break-in dealer. They don't even really like hiring break-in party pit dealers but they do it because they want that party pit. There's only one way to do it. Hire all new people, train all new people, cause the girls we have are already working. These girls, they're not going to sit on the shelf and wait for you to give them a job. You got to put them right to work. (Karen, white casino employer, Las Vegas)

Karen prefers to hire women break-in dealers out of dealing school over men and

place them into party pit or "black and white" on-call dealing. But for many, it was

difficult to find their first job after dealing school, unless new properties were

opening or there was an upcoming gaming tournament.

Dealer compliance and consistency in the service production line is one

motivation for casinos to train inexperienced workers at the same time.

You can teach them to do it the way that you prefer. A couple hundred candidates, maybe forty that we put into school, maybe 15 or 20 actually made it all the way through, I'm proud to say they're some of the best dealers I've ever seen. Some talented kids. One of our employees, her Mom and I guess some of her aunts and uncles had all made a living in the field picking grapes. For her it was actually an opportunity. She was going to school for accounting, and not only became by far the most natural dealers but also became the accountant for the casino. (Kevin, white casino manager)

Since there are seventy procedures involved in running one game of black jack, dealer compliance with the house rules is important for a game to run in compliance with the casino's procedures.

The casino service line production of gaming requires a specific set of skills from its workers and an ability to work as part of a team. Physical stamina, speed, dexterity, and accuracy are important to run the games well. For the casino, it is equally as important for the dealer to do math quickly, run the game and count out the bets efficiently and without error, so that each game is paid out accurately, either to the house or to the dealer. The faster the dealer, the more money the dealer makes and the more the house makes. For example, one strip casino keeps a "fastest dealer list" of the dealers who deal more than 26 hands an hour. The older dealers aren't usually on this list but since they have seniority and full-time work, they have little incentive and may be suffering from work-induced physical ailments. Slower dealers also earn less than the faster dealers. "One of the slower and older dealers was at $45 so far in the night, and I was at $107" (Jessica, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Or, "You keep your own. That's the one thing in poker is, we have incentive to be fast and efficient. If everybody's pooling their tips, then what's the point of me joking around and making extra. The bad dealers, you'd have to pool with them, and I don't think that I'd like it. What's the point of being good" (Andy, white Las Vegas poker dealer). And, "Most of them tip a dollar for every pot. The more hands you can get out, the more money that you can make. I deal between 20 and 25 hands an hour." (Andrea, Latina dual rate, Las Vegas). With the exception of poker dealers, all the

116

other table games share tips among the dealers, which can benefit older dealers who

may have a slower pace of dealing. In poker, regular players are also regular tippers

who usually tip $1 or $2 a pot.

> Some of these poker pros, they don't tip much, they'll tip you a dollar a pot. Maybe if it's a big pot, they'll tip you $2 a pot. The people who tip the most are the tourists, they people you don't know. You'll be friendly with the game, you'll joke around a little bit with them and smile, and you basically be a good dealer, fast, efficient and everything else, they'll see that and tip you extra. (Andy, white Las Vegas poker dealer)

Securing a position in a casino with players who consistently tip is a large part of

what makes a dealing job a good job. Dealers can be the best in their casino if they

combine speed and accuracy with excellent customer service. Because the casino is

trying to maximize the house's winnings, dealers are valued if they keep their payouts

low.

> I'm a good house dealer. My cards are coming out of that shoe so fast that you can't see them until they're standing in front of ya. They're not slipping out of my hands, they're perfectly placed. Right now, I'm can turn 130 hands in an hour, which is some of the fastest scores in the place. I'm sure there's Vegas dealers out there who can do 160 or maybe more. With a good table and with good players, I can beat my shuffler, that's an accomplishment. In this job, you need those little things. They want me to do roulette or to get back into craps, and I tell them, I like my cards. Where I am now, if I did craps, they'd most likely put me on a later shift, and I would be working more of the busy days, later at night, I'd have less time on the cards, doing more math, more betting, working harder, for the same amount of money. It would be in my best interest though, because once I get that game, and I'm a dealer and I know craps, I can go to any casino. That's the big game, craps. If you can learn that game, and it's the hardest to learn, then you can learn any of the other games. If you're a craps dealer, and you go to an audition, you're automatically offered a dual rate or the floor, unless you're so good that they want you on the floor dealing. I don't pay very much out. There's a lot of regulars who know that and they don't play with me. They'll look at that rack and

see what's going on. Sometimes they'll ask me, hey are you being nice today. Well I'm nice every day, but no I'm not paying anybody. I'm not really supposed to say that but for the sake of the next time I'm hot, I can say, hey you need to get on to my table. Then, I'm going to make some tips and it's going to make up for that. (Jacob, white cards dealer, West Michigan)

Jacob valued his position as a black jack dealer because he was fast and efficient dealing black jack, knowing that his skills were ones that any casino values in their employees.

Dealers can learn to become specialty dealers in one game or become a general dealer in a range of games. Specialty dealers are at a disadvantage because they're not as competitive as general dealers in the hiring process, so their mobility on the casino floor and between casinos is limited. Most casinos won't hire a new dealer unless they know two core games, which are blackjack, craps, roulette and poker – known by general dealers. Karl, a current dual rate in Las Vegas said,

> The old rule of thumb in this business was that you learned craps first and you learned it well. That gets you your entrée onto the strip. All jobs start downtown, in those days, the good days. Once you acquired firm, strong knowledge, then you moved to the strip. And that's a good formula. It should be used today but it's not. Once you learn craps, everything else is easy. Except for roulette, which isn't easy but it's less difficult. You can easily learn any other game because your mind is already trained in terms of gaming and dealing. You can handle chips, you can deal, you can make change, you're thinking fast, because you're getting bets called in from every direction constantly, you're learning to maneuver around on the craps table. Once you get that down, black jack is nothing, it's a joke. There's nothing to it, comparatively. The average craps table is sixteen feet and six people can crowd in each side, with one dealer on each side.

General dealers are also more likely to be promoted to management, because pit bosses and floor managers have to know multiple games on the floor.

My findings showed that employers sought to hire employees who could handle the specific demands of the labor process in card dealing — dealing cards fast and with accuracy, while pleasing the customers but without letting the customers slow the speed of play. Employers preferences were similar to the style of management uncovered by Sallaz that secured fast play and better profits for the casinos by allowing dealers to give poor customer service to non-tipping players who often slowed play down. My findings were also similar to Waldinger and Lichter's finding that in frontline work, employees' ability to "get along" with customers was more positively evaluated than employees' skills. Next, I explain how job seekers evaluate job quality in casino work, and why they are motivated to accept entry-level casino dealing jobs with the hope that these jobs will enable them to move into better jobs within casinos.

Job Queues in Casino Work

What motivates job seekers to seek and enter into casino work? Some dealers sought casino work because they lost their jobs during the recession; others switched their jobs later in life; while most entered into dealing as their first job. Before becoming a poker dealer, William (white poker dealer in Las Vegas) worked 60 hours a week in a roofing construction company and earned $25,000 a year. Dealing immediately doubled his earnings. Or Karl, a white former casino owner and current dual rate in Las Vegas said,

> I started out as a craps dealer four hours after my 21st birthday. I turned 21 at midnight and at 4 am I started my first shift. And I've been in the business all of my life, for thirty-nine years. I've been in every position. I've done everything, from shill, who's the guy who

119

> stands there and tries to get the game going when no one's around, just throws the dice or lays out the cards, until someone sits down and then they get off the table. I did that for the first two days that I worked, until they had room for me on the craps table. To owner, casino manager, floor manager, shift manager, pit boss, floorman, dealer. I've dealt just about every game in the casino at one time or another.

Jenny, a white West Michigan black jack dealer, lost her job during the recession. She said about training, "The days flew by. I was excited, because it's a trade. Now that casinos are everywhere, there will always be something that I can do, like with a college degree. Something that nobody could take away from me." The perception that dealing was recession-proof and could offer a transferable trade was an appealing reason for many to enter into dealing.

The job is also appealing to many because of it doesn't require any formal education and there are low barriers for workers to enter into dealing.

> It's not rocket science. To deal, you don't need a high school education. You need basic math, a little bit of personality and you have to know the game. You can learn it. A lot of people say that a monkey can do our job. But if you're full-time, you can make $70,000 or $75,000 a year at this job. And you don't need a high school diploma, anybody can do it. Once you learn it, you can go anywhere. I can go to Florida or California or anywhere there's poker to deal. It's a skill, it's supply and demand like anything else. (Andy, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

> I started working in '99. I started because it was a lot easier than having to go to school. I make more money than most, colleges where you spend a lot, unless you're going to become a doctor or a lawyer. It's simple and I make good money. I can take my money home every day and you get a paycheck every two weeks. I had a daughter and it was easy for me to work there because they worked with me on my schedule and they offered day care. I could go to work and take my daughter. You had to pay but it was a lot cheaper than elsewhere. It was 24 hours a day. Same thing here at Las Vegas, they had 24 hour day care. I'm a single mom of two kids. (Andrea, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas)

"We're giving some very well-paying jobs to a lot of people who otherwise wouldn't be making nearly what they're making now." (Scott, white casino employer, Las Vegas).

For many casino workers (most without a college education), dealing offers a pathway to better jobs than other types of jobs that have no formal education requirements.

> If you don't have any college experience, it's a really good paying job. It really is. A lot of what you learn is all on the job, so you can advance without any education. That's what I started doing, dealing and showing my dedication of my work and performance, they slid me in to doing supervising. Taught me on the job what to look for, how to deal with situations. I could even go on and go into a bigger casino and work my way up there too. You can make good money. (Katie, white dual rate party pits, Las Vegas)

> The casino is a very decent paying job especially for those who don't have a formal education, a 4-year degree of better for college. Without a degree, this is one of the best options, especially because Michigan is no longer a manufacturing state, that it's one of the best options for a lot of people without college educations have to advance themselves and their family. You have a trade that you can take anywhere you want. (Jenny, white black jack dealer, West Michigan)

> It's a position you don't need a degree for but you're making degree kind of money, usually close to $20 to $30 an hour, or maybe even more out on the strip. So you're making degree kind of money but you don't have to have a degree. You have to be a brain to be a dealer, and you have to deal with stress. (Darryl, Black black jack dealer, Detroit)

> You make a lot of money dealing, compared with going to school. Going to school, you have loans. After, you may make $2000 a month. I make that in two weeks and I don't have to pay loans back. It's an easy job. I think kids should go to school, not everyone's made out to be a dealer. All the personalities are not made to be out there, dealing with the public eight hours a day, all day. But for the most part, if you don't know what you want, or you like that kind of stuff, being in customer service, dealing's way better. (Andrea, dual rate in a Las Vegas poker room)

121

Most participants agreed that their jobs in casino dealing were better than other jobs they would be able to secure without a college degree.

Dealers can receive certified training from dealer schools that require paid tuition and are eligible to work in a range of casinos, from the minor to major establishments. Dealing school courses take about six to eight weeks and cost between $600 and $800 in tuition. Trainees can also receive free training from a casino that is hiring but are usually uncertified, which can prevent them from working at core properties. Some companies offer free training to current employees who are interested in moving to dealing. One exception for beginner or transitioning poker dealers to gain entry into Las Vegas casinos is the time period surrounding the World Poker Series, when temporary poker dealers are in high demand.

> I didn't do very well on my audition but they were desperate to hire people. They needed 75 dealers and they were stuck. I was a beginner, I didn't do very well on my audition but they hired me anyway. By the end of the six-week tournament, I was a pretty good dealer from working forty to fifty hours a week but at the beginning I was a basket case. (Andy, white Las Vegas poker dealer)

It's a common practice for newly opened casinos to offer free training to a group of potential employees, to ensure a consistent and available labor pool. For example, in the late 1990s, newly opened casinos recruited and trained a new labor force in Detroit. Or more recently in West Michigan, a three-year old casino hired a brand new pool of workers before its opening. The casino advertised about hiring and applicants submitted their applications online. Potential employees were invited for an interview and a math test. Job seekers in the local labor market were new to the

casino business and matched the casino's interest in seeking a "green" workforce.

New hires were trained full-time for twelve weeks before the casino opened, to ensure

that each worker followed the set procedures of the house for every game and every

table.

A commonplace attitude among dealers is that they have the best jobs on the

floor and management has the worst. But some disagree and want to become

supervisors,

> Management is where it's it...Dealing is boring. If you've got an
> active mind at all, you'll go mad at any point in time. Dealers either
> move up into management or supervision, or they'll leave the business.
> I'd say 85% of table supervisors were once dealers at the same
> property. The difficult thing is that there aren't that many positions. If
> you have a casino with say 100 table games, you need 4 dealers for
> every three tables but you only need one supervisor for every four, or
> even every six. So, there's a lot more dealing positions, to get your
> foot in the door. Shift manager is probably the best job. You have a
> lot of responsibility, a lot of discretion, a lot of decision capability, but
> you're not hounded on a daily basis by people above you. A casino
> manager on the other hand has two to four who he has to report to.
> The top position would be shift manager. I did that, but I would do it
> again. I don't want any responsibility. But I'd like to get through it
> until I'm 70. There are occasions where I the aches and pains get to
> me. But, I still look forward to going to work every day. There's a
> saying in the business that one day dealers will have to go find real
> jobs. I'm a full-time employee, work 8 hour shifts, five days a week.
> Where I work, full-time employees earn one day of vacation every
> paycheck, but you can't find that everywhere (Karl, white dual rate,
> Las Vegas).

Workers see increasing their tips as advancement, as well as moving up into
supervisory roles.

> I'd like to become a full-time supervisor in about five years. Yes, the
> pay is cut because you get a salary instead of your money every day
> but in the long run, I don't know how much longer my body will hold
> up in that box. When I fill-in for supervisor, I make $22 an hour.
> You're not going to be a millionaire, but you're not going to hurt

either. Because people are always going to gamble, people are always going to go out and eat in restaurants, whether they have money or not, they're always going to find a way. You're always going to make money. And you don't need a college degree. Unless you're going to have a major where the money's good, going to school, if you like an industry of customer service, why not the casino business, where you don't need to go to school, pay money back to student loans and you're making cash every day. You're generally going to make a decent living. I can provide for my children. I didn't have to have two jobs and the casino offered free day care. (Andrea, dual rate in poker, Las Vegas)

From a long-term perspective, many dealers saw their careers moving into supervisory roles, to avoid burnout as dealers and to take advantage of the full-time status in management. Many dealers expressed not wanting to move into management because it's a higher stress job. Managers have to deal with conflict among players and with dealers, and handle unruly guests, like inebriated players. Managers have to make decisions at tables when a dispute arises and deal with players who have bad reactions to the decision. "It's also known as closer to the floor, closer to the door. The previous poker manager was there five years and was fired quickly to hire someone new and pay them less. Management has a high turnover but dealers can be around forever" (Jessica, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Thus, managers are at a greater risk of losing their jobs than dealers. Even so, because dealing is a very physical job that requires standing for long periods of time (with the exception of poker) and involves repetitive motion, many older dealers see management as the next step in their careers. "Even though it doesn't appear to be, it's a very physical job. I think my body is going to force me into a management position" (Jenny, white black jack dealer, West Michigan). And,

> I love the casino business but I couldn't work at the casino for eight hours a day anymore. There's definitely a burn out point. The problem is when most people reach that burn out point, they have nothing…they have no other options. Especially the floor workers, the people who work on the floor, like the dealers, the floor men. (Scott, white casino employer, Las Vegas)

> A lot of people don't have the personality to get them through the job, or the motivation. Dealing is a pretty unique job. You're like a human robot. You just do the same thing over and over and over again." (Scott white casino employer, Las Vegas)

In Las Vegas, one dealer reflected, "Dealing isn't a bad job. It's definitely allowed me to do things. I moved into a beautiful new apartment, I paid off debt. Monetary wise, it's afforded me things that marketing wouldn't have. You have to be prepared for politics, playing the game, playing the casino situation" (Marissa, white black jack dealer, Las Vegas). Before dealing, Katie (white dual rate party pits, Las Vegas) worked as a waitress in restaurants but explained,

> I had to find a tipping job when I came back to Las Vegas. I couldn't survive on minimum wage which was around $7 an hour. I needed something that paid enough and was long-term because I was a single mom to two girls. I don't have any education past high school. I found an ad on Craigslist for party pit dealer, no experience necessary, will train, model-type dealers. I talked with other people who lived here who were dealers and it was definitely a career, not just something that would get you by for the time, but you could make a living off it and be okay. I sent in a head photo and was invited to an interview. In the interview, I was asked if I felt comfortable wearing sexy clothes and to tell her about my customer service. The classes started the next day and the job wasn't guaranteed. The training was free, but I didn't have any money. If I learned the training well, for a couple of weeks, then they could place me. But it ended up being eight weeks, because all the pits were fill and they couldn't place me.

For tipped jobs, the average income reported to the government bears very little relation to the amount of money dealers took home from the job. The perceptions of

dealers about job quality were more complex than simply moving from being a dealer

to becoming a manager.

Dealers are strategic in their work to position themselves to be converted to

full-time status. Because full-time dealers don't often quit, full-time dealing positions

are hard to come by.

> What I see at stations, is they have the list of the on-call dealers
> who've been there the longest. In a situation where they're going to
> hire a full-time dealer, they go to the top of that list. Me, I'm versatile.
> I do the cashiering, I do the supervising and I can deal. The other
> dealers don't understand, that if you can do all those, your shot at it is
> better. They're going to put you in first because they know they can
> use you everywhere. You're not just stuck in dealing. A lot of on-call
> dealers now are getting three days. I'm getting five, because I'm
> picking up cashiering shifts, dealing shifts and supervising shifts. I'm
> flexible in the spot where they need it. The other dealers are only
> dealers and can't fill in the spots if someone's sick or taking time off.
> They're going to give me more days because of what I can do for
> them. The other dealers don't' understand, they ask me why I'm
> getting so many hours. I say, well if you wanted to cashier, or
> supervise, you would get them. But if you don't want to supervise
> because it's stressful, or you don't want to cashier because it's stupid,
> they don't see the long picture. I'm going to get to full-time before
> they will because of what I can do for the company. Who's going to
> be versatile. (Andrea, dual rate, Las Vegas poker room)

To move up to a full-time position and to receive benefits, dealers have to be

versatile, available to do any job, at any time, whether it's cashiering, dealing or

supervising. One advantage of dealing in Las Vegas is the high demand for dealers

among the casinos. If a dealer is unhappy with her current position, then a competing

casino may have a job to offer her down the street. Considering the high rates of

turnover in the dealing business, dealers do jump from room to room. Dealers will

often change rooms based on the volume of players and to avoid slow rooms. But

getting full-time work is an issue for many dealers and often times, dealers will work two part-time jobs. This is difficult for poker dealers on the Vegas strip because many casinos hold special tournaments two or three times a year when they require their part-time dealers to work full-time and don't provide an early-out list (dealers assigned to a shift can add their names to the early-out list and leave early if play is slow). "If you're working two jobs, you constantly have to juggle where you're working and what shift you're going to have" (Andy, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Or,

> My typical, it's changed over time, because of the economy and the competition. There was a time when my bad day was I took home $200 in tips. Now, that's a good day. Now if I work a full eight hour day, I'm typically going to take home $150 to $200 in tips. This week I worked Tuesday morning at 3 am and I earned $13. The next night I worked I made $41. There wasn't a consistent game. But if I can work shifts with consistent games, then I can make that kind of money. A typical floor supervisor makes somewhere from $140 to a little over $200 but there's a big tax difference. It's reported income to taxes. Our tip money is taxed in compliance with the IRS that says basically that we're going to be taxed as if we're making x number of dollars in tips and that's how that works. Even if you're making more in tips, you're paying less in taxes. For the most part, there's a tax benefit, even if you end up paying more on nights like the one I had when I made $13. So, even if you earn the same amount as floor supervisors, you usually come out ahead. (Robert, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Because dealers rely on tips for their incomes, their pay varies according to night and is tied to the general state of the economy. In the most recent recession, dealers saw their incomes decrease from less tourism and less generous tipping.

Some casino workers transfer from other department in the casino industry or from other areas of the service sector.

As a casino host, you're dealing with the VIP guests, you're trying to bring in the big customers, and the big players and then marketing casino events. They started us at $26,000. The possibility of a raise or a bonus wasn't really on the table. You're putting in a lot of time, it's salary, you're working six or seven days a week, coming in to meet customers and trying to hustle players. And all you're getting is $26,000. So when I found out the dealers were making more money in a less stressful position, that sounded appealing. I saw my earnings double as a dealer. (Marissa, white black jack dealer, Las Vegas)

Even though the hourly rate was less, the opportunity to earn tips proved to more lucrative for the overall wages. "It really depends on where you work. Like the stations, they usually average anywhere from $60 to $100 a shift. Most places average $200 to $250 but that's on the strip" (Karen, white casino employer, Las Vegas). In the central strip area of Las Vegas, such as the Wynn, the Bellagio and the MGM properties, offer a higher earnings potential to dealers, as well as party pits. The neighborhood casinos, depending on their geographical area in Las Vegas, are also desirable locations off the tourist track. There are more likely to be local regulars at the neighborhood casinos and tipping is steady. Andrea (Latina dual rate) explained,

On the strip, there may be a lot more tips for everybody, because they're tourists, or sometimes it hurts them because they don't know they're supposed to tip because tourists just come and play and don't tip. At a locals' casino, everybody knows what they're supposed to do. They come in every day, you see the same people every day. You can count going to a locals' casino and know that you're going to make money that day. On the strip, you don't know but in the locals' casino, they're consistent. They're always there, they're always going to throw you a dollar, and they're always going to complain about the same things every day.

There are complex rules for workers to navigate from part to full time work with benefits. At times, part-time dealers will take on some supervisory shifts to fill out

their schedule and earn extra money. Showing commitment, being flexible and

consistently available helps dealers to secure the best shifts. "When I was full-time, it

took me about a year and a half to get a full-time day shift job. I worked nights

mostly" (Andrea, dual rate in a Las Vegas poker room). Or,

> We were having a situation, a problem with when people were getting
> scheduled. Who becomes full-time from part-time. They said, well
> here in Vegas, we do everything by seniority because that's what
> everyone else does. You guys promote here by seniority, it's the worst
> thing I've ever seen. It's how long you've been at that particular
> place, how long you've been at that property. They don't care about
> how much experience, my experience doesn't mean anything to them.
> Even if you go talk to the day shift manager, he'll say, oh I have some
> of the worst dealers. Because all these guys have to know is how to
> play the game. We have a point system and once you get to 15 points,
> you'll be terminated. You get points by calling in sick, coming to
> work late, asking to leave work early, no call and no show, have a
> situation happen at the table where you get disciplinary action taken
> against you, it all adds up. And you lose a point every month. So
> these guys, they know they've been bad, but they know how to be
> good for a few months, to manipulate the system. They don't care
> how good you are at your job. But they think that their job is to be
> entertainment, to be there to socialize. They've created their own
> problem here with the seniority system. The next time a full-time
> dealer position opens, they don't do evaluations. They don't do it
> based on who's the best. They do it on who's worked here the longest.
> (Sharon, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

> We were told that we'd be full-time within 2-5 years and have benefits
> paid for. Find out, there's dealers at the strip casino who've worked
> there 8 -9 years and are still part-time and don't have benefits. They
> hired on 23 dealers in my group. They did a lottery drawing to see
> who would get seniority, to see who would get the first opportunity to
> get a full-time position once the older dealers retire. My manager has
> told me that he wishes he could do it another way, based on the dealers
> who want to be in there to work. There are some dealers who as soon
> as they get there, sign the EO or early out list. In my group, another
> dealer drew #1 and I could become full-time after him 1 month later, 3
> years later, 5 years later, it's unknown. The company has to keep a
> certain percentage of dealers full-time within the entire international
> company and across all their properties. I'm a single mom and need

health insurance paid for my daughter. I work three to four months a week, plus I pay $200 a month on insurance. My hours have to average under 32 hours a week, so in a quarter of 12 – 14 weeks, I can put in 40 hours for eight weeks but then the last 2-4 weeks, I'll be working one or two days a week. The dealer coordinator wants to get in the younger dealers, to improve play and the reputation of the room. (Jessica, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

There are some people who prefer being a supervisor. And it's very often a quicker road to getting a full-time position. Full-time work is very hard to get here. It's a little faster to go through supervising. But there's less job security. Floor people tend to get fired a lot faster than dealers. Some people are getting older and they can't deal any longer. Their hands aren't there, they can't sit for as long. It's a nice change of pace, when you've been doing the same thing. Sometimes it's just nice to be doing something different. And there's a certain amount of authority that comes with it. There's something to be said for being entrusted with authority and responsibility. Some people do it as an ego thing. They want to be in charge. You can't be a good floor manager if you haven't done the job that you're managing. Is it a requirement? It should be. (Robert, white poker dealer, Las Vegas).

Moving into management is one way to secure a full-time position with benefits, but the tradeoff is often a decreased salary. Some describe the dealers' choice to move into management as "all women, seeing the big picture" (Sharon, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Or,

In 2004, at the station, they asked me if I wanted to pick up some shifts. I was full-time dealing, but they asked me if I wanted to start supervising. They asked what my long-term goals are. I don't want to deal when I'm 70. I don't want to deal when I'm 60. I'd even rather be a poker manager and work my way that far up. Because I don't want to deal forever. So when they asked, I said sign me up. It gives you a break from dealing, because you get tired of being in the box every day. So I thought, that will change things up, I can supervise, I can learn and then I can also deal (Andrea, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas).

Dealers know their ranking on the seniority list and can estimate how long it will take them to become full-time dealers. It is common knowledge because the list is

130

publically posted. If they take a supervisory position, they can transition to full-time

work and receive benefits, as well as a reduced but secure salary. To get a floor

manager position, interviews are required because it isn't based on seniority but on

the basis of a regular interview process to be hired. Yet, management positions held a

lower status among casino workers than dealer positions.

> I don't want to move into management because I like being a peon. I
> do my eight hours, I work Monday through Friday and I have
> weekends off. That's all I want, leave me alone. Our boss is after me
> numerous times to stand in and I tell him that I'm not interested. If
> you're on the floor and someone calls you over and you made a bad
> decision, it's all going to come on you and go downhill. To me, it's
> not worth it. I don't get into trouble. (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las
> Vegas)

> Most people I talk to who supervise initially volunteered to do so when
> the casino needed help. But once you volunteer, they're never going
> to let you go back to just being a dealer. You're the sucker who
> volunteered. (Robert, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Kevin, a white casino manager in Las Vegas, explained that moving into management

is often perceived by dealers as a demotion from dealing cards.

> The casino business tends to attract people, I don't think that rebels are
> the right word, but people who don't like a lot of…in this business,
> you're almost an independent contractor. You can decide how much
> money you make, how friendly you are to the customers, how fast you
> are, how much you're going to get tipped. It brings in a lot of people
> who don't necessarily like punching a time clock 9 – 5, the casino
> business is appealing. My ideal candidate for dealer school is
> someone who has completed maybe one to two years of college, so I
> know they have some intelligence level and they can handle the math
> and following the rules. But they haven't, I don't like to take someone
> off a career path but if they're interested and say what field they're
> studying, I tell them they might make $35,000 in an entry-level job in
> that field but will make $60,000 when you start off just pitching cards
> around a table. You can't make that kind of money in another kind of
> industry. The room for advancement, getting quote promoted to a
> floor person is actually a demotion. You have responsibility, you have

to wear a suit to work, not only do you not make as much, but your entire amount comes on a paycheck. If someone doesn't report all their tips, there's a huge tax advantage there. But if you bring in someone who was making $14 an hour at Verizon and you tell them it's going to be $20 an hour, they're just looking at that difference. Because they don't know how to deal, it's still mysterious thing they can't do. They justify it, I don't know how to do that. (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

If a supervisor doesn't work his or her way up from the floor as a dealer to management, there is animosity among the dealers towards the supervisor.

Many people say, I can't work for a woman who is just a paper pusher, following the company line and doesn't really care for us. She doesn't have the experience as a dealer but supervises them. They don't feel that she's qualified to be our department head. The casino just says, no one else wants to do it, work on the floor. (Sharon, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

How a dealer views movement from dealing into management depends on their evaluation of monetary and nonmonetary characteristics of the job, and changes according to if they value monetary or nonmonetary benefits more.

Dealers generally agree that the casino industry is recession proof, even if they did see a hit on their income after the Great Recession. Many said that their incomes have already rebounded. In the strip casinos, dealers aren't allowed to share their tips with the supervisors but in the station casinos (which are the "locals" casinos in the suburbs of Las Vegas), it's their discretion if they want to tip and how much. Tipping can garner better treatment from supervisors because they have decision-making power over the dealers' schedules on the floor. For example, supervisors can choose who to send home early from a shift. Andrea, a Latina dual rate who tips out the supervisors, explained,

Because they don't like those other dealers, they're going to send them home and they're not going to send you home because they like you, they want you to work and make money. They'll send the other ones home. I see it, it happens. And I think it has to do with tipping. If you throw them $10 on top of their $22 an hour and there's ten dealers, they're making another $100 a day. And if you don't tip them, they remember that, and say, well if that person doesn't tip, they're going home.

By informally sharing their tips with supervisors, dealers can increase their chances of getting the best schedules on the floor.

Advancement in the casino industry is complex and consists of workers moving to better tipped positions or moving into supervisory positions. Because it's a norm in the casino industry to employ a contingent workforce of dealers, it can be very difficult for workers to advance into better full-time jobs from part-time jobs. "I came in one day and there was a memo there that said if you work in this poker room, you can't work in any other poker room. None of these jobs that I had was full-time, they were all part-time. Because of that, I left" (Robert, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). And,

[To reach full-time status] it just depends. I'm eighth on the list but I've been at the same casino for over four years. The people ahead of me aren't quitting and for a while there were a lot of full timers with benefits. There's a lot of attrition, people quit or get fired and they weren't replaced. So there's a lot more part timers and fewer full timers. So it's really difficult to get full time. (Andy, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Dealers see increasing their tips as job advancement and can do so by cultivating higher tips from players, by securing the better shifts on the floor or by moving to a higher-end casino.

From the perspective of those working in the casino industry, what are considered to be the bad, better, and good jobs? Jessica, a white poker dealer who used to work in the front of house in restaurants, said "This is the most money I've ever made in my life. I've always lived paycheck to paycheck. I have players tip me when I sit down, when I get up, because I have red hair. They'll say, here's a red for a red, which is a $5 tip. That's why I keep it red." For the majority of dealers, getting into dealing was an economic step-up for them, better paid than their previous jobs. But for a minority of the dealers, the economic recession forced them out of their jobs and it was a step-down for them to deal.

> In four years of dealing, it's been a decent job. I've had benefits on and off. The casinos don't want to pay you benefits, they limit your hours but when the World of Series of Poker comes around, we all work extra. So most of us qualify for these benefits. We'll have them for six months or so and then they don't schedule us enough and then they take them away. [To qualify] you have to work an average of thirty hours a week in two consecutive quarters. But they're pretty diligent about keeping track. If you get close to that in the second quarter, they pretty much take you off the schedule. So, it's really difficult to get benefits and it's really difficult to hang on to them. (Andy, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Perspectives on "good" and "bad" jobs in casinos vary by age. Younger workers see good jobs as the positions that hold the most promise of attracting gamblers to the table who consistently tip the dealers. This can be secured by moving between games at the same casino or by moving between casinos. Among dealers in local labor markets, such as in Las Vegas and Detroit, dealers often break-in to games or at casinos that are less lucrative, with hopes of securing advancement to better paying games or casinos. Some workers valued the potential of management to reduce the

134

stress and to secure a long-term career in the casino business as better than higher

earnings.

> It's low stress and longevity versus pay. I think choosing less stress
> and longevity would be more valuable than having the pay. Now that
> I'm middle aged, the age that I am, the experience that I have, I'll
> work there, at the casino for the benefits. The perks of being a casino
> worker, discounted meals, health benefits, all of those type of benefits.
> I get that as a part-time or full-time worker there. Even though the
> money would be less than on the table games side, anywhere from $5
> to $8 less. (Darryl, Black black jack dealer, Detroit)

> Many of the managers that I had previously worked under and some
> that I've seen in a lot of places, they're burned out dealers. They for
> one reason or another, their back can't take it anymore, their shoulders
> are bad, they don't want to deal with the players anymore. And that's
> absolutely the worst mold to take your managers from. While they
> know what happens at the table and what it's like to sit in the box as a
> dealer, they also are jaded. I try to bring in managers without dealing
> experience, maybe some playing experience, because they don't see a
> dealer make $250 in tips over a day and say I should have made that,
> all I had to do was deal today, instead of my $175 on my paycheck.
> Food and beverage is the best place to find managers, other service
> industries to bring people over, rather than from within. It's hard to
> tell someone, today you're their equal and tomorrow you're their boss.
> (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

Some dealers viewed moving into management as increasing their chances to secure a

better job eventually.

> For me, it's [becoming a games supervisor] is one step closer to being
> a pit boss. You get four weeks' vacation. It's only one or two dollars
> less than us in pay. So, $25 or $26 an hour. There's some supervisors
> who make $35 an hour. They've been here for ten years. It's
> something I eventually want, and then to be a pit boss. (Adam, white
> table games dealer, Detroit)

Other workers valued the security of receiving benefits from management jobs as

better than the insecurity of receiving benefits from dealing if they worked the

minimum number of hours. Sharon worked for many years as a manager and dealer

135

coordinator of a California card room. She retired, lost everything in the Great

Recession and moved to Las Vegas for a new job as a strip poker dealer.

> I dealt for a year and a half and then I started moving up the ladder into management. The reason I was working for was the health insurance benefits, benefits was a big thing. As a dealer, I was making $120 a day in cash, so I was making $600 a week. The paycheck I never saw, because whatever hours I worked paid for benefits. The paycheck was a wash, you just got your tips. The one thing they told us at dealer school was learn more games, and move up. All you had to do was show interest to the supervisors and the management and they knew that you were walking away from a cash job that paid really well. Supervisors job still paid really well, but it wasn't the cash. I moved up from my first part-time dealer to be an assistant floor. I would assist the floor people, from there I worked to a full-time floor manager. From there, I took a full-time position as a dealer coordinator. I put the dealers to work, organized breaks, starting and ending shifts, that kind of thing. I earned $30 an hour plus full benefits, paid for by the casino. Once you move into management, the casino pays for the benefits. The big picture is you do make more money, the cash you're making, lots of dealers don't declare all of their tips. Here at the major strip casino, you have to work 30 hours to keep your benefits. We're all considered on-call, so they don't give us enough hours to receive benefits. As a supervisor, you're there for eight hours and you get paid for those hours. I can get paid when I'm sick as a supervisor and I can still work. I can't deal if I'm injured or sick. (Sharon, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

The assessment of job quality in casino gaming is complex and workers incorporate

nonmonetary characteristics and monetary characteristics into their evaluation of job

quality.

Workers' perception of bad and better jobs influences the types of jobs that

they seek out in casinos. For example, dealers sought jobs that were likely to award

them full-time dealing work, if they could secure a good position on the ranked

promotional list that casinos internally manage according to seniority. Or, workers

sought jobs in casino establishments that gave them the opportunity to both be a

dealer and be in management (a dual rate). This finding supports earlier research by Jeffrey Sallaz (2009:76) who noted that casino workers viewed "dealing as a first step onto a solid career ladder; from here they aspire to move into casino management" or into financial and retail sectors. Casino workers also evaluated jobs on the basis of consistent tipping from customers and would try to position themselves to be hired into the casinos that had a reputation for having the best tipping customers. And older dealers who were fatiguing from the fast paced and difficult table gaming work often viewed management positions as better jobs than dealing because the management jobs were a steady paycheck and offered benefits.

While there was no single definition of job quality among dealers, there were shared beliefs about what made their job bad or good, and what type of job they perceived to be better. An important measure of job quality for casino workers was promotional opportunity, whether that was awarded from being converted from part- to full-time status, being assigned to shifts with better tips from players, or transitioning to supervisory or managerial roles. These findings show that workers in entry-level, low-wage service jobs may view their current job of poor quality, but are motivated to work in the job based on their belief that it will lead to a better job. In my comparative case study, workers in casino gaming and restaurant kitchens shared this type of reasoning for accepting employment in kitchens or casinos. Considering that pay, health insurance and pension benefits are the three most typical measures used by scholars to assess job quality (Kalleberg et. al 2000), it is striking that despite the absence of these characteristics in their jobs, casino and restaurant

workers did not view their jobs as bad, because of the potential the job awarded to advance into better jobs that did offer more pay, stability and in casinos, health benefits. Workers used the job quality framework of bad, better and good jobs to describe the occupational structure within restaurant kitchens and casino gaming, helping to explain the labor queues found in each type of work.

Conclusion

Who employers want varies by the type of service production line, based on their beliefs of the best type of worker for the demands of the job and their preferences for hiring workers from particular backgrounds (Moss and Tilly 2001). Even though employers may describe the best worker for any particular job on the basis of skill, experience, aptitude, or productivity, who employers associate with these qualities can be associated more strongly with one group of workers than other groups. In my findings, employers were likely to hire workers from different backgrounds for the entry-level positions but these workers were not equally as likely to advance to better positions (discussed in chapter five). At the bottom of the labor market, workers with low levels of education gain skills through work experience. The longer a worker is in the labor force and employed, the more skills the worker will gain. Some have emphasized that these skills are learned at the bottom (or in low-wage work) through social networks on the job (Waldinger and Lichter 2003).

The demands of the labor process in each type of workplace are very similar. Both processes involve fast-paced, heavily demanding and stress work. Preparing food and dealing cards are both highly physical work, requiring workers to do

repetitive motions very quickly while standing (or sometimes sitting in casinos). Yet, even though the labor processes are very similar and both workplaces show integration at the entry-level positions, the internal job ladders look very different, with advanced positions showing patterns of segmentation.

In restaurants, those with decision-making power seek workers who they believe not only have the skills to do their part on the service line, but can also join the employee group and work well with other kitchen workers. The data collected from managers, head chefs and sous chefs showed that workers were evaluated for hire and promotion on the basis of their speed and efficiency of work. Workers were also evaluated on the likelihood that they could gain social acceptance from the other kitchen staff. I discuss in chapter five the ways that workers were also evaluated for hire and promotion into advanced positions on their acceptance of and participation in kitchen banter. Casino gaming is similarly demanding physically with a fast pace of work. Employers sought casino dealers who could deal the game accurately and efficiently. Employers seek workers who they believe not only have the skills to deal quickly and effectively without error in the gaming pit, but who also can do interpersonal management within the acceptable boundaries of the casino's rules of dealing. Thus, employers' preferences for workers shape the labor force employed in these service production lines. Network hiring is more prevalent in restaurant kitchens than in casino gaming, where hiring is controlled more by management.

The segmentation of internal job ladders in restaurant kitchens and gaming pits can be explained at the point of workers entry into these ladders and their

experiences once in the labor force on the job. Workers enter into these occupations from the labor market through labor queues and job queues. Employers want particular kinds of workers to match the demands of either the teamwork dynamics in the kitchen or customer dynamics in casino gaming. The processes of hiring and screening workers follow from employers specific demands for labor (Moss and Tilly 2001; Waldinger and Lichter 2003). Job queues and labor queues can help to explain why entry-level jobs are integrated in my selected occupational cases, but do not help to explain why but more advanced positions are segmented. To do so, it is essential to look past the preferences of workers and management to the labor relations and interactions at work to explain why some groups have more advantage than others to advance to better jobs.

Workers want to navigate internal job ladders to the best jobs, often staying within the same occupational structure of the service production line for their entire career. Workers' perspectives on job quality varies by service production line — what counts as good jobs for workers is different in restaurant kitchens and casino gaming. The literature on job quality tends to define good and bad jobs using monetary characteristics like earnings and benefits (Acemoglu 2001; Bluestone and Harrison 1982; Fuchs 1968; Esping-Anderson 1990; Nelson 1994) or workplace flexibility (Kalleberg 2003). Yet, workers in these internal occupational ladders describe job quality also with nonmonetary characteristics like interpersonal dynamics, degree of autonomy, and access to better jobs. Workers also take into account these nonmonetary characteristics when evaluating jobs that require a

moderate to high degree of flexibility from its workers — and often count these jobs as good. This is a distinct finding from the existing literature, which has evaluated these jobs as bad because they don't offer as high of monetary value or give benefits to workers. But for workers in the service sector, in which most jobs require moderate to high degree of flexibility from the labor force, workers evaluated job quality with nonmonetary characteristics in addition to monetary ones.

In my comparison of the labor process between restaurant kitchens and casino gaming, there were striking similarities between the specific demands of each type of work. The labor process in kitchens and casinos similarly demand fast, efficient, and highly coordinated skills to produce a service. Employers seek workers who have a similar set of skills and experiences for casino work and restaurant work for entry-level jobs. If there is a similar labor process and employer demand for workers, then why are there differences in segmentation and mobility within internal job ladders? In the patterns of mobility, men do better in restaurant kitchens and women do better in casino gaming. To explain these divergences in mobility, I examine workplace interaction in the next chapter.

Chapter Five:
Workplace Interaction and Segmentation of Internal Job Ladders

My research has shown that inequality is maintained at work, even within types of workplaces that show patterns of integration in entry-level positions. This chapter will describe the internal ladders that have segmented advanced positions and explain why some workers are more likely to secure better jobs in restaurant kitchens and casino gaming via their participation in workplace banter. Segregated advanced jobs in gaming were 43% women and 25% people of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers) and in restaurant kitchens were 22% women and 45% people of color (including Black, Asian and Latino workers) (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Banter is an interactional strategy of exclusionary closure or boundary making in restaurant kitchens and an interactional strategy of crossing normative boundaries in casino gaming. Workers draw symbolic boundaries along socially constructed characteristics that organize workers into groups by gender via boundary work. In restaurant kitchens, men do boundary work to construct symbolic, gendered boundaries between themselves and women, to hoard their opportunities and socially isolate women in the workplace. In casino gaming, women do boundary work to cross the symbolic, gendered boundaries constructed around doing gender appropriately in the workplace (West and Zimmerman 1987). By looking inside of work organizations at face-to-face interaction, my research shows how and why advanced occupations are segmented. Social boundaries at work translate into unequal access to better, advanced positions in the workplace and can explain the differences in segmentation with the internal job ladders.

142

Workplace banter is a type of interactional gendered boundary making or crossing in interactive food, hospitality and personal service work that is similar to, but distinct from, emotional labor. Hochschild (1983: 147) identified three characteristics that define jobs requiring emotional labor: includes personal contact with the public; requires making another person feel particular emotions; retains employer control over emotional activities of employees. In food, hospitality, and personal service jobs that require a team to produce the service and deliver it to customers for consumption, the dynamic among the team becomes paramount for job success. While emotional labor is involved in doing workplace banter, the practice of bantering among the work group or with customers is unscripted, is not required by employers and does not always involve interaction with the public.

Research has shown that social exclusion is an important mechanism that privileged groups use to retain their advantage in the labor market (Royster 2003). Social exclusion has significant negative consequences for out-group members in the opportunity structure at work, especially in dynamic interactional workplaces where team members work on a service production line. Micro-interactions among workers and with management and customers all contribute to a hostile workplace for some groups of workers — thus explaining differences in job entry and mobility. Workplace banter is a type of gender boundary making in the workplace that contributes to opportunity hoarding by the most privileged groups of workers, reproducing inequality at work. And in restaurant kitchens, the segmentation of advanced positions is more highly driven by men, who are the more privileged

workers, using banter to retain their advantage in the workplace by creating gender

boundaries apart from women in the kitchen. In casino gaming, the segmentation of

advanced positions is more highly driven by women using banter to gain advantage in

the workplace by creating gender boundaries apart from men in casinos. The type of

engagement in banter requires noncompliance with official rules of engagement

among the work group in restaurant kitchens and with customers in casino gaming.

Rules governing intergroup interactions are central to explaining differences

in occupational integration and job mobility across workplace context. In a study of

interactions among women and men sales professionals outside of the office, Morgan

and Martin (2006) found that the type of interactive setting had different implications

for the type of boundary-making or boundary-crossing women had to accomplish for

their career advancement. In heterosocial settings (mixed gender), like lunches or

dinners at restaurants, some women reported engaging in sexual banter to retain

clients and to advance their careers but while maintaining boundaries between

themselves and the clients. In homo-social settings (same gender), like golf courses

or strip clubs, most women reported they were excluded from being invited to join

their men colleagues. Some women crossed this masculine boundary to play golf for

example, but where marked by their difference with the rules of golf, like men's and

women's golf tees. One implication of exclusion is the missed opportunity to have

extra networking time with clients and the weaker personal relationships have a

negative effect on their sales. What is intriguing about their study is that women had

to both do boundary making and boundary crossing to advance their careers, depending on the type of interactive setting.

Intergroup interactions produce dynamics of power that influences status, authority and prestige among workers. Bantering among coworkers is one form of power exercised on the job, and is especially common at worksites that require high levels of interaction between workers on a service production floor. Workplace norms shape the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable bantering behavior and can vary across firms. This variation in part is determined by the composition of the workforce and the degree to which the workplace is integrated. Unacceptable bantering consists of unwanted joking or behavior that could be a routine feature of jobs. Acceptable bantering is a form of social bonding and creates a sense of togetherness, even solidarity. Joking in all men-only settings like sports locker rooms and fraternities fosters in-group bonding (Curry 1991; Lyman 1987). How workers and managers negotiate the boundaries of bantering can increase their inclusion to the group or their exclusion from the group. Thus, bantering is a significant aspect of workplace power and group dynamics that determine perceptions of skilled workers and managers.

Even though there are many different types of banter, sexualized banter has received the most attention in the scholarly literature (Dellinger and Williams 2002; Guiffre and Williams 1994; Lerum 2004). Less attention has been paid to racialized and sexist forms of banter among coworkers and between workers and clients in the workplace. Bantering is most often analyzed as potentially leading to harassment or

to social bonding but rarely, if at all to group inclusion, workplace success and access to occupational opportunity. Moreover, bantering has been described in ways that leave out the complex identifies of those participating or observing. Most frequently, bantering is described as taking place between men and women on the job, without simultaneously analyzing race/ethnicity or other social characteristics of groups.

How people react to sexualized banter as a normative part of their job routine varies. Dellinger and Williams (2002) noted that even though sexual behavior is commonplace in workplaces, few women identify it as harassment. But they also observed occasions when women sought out and enjoyed highly sexualized jobs. By comparing a pornographic publishing house with a feminist publishing house, they observed that tolerance for sexual banter varied but found higher tolerance at the pornographic magazine workplace. Whether or not sexualized banter influenced status and in-group inclusion depended on the workplace context and culture. They wrote, "We need more case studies of organizational sexuality in a variety of workplace settings to broaden our understanding of how organizational culture influences workplace definitions of acceptable and unacceptable sexual joking and behavior" (p. 255). Research should also examine how bantering impacts the inclusion and exclusion of different groups by gender, race and sexuality. Moreover, how does workplace banter impact groups' access to occupational opportunities, such as job mobility into management positions? Notably, Lerum argued that sexualized relations between coworkers were acceptable in workplaces that were free of "cultural outsiders" that would increase "the likelihood of sexualized trouble" (p.

773). But how do organizational sexuality and other forms of banter shape mixed-group dynamics within integrated occupations and workplaces?

In this chapter, I examine how the organizational logic of workplace banter rewards particular groups' occupational advancement. Workplace banter isn't codified in policies or taught in formal training, but is part of the labor process within these two types of interactive service workplaces. The practices of workplace banter are not only shaped by how the labor process is organized and regulated in each type of workplace, but also by the type of banter and with whom the banter takes place. I argue that banter is a type of strategy used by workers to manage their differences among the work group and to retain more opportunity for advancement to some workers over others. This strategy contributes to the retention of privilege and power for in-group members and the continued stratification of the workplace for out-group members. Workplace banter reflects power and status in the workplace, having significant consequences for the normalization of stratified mobility in work organizations that disadvantages particular groups of workers. The mechanisms of inequality via employment relations and workplace dynamics are identified in this chapter on workplace interaction.

My comparative case study highlights the importance of examining variation across occupational context to see how interactional processes change according to how the workplace is organized and regulated. By taking into account this intersection, my dissertation shows how variations in rules of conduct and workplace culture awards privilege or disadvantage to groups in different ways, and thus

explains why there are opposing patterns of integration in these similar occupational sites. I consider the normalization of discrimination in workplace culture and how banter and joking can contribute to restricting the genuine integration of women and people of color into workplaces. Out-group members can be socially included in the workplace if they interact with others by successfully participating in the specific type of organizational social boundary. Yet, this participation normalizes power differences between in-group members who have a higher status, more authority and control the rules of interaction. In restaurant kitchens, these power differences have the effect of highlighting gender and racial differences among the diverse kitchen staff, even as banter is described by more privileged kitchen workers as neutralizing difference to create a more cohesive team. But workplace banter is not merely harmless but can be pervasive and severe, contributing to a hostile work environment for out-group members. And if those with discretionary power to promote perceive that employees fail to successfully participate in the gender boundary making in their work organization, they are unlikely to gain access to opportunities for upwards mobility.

Integrated, interactive workplaces pose a challenge to existing explanations for why members of certain groups are incorporated into particular levels of organizational hierarchies, namely tokenism. For each type of interactive service work, employers prefer a different group of workers based on their perceptions of who can perform the specific type of interactive gender boundary work required. In restaurant kitchens, men create gendered boundaries between themselves and women

148

to achieve opportunity hoarding. In casino gaming, women cross gendered boundaries between themselves and men to gain opportunity. In these types of workplaces, workers in more advanced positions do boundary work while interacting with others during the labor process to demonstrate their competency and to be perceived by management as qualified for promotions to better jobs.

In particular, my analysis adds to the existing literature on intergroup dynamics in two important ways. First, I argue that the skill and ability of employees to engage in informal banter influences their workplace success and that bantering is as important as skills and ability learned through training and experience. Second, I argue that job mobility is gained through a perceived ability to manage others while simultaneously participating in workplace banter. Working in interactive workplaces in service production both enhances and diminishes genuine integration of occupations in a mixed-group workplace — depending on how the work is organized and on the workplace rules of interactions. By comparing highly integrated workplaces in two sectors of the service industry, I add a deeper understanding of how workers engage in different types of banter. Does the degree to which coworkers participate in different types of banter secure their mixed-group inclusion and thus workplace success? How does managerial perception of bantering skill affect their ideas of a worker as an integral part of the service production team?

I present the data below to support my arguments by comparing the experiences of workers in segmented internal job ladders within two sectors of the service industry — full-service restaurant kitchens and casino gaming tables — to

better understand how workers engage in different types of banter. Does the degree to which coworkers participate in different types of banter secure their mixed-group inclusion and thus workplace success? How does managerial perception of bantering skill affect their ideas of a worker as an integral part of the service production team? Workplace banter can explain differences in mobility and stratification in service workplaces. Integrated workplaces are an opportunity to reduce inequality but even within integrated workplaces there are patterns of inequality. Banter is a key element of workplace interactions that reproduces inequality and limits the possibilities for shared mobility even within integrated workplaces.

Workplace Interaction in Restaurant Kitchens

In restaurant kitchens, interaction mostly takes place among backline employees on the service production line. Restaurant kitchens are often small spaces with little physical separation between workers, making interaction among the work group a constant feature of the workplace.

> There's going to be rivalries, there's going to be fights. But you need to all agree and keep constant in your mind that you're united to work together, through the love of what you're doing. You have to have that in a small tight kitchen. There's huge regimented kitchens, where it's like an assembly line but in a small, tight space, you need to work as a team. (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining)

On the food service production line, group dynamics plays an important role in the kitchen culture. Working closely together, space is limited between working bodies and the kitchen is hot, physical and difficult work. Working on the service production line requires a high degree of coordination among the workers at the

different food service stations in the kitchen. To produce food efficiently and with

consistent quality, kitchen workers have to coordinate their work together as a team.

> We have to get things out. I've been working in restaurants my whole
> life and timing is something that I know. I will call things out and try
> to get everybody to pick things up faster because we all work as a team
> and if I'm cooking something, I can't necessarily slow sauces down,
> for example. Certain sauces break after a time, if somebody's dish is
> going slow, then it will ruin what I'm working on. (Laura, white sous
> chef, fine dining)

Because the pace of work is fast and involves the assembly of different components

into a number of dishes, group cohesion is important for an effective and productive

service.

Restaurant workers are aware that the head chef has a large amount of

discretionary power for hiring and firing, with no outside oversight or rebuttal. Juan,

a Mexican line cook, said about another white woman line cook, "I'm going to do it

better than you can, and I'm going to kick your ass. And all the time, she was

pushing me. I was doing all of my work, but there were times when she was making

mistakes. I told her, now you're making mistakes and I'm doing it right…If you

blame someone else, you're not going to get in trouble." There is weak oversight of

the production line work — and especially at the bottom workers have to rely on

others to not report their mistakes to the top and to do their work together

successfully.

To survive working in a kitchen and be successful, participants consistently

remarked that a good work ethic and a thick skin are necessary. Fast, productive

work is essential to put out food quickly when ticket orders come in to the kitchen. A

thick skin is literal and figurative – tough skin is better to deal with heat, fire and

knives, while a resilient mental state is needed for stamina and keeping one's cool.

Kitchen workers have to work together to run a tight ship and get out the food on the

tickets. "That's the part of working in the kitchen and building a repertoire, is that

you should know what everybody else needs and you should have it done" (Tessa,

white line cook, fine dining). The high degree of team work in the kitchen intensifies

intergroup dynamics among workers, particularly because of the demands of difficult

work in the kitchen. The intensity of work in the kitchen makes conflict common

among the kitchen staff. To cope with stressful working conditions and tension

among workers, management encouraged joking and banter at work.

> One of the hardest parts of my job is to make everyone as happy as they can be, my employees, my customers, my bosses. What the boss wants me to do sometimes clashes with the needs of my employees. Or sometimes a customer and an employee will get into an argument. I have to take the customers side but I also don't want to upset a good employee to the point that they want to leave. There are conflicts all the time among my employees. Let's say one employee feels that they have some sort of seniority or they have a certain attitude, they'll be like, I've been here longer and they'll take it out, if somebody says something to them even if they're right, the employee will say something to them and they'll start arguing. Strong egos, head butting, especially if I develop a few of them at a time and they're up for a promotion. They're trying to tell each other what to do. I tell them we have to get along in those type of situations because we're a team and I want them to have that team spirit. To keep that team together, to keep building them up, even though they had conflicts. (Zachary, white fast food manager)

> They give each other a hard time sometimes but in a joking manner. I've never had too much, well minor things, but no real issues. It helps people get along better. I definitely like to have fun at work. I go around and joke around with everyone. I try to get them to have fun. But there are times where it's time to quit joking and just work. (Isaac, executive chef, hotel restaurant)

Kitchen workers also repeated the perspective that joking and banter helped to reduce stress and tension in the kitchen work day.

> Conflicts happen, they just do. People don't always get along. Hopefully everyone can handle it. People who've worked in restaurants know that they're stressed out, they're hot. We've had thermometers on the line and its 135 degrees on the line plus you're busy. You got the one guy who's running the line who might get to the point of telling everyone don't talk, just shut up, do what I tell you and don't say anything. I'll step down from my station and help others do it right, check on what they're doing, calm everyone down. In a busy restaurant, it can be busy for hours and hours and hours. If you don't get along, you don't make it long. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

In a high pressure, high intensity workplace, group cohesion is important for the efficiency and productivity of the line.

Authority from the top of the line is often exercised to get others in order lower on the line. In this highly coordinated work team, the team member at the top of the line often has the most managerial authority because there is no official manager outside of the service production team. Thus, there is weak managerial oversight on the service production line, with workers at the top of the line often exercising managerial control over workers at the bottom of the line.

Because many plates require a combination of components assembled by different kitchen workers, friction among workers can easily cause one or more workers to sabotage another's work quality.

> People get along. You know when you're working with someone who you're not going to get along with. There's people who don't click. If you don't get along with the person next to you in the kitchen, somebody's going to end up going. If you guys aren't going to get along, you're not going to like each other, someone will eventually not

> work there anymore. You have to get along, personalities have to match up. And if they don't, somebody leaves. Because if you come to work every day and the guy next to you, you don't get along with. You're not helping each other, you're making each other's work harder, somebody's going to leave. (Ethan, white sous chef, fine dining)

For workers without group inclusion, group dynamics can make completing their tasks on the food production line difficult and can even get them fired.

Positions in kitchen work are also gendered. Ethan, a white sous chef in fine dining said, "The women I've worked with before in the kitchen typically have all done prep. They don't really get on the line. In the kitchen, that's why we don't work with people. We're loud, we yell, we cuss, that's just who we are. We wouldn't go up front." And national employment data supports this observation, that women are hired into the entry-level positions but usually do not advance up the line into hot food preparation (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Many kitchen workers view the grill as a masculine position and it's often dominated by men in mixed-gender kitchens. Laura, a white sous chef (in fine dining) said,

> There's always been some trouble with me working on the grill. The guys always want to handle the meat. Every guy I know wants to use the grill, it's very masculine. So I always get stuck doing the sauté. I really enjoy the grill and there isn't any question of my skill. Even after I expressed interest, the chef would only let me do the grill if he wasn't there. Otherwise, I'd do sauté. He assured me that it wasn't based on skill but rather on his preference. He was the executive chef and I was the sous chef. It means that he's first in command and can say which person he wants to do what. I felt that he was underestimating my speed and my strength.

Executive chefs, who are 80% men, have the decision-making power to hire and promote workers into kitchen positions (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2013). This puts

154

many women at a disadvantage, because they aren't perceived by executive chefs as

capable in their efficiency and speed, two of the most valued skills in the kitchen.

Women in positions at the top of the line can experience challenges to their authority

from other men in the kitchen staff.

> Sometimes, the guys get offended or belittled, they feel off by a woman saying come on, hurry up. They don't like that. I feel like they don't listen to me because I'm a woman. If the executive chef [a man] were to say, ok, come on move this along, my sauce is going to break, they would just listen to them immediately without saying anything. Or even if it was another male sous chef. But because I'm a girl, it's just that way. They don't like to listen to me when I tell them to do something in the heat of the moment. It's my job, just as much as the executive chef, to tell them to do something a certain way. But for me, they give me a look, or an exasperated sigh, or complain. The main people on the line were white guys, young. They had an attitude. Chefs have an attitude. If you tell them what to do, especially if you're a woman, they don't like at you like their equal. They think, this is a girl in the kitchen. I've seen this in almost every kitchen that I've worked in. It's pretty much always that way, no matter how high end the place is. (Laura, white sous chef, fine dining)

Or,

> There are times when people just don't get along. It happens with me and Tessa. She's always pretending that she's my boss and I'm supposed to do whatever she says. She thinks that I'm stupid, that I'm not going to do it right. She's just doing the easy stuff. Sometimes, I'm doing all the prep and she's just walking around. I get made because I'm doing too much, more than I have to. The other day, she was joking but I said, come on Tessa, I'm not your slave. She said, yes you are. I said, you're kidding right? And she said no, I'm not. (Juan, Mexican line cook, fine dining)

In restaurant kitchens, women were more likely than men to be excluded from the

work group. This exclusion can affect women's promotional opportunities in the

kitchen, because women are perceived by management as unable to exert authority

over the staff.

155

There was a supervisor who was a woman when I started. We thought about promoting her to sous chef but we ended up not and she ended up parting ways with us. But she didn't get a lot of respect from the people. Once you lose that with them, you can lose respect in a minute and it's going to take 10 minutes to gain it back. She was at a point, I don't think she could have gotten the respect of 75% of the people at that time. With her mood, she was always in a bad mood, she was yelling at people, she was disrespectful. When I started, that was one of the things I had to do, to decide if we were going to promote her. I was very open with her and told her my concerns and she stayed for a couple of months and wasn't able to fix any of them. She decided to leave and go somewhere else. We have a lot of people who've been there for a long time and are set in their ways. Trying to change them all at once, while disrespecting them isn't going to work. You can't just tell them, you have to work with them. (Isaac, white executive chef, hotel kitchen)

This executive chef's kitchen staff was mostly men and he drew upon the staff's rejection of her authority and their attitude of disrespect towards her as rationale for not promoting her to sous chef. In his explanation, it was clear that he expected her to cultivate and secure cohesion with the kitchen staff but didn't help her navigate these working relationships. His suggestion was to work with them, rather than handing down orders to them but this contrasts the hierarchical nature of service production lines in kitchens.

In a team-intensive work environment, two primary characteristics of the kitchen culture are the *intensity of group cohesion* and *boundary making through worker exclusion*. In-group inclusion was particularly important for workers to retain their jobs. If a kitchen worker is not accepted into the group, others on the line can make that member's work suffer.

The one white guy in the kitchen, everybody is picking on him, giving him a hard time because every time he's on the line, he's always backed up, he's always asking for help. If it was someone they liked,

they would just help out, just jump in and help him out. But if someone they don't really like, they'll just let him get their butt kicked on the line. We get written up if a customer makes a complaint to the management, like if a burger is supposed to have an avocado but doesn't. Jose, if he's sees that I didn't put an avocado on, he'll just put it on there for me. But for certain people, he won't do that, so it can lead to a write-up. (Dennis, Asian line cook, fine dining)

In a team-oriented workplace, group cohesion is important for each team member's success. If workers perceive each other as part of the group, they will help each other to maintain their work, if not improve it.

Workplace banter is a constant and pervasive form of interaction in restaurant kitchens. Joking was a central feature of the rules of engagement among workers. Regardless of whether the kitchens were closed or open to the customers, part of the workplace culture was a steady flow of conversation and banter between different occupational levels, from the food prep positions up to the executive chef.

In an open kitchen, very little changes at all because our kitchen is a full exhibition kitchen. There's not really, with the exception of the dishwashing area, there's not really any part of it that's hidden, that you can't see. It's very much like being on a stage. It's that fourth wall that's just faces. Half the time you forget that they can hear you. They're looking at you and they just see a kitchen going on. There's a lot of communication and calls happening. There's a lot of chatter. There's just an endless stream of dialogue. (Seth, white sous chef, fine dining)

 "Making jokes makes the day go by quickly and makes it more fun" (Dennis, Asian line cook, fine dining).

You really need to be joking around a lot on the line. Humor's important, even if they're stressed out, you can still joke about it. If you can crack jokes with someone, no matter what, you're going to get through the night, and you're going to be okay. If there are tensions, any arguments on the line are dead at the end of service. That doesn't

157

always happen, sometimes you have cooks at each other's throats. (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining)

Workers in the most advanced and best jobs in the kitchen heavily influence the workplace culture. "The chef or the top person on the line usually sets the tone for the kitchen" (Dennis, Asian line cook, fine dining). Men are more likely to set the tone of the kitchen than women, because men are more likely to fill positions at the top of the service production line than women. Banter in restaurant kitchens is likely to utilize joking that is gendered, racialized, and sexualized. For example,

> You're just endlessly making fun of each other and stuff like that really is what goes on. Cause it's a brotherhood, we're all in this together, we're all the same . So racial difference usually goes out the window. Occasionally, you'll make jokes about it. There's never any intentional, I've never worked anywhere there's been intentional racism. I've been unaccepted by one of the kitchens I was running. It was all Latino staff with the exception of me. And I couldn't speak a lick of Spanish. And you know at first, who is this gringo coming in, so they made it really hard for me and really difficult. [How?] Not helping me in any way shape or form. Being obstinate about stuff. But then as soon as you've done two 13 or 14 hour days in a row with them, they understand, no no. We're actually just the same. We're all cooks. That's what it boils down to. We're all cooks. It transcends race. (Seth, white sous chef, fine dining)

> The kitchen workers usually work together, even if they have a frown behind a smile. No one wants to mess that up, because for some, it's all they have. You kind of dealt with your differences, and you sucked it up. If somebody said something crazy, you sucked it up, because you thought to yourself, I can't lose this. It was that important. Any job is that important. Anytime somebody is paying you to be your best. The kitchen was pretty mixed, half and half white and black. I've heard people say racist jokes in there in the kitchen. But the guys are so cool with each other that they don't care. You say a white racist joke and then someone else says a black racist joke and then everybody laughs. Everyone has their own way of taking their own subliminal shots at you. It was more so that the people who work in the kitchen are the most outspoken people. If there is racial tension, it's between one person and another person, or a group. It's a work

environment, so if stuff like that was going on, people would get fired, because no one can work around that, it's a work environment. (Jackson, Black line cook, casual dining)

I mean people say racist stuff all the time in the kitchen when we joke but it's never in direct relation to…a, it's never serious and b, it's never relating to the job or to the work. (Brad, white sous chef, fine dining)

Restaurant kitchen workers were aware of the racial tension in kitchens among the work group that was often a diverse mix of workers from different racial-ethnic backgrounds. To resolve that tension, workers explained that they utilized joking about race with each other to maintain group cohesion. But as Jackson noted, even if workers took "subliminal shots" at each other via the banter in the kitchen about race that was offensive, it was more important to "suck it up" to keep one's job. As I will explain, even though banter is a core feature of interaction in the kitchen, how individuals utilized and participated in banter varied across group membership and role position.

Management often explained that joking and banter was a necessary component of group dynamics in the kitchen to reduce conflict among restaurant kitchen workers. Zachary, a white manager of a fast food chain restaurant, explained that he was responsible for lowering the tension among workers. He said,

Joking around and having fun is a main part of lowering the tension and stress. I always look for lighthearted, easy going people. It has to be a fun place to work. Little Cesears actually has a policy that it has to be a fun place to work. They encourage it. People do joke about differences. Sometimes I would think that it was inappropriate conversation or inappropriate joking and I would have to step in and tell them we don't do that here. The way they took it, they didn't seem offended by it, but I stepped in anyways, because someone could be but trying not to show it. But that did happen. Someone would say

159

something or make a joke that was inappropriate, so I'd have to step in and say, you can't talk about it. For example, some employees would make a joke about this one kid who was Arab American and they'd make jokes about his Middle Eastern background or talk, make a mock Middle Eastern voice. He was a younger kid and he never seemed bothered by it, but I always stepped in and told them hey, don't do this anymore. It looks like he's not offended but he could be. The two employees making the joke were white and Black. Other times, employees have come to talk to me, if something happened while I wasn't there and someone said something. Once, we had a person there who was gay and someone there was making gay jokes to him and he came the next day when I was working to talk to me about it. He told me what the other person said and how it made him feel uncomfortable. He didn't want to get him in trouble but wanted me to know what happened.

Or,

If you make a little joke, it can wash out some of the stress. But it is a fine line. You can be joking and then get into it too much, start to lose focus. You have to get back to business. (Brad, white sous chef, fine dining)

Talking about joking, one kitchen worker remarked,

It also calls out differences. Sparky gets made fun of because he has red hair. There's a lot of gay jokes that go about. So maybe making fun of people who are different than you in that situation, which isn't great, but…it's kind of funny. If you can laugh at yourself, that's important too. (Tessa, white line cook, fine dining)

All of the kitchen workers and managers reflected that joking was an important part of their workplace interactions for reducing stress. Bantering was also perceived as one way to build camaraderie among workers and to get along with their coworkers despite coming from different backgrounds.

There's nothing off limits, not at all. You accept it whether you like it or not because if you can't accept the joking, while when we're busy, that's all we're doing is joking. You can't joke, while I can't talk with you. If it's strictly business with you, then I can't have fun anymore.

160

So you don't let the one or two things that might get under your skin get under your skin. (Ethan, white line cook, fine dining)

Even at the risk of offending, bantering played a key role in boundary-making and group inclusion for the kitchen staff. The norms of workplace banter informally required employees to find no boundary of joking unacceptable and rarely did anyone report feeling uncomfortable or upset to the point of complaining to management. Joking and banter reproduced the privileged and power of the workers in the best kitchen jobs — those at the top of the line, even if the joking and banter harassed women and men of color at the bottom of the line.

Because workers at the top of the line often set the tone of banter in the kitchen, the most privileged workers had the power to use banter to exclude others from the work group. During my fieldwork, I observed the executive chef and the sous chef discussing a marinade for duck to be served later that week. While they were figuring out the ingredient proportions, the woman Asian pastry chef came into the room. The chef made a joke about a Chinese-American woman who he had worked with before, who couldn't understand directions in English unless he spoke in an accented voice, which he demonstrated for the group. The punch line was that the woman couldn't speak a word of Chinese and the group laughed. The sous chef then took me into the prep room and showed me how to marinate the duck, which I finished up. As I was working on the task, Tony pointed out that everyone jokes in the kitchen and that's how they get along. Even though everyone in the work group is expected to participate in banter, workers in stronger positions of power higher on the service production line use banter to control and exclude workers at the bottom of

161

the line. If a worker fails to participate in the banter appropriately, the other workers

will use banter to exclude that worker. Banter is a less visible strategy that creates

boundaries between men and women in the workplace, because it's used as a

"harmless" practice of reducing tension and stress at work.

> If you don't mesh with them, they'll make it uncomfortable for you.
> Just giving people a hard time. Half of it is out of jest, he's joking but
> people get hurt feelings if you mess with them all the time, every day.
> The cooks would say to the sous chef's face, you're not my boss. In
> the kitchen, the sous chef can tell the cooks what to do, as long as it's
> cooking related. (Dennis, Asian line cook, fine dining)

Sexualized banter is also used by men kitchen workers to exclude women from the
work group.

> They [the other kitchen workers] were always making crude remarks.
> Kitchen humor, kitchens always have gross humor. Every single
> kitchen. That's also why I think it's so male-dominated. A lot of
> women don't want to stand and listen to the filth talk that goes on in
> kitchens. It's kind of gross. You have to prove yourself that you can
> hang and listen to that if you want to hold the position and be female
> (Laura, white sous chef, fine dining)

As Laura explained, women "have to prove" themselves that they can be present and

participate in sexual banter in order to keep a job and be a woman. The sexual banter

from her perspective is not acceptable because it's offensive and harassing, but

there's no other strategy for her to retain her position as sous chef other than gaining

social cohesion with the other workers through the participation in banter. For

women, there is a fine line between sexual harassment and banter. Women can

identify the sexual banter as harassment but they can also feel like they have to

participate in it to keep their jobs. Women workers were expected to participate in

banter, even if their engagement with banter created a hostile workplace for them. In

hostile workplaces with subtle or overt harassment, women mostly quit and looked

for work elsewhere, leaving them little opportunity to advance up the food production

line.

Jokes about the sexual appearance of food or the names of food are common.

For example, another woman kitchen worker referred to her experience of learning

her superiors' sense of humor that was sexualized while employed in the kitchen.

> There's a lot of sexual jokes. Recently, Soo Mi made a stencil for one of her dessert molds. She taped it up on the fridge and taped up next to it "standard size." And now we make standard size jokes all of the time. Most of the time I'll just roll my eyes. The sous chef compares a lot of things to female anatomy. It doesn't make me feel uncomfortable but I've worked with him the longest. Maybe if it was the chef making all of those jokes, I'd feel uncomfortable. But he does make quite a few also. He's intimidating at first but you just have to learn his sense of humor. (Tessa, white link cook, fine dining)

Brad, a white sous chef in fine dining, reflected about why the banter and joking in

the kitchen is always sexual.

> I can't exactly explain the humor or why it's so sexual all the time. Maybe because it's easy, food and sex can be related in so many ways. There's a lot of that, all the time in restaurants, in kitchens in general. Everyone is acting a little bit different than they may in their everyday life. It's to keep it light and to get through hard situations because it is rough sometimes to get through the day, especially in this industry, it's notorious for partying a lot, drinking a lot, staying out late. A lot of times you work late and there's not a lot to do when you get done. Even when you're exhausted, you're still wound up. You need to wind down. (Brad, white sous chef, fine dining)

From Brad's perspective, banter and joking is a central feature of interaction in the

kitchen because it's used as a release valve for stress, difficult work, and tension — to

wind down. In restaurant kitchens, men participate in sexual banter but have

autonomy from sexual harassment.

In the masculine space of the kitchen, men participate in banter and build camaraderie with the men at the top of the line in head and sous chef positions. White men and men of color advance from their participation in the sexualized joking and draw on their gender to their own advantage. Banter wasn't a threat or a barrier because they could participate in it and be rewarded for their participation. The sexual humor that is pervasive in restaurant kitchens is a strategy of boundary making between men and women in the kitchen. By using harassing language, men form a socially cohesive group with other men in the kitchen. For women to join and be accepted into this group, they are expected by men to participate in the joking and banter. There is little managerial oversight, so what takes place on the production line has weak regulation by management. As I will explain, banter is used as a gender boundary making practice among men to exclude women from social acceptance into the group and advancement up the service production line.

In a highly integrated workplace, banter became a strategy workers and management employed to make sense of the difference among the mixed-group, as well as an effort to diminish it. Thus, the banter was part of routine interactions that was perceived as neutralizing difference but worked to reinforce group stratification in the kitchen. For example,

> You get kids who are more vulgar and kind of gross. There is always sexual banter, all the time. You're endlessly making fun of each other because it's a brotherhood. We're all in this together, we're all the same. Racial and ethnic difference usually goes out the window, although you'll occasionally make jokes about it. I've never worked in a kitchen where there's been any intentional racism. (Seth, sous chef, fine dining)

164

The rules of participating in the "brotherhood" required constant participation in sexualized banter.

> The majority of conversation that goes on in kitchens is about sex or that's day-to-day conversation in kitchens largely because again it comes down to the fact that it's all society's rejects that end up in kitchens. You get kids who are more vulgar and gross. There is sexual bantering all the time. It's always about sex. That kind of conversation. But when you do that a lot and where I come from, I'm endlessly changing the names of stuff. It's kind of like the copyright slang. I give everyone nicknames, never use their real names. It makes it a little bit more easy to associate. I'll say things as loud as I can possibly can get away with. And just watch to see how many people are looking. I'll play with the environment that we're in and really push what is socially acceptable to get away with. It is a performance and it is a show and I've always believed in that and giving them the show. Otherwise our restaurant would have gone under years ago when we had this chef who was drunk, misogynistic, pig of a human being. He would just get hammered during service and be yelling and swearing. Diners could hear this and if they were genuinely disgusted, they could get up and walk out. But people usually like it. (Seth, sous chef, fine dining)

> Most of the years I've worked, from fast-food, to fine dining, to short-order grill. Right now I work at the Waffle House, off and on for the last ten years. Anywhere there's a waffle house, I know that's a go-to job automatically, because I know the standards. It's kind of like an amusement park slash restaurant because you're right in front of the customers. They watch you prepare their food. It's an experience for them. It's a good thing, because it's very, very fast-paced. It's just nonstop for eight hours, you're lucky to get a drink of water or a bathroom break. But it's second nature now and I enjoy it. In a closed setting, you can have a better flow, have a more intimate environment with communication. In the open setting, you have to be censored, watch what you say, you have to watch your facial expressions, everything. Because someone might be looking at that and taking it the wrong way. In the closed kitchen, you can joke around, motivate each other, be more boisterous. You don't have to watch what you're saying, it's still a professional kitchen but you're around your peers, be more relaxed. You can joke, develop your own relationships, your own way of cooking in the closed setting. (Jerome, Black cook, casual dining)

165

Banter among kitchen workers was so common and pervasive in the restaurant

working culture, that workers found it to be unremarkable and harmless. Intergroup

dynamics that reproduced inequality in the kitchen were normalized and invisible to

most workers who had better opportunities to become incorporated into the work

group. But for women in the kitchen, their difference from men was heavily marked

through banter and their willingness to participate in banter was one measure used to

evaluate their value as a worker.

Participants remarked that women in the kitchen become one of the guys in

order to make it by accepting banter and participating in it within the kitchen. One

line cook reported,

> You have to mold to the environment, you're still going to be a girl but
> you just want to fit it. Most women I've come across don't want to be
> singled out. They don't want to be thought about, oh we're going to
> be easy on her because she's a woman. They want to be treated just
> like the guys, so they make it a habit to fit in with the guys, be more
> oriented with the guys with the joking or the horseplay. Even with the
> language. Things that you wouldn't normally say around a woman,
> you do because she has no problem with it. She's letting it go to go
> with the flow, being laid back and trying to fit in with the blend of the
> fellas. (Jerome, Black line cook, casual dining)

> Personally, I think that you just have to be a certain type of person in
> order to get along with men in that type of environment, with such
> crass things being said all the time. You have to have a certain
> personality and you have to want to work hard. Most of the women
> I've seen aren't very girly girls. The other day I went to a bbq and
> looked like a girly girl I guess because I was wearing a leopard print
> mini skirt. I met some other cooks in town and I told them that I
> worked in a kitchen too and they laughed at me. They said that I
> didn't look like a cook. They expect women to work in the kitchen to
> look butch. Not very feminine. You have to have a thick skin to work
> in that environment. And you get burnt, you get scarred. A lot of
> people thought that I was in a sexual relationship with the sous chef
> and that's why he hired me in the beginning. I think I had to prove

166

myself that I wasn't just getting hired because he wanted to get down my pants. I'm definitely treated a little differently because I'm a girl. I still lift heavy stuff but I can play up my girlness if I want to, I don't think they judge me. But if I was going into a new kitchen environment, I wouldn't do that because you have to prove yourself first. That you can do all the jobs. If you can show them that you can do it, then maybe you could play it up. (Tessa, white line cook, fine dining)

You definitely watch what you say. Most females that are in the kitchen are cool. They're just like one of the guys. Most of them in the kitchen are just like one of us. Plus when they first start, you watch your mouth, you watch what you say, the jokes kind of tone down, until you get to know them. And it takes a certain personality to work in the kitchen. If you're easily offended, you're not going to make it in the kitchen. If you're easily offended, you just won't make it in the kitchen. I think that you can be good looking but you have to be more open with the joking, you need to be less sensitive about everything. You're going to walk in and the guy next to you will say that you look like shit once in a while. We tell that to each other every day. If you can handle that, you're doing all right. If she can't handle it, she could still make it there but you just don't talk to her, she'll feel alienated. Anyone like that, who you don't feel like you can joke with, gets pushed off to the side and eventually they leave. It sorts itself out. If you don't fit in, no one really has to do anything, you end up leaving. It's not professional, quote-un-quote at all. You say a lot of things, especially when you're busy. You yell, you swear, you tell the people their stupid, tell them to get out and come back tomorrow and it's a regular thing. You just have to be able to take it and know that no matter how pissed off someone is at you, as long as you're doing your job well, in the end it's going to be fine. Everyone's going to get along, maybe not apologize but will forget about it in twenty minutes. It's just stressful, somebody messes up, you get yelled at. It's like a family, because I don't think that I would treat a team like that, but I would treat my little brother that way. I think a team everybody's really got to work together. It gives off a different atmosphere. I see it as more professional. You're supporting each other, you're bringing each other up. Whereas this is, until everything is done and over with, we all have to get the same thing done but its, every man is doing his own thing. The one man in the middle is dealing with everybody. Everyone has their job and it has to get done in a certain amount of time and if it doesn't, it's your fault, not anything to do with the team. (Ethan, white line cook, fine dining)

It's intense and there are somewhat humiliating aspects of it sometimes. It's definitely a male-dominated industry. The women chefs and cooks that are in there are savage, raw. Because I think it is a little tougher for them to come up. To work in a restaurant by men all day. It really doesn't make a difference in the kitchen if you're a man or a woman, you won't be treated any differently. Well, sometimes. I can see it being hard on a woman to be in there. Also, women are more emotional by nature and it's really stressful and intense. I've definitely seen a lot of girls breaking down and crying. I've seen guys break down and lose it too. Not necessarily cry but it's hard. But the women who are in there strive and go for it are just as intense and hard to work for as any of them men in there, if not harder. But gender isn't a factor in the kitchen. You're not going to get treated any differently in the big picture, in terms of what needs to get done, if you mess up, and definitely not in terms of being treated like a lady or something. You're not going to be treated like that, you're going to be treated like anybody else in the kitchen. We joke a lot, we have a messed up sense of humor a lot of the times. (Brad, white sous chef, fine dining)

In mixed-group interactions, women were consistently treated on the basis of gender stereotypes. "One of the cooks irritated me by saying, come back to work when you get off the rag and he made me feel uncomfortable" (Martina, Latina prep cook, casual dining). Martina explained that she would laugh about talk and interactions that were uncomfortable for her, because if she didn't laugh, then she would be showing that she was weaker than the men.

I wanted to show them that I wasn't weak, that I wasn't showing weakness, if I was verbally abused. I would just laugh it off. I didn't want to give them to the power to think that they could control me. I would just joke about it and sometimes chuckle a little. Or on the line, if he asked me to put more salt on something, I would say, oh this much? And put out a quarter of a cup. Just something so that he knew that I wasn't going to put up with him. So that he knew that I knew how to cook. Or sometimes he would complain about the cooking, and I would say, why don't you show me how to do it? He would just mumble and walk away.

Her supervisor set sexualized standards for the women kitchen workers, such as making them wear shorter shorts and wearing their hair loose, even though it violated kitchen safety and cleanliness standards. He physically touched them while the women were prepping the food. Martina said, "It was dangerous because a few times, I cut myself with the knife because he would come up behind me and slap my butt and then I would move a little so that he wouldn't do that. The knife would move and I would cut myself. I didn't talk to him about it because I thought that I would make it worse." Sexual kitchen talk was an everyday part of interactions at work. Laura, a sous chef in fine dining, reflected on an earlier job, "I loved working there and I made good money but I worked with all guys. It was a little too much for me, so I figured being a catering chef would be better. Guys in kitchens, they like to say dirty stuff. I was just tired of getting harassed. I left because I felt uncomfortable."

> I've worked with women before but they don't really want to be in that hot kitchen, there are all of the discrimination that comes with a woman working with a lot of different men. Sometimes when you deal with a group of men, they think they know more than the woman. She'll be over dominated in the setting. There are not many women who are head chefs. They might have something to say, but they don't speak up. In a male-dominated setting, there is a fight for dominance, for the top spot. Women come in and do the job and go on home, are quieter. The kitchen is a masculine space, but I don't know why. It's more competitive, when it's professional, women want to do anything but that. Nowadays, women don't want to be cooks. They can't be pretty, you can't find prissy girls who do their nails and their hair in the kitchen. It's more the women who wear their hair in a ponytail anyways. More tomboys. Most women don't want to be in a place where they can't be pretty. They have to become one of the guys to make it, you have to. You have to mold to the environment, you're still going to be a girl, but you want to fit in. You want to do your job. Most women I've come across don't want to be singled out. They

might be the only women but they don't want to be thought about, like we should be easy on her because she's a woman, they want to be treated just like the guys. So they make it a habit to fit in with the fellas or be more oriented to the fellas. They do it by joking or through horseplay. Even with the language. Some stuff you wouldn't say in front of a woman, or how you wouldn't act around a woman, I don't have any problem with it, just because she doesn't have any problem with it. She's letting it go, going with the flow. More laid back and trying to fit in with the blend of the fellas, rather than the fellas realizing she's a woman. I am going to treat you equally, if you're a woman. There is no such thing as male cook, female cook. We're both cooks, gender doesn't matter, doing your job well does (Jerome, Black line cook, fine dining)

"Traditionally, professional cooking has been a man's world. It was more or less unheard of for a woman to work in a professional kitchen. There are various maxims of the kitchen. And one of them is to check your gender at the door. Your own personal gender has to be left there. There are no cooks and cookettes. But you do have waiters and waitresses. There is no feminine form of chef. It's neutral. Any titles in the kitchen are gender neutral and they always have been. But I would say kitchens are masculine. Your typical guy stuff, like you gotta be tough, hide your emotion, no crying, you cut yourself, walk it off. You need to be tough, get back to work, not cry about it. You have too much to do" (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining)

Tessa remarked that Juan, one of her co-workers on the line, doesn't give her as much

respect as the other men in the kitchen.

I think it's partly because I'm a woman that he doesn't listen to me. He's also of Mexican descent and they just don't respect women in a professional sense as much. He doesn't like to do things wrong, so he doesn't take criticism very well. I have to be really, really careful in the way that I talk to him.

Banter in restaurant kitchens reproduces gender difference at work to privilege men.

Men kitchen workers use observations of interactional behavior in the kitchen to

make categorical assessments of innate differences between women and men. The

following quote shows the clear differences in how one sous chef evaluates women

compares to men's temperament in the kitchen.

> Women in the kitchen tend to be a little more level headed and less excitable than guys. Guys will get all angry and throw a pan. Girls will be like, I'm very frustrated about this but I'm still just going to do my job and be calm about it. Which is good, the kitchen needs more of that. (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining)

Men kitchen workers view their gender group distinctly different than women,

contributing towards the exclusionary practices in restaurant kitchens, because gender

is a point of difference and therefore, easy to use in joking and banter. Men

participate in sexual banter but have autonomy from sexual harassment and are more

likely to gain the better jobs.

> And coming back to the gender thing, it's I think it just takes a special kind of woman to be able to cut it in that environment. To not only, to not only be able to handle the hours, the fact that it's long, and it's hard, because women are as equally strong as men. But it's hard for them. But then you have to deal with the fact that they're surrounded by guys who, it doesn't matter what age they are, are essentially just horny young school boys. Do you like penis? That's what it comes down to. Half of the conversation during my work day is like this, that's all it is. So it takes a special kind of, tomboyish woman to be in kitchens. So usually most women you find in kitchens are tomboyish and a little outrageous and probably grew up with a couple of brothers. So it is a very masculine kind of environment. And I think that's just because what we do is…one, I think it is because we are the ones who didn't behave well, people who have problem with authority that come into it. Yet, it's people who have problem with authority, yet they go into a place that leads with a hierarchy system and you literally have to kiss the shoes of the person who is above you. You have to have bravado because otherwise there will be points where you'll break down and cry because it's so tough. Asshole chefs are common. You put the dues in, so that one day you have the position to do it. (Seth, white sous chef, fine dining)

Men workers in less advanced positions participate in kitchen banter in collusion with men workers in advanced positions. Men in entry-level jobs do so out of the belief that men with discretionary hiring (executive, head and sous chefs) will award them with advancement up the production line to better jobs. If they do advance, men kitchen workers are likely to accept the kitchen culture and the bantering practices, reproducing exclusionary boundaries in the kitchen. The power of group inclusion contributes to men's greater chances in the kitchen to advance to better jobs — and group exclusion contributes to women's lesser chances to advance.

In the masculine space of the kitchen, men participate in banter and build camaraderie with each other. Men advance because they participate in the sexualized joking and draw on their gender advantage. Banter wasn't a threat or a barrier because they could participate in it and be rewarded for their participation. This finding is similar to previous research on the use of "fun" by men against women and men (or "outsiders") at work via the engagement with sexual joking (Papp 2006).

For women kitchen workers, there is a fine line between sexual harassment and banter. It can feel like sexual harassment to women in the kitchen, but participation in kitchen banter is expected by other men on the job. The experiences of women in restaurant kitchens are similar to the expression, "if you can't take the heat, get out of the kitchen." In hostile workplaces with overt or subtle harassment, women mostly quit and tried their luck elsewhere, leaving them little opportunity to advance up the food production line.

> If every person isn't doing the exact same thing every time, then it's easier to get messed up. And that's why they do it – everybody wants

172

to be the best and when you're working on the line, if every person isn't doing the work the same, at top speed, at the end of it, the sous chef usually gets the brunt of it. Guys don't like to be bossed around by girls. In the kitchen, it's very hardcore. Guys like to show off their big knives and how much they can lift. The salad boy listens to me because he has to, if I have a dish, he has to do my garnishes and he will. If he doesn't do it, he gets in trouble. But, the other guys feel like they should be in my position. (Laura, white sous chef, fine dining)

Subtle and overt forms of harassment are normalized in restaurant kitchens. Workplace incivility is perceived to be an everyday part of work but reinforces men's power in the workplace and their status in better jobs on the service production line.

Workers engaged in different types of banter and defined acceptable and unacceptable forms of banter. The level of skill in and ability to banter influences the degree to which individual workers are given inclusion into the mixed-group by coworkers.

Chefs are hard on cooks and on interns. It is kind of a hazing but it's not to be mean, to not upset the person. It's out of care because you want them to succeed. If you're too nice, if you're always sensitive and sweet to them and they go to a kitchen where the chef is screaming at them, they won't last a day. So they need to be able to cope with that. They need to be comfortable with being disciplined. (Graham, white sous chef, fine dining)

There's definitely a little hazing. It's also, I feel that it builds community in the kitchen. We all make fun of each other, just the stodge gets a lot of it. It's not just your skill but also your ability to build camaraderie with your coworkers. If I was uptight or took offensive, I don't think that I would have gotten into the kitchen. I think it's funny. I get the humor, not all of the time but most of the time. (Tessa, white line cook, fine dining)

In one full-service kitchen, kitchen workers first went through a trial period of working for free and doing the grunt work. He said that they nicknamed their current

apprenticing stodger "Sparky" for his red hair and slightly annoying personality. To

"survive" the stodging position and to be promoted to staff, the stodge has to prove

that she or he can withstand not only grueling labor and long hours, but also the

hazing period of teasing, joking and being the bottom of the kitchen hierarchy – what

he described as "grin, grit and bear it." Sparky didn't come into the position without

any training, he had gone to culinary school but Seth, the sous chef, made clear that if

someone comes into the restaurant "cold" and doesn't know anyone, then stodging is

a pathway to a job even if just showing up the doorstep. A few of the other staff

commented that they disliked him at first because he acted defensive about the joking

and didn't warm up to the bantering dynamic of the kitchen. Seth told me that they

were considering letting him go (he shared responsibility with the executive chef for

hiring). Yet a couple of weeks later, the trial cook was hired as a permanent staff

member and when I asked why, Seth said it was because he relaxed and started joking

with the other staff. The executive chef also consulted the entire kitchen staff when

considering hiring the stodge.

> Chef definitely asked everybody's opinion. Because initially, Juan,
> Sparky and Nate were all stodging at the same time. He asked us
> which one we thought would work better and in what sense. He asked
> us and he conferred a lot with the sous chef about what to do. A lot of
> what they tell me is that you learn, you don't necessarily have to have
> a ton of experience, having a ton of techniques. Knife skills are
> definitely important but every time you come into a restaurant, you're
> going to have to learn everything new. (Tessa, white line cook, fine
> dining).

Sparky became included in the mixed-group once he learned to banter with the rest of

the working staff and managerial kitchen staff. Successfully playing the rules of the

workplace by bantering with coworkers proved to be an important mechanism for

inclusion into the kitchen.

> Me, I like to make jokes but sometimes people get mad if you say something. So, I just don't say something that's going to make some people angry. For me, it's difficult to make a joke in English. When I want people to laugh, I say something in Spanish. At the end of the night, I'll say hey jefe, are you going home tonight with this chick? And he'll laugh. And they do it. They make fun of people. And you have to get along with people and go along with the jokes. But if people make jokes, people can get confused. It's fine to laugh and joke around, but sometimes they talk about some weird stuff, like sexual stuff, even when customers are around. (Juan, Mexican line cook, fine dining).

> You have to be able to stand it and give a few come backs. I'm pretty witty and I'm quick with it. So if somebody says something gross, I'll catch it and throw something back. You work with meat and all kinds of funny things, funny looking and funny feeling things, so there's always dirty, sexual comments. There's no way around it, sometimes using the names of kitchen items, you have to say it. For example, I can't reach for a cucumber or anything that's that shape without a comment, so you just have to get over it and laugh. It can be funny, but sometimes it's just too much. I have to touch about fifty of them a night. Being a lady, I have to figure out how to counteract that because it's a really good paying job at the end of the day and it's nice to be able to cook for people. You have to learn how to put up with it or if you can't handle it, you gotta get out. I had to take it with a grain of salt if I wanted to keep the position. Unless you're working in an all-female kitchen, but that's something I've never seen. I often feel like the mother of a bunch of teenage boys, because everything that can be taken the wrong way is to the extreme. And these places are fine dining, where the chef goes out and they are respected. But no one has any idea what happens behind the scenes, all the stuff they are talking about and saying, like saying a bunch of sexual jokes all night" (Laura, white sous chef, fine dining)

The owner of the restaurant made jokes at Laura's expense and aimed at her – rather

than at something "neutral", like the food being prepared. He was harassing her

directly by using a norm of the kitchen culture – the expectation that in-group joking

would be accepted. "If a man had been standing there, I don't think he would have said those things, because then he would have sounded like a gay guy" (Laura, white sous chef, fine dining). She talked to him about it and the joking was reduced, but not stopped completely. He would include everybody in the joke but the norm of the kitchen didn't change. She said,

> They just have to put it to you. People will do silly things just to see how tough you are because you have to be fairly tough. You're on your feet for long hours, you're working in really high temperatures, you're standing in a room that's 120 degrees for twelve hours while moving constantly and people messing with you. Some of the guys will leave the spatula on the grill just to see if you get burned badly when you touch it. They have grill lighters and they'll snap it off so that it shocks you in the back of the neck. Or put knives in messed up positions. It's all a test to see what you know and you don't know. It's weird kitchen humor that's really not funny and you can get seriously hurt. In every kitchen that I've worked, they twist a kitchen towel up and whip you with it. So, it's exactly like hazing in a college for a fraternity or something. Because all of that is always going on.

Because the kitchen is an enclosed workspace with a lot of activity and movement among workers, men kitchen workers use the physical proximity to physically harass women, by downplaying the harassment as merely joking around. In contrast, women are protected from physical sexual harassment in casino gaming because of the spatial separation from players. Dealers sit across from a group of players on the table, with a considerable amount of space separating them. Dealers are also protected by a greater degree of supervision from the pit supervisors, having the option to call over their supervisor if a customer is acting out of bounds. Even when a dealer exits the dealing area, he or she exists separately from where customers enter and exit from the tables. But in restaurant kitchens, women don't have physical

separation from men kitchen workers and in fact close physical proximity with each other is part of the labor process for kitchen workers. How the labor process is organized in each type of workplace creates the specific conditions of interaction between team members in the kitchen and between customers and dealers in the casino, having different implications for women.

In restaurant kitchens, men are more likely than women to advance from entry-level jobs of poorer quality to advanced jobs of better quality. The team-intensive labor process in this type of backline service line creates the strict condition for unfettered banter among workers. Because workers in advanced positions on the service line have the most authoritative power, they set the cultural and interactional tone of the kitchen. Men kitchen workers in entry-level positions at the bottom of the line participate in the banter because they believe it will help them get ahead in the kitchen. Indeed, those with authoritative power explained that they did evaluate workers' ability to participate in banter and "get along" with others in the kitchen as an important skill necessary to succeed in the kitchen.

Through the practice of bantering, men kitchen workers created and reinforced gendered boundaries that enabled them to hoard opportunities of advancement. Women kitchen workers varied between participating or not in the banter, but these women understood one of the requirements of working in the kitchen was to at least tolerate the banter, if not be full participants themselves. Because women were less likely to want to participate in banter, women remained in their current positions, quit or were fired. The exceptions to the rule were a few

women who did participate in the banter, although with reluctance, to retain their jobs. The exclusionary practice of banter in restaurant kitchens explained why men were more likely than women to advance in their careers, highlighting banter as a key mechanism of the stratification of advanced positions in kitchens, and the reproduction of inequality at work. The next section will examine workplace interactions on casino gaming floors to address the puzzle of why women are more likely to get ahead in casino gaming than in restaurant kitchens.

Workplace Interactions on Casino Gaming Floors

The team of dealers and management on the service production line in casino table gaming have to work together to facilitate the delivery of casino entertainment to customers. When a customer arrives at the casino, their ID is checked by a security guard and their face is remotely scanned through facial recognition by the security camera. Once a customer sits down at a table, the cocktail waitress takes any drink orders and the dealer calls the customer in to the game. They call out for the pit boss to "color you up" or cash the customer in to the game. The pit boss watches three to four tables at a time and reports to the floor manager. The floor manager watches three to four pit bosses. The general manager watches the floor managers. Everyone is being watched by one or two branches of security all the time. Casinos even monitor what route dealers take from the table to their break room – if they deviate, they can get in trouble. Even with the heavy surveillance, there is so much activity going on at once, that it's impossible for the cameras and management to watch everything, at all times — and in particular, micro-interactions at the table.

There are high levels of external oversight from security cameras and floor

supervision, yet these are limited to observing the visual aspects of the game and

ensuring rule compliance, more than regulating table conversation and interaction. In

this frontline service work, the dealer mostly interacts with customers and with their

supervisors. There is little to no interaction among dealers on the floor. The

organization of the gaming floor physically separates dealers from the customers and

supervisors are on the floor to deal with any dealer-player conflicts or disagreements.

Supervisors have an advantage of mobility, being able to move around the gaming

floor within the circle of dealing pits that they're overseeing. In contrast, dealers are

physically limited to their table for twenty to thirty minutes at a time, until they're

shifted to another table in a continuous rotation with breaks interspersed during their

shifts.

Micro-interactions on the table, such as conversation, physical contact,

disagreements, arguments and other types of interaction are monitored by the dealer,

who's first in the service production line, followed by the pit boss and then the floor

manager.

> You basically have to be observant, responsible, able to manage
> people without being too mean or letting them push you over. There's
> a definite balance you have to hold there. (Karen, white casino
> employer, Las Vegas)

Karen, an employer of temporary dealers in various Las Vegas casinos, emphasized

that a key skill that dealers must have is the ability to manage micro-interactions on

the table with customers by staying within the bounds of customer service but skirting

these rules by maintaining boundaries with customers, by not "letting them push you

over." The dealers are also managed by their customers, who can complain about the dealer to the management or dispute any aspect of the gaming play.

There is a distinct hierarchy of management between the different workplace roles on the gaming floor and with the customers, shaping the codes of conduct and communication in different ways than in restaurant kitchens. In casinos, dealers interact more with customers than with each other and interact with supervisors routinely during their shifts. Because supervisors circulate among separate dealing tables in a gaming pit, dealers are mostly alone at their tables with customers during their shifts. Dealers are therefore the most responsible for managing the conduct of their players at the table but supervisors, when called over to the table, have the most authority for making decisions about the play. In contrast, those with the most authority in restaurant kitchens (executive, head and sous chefs) work alongside the restaurant workers they supervise in the labor process. In full-service and independent restaurants, executive and head chefs have discretionary power to promote workers, based on their own preferences. Often, employers keep out of the kitchen and give full power to the executive and head chefs to promote the workers they believe should advance into better jobs. And because executive and head chefs also set the tone for the kitchen banter and interaction, workers in entry-level jobs reported that they felt participation in banter and the culture of the kitchen was required to advance into better jobs. And supporting this perception was the evidence from those with managerial control that indeed the ability to achieve social cohesion with the group was used when evaluating promotions. In contrast, because dealers

don't usually interact with each other on the floor, the interactions between dealers and customers and the relationship with their supervisors proved to be more important for their promotions to better jobs.

If dealers could control the players at their table via banter to achieve efficiency in work and secure supportive relationships with their supervisors (who would be more likely to support them in disputes with players and step in if players got out of hand), they were more likely to advance into better jobs, via more tips, better shifts, or moving into management. And because women had a greater ability than men to engage in banter with customers to achieve both *customer satisfaction* and *speed of play*, they were perceived by management to be better dealers than men. Women dealers were more likely than men to receive higher tips from customers and better shifts from management. Women crossed gender boundaries via bantering to also be as likely as men to advance to supervisory positions, because they were perceived by management to be better skilled at managing difficult customers and neutralizing table disputes among players or between players and the dealer.

Dealers, because they're on the front line of the casino service production, have to monitor not only the rules of play, but also the dynamics of the players. "My husband is a police officer and he said that he would not work in poker, that he can't believe the kind of stuff that I put up with. Yelling at us, blaming us, throwing cards at us. When they lose, they have to blame something and they blame us" (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas). Or,

> Each table has its own environment, its own little ecosystem. You have the sharks feeding off the fish in some ways, playing the game

and you have people who try to intimidate people not just with bets or chips, to put them in a tough place in the game, but they did it verbally or physically and it all has to be monitored (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

Dealers have to work very hard to manage their tables, not only to meet the expectations of the casino for pace of play, but to also maintain their authority and dignity on the table. Jenny and her husband both work at the same casino in table games. She said,

> We both deal craps. We don't work on the same table. It's amazing to see how in certain situations women can defuse situations. But at the craps table, it's almost like a female dealer is almost viewed by the patrons as weak or as a pushover, or as docile. If I'm telling somebody, because there's a lot of standard operating procedures with dice, I'll tell a customer to please do it this way and then I have to repeatedly tell them and get stern with my voice. If it was a male saying it to the same patron, the positive response the dealer was looking for would be shown immediately. Girls on a dice table have to earn their wings twice as hard as males do. Gaining respect from the patrons, not being taken advantage of by them. The game of craps is controlled chaos and that's why we ask for certain things to be done a certain way. The only way that I've found to be successful was to be stern and to not back down. Doing a growling, grrr with my voice. So that everyone knew what I was doing. Like a lion, to ruffle my mane and show them, look I'm not going to be a pushover. It's the only game that's made me cry and I said that it wasn't going to beat me.

For example, when Jenny is paying out a bet to patrons, at times, patrons will question if she did her math correctly, even if the patron admits after the fact that it was only to challenge her authority, knowing that the math was accurate from the start. Jenny said that some older patrons will express that "girls shouldn't be on the table." Most of the craps players are men and it's a men-dominated game. It was only in the past two decades that women started to deal craps on the casino floor. Interactive boundary work helps to maintain player satisfaction and potentially

increase their likelihood to tip. Plus, it helps to improve the quality of work and job satisfaction for the dealer.

As I will explain, because casino gaming floors are organized and regulated differently than restaurant kitchens, the rules of conduct for workplace banter are different. In casinos, the rules of interaction give management power over workers who have a high level of interaction and interdependence in their work. Because dealers are a tipped profession and are on the frontline of service at the table, the organization and regulation of the casino gaming floor encourages dealers to do banter to maintain their own dignity and workplace performance. But at the same time, dealers doing banter meets the goals of the casino by securing a high speed of play. This informs the organizational logic that fosters a workplace culture necessary to control workers in the labor process. This labor control serves the interests of the work organization to maximize team work productivity and profits generated from providing good service to customers. This finding is very similar to the research by Sallaz (2009) that showed dealers subverted casino rules to improve their chances to get tipped, with the support of management when it made for speedier play.

The dealer team is the front line of the casino service production line. The dealer is responsible for managing their table, which includes monitoring the game play and their players. Handling player's money is high stakes for the dealers, both for retaining their jobs and for minimizing stress on the job.

> Being on a table, you cannot leave a situation. There's only so much
> that you can do, because you have to protect the company's assets,
> number one. If somebody's unhappy or unruly, as dealers we're
> limited to how we can try to accommodate people or defuse a situation

when guests get angry towards each other. It feels like our hands are tied but it's for a reason. From the very beginning, having to learn those things, and how to handle those situations while keeping your composure for everybody else was pretty challenging. (Jenny, white black jack dealer, West Michigan)

Workers learn the organizational culture informally at the workplace and are expected to embrace their role in the team. In the quote below, Katie describes "the floor" or the pit supervisor's interaction with customers when she first began dealing, a supportive action by her supervisor to maintain consistent and efficient dealing by doing some of the interactive labor for Katie.

> When you're in training, they just teach you the basics of black jack. There's so much more to learn once you're on the floor and dealing. When you size out the payout, you have to demonstrate to the camera, break it down, to show to the camera what it is. They don't show that to you in training. The fastest way to set up the chips, to break down the payments, the tricks of the trade. It was hard interacting with customers at the time. I wasn't making too many errors counting because I was going slow and steady. It was an awkwardness, trying to interact. The floor, she's talking back and forth with the customers, making them laugh and I felt that I had to also be there. She told me to concentrate dealing the cards and that she was there to help and entertain the players. She wanted me to stay focused on the cards, the procedures, the money. That was a relief. (Katie, dual rate party pit, Las Vegas)

> You have to keep them smiling and you have to keep smiling. My first irate customer the second day that we were open, I was dealing blackjack. It was a full table, with one empty seat. The player that I remember was a little, 75 pound woman in her 80s in a wheelchair. When I flipped a blackjack, she looked me in the eye and called me an [expletive]. I couldn't believe it. And that's mild. That's just a name calling. I've been threatened and called worse than that, very creative names. It makes an impact if that's a $500 bet and they say it. Or they've already paid in $5,000 and you're the one who took that from them. It is a lot of thick skin that you need. I've taken amounts of money so quickly, I've taken my year's salary in twenty minutes. Not just a one-time occurrence but once a week if I'm on the right table. It can happen in one night. (Jacob, white table games dealer, Las Vegas).

184

Even though Jacob had to face irate customers on a regular basis, how to emotionally manage conflict at the table wasn't included in their job training, even though managing micro-interactions on the table is a key part of doing their job well.

The personal relationships that are developed between dealers and regulars at a casino help to bolster dealers' earnings from tips and form a committed group of customers. Employers want customers to be committed to their dealers, because it improves the likelihood for return customers.

> Poker players are very committed. When I deal in Detroit, I had close to 80 or 90 regulars that would come in religiously four or five times a week. Poker players are more critical of you than black jack dealers. But a losing customer, they're going to be more critical of you. They're going to jump over you anytime they can. (Adam, white table games dealer, Detroit).
>
> Part of the advantage for having a party pit is that when your dealer is interacting with your customers, they develop relationships. When you develop relationships, especially with locals, people who live here, you're going to have regulars now that actually follow that dealer wherever she goes. She's dealing at one station, well there going to play at that station, because that's their favorite dealer and they are going to go follow her. Most of the girls who've dealt longer than six months have regulars that follow them around. So, they're very valuable employees for the casino…It's very important to interact with people. Very rarely have I seen a girl not talk to anybody make very much tips. Why play with this girl who's not talking to me, when I could go over there where they look like they're having a really good time. At our most popular venue with the longest standing relationship, the record is $2200 for one girl's shift. Most girls on the weekends make $800 to $1200. (Karen, white casino employer, Las Vegas)

Having regulars who know the dealer and tip them consistently can help generate more tips from other players on the table and is seen as using momentum to increase

earnings. If a player is winning and tipping, other players can see that as good luck

for their own hand.

It is possible for dealers to engage in banter because of the inadequacy of

surveillance and management to see and hear everything that happens on the dealers'

tables. The organizational culture plays an important role in the labor process of

these work organizations to generate profits for the firm while maintaining a high

level of control over its workers. Banter gives dealers control over themselves, their

tables and their customers on the floor. Karen, an employer of temporary party pit

dealers for casinos in Las Vegas explained,

> They're going to be abused a little on a table, there's no doubt. People
> are going to get upset, going to cuss, they might mumble something
> terrible under their breath. You know you're going to take some abuse
> as a dealer. We always tell them what's tolerated and what's not
> tolerated. If they're threatening you, that's not tolerated. If they're
> just m and fing you, there's going to a lot of cuss words on the table.
> The girls know when somebody crosses the line. If it goes too far, the
> girl calls the supervisor over and the player is escorted out of the
> casino by security. And that girl later is escorted to her car by
> security. And they usually are anyway, because they have a lot of
> money in their pocket and are scantily clad. Customers may get the
> wrong idea. But that's the whole reason why they [party pit dealers]
> are there, to get hit on. But it's all in good fun. We tell them what's
> allowed and not allowed. They [the dealers] can't…we've caught girls
> before going up to somebody's room, after their shift at the same
> property. It's, you can look but you can't touch. (Karen, white casino
> employer, Las Vegas)

The quote above by Karen demonstrates the expectations of management for women

to engage in sexual, flirtatious banter with customers, because participating in banter

with customers is why the casino hired the women into party pit dealing. In contrast

to regular "black and white" dealing, party pit dealers wear scanty clothing and

186

dancing, singing and sexual banter is a regular part of their dealing. Even though

women participate in sexual banter in regular and party pit dealing, sexual banter is

allowed in party pit dealing to a greater extent. But as Karen explains, there are limits

to what is allowed for women dealers in party pit dealing. When engaging in banter

with customers, women dealers can call over supervisors to address any conduct that

crosses the boundary of acceptable banter. Also, women dealers are not allowed to

fraternize with dealers outside of their shift, and if a dealer engages with a player

outside of the table, the dealer can be fired. Women party pit dealers have to

negotiate crossing normative boundaries with customers and are expected by

management to control the extent of interactive banter with customers.

The primary strategy that dealers use to do their jobs effectively is to engage

in workplace banter when dealing at the gaming table. The dealers' bantering is in

contrast to deference, in which service workers are expected to practice deference to

the customer, maintain a positive demeanor at all times and to do surface acting

regardless of interior feelings.

> You're always trying to make people happy. We as dealers are there
> to be entertainment, the purpose of dealers is to entertain. If we
> weren't there, we could just have a million machines running and they
> wouldn't have to pay them. They're paying us to be entertaining to the
> guests. You try to have a good time at work, smile and make guests
> happy. When you're entertaining guests you want to make them feel
> special. You joke with them, you have fun. You have to know when
> to be serious and when to joke. I can't explain it, but you have to
> know when to be entertaining and when to be serious. If there's a guy
> losing a lot of money, you have to be more strict, more composed.
> You can't mess up, because you never know when they're going to go
> to your pit manager or even higher, your shift manager and say this
> guy was rude to me, this guy was joking at the table while I was losing

this amount of money. It's another skill set you have to have, knowing when to be serious. (Adam, white table games dealer in Detroit)

On the casino gaming floor, dealers do banter differently depending on the composition of players at the table and the type of managerial oversight at the time. It is significant that dealers describe the atmosphere of their tables as friendly and relaxed most of the time — yet, can easily be disrupted by an unfriendly or rude player at any time. "I like my freedom. I like that I'm the boss. I rule the table, what I say goes. I enjoy that part of the game. 90% of the people are great, 10% will make it miserable" (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas). And how dealers manage their tables in distressed moments depends on their group status relationship to the manager and those sitting at the table.

In casino gaming, a high degree of managerial oversight minimized aspects of a hostile workplace for dealers when interacting with customers. There is a high degree of oversight from cameras filming the pit, security details near the pit, and floor people behind the dealers in the pit to assist when situations come up. The floor person is responsible for smoothing out any conflict at the table between the dealer and the customers. It is the dealer's responsibility to keep order at his or her table. They can ask gamblers to stop swearing or tone it down because it is offending another person, for example. Dealers can ask for customers to be removed from their tables and these players will often be kicked out of the casino.

In this job, you gotta have thick skin. Players are going to talk about you, to embarrass you, and you have to have a comeback. You can't let them mow you down and make you look bad. You always have to remember that that's your table. You listen to me. You're in my

188

> house now, it's my rules or leave. If you don't like the way I do it, play at another table (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas)

The above quote by Lynn demonstrates her feelings of authority and control over her table. By stating that players are in her house now, Lynn shows that she decides how the game is played and how she will interact with the players. After all, players leave her table, she rotates to other tables during her shift, and she can request players to leave her table. This is quite different than the experiences of women in restaurant kitchens, who feel that they have very little authority in the kitchen among men kitchen staff. If women kitchen workers participate in banter, they risk verbal or physical harassment, because there is little oversight in their workplace. For women dealers in casinos, they have a greater degree of supervision from the casino and the ability to distance themselves from players acting inappropriately. For example,

> There have been times where I have felt very uncomfortable by players. In a year and a half at my strip property, it's happened maybe 2-3 times in front of everyone at the table. Mainly getting hit on by married men. I don't like that. When you get these old players, 60-70 years old who don't think that women belong at the poker table as players or dealers. I had a guy ask me to meet him in his room and offered me $500 to sleep with him. I've been solicited. I had other player swear at me or throw their cards at me. One time I had another player threatened to kill me. I had the floor standing behind me because another player on the table had already thrown his cards at me. I asked him if he wanted to buy in the next game and he didn't say anything. Once I started dealing the game, he stands up and starts yelling sexist profanities at me. He yelled that he was going to kill me and reached down for a white bag to put on the table. My manager and the security got him out of there but I was shaking and thought that my life was threatened. He got eighty-sixed from all the properties. (Jessica, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Jessica had a physically threatening experience while dealing at the table but could utilize management to remove the threatening player from her workplace. In

189

restaurant kitchens, women kitchen workers have little recourse for addressing

inappropriate conduct from other kitchen workers. The quote below shows how

management will exercise authority over players overstepping the acceptable

boundaries of discourse at the table and kicking a player out of the casino for

inappropriate conduct.

> You keep a table appropriate by keeping it from being filthy. Not
> letting people say the f-word, to get people away from swearing in
> general, especially if there's women at the table. You don't want
> people making dirty jokes, especially if there's women at the table.
> You don't want them saying inappropriate things about women to
> women. It's fun to joke around but you gotta keep it appropriate. The
> other day some guy was talking about having sex with minors, some
> guy was at the poker table saying that. And the dealer called the floor
> supervisor over and she said you can't talk about that. And he said I
> can talk about whatever I want. No you can't, it's not a public square,
> this is a business, you can't sit there and say whatever you want. The
> guy wound up getting thrown out. The dealer went on to the next table
> and the supervisor talked to the guy and he left. There's ten people at
> the table and you can't have somebody drunk, slowing up the game,
> you have to keep things within the normal boundaries of good taste,
> allowing people to have fun. (Andy, white Las Vegas poker dealer)

Players are allowed to joke and banter, but only within the acceptable boundaries

determined by the dealer. And management perceives women as being better at

engaging in banter, particularly sexual banter, with their customers — giving the

casino incentive to provide a higher degree of managerial oversight over the tables, to

encourage women dealers to engage in banter.

> It's a very sexist business. And the reason the party pits work so well,
> is because typically with the party pit dealer, most of the guests, male
> and female, stay at those tables a lot longer because their appearance is
> meant to attract people and the appearances are only one thing. The
> majority of table game players are men and they're going to engage
> longer with an engaging female than a male like myself dealing. They
> also have to have the right personality. And they have to have that

outgoing, flirty personality. And that's what keeps the people at their table. That same personality type, the appearance, it works the same way on a regular casino floor, that's not a party pit. You have a pretty girl there, who has a great personality, and her dealing skills meet the standards, then that girl's table is probably going to produce a little better than somebody else's table. So for the kind of girls that we use, the pretty, young females, opportunity abounds for them. Every casino will scarf them up in a minute. Not necessarily to put them in party pit clothes, but just to put them in as a regular dealer. Most girls stop working for us when they get fired, the ones who stopped because they quit is generally because they've gotten a job at the big paying casinos on the strip. We have a lot of girls who started with us who work at Cesar's Palace now. Their dealers make a $100,000 a year. So opportunity for women I believe in the gaming business now is better than it is for men. That's flipped 180 degrees in the last thirty years. The women in casinos then were horribly abused and there was no such thing as a woman supervisor, let alone a casino manager thirty years ago. And now 50% of the managers we run into are women and certainly 50% of the supervisors we run into are women (Scott, white casino employer, Las Vegas).

In the above quote, Scott explained that women are better at banter than men, customers were more likely to seek out women dealers and to play and spend money at a table longer —earning the casino higher profits. A woman dealer explained how "doing gender" (West and Zimmerman (1987) in interaction with customers earns the casino more money from repeat customers.

I'll have my pretty make-up on, especially on the weekends and I'll look presentable because I'm in a public atmosphere providing a service at that time. If there's a younger gentleman at the table or younger lady that flirts, I flirt right back with them jokingly. Because it's going to be more money in my pocket at the end of the day, if they have a better time, they're more likely to give me money. And more likely to come back and be a repeat customer for the casino. (Jenny, white black jack dealer, West Michigan)

To secure repeat customers for the casino, women dealers have to both act and display themselves "appropriately" to their sex category but at the same time, handle

191

customers to keep them from acting inappropriately at the table. As Sharon (white poker dealer, Las Vegas) explained, "If you can handle it yourself, you handle it yourself. I can really be a smart ass if I want to. Otherwise, you call the floor man over." It's the dealers' responsibility to handle the table, but they can call over their supervisor if there is a situation that is out of hand.

Experienced dealers develop strategies to manage the players at their table, but also rely on their supervisors to back them up on the table, making the supervisory relationship important for a dealer's ability to handle their players. For example, when a conflict occurs at the table between the dealer and a player, the dealer often first attempts to minimize or eliminate conflicts through light banter or by reiterating the house rules. If these attempts fail, dealers rely on supervisors to step in and help them manage the players on the table. "She [my manager] takes charge. If someone's giving me a hard time, she'd say, hey, leave him alone" (William, white poker dealer, Las Vegas). Dealers reported that they struggled to retain power over their tables, even though it was paramount to their success in their type of service work. Less experienced and skilled dealers, because this type of player management was not taught in dealer training, are less likely to retain power over their table. More experienced and skilled dealers, because of the training they receive informally after they are hired from other workers and supervisors, are more likely to manage their tables effectively. "There's some games and some people where you have to be able to squeeze authority over them. The one thing in this job that you need in this job is a backbone. There's times where you have to say, sir calm

down. People get so uptight and so angry. If you cost them three hands in a row,

they think that you're the devil" (Matt, white poker dealer, Las Vegas).

Because the dealers depended on the managers for protection and to provide a

buffer between themselves and the customers, cultivating that relationship proved to

be important for dealers. At the same time, dealers knew they were the front line of

the gaming pit and responsible for managing their table, including the pace of play

and the conduct of the players. Thus, dealers used banter to manage and control the

customers on the table to their own benefit, which involved matching or emulating

the customer's emotional performance to hold him or her in line.

> I'm a representative of the casino. It's my job to run a good game and
> to be friendly. They don't want some grouch in there, they're not
> paying me to be in a bad mood. Of course, you make more money
> when you're friendlier but sometimes you're not feeling it, like any
> other job. I'm definitely not grouchy, I put the best face on I can but
> sometimes I just don't want to be there. But for the most part, I am
> friendly and positive and I run a good game. Sometimes I feel like
> talking to everybody and joking and sometimes I don't. I think that
> I'm making more money when I'm joking around. It's not easy for me
> to be upbeat all the time. (Andy, white Las Vegas poker dealer)

In contrast to deference (Hochshild 1983), which requires that the customer is always

right and to maintain a positive presentation of self, bantering required that the dealer

(and at times managers) exert control and dominance over the customer in the micro-

interaction — even though rules on the books tell the dealers to provide excellent

customer service at all times (Sallaz 2009). Effective table management is important

because even though dealers can circumvent the rules of customer service on their

tables in micro-interactions that are not closely monitored, making their customers

happy remains central to their success.

Dealers explained that they'd control their customers in a joking manner to

minimize the chance of making them angry. In poker especially, women dealers are

at times challenged by the mostly men players.

> There are some players out there who only tip women, discrimination obviously. Women, if they're nice and attractive, they can make more money. There are a couple of girls where I work now, every day if I make $160, they make $220. It's always a little bit more. I was tapping in a dealer, this short little lady, she's really slow. The players were just like, God, their faces, making remarks like, god are you serious. Then when I sit down, they are like thank god Matt. (Matt, white poker player, Las Vegas)
> There is a respect issue for when a woman comes to the table to make a decision. Because sometimes men they have cultural bias against women. So no, I'm not going to let a woman tell me, especially because it's my money, how this is going to go down. They tend to argue more with a female floor person who just needs to learn how to shut them down and say nope, this is how it's going to be. Dealers continue the game under these rules, let's go (Kevin, white casino manager, Las Vegas)

There are rules of conduct, but the everyday conversation between players and the

dealer is not monitored closely. Casino workers on the frontline of service work do

a significant amount of table management, not only handling angry players but also

harassment from players on the table.

> It's to your discretion. MGM International puts forth how they want their employees to act. But we're also supposed to make experiences memorable for our guests, that way they will return. Poker is considered a different society separate from the rest of the casino. Being a poker dealer, I can something to a guest that I wouldn't be able to say if I was a black jack dealer. I'll get tipped for saying one-liners to the guests, for being a smart-ass. A black jack dealer would get in trouble for saying something like that.
> To increase my tips, I try to be as fast and efficient as possible. I try to treat the guests exactly the same, whether it's my first time dealing to you or my 300th time. It also helps to make the tables laugh. You got to be quick on your feet. Because I've been there a year and a half, I've built camaraderie with the locals and then I have recurring tourists

194

that come to my casino and made friends with the tourists and only play in my room when they come back. I love my job, this is my dream job, I couldn't imagine doing anything else. You have to make it fun. It also helps that I'm a female dealer, because female dealers make more money than male dealers. (Jessica, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Even if you're nice, unless you show cleavage, nothing's going to work. A player is going to tip you how they're going to tip you, regardless. Some players will talk to another player, to avoid tipping you. Even in big games with $4000 or $5000 pot, sometimes you won't even get a $1. I am friendly, talk with them, flirt with them. Sometimes there's a player who you don't want to be there with. So I'll distract myself by talking with somebody else, to get your mind off who's sitting at that table. Sometimes 30 minutes takes a long time. If they don't like you and leave, that's the best. (Lynn, Latina cards dealer, Las Vegas)

Women use joking and banter to their advantage by using it during interaction with players to exert control over their tables.

I joke with them all the time. I say, there's a corner over there, and you're going to go to time out. They kind of laugh, and say oh sorry Andrea, but you just joke with them and be friendly. You can't be really mean, you can't treat them like your children, they're adults. You treat them with respect and you joke with them. Like I said you joke with them, I say, the next time you do that I'm going to spank you, you're going to stand in the corner, you're going on time out. They just look at me and then start laughing, and say okay. (Andrea, Latina dual rate, Las Vegas)

I'll say something back to them and put them in their place. I'll say something like, oh I forgot that you're supposed to win every hand when I'm dealing. Make a joke out of it, so that the other players start laughing about it. I'll try to change the situation so that it's put on them. I'll challenge them. (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Some players can be very difficult to manage on the table, so dealers have to skirt formal customer service rules with informal strategies to improve the interactions on the table.

Players are sexist, players challenge me and I've had one player threaten me before. He lost on the game and once he lost, he started asking me when I got off work, where I park, what kind of car I drive. I told him and said, you had better draw first. Some players, they're trying to push your buttons. I'm not going to let a player cost me my job. Because that's what they're trying to do. (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas)

I'm very good at working with men or women customers. I'm good at reading them to know what they want from the dealer. Do they just want you to dummy up and deal to them and very P.C., five star – absolutely ma'am, let me recommend the buffet – that kind of thing. I've noticed in the high limit setting, and most of the male clientele. They like a dealer with a personality, so they tend to prefer a female dealer. With me, being a young female dealer will help me get more tips in those games. Even if they're not winning ,they tend to like a little bit of sass, a little bit of attitude, that kind of thing. A lot of them enjoy that and it puts me at an advantage. Of course, there's always the jerk customers that will take the cheap shots, make the sexual innuendos, the rude things. Those things, you have to brush off and ignore. There was one guy, and a couple of guys on the game. They were drinking and not really betting anything noteworthy. They were losing, and so the guy starts heckling me, I bet you like that right, I bet you like bitching at us, I bet you like wearing a strap-on, stuff like that. It can range from inappropriate and heckling you like that, or of course, you get the, come back to my room, kind of thing. People come to Vegas, get a few drinks in them and get a bit of courage. Most of that you have to brush off. If a player gets out of line, then the supervisor will step in and kick the player off the game. The customers can swear at me all day, and I don't care. I'm not going to see them again for the most part. It's about a fifty-fifty split between tourists and locals. (Marissa, table games dealer, Las Vegas)

I've been a supervisor too, so I've ran the room. I've dealt, or I've been a supervisor. You have to be in both modes to know how to treat your customers without really making them angry. Because if you do make them a lot angry, then they go to upper management and then they come back and look at you. But you have to be firm enough to where they understand they can't push you over either because they'll try. It's very tricky, to keep them happy, yet keep your job. And for them to not stop over the boundaries because there'll be a lot who will try to push you around. (Andrea, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas)

196

Managing boundaries with customers is important for dealers to be perceived by

management as a good dealer or a good supervisor. Dealers must maintain speed and

efficiency on their tables, while keeping customers under their control. It was agreed

among participants that women are more successful dealers and better supervisors

than men, because of their ability to engage in banter to make customers happy or to

minimize conflict.

> The majority of the time, women make more tips than men. Most
> players are men and that is a big factor. Anytime you're around a
> bunch of men and there's only one female, you know it's always going
> to be focused on you, they're going to be focused on the female.
> Talking to the female, because who wants to look at a bunch of guys.
> They'd rather look at you, flirt with you, talk back to you, than all the
> men at the table. The women are better for dealing. But not all
> women. In table games, it's different because you're playing with
> house money. In poker, you're playing with their money and females
> are better. You need to be outspoken and fun, and have more
> personality when you deal. I know when I go to a table and start
> dealing after a man, I can feel tension at the table. So I open it up and
> show my personality, I can see how it was a crummy table before I got
> there. You could feel how they weren't having a good time, or they
> were upset or it was quiet and nobody talks. Poker is more social that
> the other games. (Lynn, Latina poker dealer, Las Vegas)

On casino gaming floors, women can use banter, such as flirting and joking, to earn

more as dealers. Women use workplace banter to manage and control their tables,

plus to encourage tipping from players.

> One night, another poker dealer was complaining because he made
> less than a $100 and I made more than $130. Most of the poker
> players are men, there are very few women who play poker. Guys are
> like that when they're tipping but I don't know if they really notice
> other than when it's one of the hot chicks who are working. We have
> a few nice looking, very nice looking dealers. The rumor is that the
> most bubbly one of us makes more than 50% than all of us. If I make
> $200, she's making $300. The guys say that all the time, I don't know
> if it's true or not. One of my best friends, a female dealer, would flirt

and banter at the table, do whatever she had to do at the table but she would leave it at the table. Some of the girls do go over the top. There's another female dealer, and if she likes the guy she's dealing to, she's flirting the whole time that she's dealing to you, 100%. I'll be waiting behind her to push on to the table, and she'll be talking about stuff that I wouldn't even talk to my husband about, but that's just how they do it. Some of the women, they'll play it for all it's worth. And they won't be reprimanded or written up. They would be if a customer complained, but the management isn't walking around listening for that. The supervisors don't care. (Sharon, table games dealer, Las Vegas)

Some of the dealers who make the most money in this town are technically the worst dealers but they're friendly. It's weird, I have one of the few jobs in the world, at least in this country, where men typically make less than women. Nothing I can do about it. I can't bring a lawsuit because the company pays me the same minimum wage. It's the tips. Women generally make more because most of the players are men. I think in general men may be inclined to tip more, especially young pretty girls, but there's a lot of these girls who work, I mean they flirt. They flirt with the guys. Some guy's going to walk in and some woman dealer is going to walk over, give him a hug and call him honey. I'm sure that it's not something the guy who's writing the rule book is thinking is going on but in reality there's a certain amount of they want their players to develop, it's a relationship based business, you want players to develop relationships with your dealers. If I go into IHOP and the waitress calls me honey, I'm a little bit irritated because there's a certain level of intimacy that I don't think the waitress at IHOP should have with me. But I know a lot of guys like that, they want that kind of waitress. Every procedure book tells you to not refer to players as honey but to use their name or sir or ma'am. The truth of the matter is no customer ever complains if they're called honey and a lot of men like it." (Robert, white poker dealer, Las Vegas).

Guys tend to tip the women more. And women I think they make more than men, at least the attractive ones. They're friendlier, there's more guys over there [in the poker room], they can flirt a little bit if they want, they can joke around. A table full of guys, I sit down, I gotta work to entertain these guys. A girl sits down, they guys go, oooh a girl. Being a female is an advantage because of all the guys at the table and it's a tipping industry. I think it is advantageous to be a woman in the business. (Andy, white Las Vegas poker dealer).

> Oh yeah, if there's a guy flirting with me, I'll flirt back. I flirt back 90% of the time. It's rare in one shift that I go back to the same table and I will only be there 30 minutes. Usually if you flirt with them, they'll tip you and they'll even come back to play at my table the next day. My number one question is if they're a local. If they're locals, I don't want to be flirtatious with a local regular. I usually know who they are and will be overly nice to them. If I know they're a tourist, I'll flirt with them, because I won't see them again or at least not for a year. I'll do it, because it does get you more money. (Jessica, white poker dealer, Las Vegas)

Women use banter to manage and control their table and still follow customer service protocol, while maximizing their tips. Men, however, can't use the same strategies of controlling the interaction with their players through workplace banter and this negatively impacts their chances of increasing their earnings and making their jobs better. "If you're a woman, men might try to take advantage of you a little more, but they'll also tip you better. Pretty women get tipped better than men. It's a fact, every day of the week" (Adam, white table games dealer, Detroit). Because dealers rely on tips as their "bread and butter," maximizing tips is an important strategy for improving their jobs in casino gaming.

Workplace sexual banter has different consequences for women in restaurant kitchens than in casino gaming. In restaurant kitchens women are in less authoritative positions and have less workplace power. The pervasiveness of banter in everyday kitchen work makes women socially isolated from the men kitchen workers, and less likely to receive equivalent chances to move up. Men use banter to create gendered boundaries between themselves and women, effectively hoarding opportunities for themselves. If women don't participate in the kitchen banter, they are likely to be seen by others as poor team players and are unlikely to advance to better jobs. For

199

example, one executive chef and manager, Isaac, spoke of a woman in his kitchen

staff who he considered for promotion to a better job, into a sous chef position. Yet,

she was socially isolated from the rest of the men in the kitchen staff, and Isaac

doubted her ability to manage them, because she wasn't able to gain the respect of

others. In Isaac's opinion, she was too moody and uptight, or the opposite of relaxed

and jovial, characteristics that can be demonstrated through participation in banter.

Similarly, sexual banter is also a pervasive form of dialogue on casino gaming

tables for women. Women dealers consistently described using flirting, sexual jokes

and innuendos on the table with customers. Yet, women did not describe this banter

as sexual harassment but rather viewed banter as a strategy to gain advantage through

increased tips from customers. Women also viewed their position on the table with

more authority than women saw their position in restaurant kitchens. As Lynn, a

table games dealer said, it was her rules and her table. Women used management

strategies to keep the players under control. And if banter got out of control, there

were supervisors who were most likely to take the dealer's side over the player's side.

The physical distance between women and the players also prevented players from

harassing the women dealers physically. Thus, women used the strategies of sexual

banter to improve the quality of their dealing jobs via increased tipping. As Sharon

explained above, supervisors will look the other way if sexual banter is taking place

on the table, because it generates repeat business and players are more likely to stay

on the table longer. This is similar to Sallaz's (2009) finding that supervisors looked

the other way if dealers will encourage players to tip, if it increased the speed of play

and profit. In contrast to restaurant kitchens, women utilize sexual banter to their

own benefit but also have greater autonomy, authority and control at work.

Conclusion

The labor process in both types of service work demands a type of emotional

labor — impoliteness and noncompliance with standard customer service standards

— that is distinct from deference (Hochshild 1979). The extent to which a worker

can both perform impoliteness and accept it from others plays a key role in social

cohesion among service workers in restaurant kitchens and between workers,

supervisors and customers in casino gaming pits. The failure to act according to the

intergroup dynamics of each type of work plays a key role in social closure. The

participation in the workplace dynamics of each type of service production line

excludes some workers, while including and advancing others. In terms of intergroup

dynamics, the kinds of boundary labor workers do at work differ because the labor

process of these service production lines is organized in distinct ways.

Workplace banter in food, hospitality and personal service work plays a key

role in exclusionary boundary making by men against women kitchen workers.

Through the practice of banter, workers organize themselves into those who form a

socially cohesive group and those who are excluded from this group. This dynamic

among the team shapes which workers gain opportunity for advancement by proving

that they can appropriately participate in banter following the norms of the particular

type of workplace. And since men hold 80% of the executive and head chef

positions, this has significant consequences for women's advancement. The norms of

banter are shaped differently in restaurant kitchens than in casino gaming, which helps to explain the differences in mobility found within each type of internal occupational ladders.

Even though the internal occupational ladders examined are integrated by gender and race-ethnicity at the entry-level and overall, some groups of workers are more likely to gain advancement to better jobs than others. In restaurant kitchens, white and racial-ethnic men are more likely than white and racial-ethnic women to advance to better positions from the entry-level jobs. But in casino gaming, white women and white men are more likely than workers of color to advance into better positions from the entry-level jobs. These groups of workers have historically been excluded from advancement in casino gaming (Enarson 1993) and in restaurant kitchens (Duffy 2007; Nakano Glenn 1992).

The degree to which workers participate in different types of banter secures their mixed-group inclusion and workplace success. The evidence in this research shows that how workers engage in banter is not uniform because they are working in interactive service work. It actually is the differences in who the workers interact with on the job that matters. In backline service work, workers interact primarily with each other. As described in chapter four, workers are organized into stations on the food production line, with each station for producing one component of a dining ticket. The workers at the stations have to closely work together to get the food out efficiently and with cohesive timing. This requires a high level of coordination and communication among the workers, making it a team-intensive workplace.

Restaurant kitchen workers are also managed by other kitchen workers higher on the line in most establishments (with the exception of some corporate restaurants and hotels that have a designated kitchen manager).

Scholars of work have argued that emotional labor is a central feature of interactive service work, with management standardizing scripting and feeling rules that require workers to display positive emotions on the job to customers (Hochschild 1979; Leidner 1991). Yet, the triangulation between management, workers, and customers ignores a crucial type of interaction at work among workers on a backline service production line. The assumption that backline service work is on the periphery of the core of service work that involves interaction with customers and controlled by management implies that interaction among backline service workers is irrelevant to considerations of workplace power. Backline workers do not share power evenly among themselves. Rather, micro-interactions between workers in restaurant kitchens shape the internal stratification of workers into bad, better, and good jobs. Banter is one mechanism that makes boundaries in integrated workplaces among workers. And the boundary between workers who have gained social cohesion into the work group and those who are socially excluded shapes upwards advancement in kitchens. Men are more likely than women to hold positions of authority in the kitchen and set the cultural tone of banter in the kitchen. Men in entry-level jobs seeking advancement see participation in banter as one pathway to a better job. Thus, men lower on the service line form social cohesion with men higher

on the service line via banter. For women, banter in the kitchen creates social exclusion, isolating women from the same opportunities for advancement as men.

In frontline casino work, workers interact primarily with customers. In casinos, the gaming pits are organized in semi-circles, with the gaming tables making up the outer ring, with the dealer facing the customers at the table. In the inner ring are the pit bosses, the pit clerk and occasionally the floor manager, who also circulates between gaming pits on the floor. Dealers are managed both by the customers and management, but not directly by their co-workers. The dealers only have one shared interest among themselves to increase their tips when the tips are pooled (with the exception of poker dealers, who keep their individual tips). In contrast to restaurants, table gaming work in casinos is customer-intensive, frontline work that requires a high degree of player management from dealers. Part of managing players is the ability of dealers to do manage the players on the table and make it work to the dealers' advantage. For women, doing this effectively via banter increased the level of tipping from customers and often requires the cooperation of the pit supervisors.

In both workplaces, workers are expected to engage in banter, a practice of interaction that creates inequality among workers even within integrated workplaces —long argued to be one way that inequality could be reduced (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Elliott and Smith 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2008). Because boundary work is context specific, the rules of conduct and interaction differ between types of service work organizations. Thus, the extent

to which workers are perceived to be successfully doing boundary work shapes their workplace advancement through processes of in-group inclusion or exclusion. Inter-group boundaries are maintained at work via a shared workplace culture among the more privileged workers. Banter is an established part of workplace discourse in restaurant kitchens and casino gaming. To advance in their careers, workers must use the established discourse in the workplace to demonstrate their teamwork competency in restaurants and their table management competency in casinos. In restaurant kitchens, banter is an exclusionary practice because it includes hostile discourse towards women. In casino gaming, banter is a boundary crossing practice because it enables women to use gendered and sexualized discourse strategically in interaction with players, which advantages women over men.

In both workplaces, workers are more likely to advance if they are perceived to engage in banter appropriately for the type of interactional work — in frontline or backline service work. For example in one full-service restaurant, the executive chef and sous chef, Seth, closely conferred with each other about whether or not to hire a working intern. They were unsure of hiring him, because he was unwilling to participate in the kitchen banter with the rest of the men in the kitchen. It wasn't until the intern began to participate in the banter, that he was seen as a worthwhile hire into the kitchen staff. Or in casino gaming Karen, an employer of temporary casino dealers, explained that she was more likely to place women into the better dealing positions, if they were skilled at banter in customer service on the tables. Even though the character of banter was similar in the two workplaces compared in this

chapter, banter limited women's upwards advancement in kitchens but facilitated their advancement in casinos. Thus, banter can explain segmentation of advanced positions in restaurant kitchens (with men more likely to get ahead) and the segmentation of advanced positions in casinos (with women more likely to get ahead). And a key difference in my comparative study was whether women were working in backline or frontline service work.

In restaurant kitchens, men are more likely than women to advance in restaurant kitchens because the norms of workplace banter exclude women from gaining in-group cohesion, which negatively affects their upwards advancement to better jobs. In restaurant kitchens, joking and banter is an everyday part of workplace interaction. Workers say that it helps with stress, with the hard work, with the physical and mental toll it takes on them. Workers expect their co-workers to engage in banter and doing so helps workers to be included in the work group. Despite these perspectives by those who work in restaurant kitchens, bantering reproduces the cultural logic of the privileged and powerful men who work on the service production line. Thus, the workplace becomes hostile to women kitchen workers, becoming a barrier to their genuine integration into the opportunity structure at work. Conversely, in casino gaming, workplace banter facilitates women's inclusion in the in-group dynamics of the gaming pit, which improves their chances of getting better outcomes from their jobs, such as better tips, better shifts, or supervisory shifts. Women were more likely than men to engage in loose banter with customers to achieve both *customer satisfaction* and *speed of play*. Management

perceived women to be better dealers than men because of their efficiency of dealing cards and ability to manage the players on their table. Women dealers were also more likely than men to receive higher tips from customers because of their "customer service." Women secured the better shifts because it was in the casino's best interest to have the fastest dealers. Women were also perceived to better supervisors because they could manage conflict and entertain the players.

Research has shown that privileged groups do boundary work to socially exclude others to retain their advantage in the labor market, and that these boundaries are often applied to workers of different backgrounds (Royster 2003). My research extends this finding by examining employee relations and interaction within the workplace. In restaurant kitchens, my examination showed significant evidence of interactional gendered boundary making by men to preserve their privilege and hoard their opportunities at work. By engaging in workplace banter, men cooperated with each other to protect their advantage and limit women's access to valued resources, like better positions in the kitchen and the improved rewards from more advanced positions. In casino gaming, my examination showed that women gained privilege in the workplace by using banter to cross the gendered symbolic and material boundaries at work. When symbolic boundaries are socially embedded in the workplace culture via banter, these boundaries translate into material consequences for workers. In restaurant kitchens, men's shared group membership (and women's exclusion) gives them greater access to resources at work for upward mobility. In casino gaming, shared group membership is less salient because the dealing labor

process is more independent and autonomous work with dealers largely interacting

with the public. This organization of the labor process enables women to draw on

strategies of banter to do the work of crossing gendered symbolic and material

boundaries via their participation in banter. The similar demands of the labor process

in kitchens and gaming enables the integration of entry-level occupations but the

differences in how the labor process is organized creates the conditions for banter to

either be boundary work that creates symbolic and material boundaries between men

and women (as in restaurant kitchens), or to be boundary work that crosses symbolic

and material boundaries between men and women (as in casino gaming).

Social exclusion had significant negative consequences for out-group

members in the opportunity structure at work. Workplace banter normalizes

discrimination in the workplace and reflects the power of higher status workers.

Boundary work creates workplaces that disadvantage to particular groups of workers.

Thus, even though the entry-level jobs and the overall internal occupational ladder are

integrated, it is not genuine integration because certain groups are excluded from

advancement.

My research challenges the assumption that inequality can be reduced if

occupations are integrated with groups who have been historically excluded

(Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Elliott and Smith 2001, 2002; Kanter

1977; Reskin and Roos 1990; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2008; Waldinger and Lichter

2003). By examining integration in combination with mobility to better jobs, I found

that workplace interaction is a significant mechanism of internal stratification of

workers. From entry-level jobs, some groups of workers are more likely than others to advance upwards, based on the type of workplace and the norms of workplace banter. By studying integrated occupations, I found that more should be done to improve workplace relations to reduce inequality at work.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

My dissertation was concerned with explaining a puzzle found in the quantitative employment patterns found in restaurant kitchens and casino table gaming. I identified two case studies of stratified internal job ladders that show integrated entry-level jobs but segregation in advanced jobs. In these service occupations, there is a potential for workers to move up from bad entry-level jobs into better jobs within the job ladder. Even though entry-level jobs in kitchens and casino gaming show integration by gender and race-ethnicity (counted between 40% and 55% of women or 30% and 45% people of color), advanced positions are segregated. In kitchens, men are more likely to advance to better jobs than woman. In casino table games, women are more likely than men to get the better dealing jobs, while white workers are more likely to advance into supervisory jobs than workers of color. Why are there divergent mobility pathways for different groups of workers from entry-level jobs with similar education and skill requirements? I argue in this dissertation that this puzzle can best be explained by practices of banter in workplace interaction. By combining an analysis of job and labor queues with employment relations at work, a more robust understanding of inequality in jobs emerged.

In restaurant kitchens and casino gaming, the labor process is similarly organized into service production lines, with demands of speed, efficiency, and precision. Job queues and labor queues helped to explain why entry-level jobs are integrated by nearly equivalent numbers of women and men, and white workers and workers of color. Employers in casinos and restaurants sought workers who they

perceived having the ability to get along with others ─ in restaurant kitchens with the work team and in casino gaming with customers. For entry-level jobs, employers were not more likely to draw from one pool of applicants over another by gender or race-ethnicity. And workers applied a framework of bad, better and good jobs to describe their perspective of job quality in casino gaming or restaurant kitchens. Even though the entry-level jobs may be of bad quality, workers believed that they could secure better, if not good jobs eventually. To advance in kitchens, workers understood that the promotional decision making power was given to the head or executive chef (in full-service restaurants and hotels) or to managers (in chain restaurants), who often work alongside them on the service line or have a high degree of contact together. To advance in casinos, workers understood that they were evaluated by their speed of dealing and their ability to provide customer service by the rules, but also diverge from the rules if necessary to retain control over the speed of play. In both workplaces, workers were motivated to advance up the internal job ladders to better, if not good jobs.

In this research, I examined the mechanisms that shape social inequalities within service work organizations that have stratified internal job ladders. I conducted a qualitative, comparative case study between restaurant kitchens and casino gaming floors by interviewing workers, managers, and executives. I chose this case study because of the similarities by race and gender of workers' entrance into entry-level occupations but significant variation of upwards mobility into better jobs within these types of workplaces. I argued that these patterns can be explained by the

differences in workplace interaction. Workers were expected to engage in workplace banter that created new hierarchies of privilege within diverse workplaces. Because banter is context specific, the rules of conduct and interaction differed between the types of service work organizations. Thus, the extent to which workers were perceived to be successfully participating in banter shaped their advancement from entry-level to better and more advanced positions through processes of gender boundary making or gender boundary crossing.

To explain the segmentation of advanced jobs in kitchens and casino gaming, I argued that workplace banter is a key process of opportunity hoarding through gender boundary making in restaurant kitchens and of gaining opportunity through gender boundary crossing in casino gaming. My comparative examination of one type of frontline interactive work with one types of backline interactive work shows that who workers interact with shapes opportunity structures at work. Both internal job ladders offer workers the opportunity to move up into positions that offer better rewards, like pay or benefits but workers did not have an equal chance to advance.

Organizational norms of behavior became apparent in the comparison between two similar yet different types of workplaces – restaurant kitchens and casino gaming floors. By examining participant observation and qualitative interview data, I showed how within restaurant kitchens, rules of bantering and the degree to which they were followed determined whether or not a worker was socially incorporated into the mixed group. The production of service was highly interactive and required high amounts of teamwork and team mentality to get the best service

and product to the customer. Thus, bantering was more important to workplace success than purely trained skills that were necessary to do their job well, such as delivering the best ticket of food possible. If a worker was able to participate in and be perceived as someone skilled in bantering, then he or she was likely to be incorporated into the workplace and awarded inclusion into the mixed group and likely to be offered occupational advancement.

By comparison, casino gaming workers engaged mostly with customers and supervisors. Dealers' ability to engage in good customer service while at the same time, retaining control over customers and the speed of play were important skills to be a successful dealer. Women had an advantage in casino dealing because they could utilize sexual banter with men players at the table, both to increase their tips and to exert power over the table dynamics. Women were also likely to move into supervisory positions, because they were perceived to be able to handle customer issues effectively. Bantering was also important for casino workers to do their job well, but awarded opportunity of advancing to better dealing jobs the most to women. But explaining why white women were more likely than workers of color to move into supervisory positions was not well explained by my research findings. Based on my data, I was not able to explain racial differences in casino mobility. One, my findings were limited by my ability to recruit dealers of color from snowball sampling and the difficulty via interviewing methods to facilitate participants' discussion of racial-ethnic dynamics at work. Even though I was given entry into observing table games from the vantage of the pit, this observational data did not help to explain

differences in mobility to supervisory positions. This leaves the question open of why traditional racial barriers bind in the casino setting, but not in kitchens? The patterns I identified in casino gaming and restaurant kitchens have an interesting parallel to previous research by McCall (2001) that found white men and men of color earned more than white women and women of color ─ showing that there was more gender wage inequality and less racial wage inequality in Detroit. She explained this pattern by arguing that the strong influence of masculine unions skewed its support towards men manufacturing workers over women. It is possible that in casino gaming that there a parallel explanation could be applied to the advantage of white workers over workers of color to advance to supervisory positions. Because my dissertation did not include in its analysis the potential influence of unions on inequality found in the workplace, my analysis could have missed unionization of casino jobs as an important factor to explain racial inequality. Future research could help to explain racial differences in casino gaming advancement by recruiting more dealers of color into its sample, conduct deeper observational methods in casino workplaces to observe racial-ethnic dynamics, or making a comparative analysis of unionized jobs with nonunionized jobs.

My dissertation highlights the importance of workplace context to explain the variation of stratification across different types of internal job ladders. Socially constructed gender boundaries in restaurant kitchens made it less likely for women to advance up the line, while violating similar boundaries in casino gaming made it more likely for women to advance into better placed positions on the casino floor.

The interactive practice of banter and its role in sorting workers into and out of advanced positions is largely invisible in the workplace. Banter is a common and pervasive form of interaction in casino and kitchen workplaces and could be observed in other workplaces that involve a high degree of interaction among co-workers or with the public — and not just in service industry occupations. Further research should look inside of workplace organizations to observe interaction and to interview workers about their interactions to examine banter in other case studies. If more is learned about banter at work, sociologists could uncover more variation among different internal job ladders to examine if other variables influence how engaging in banter affects inequality at work.

In restaurant kitchens, what might seem as nothing more than workplace banter was a practice of boundary making by men in relationship to women, socially excluding them from the core group of men workers. Gendered boundaries reproduced the cultural logic of the privileged and powerful on the service production line who were men working in the most advanced positions on the line. Social exclusion had negative effects on women's advancement up the service production line, by preventing them from learning the skills and receiving cooperation from the work team. Particularly in entry-level jobs within low-wage work, skill and knowledge transmission is important to workers' successful transition into the workplace (Vallas 2003; Waldinger and Lichter 2003). My dissertation research helps to address how informal social networks within the workplace influences the distribution of skill and social support after workers are hired.

In casino gaming, dealers' production of service or dealing of the game is largely independent from each other and only periodically dependent on the role of supervisors, like in the case of a player disputing how a hand was called on the table. Thus, dealers have a higher degree of independence and control over their tables than restaurant workers do over their food stations in the kitchen. In restaurants, food production is a combination of components created by workers at the food stations, requiring intensive teamwork, coordination and cooperation. But in casinos, interaction takes place mostly with the players at the table. Women are more likely than men to use banter when interacting with players at the table, and to specifically use sexual banter. Participants agreed that women were more successful at earning more tips than men, an important form of advancement in the workplace because dealers rely on tips for most of their earnings. To earn more tips, women violated gender boundary norms in interaction with customers, by engaging in banter that in other types of work settings would be unacceptable because it contrasts with standard customer service rules. And to manage unruly players who often contested women dealers' decisions about a hand or challenged them in some way, women retained a fast speed of play by practicing the opposite of deference in the form of speaking out to stand up against the players. These interactional practices enabled women dealers to advance in their careers to the better shifts, the better tables and the better tipping.

Banter is a micro-interactional explanation of workplace stratification and how inequality can be reduced for some groups and not others in certain types of occupational ladders. In the case of restaurant kitchens, by identifying barriers that

groups can face after they are hired, I identified the mechanisms that create hostile

working environments for women in restaurants that limit their genuine integration

into the workplace. By recognizing workplace dynamics on the restaurant service

production line, I aim to reduce the perception that micro-interactions like banter or

joking are harmless but rather evidence of bias. My research brings attention to the

micro-interactional practices embedded in work organizations that can contribute to

groups' social exclusion. Micro-interactions reproduce power and privilege on the

service production line and play a role in creating hostile work environments and

discrimination. The normalization of discrimination in workplace culture restricts the

genuine integration of women into restaurant kitchens. Further research should

examine micro-interactional processes in other kinds of workplaces to identify how

banter contributes to hostile workplaces for groups of workers organized by socially

constructed characteristics like race and ethnicity and gender.

Yet in the case of casino gaming, banter helped women gain opportunity to

advance to better jobs. Women only started to be hired into gaming service

occupations in the early 1970s (Enarson 1993) but today make up 48% of gaming

workers (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012b). Because the quality of dealing jobs

varies across establishment, assigned shifts, and type of game, advancement to better

jobs is harder to track. And while some workers view the advancement to

supervisory positions as advancing to the best jobs in casinos, not all workers share

this view. Job quality is complex in casinos and mapping out inequality is not as

easily captured by a hierarchical job ladder, as in restaurant kitchens. But even in

217

restaurant kitchens, workplace inequality embedded inside of kitchen teams could be easily missed if only quantitative patterns are utilized to describe who is likely to work in occupations. For example, executives in one national chain restaurant and in one Las Vegas casino conglomeration spoke in interviews about their workforce diversity, and what one executive coined their "excellent story" of diversity (Kate, Las Vegas casino executive). At the industry level, statistics do support the story of diversity but when the statistics are broken down between entry-level and advanced positions, the patterns of internal stratification are revealed. It is important for social scientists to not only critically analyze quantitative employment patterns, but to also employ qualitative research methods to the inside of work organizations for identifying mechanisms that can either reduce or perpetuate inequality. My research shows that using qualitative observation and in-depth interviews is a particularly useful methodology to explain quantitative employment patterns and to uncover not just how workers are organized into occupations but also why.

My dissertation adds to the existing literature on service work and complex inequality within work organizations in two important ways. The production of service is highly interactive and requires intensive team work to get the best service to the customer. First, I argue that the skill and ability of employees to engage in banter shapes their workplace success and that bantering is more important than skills and ability learned through training and experience. Organizational norms of interaction and the degree to which they were followed by employees influenced whether or they had opportunities to advance into better jobs. Racial and gendered hierarchies were

reproduced in the workplace, limiting occupational advancement up the service

production line differently — depending on the type of service work. Second, I argue

that the concept of emotional labor is better at explaining frontline service work but is

inadequate to explain backline service work. "Feeling rules" (Hochshild 1983)

instruct workers in self-presentation (such as facial expressions, tone of voice) and in

self-control (such as absorbing insults or anger from customers without retaliation) to

ensure that the "customer is always right." This assumes that emotional labor is a

positive display of emotion through surface acting and is only performed in

interactions with customers. The interactions among workers are seen as less

important and emotional labor is seen as having a consistent motivation and outcome

across types of service work. But I argued that the distinction between frontline and

backline service work and between different sites of service work is crucial to

understand workplace inequality.

Earlier research identified that in frontline service work, employers wanted to

hire employees who practiced deference to customers via doing emotional labor like

smiling and politeness (Hochshild 1982; Waldinger and Lichter 2003). Waldinger

and Lichter wrote, 'As the employers told us, enthusiasm, friendliness and an

outgoing disposition made it easier to "get along"; even so, getting along involved a

good deal more than "people skills" (P.223), meaning a "good" attitude (willing to be

subordinate) instead of a "bad" attitude (being recalcitrant to authority). My research

showed distinct differences in how employers expected their employers to act that

differed depending on the type of interactive labor. Across the two types of

workplaces, employers required their workers to engage in banter, an interactive

practice that proved to be essential to securing advancement from bad to better jobs.

My research showed that employers sought employees who could both control their

feelings through surface acting (Hochschild 1979; Leidner 1991; Pierce 1999), but

also be noncompliant with standard service rules by bantering and joking in ways that

violated standard employment rules.

The primary research questions of my dissertation were: Does increasing the

representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in

work organizations? Why do groups with similar educational backgrounds get their

foot in the door but some are more likely to advance in one sector than the other? In

contrast to earlier research that has studied the experiences of token workers and their

lack of chances to move upwards within organizations (Kanter 1977; Garciá-López

2008; Martin 1994; Texeria 2002; Yoder and Aniakudo 1997), in my comparative

case study I studied two cases of internal job ladders with integrated entry-level jobs

by gender and race-ethnicity. By doing so, I examined if a numerical balance

between groups could reduce inequality at work among workers, an argument that

scholars of work and sociology have previously made in the literature (Bergmann

1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Elliott and Smith 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Williams

1992; Wingfield 2008). There should be less inequality between groups of workers

with more equal numbers of groups in the workplace. Yet my research showed that

even within internal job ladders with entry-level jobs that were integrated by gender

and race-ethnicity, better and advanced positions remained segregated, showing there was still complex inequality within these workplaces.

Is the integration of entry-level jobs evidence of reduced inequality at work? The integration of these occupations indeed should be a sign of progress in the workplace, but it is also the case that these entry-level jobs are not what could count as "good jobs." Nevertheless, those in the labor supply still seek out these types of jobs, based on their perception that these jobs offer opportunities to advance to a better job, even a good job, without the additional investment in education. Earlier research supports the finding that workers in the bottom of the labor market show less preference among jobs but rather are seeking any job (Waldinger and Lichter 2003). Moreover, the quantitative patterns at the national level show that not all workers have the opportunity in restaurant kitchens and casino gaming to advance to better jobs. If entry-level jobs are integrated, then why are advanced positions segmented, making internal job ladders stratified?

Scholars of work have often theorized that numbers matter for the degree of inequality found within a work organization (Bergmann 1986; Brewer and Brown 1998; Smith and Elliott 2001, 2002; Kanter 1977; Williams 1992; Wingfield 2009). Their studies identifyed how gender and racial-ethnic groups are organized into jobs within work organizations. A consistent pattern found in the existing studies is that occupations tend to be sex segregated and that men experience better chances for advancement than women, even from women-dominated occupations like nursing or teaching. My study also started with identifying divergent patterns of mobility within

internal occupational ladders but varied by selecting occupational ladders that had integrated entry-level jobs and segregated advanced jobs.

But earlier studies and my own diverge in theorizing about what can best explain why different groups of workers may get their foot in the door but some groups are more likely to advance to better jobs. Earlier studies argued that gendered and racialized perceptions shared among co-workers and with supervisors negatively impacted women's and men of color's advancement opportunities. For example, Williams found that there were processes in place to facilitate men's advancement from women-dominated jobs into better jobs via a "glass escalator." Adding to Williams' previous research, Wingfield's study of Black men in nursing showed that the glass escalator is racialized because it does not afford Black men the same advantages of advancement as it does to white men. She argued that men's different experiences can be explained by gendered racist images held by workers and supervisors in the workplace, such as perceiving Black men to be less capable, having less expertise, or being less suitable for higher status jobs than white men. These earlier studies argued that the common perceptions of men's and women's abilities in their respective professions had the biggest impact on facilitating white men's advancement. Stereotypes and presumptions about professional aptitude made it more likely for white men to advance, even if they are tokens in entry-level jobs. Commonly held stereotypes and presumptions about individuals' aptitude, skills and abilities made it more likely for some groups to get ahead than others. In contrast, I argue in this dissertation that the interactive dynamics of the workplace requiring a

222

certain type of engagement — banter — makes it more likely for some to advance over others.

Mobility is a key measure of inequality at work because research has found that workers sharing characteristics that award privilege over other workers (like race and gender) are more likely to advance (Acker 1990, 2006; Moss and Tilly 2001; Waldinger and Lichter 2003). In my research, I found that men restaurant workers preserved their privilege by maintaining boundaries between themselves and women restaurant workers. I also found that women casino workers gained privilege by using banter to violate gender boundaries between themselves and table game players. By examining the puzzle of why occupational ladders with similar integrated entry-level jobs also have segmented advanced jobs (but in different ways), I show how inequality is reproduced even within workplaces that on the surface appear to have made inroads into reducing inequality. I also show how the interactional practice of banter can both serve to exclude women from privilege in restaurant kitchens and award women more privilege in casino gaming. Interactional boundary making in these workplaces is one social mechanism that translates socially constructed boundaries between workers like gender and race into entrenched inequality along categorical lines.

My approach to the study of banter in workplaces could be better integrated into analyses of work and inequality if further research combined the identification of large-scale workplace mobility patterns with small-scale, rich examinations of workplace dynamics. Previous research about the different experiences of groups by

gender and race-ethnicity in similar occupations have relied on qualitative interviews to identify how workers' perceptions and beliefs about their co-workers' aptitude and potential for advancement are shaped by racialized and gendered presumptions and stereotypes (Williams 1992; Wingfield 2009). By designing research that allows for a deeper engagement with workers and observation of interpersonal dynamics of work via observational methods, scholars of work can identify other cases in which the multiple dimensions of banter can be systematically uncovered and incorporated into sociological scholarship. These efforts will strengthen the sociological understanding of how bantering in interpersonal dynamics at work impacts divergent mobility pathways and to address how more equitable workplaces can be created that moves beyond the assumption that a numerical balance would be enough to reduce inequality at work.

My dissertation helps to explain why some groups that have been historically excluded have gained advancement into some types of advanced positions but not all, despite the integration of entry-level jobs. In the context of reducing inequality between groups and achieving better conditions for all workers, it's necessary to investigate upwards advancement to better jobs through the lens of workplace dynamics and employment relations. In the team-intensive work environment of restaurant kitchens, two primary characteristics of the kitchen culture that created the conditions of men's gender boundary making between themselves and women were the *intensity of group cohesion* and *boundary making through worker exclusion*. In the customer-intensive work environment of casinos, the primary characteristics of

224

casino culture that created the opportunity for women to violate gender boundaries and gain opportunity were the *independence of labor* and *boundary violation through managerial oversight.* These differences can help to explain the distinct patterns of segmentation in better or advanced jobs in kitchens and casinos.

This dissertation addresses the lack of research on advancement from integrated occupations in the sociological literature, because of the strong research tradition on segregated occupations (Gattos and Roos 2005). My research found that certain groups have more advantage in some occupations than others, a surprising finding from the quantitative data, considering the expectation that greater integration of entry-level jobs would lead to greater integration of advanced positions. By examining comparable internal job ladders in the service sector, I provide a specific explanation for why better jobs are stratified by race and gender from divergences in the chance to gain mobility to better jobs.

My dissertation was centered on this research question: "Does increasing the representation of women and minority groups reduce gender and racial inequality in work organizations?" In this dissertation, I argued that it's not enough to achieve occupational integration at the entry-level, but that equal access to the better and more advanced jobs is necessary for inequality to be reduced. To understand inequality at work, inequality should be measured by a group's representation in entry-level jobs and advanced positions in the overall job ladder. Often inequality produced through the internal stratification of jobs can be obscured by statistics that capture the composition of the overall workplace, ignoring the positioning of different groups in

the occupations that make up any given workplace (Gatta and Roos 2005). This dissertation identified the mechanisms in interaction that create and reduce inequality at work through employment relations on the job. The movement of formally excluded group upwards within internal job ladders is a useful measure of some reduction of inequality between workers. Even so, my study shows that there are still unequal chances for service workers to navigate from entry-level jobs to better jobs in complex, interactive workplaces. More could be done at the organizational level to regulate interactional workplace dynamics to encourage civil or nondiscriminatory form of banter or joking that could foster interpersonal bonding among co-workers or excellent customer service that is not at the expense of certain groups of workers. Implementing institutional policies could be an important step to reducing inequality at work by making advanced or better jobs more equally accessible to everyone.

In casino and restaurant work, the funneling of workers into low-wage work is one way that inequality is produced in the labor market, making it nearly impossible for workers in entry-level jobs to earn a living wage. Nevertheless, the casino and restaurant sectors employ millions of workers in entry-level jobs, and most will never advance to better jobs. Even so, upwards mobility opportunities do exist in casinos and restaurants and the patterns of who is more likely to gain these better jobs tells an intriguing narrative about the implications of integrated jobs for low-wage workers. Despite the promise occupational integration could hold for workers to have equal opportunity to advance in the workplace, it is clear that mechanisms are in place that

limit women from getting better jobs in restaurant kitchens and men of color from getting better jobs in casino gaming.

The dynamics of banter proved to be an important process to further men's advancement in restaurants and women's advancement in casinos. The informal nature of banter is learned on the job according to the specific rules of a given workplace and is often encouraged or at the very least, tolerated by those with supervisory power. This makes it difficult for workers or outsiders (such as scholars of work, legal advocates or policy makers) to identify and document the inequities created by banter in the workplace, and to help create neutral practices of informal engagement among workers in restaurants and with customers in casinos. To address the inequalities produced by workplace banter, low-wage workers in restaurants and casinos could collectively identify specific language of banter that excludes certain groups from full participation and advocate for formal rules to be put into place that prohibits language used with others that creates a hostile workplace. This could raise awareness of the power of banter to be exclusionary in the workplace, allow for a closer identification of the practices of banter to bring into formal complaints at work, and build closer interpersonal ties among teams of workers in restaurants and more neutral interactions between workers and customers in casinos. With these changes in place, it would be possible for the promise of integrated occupations to come to fruition, and for inequality in the workplace to be reduced.

Appendix A: Tables

Table 1: Gaming Services

First-Line Management ↔ Gender Integrated ↓ Race Segregated
Service Workers ↔ Gender Integrated ↔ Race Integrated

Table 2: Food Services

Chefs, Head Cooks and Cooks ↓ Gender Segregated ↔ Race Integrated
Food Preparation Workers ↔ Gender Integrated ↔ Race Integrated

Table 3: Casino Sector
Racial/Ethnic and Gender Composition, 2012

	Percentage			
	Women	Black	Asian	Hispanic or Latino
Gaming Services Workers	51.0	9.4	24.3	13.5
First-line Supervisors/ Managers of Gaming Workers	43.0	5.2	9.2	10.1

SOURCE: Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012

Table 4: Degree of Racial/Ethnic and Gender Integration in Entry-Level Casino Work

Degree of Integration	Low	Moderate/High
Race/Ethnicity		X
Gender		X

Table 5: Degree of Racial/Ethnic and Gender Integration in Supervisor Casino Work

Degree of Integration	Low	Moderate/High
Race/Ethnicity	X	
Gender		X

Table 6: Restaurant Sector
Racial/Ethnic and Gender Composition, 2012

	Percentage			
	Women	Black	Asian	Hispanic or Latino
Chefs and Head Cooks	21.5	11.9	14.2	18.6
Cooks	37.7	16.6	6.0	31.7
Food Preparation Workers	58.0	12.1	5.7	27.5

SOURCE: Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012

Table 7: Degree of Racial/Ethnic and Gender Integration in Entry-Level Restaurant Work

Degree of Integration	Low	Moderate/High
Race/Ethnicity		X
Gender		X

Table 8: Degree of Racial/Ethnic and Gender Integration in High-Level Restaurant Work

Degree of Integration	Low	Moderate/High
Race/Ethnicity		X
Gender	X	

Appendix B: Interview Guide
Interview Guide

Introduction: I'm doing this study to learn more about the experiences of those working in the service sector in casinos and restaurants. During our interview, I may take notes and audiotape what you say with your permission. Please feel free to ask me to turn off the tape recorder at any time, tell me that you would prefer to skip a question or take a break during the interview. Before we start, do you have any questions for me?

A. Background Information

To begin, I would like to ask you a few questions about your background.

1) When did you start to do your line of work? Can you describe your professional background? I'd like for you to give me a picture of the work you've done in (restaurant kitchens or in casinos), starting from the beginning.

2) Did you do any kinds of work before your current profession?

B. General Description of Paid Work

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your work in (restaurant kitchens or on the casino floor).

1) Is this your primary occupation? Are you paid for any other type of work?
2) Can you describe the place where you are currently employed? Who supervises you? Do you supervise anyone else? How many people do you work with directly in the (kitchen or casino)?
3) Are you employed in more than one place?
4) What is your job title or position?
5) Would you describe for me your workplace environment?
6) What are your primary responsibilities at work?
7) I want to understand the work process for you at a typical day of work. Can you describe this for me? Who do you depend on to do the work well? Who depends on you?
8) What are the physical requirements of this work?
9) What is required of you emotionally?
10) Does your job require interpersonal skills? If so, please describe.
11) What other kinds of skills and expertise does your job require?
12) How many hours a week do you work?

13) How long have you worked in this job position?
14) How do you feel about your work?
15) What are the advantages and disadvantages of this job?
16) What do you like the best and the least about your work?
17) Have you ever wanted to work in a different type of job? Why?

C. Hiring and Promotion

I would like to ask you some questions about when you were first hired and if you've received any promotions or pay increases at your job.

1) When did you first consider entering into your type of work?
2) When did you start doing service work?
3) Why were you interested in entering into this type of work?
4) Can you tell me more about your decision to work (in the kitchen or on the casino floor)?
5) How did you match yourself with this type of employment?
6) How did you find out about the job opportunity?
7) Did any of your friends or family help you find this job?
8) What skills, training, education and certification are required for this type of job?
9) Why did you think you were suitable for this type of work?
10) Would you describe to me the hiring process, including applying to your job, the job interview and the process of starting the job?
11) Were you formally or informally hired? Why?
12) Why do you think that you were hired over other applicants?
13) Do you think you were a better applicant because of your educational or professional background and training?
14) Have you received any promotions to a higher level of pay and work position?

D. Relationships with Others in the Workplace

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your co-workers and customers.

1) Can you tell me about the people you work with in your field of work?
2) Are the people you work with similar to you? How?
3) Are the people you work with different than you? How?
4) How do you feel about the people you work with?

5) What are the most enjoyable and least enjoyable parts of these relationships?
6) What has been difficult about working with others in (kitchens or casinos)?
7) Do you interact with customers? If so, can you describe these interactions to me?
8) Can you give me an example of a good interaction you've had with others at work?
9) Can you give me an example of a bad interaction with someone else at work?

E. Employee-Employer Relationship

I would like to ask you a few questions about your work relationship with your immediate supervisor.

1) Who oversees your daily work, if anyone?
2) How much do you interact with your supervisor? Can you describe these interactions?
3) How does your supervisor oversee your work?
4) How do you feel about your working relationship with your supervisor?
5) Would you describe for me any problems you've had or are having with him or her?
6) Have you had any kinds of misunderstandings with your employer or manager?
7) How do you feel about how your employer or manager treats you?
8) Are there times that you don't do what your supervisor wants? Can you describe these to me?

F. Organization of Work

Finally, I would like to ask some questions about the types of work that men and women do at your job.

1) Are men and women responsible for different types of work at your job?
2) Do you think men or women are better at doing this type of work?
3) Does management or your employer have different expectations for men and women? Are men or women perceived as being more apt for particular kinds of work, such as physical, intellectual or emotional work?
4) Do you feel that any of the people you work with are different from yourself? In what way are they different from you?

5) Have you ever worked with others who are of a different class background than yourself?
6) Have you ever worked with others who are of a different racial or ethnic background than yourself?
7) Do you feel more comfortable interacting with men or women on the job?
8) Do you think it makes a difference if the people working together (in the kitchen or on the casino floor) are similar to each other? Does it help the work process? Why or why not? What about if people are different from each other?

G. Supervising and Managing Others (Questions for those with supervisory or managerial roles)

1) Do you supervise and/or manage other employees in your line of work? Please explain.
2) Do you participate in the hiring, promotion and firing of employees? Please explain.
3) How do you match workers with their jobs? How do you know that someone is right for the job? Have you ever been wrong? Please explain.
4) How do workers earn advancement? What types of advancement is available to entry-level workers? How long do workers usually work with you to be promoted? What are the potential increases in earnings? Benefits?
5) What kinds of challenges to you face in managing a diverse workforce? What are the benefits of having a diverse workforce?
6) What are the best business practices to achieve diversity in the workplace?

H. Concluding Questions

Thank you so much for your time and for participating in this research study.

1) Is there anything else that you would like to add that we haven't talked about?
2) Are there any questions related to our research that I might answer for you?
3) Is there anyone else you could suggest who may be interested in participating in our study?

Appendix C: Participant List

Interview Number	Position	Pseudonym	Gender	Race
1	Restaurant Worker	Seth	Male	White
2	Restaurant Worker	Juan	Male	Mexican
3	Restaurant Worker	Tessa	Female	White
4	Restaurant Worker	Brad	Male	White
5	Restaurant Management	Thomas	Male	White
6	Restaurant Management	David	Male	Asian
7	Restaurant Management	Trevor	Male	White
8	Restaurant Worker	Alex	Male	White
9	Restaurant Worker	Graham	Male	White
10	Restaurant Worker	Dennis	Male	Asian
11	Restaurant Management	Jason	Male	Asian
12	Restaurant Management	Michael	Male	White
13	Restaurant Worker	Henry	Male	White
14	Restaurant Worker	Abbie	Female	Black
15	Restaurant Worker	Jackson	Male	Black
16	Restaurant Worker	Jerome	Male	Black
17	Restaurant Management	Isaac	Male	White
18	Casino Worker	Jacob	Male	White
19	Management	Ethan	Male	White

20	Casino Worker	Darryl	Male	Black
21	Restaurant Management	Zachary	Male	White
22	Casino Worker	Robert	Male	White
23	Casino Management	Kevin	Male	White
24	Casino Management	Barbara	Female	White
25	Casino Management	Danielle	Female	Black
26	Casino Management	Karen	Female	White
27	Casino Management	Scott	Male	White
28	Casino Worker	Karl	Male	White
29	Casino Management	Hannah	Female	Black
30	Casino Worker	Mark	Male	White
31	Casino Management	Kate	Female	Asian
32	Casino Worker	Marissa	Female	White
33	Casino Worker	Laura	Female	White
34	Casino Worker	Martina	Female	Hispanic
35	Casino Worker	Jenny	Female	White
36	Restaurant Management	Allison	Female	White
37	Casino Worker	Adam	Male	White
38	Casino Worker	William	Male	White
39	Casino Worker	Matt	Male	White
40	Casino Worker	Sharon	Female	White

41	Casino Worker	Lynn	Female	Latina
41	Casino Worker	Jessica	Female	White
43	Casino Worker	Katie	Female	White
44	Casino Worker	Andrea	Female	Latina
45	Casino Worker	Ellie	Female	Asian
46	Casino Worker	Julia	Male	White

References

Acemoglu, Daron. 2001. "Good Jobs Versus Bad Jobs." *Journal of Labor Economics* 19: 1-21.

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, and Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4: 139-158.

-----. 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender & Society* 20: 441-464.

American Culinary Federation . 2011. "ACF Salary Study." Retrieved June 13, 2013 (https://www.acfchefs.org/ACF/Resources/Salary/Survey/ACF/Resources/Salary/Survey)

American Gaming Association. 2013. "State of the States: The AGA Survey of Casino Entertainment." Retrieved June 13, 2013 (http://www.americangaming.org/sites/default/files/uploads/docs/aga_sos2013_fnl.pdf)

Arthur, Michael B. and Denise M. Rousseau. 2001. *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Barker K and K Christensen. 1998. *Contingent Work*. ILR Press: Ithaca.

Bergman, Barbara R. 1986. *The Economic Emergence of Women.* New York: Basic Books.

Bluestone B. and B. Harrison. 1982. *The Deindustrialization of America.* New York: Basic Books.

Bonacich, Edna. 1972. "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 37: 547-559.

Brewer, Marilynn B. and R.J. Brown. 1998. "Intergroup Relations." Pp. 554-594 in

Handbook of Social Pscyhology, edited by Daniel T. Gilbert, Susan T. Fiske and Gardner Lindzey. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Britton, Dana M. 1997. "Gendered Organizational Logic: Policy and Practice in Men's and Women's Prisons." *Gender & Society* 11: 796-818.

-----. 2000. "The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization." *Gender & Society* 14: 418-434.

Budig, Michelle J. 2002. "Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator?" *Social Problems* 49: 258-277.

Bulan, Heather Ferguson, Rebecca J. Erickson and Amy S. Wharton. 1997. "Doing for Others on the Job: The Affective Requirements of Service Work, Gender and Emotional Well-Being." *Social Problems* 44: 235-256.

Burawoy, Michael. 2009. *The Extended Case Method: Four Countries, Four Decades, Four Great Traditions, and One Theoretical Tradition.* Berkeley: University of California.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. 2012. "Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2012-13 Edition." Retrieved May 03, 2013 (http://www.bls.gov/ooh/about/projections-overview.htm).

-----. 2012b. *Employed Persons by Detailed Occupation, Sex, Race, and Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity.* Washington DC: Government Printing Office.

-----. 2013a. "Current Employment Statistics Highlights." Retrieved May 03, 2013 (http://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/ceshighlights.pdf).

-----. 2013b. "Occupational Outlook Handbook." Retrieved June 14, 2013 (http://www.bls.gov/ooh/home.htm).

Cappelli, Peter. 1999. *The New Deal at Work: Managing the Market-Driven*

Workforce. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Chamberlin, Lindsey Joyce and Randy Hodson. 2010. "Toxic Work Environments: What Helps and What Hurts." *Sociological Perspectives* 53: 455-478.

Cotter, David, Joan Hermsen, and Reeve Vanneman. 2000. "The End of the Gender Revolution? Gender Role Attitudes from 1977 to 2008." *American Journal of Sociology* 117: 259-289.

Curley, Caitriona and Tony Royle. 2013. "The Degradation of Work and the End of the Skilled Motion Worker at Aer Lingus: Is It All Trolley Dollies Now?" *Work, Employment & Society* 27: 105-121.

Curry, Timonthy Jon. 1991. "Fraternal Bonding in the Locker Room: A Profeminist Analysis of Talk about Competition and Women." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8: 119-135.

Dellinger, Kirsten and Christine L. Williams. "The Locker Room and the Dorm Room: Workplace Norms and the Boundaries of Sexual Harassment in Magazine Editing." *Social Problems* 49: 242-257.

Doeringer, Peter and Michael Piore. 1971. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Duhigg, Charles and Keith Bradsher. 2012. "How the U.S. Lost Out on iPhone Work." *The New York Times*, January 2012, A1.

Duffy, Mignon. 2005. "Reproducing Labor Inequalities: Challenges for Feminists Conceptualizing Care at the Intersections of Gender, Race and Class." *Gender and Society* 19: 66-82.

-----. 2007. "Doing the Dirty Work: Gender, Race, and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective." *Gender and Society* 21: 313-336.

Enarson, Elaine. 1993. "Emotion Workers on the Production Line: The Feminizing

of Casino Card Dealing." *NWSA Journal* 5: 218-232.

England, Paula. 2010. "The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled. *Gender & Society* 24: 149-166.

Epstein, Cynthia. Fuchs. 1992. "Tinker-bells and pinups: the construction and reconstruction of gender boundaries at work." Pp. 232 – 256 in *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality,* edited by Michele Lamont and Marcel Fournier. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.

Esping-Anderson, Gosta. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fichtenbaum, Rudy. 2006. "Labour Market Segmentation and Union Wage Gaps." *Review of Social Economy* 64: 387-420.

Fuchs, Victor. 1968. *The Service Economy.* New York: Praeger.

Gabriel, Paul and Susanne Schmitz. 2007. "Gender Differences in Occupational Distributions Among Workers." *Monthly Labor Review June:* 19-24.

García-López, Gladys. 2008. "'Nunca Te Toman En Cuenta [They Never Take You Into Account]": The Challenges of Inclusion and Strategies for Success of Chicana Attorneys.' *Gender & Society* 22: 590-612.

Gatta, Mary L. and Patricia A. Roos. 2005. "Rethinking Occupational Integration." *Sociological Forum* 20: 369-402.

Giuffre, Patti A. and Christine L. Williams. 1994. "Boundary Lines: Labeling Sexual Harassment in Restaurants." *Gender & Society* 8: 378-401.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1992. "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor." *Signs* 18: 1-43.

Handel, Michael. 2005. "Trends in Perceived Job Quality, 1989 to 1998. *Work and*

Occupations 32: 66-94.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hodson, Randy and Vincent J. Roscigno. 2004. "Organizational Success and Worker Dignity: Complementary or Contradictory?" *American Journal of Sociology* 110: 672-708.

Hollister, Matissa. 2011. "Employment Stability in the U.S. Labor Market: Rhetoric versus Reality." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37: 305-314.

Huffman, Matt L. and Lisa Torres. 2002. "It's Not Only 'Who You Know' That Matters: Gender, Personal Contacts, and Job Lead Quality." *Gender and Society* 793-813.

Huffman, Matt L. and Philip N. Cohen. 2004. "Occupational Segregation and the Gender Gap in Workplace Authority: National versus Local Labor Markets." *Sociological Forum* 19: 121-147.

Jencks, Christopher, Lauri Perman and Lee Rainwater. 1988. "What is a Good Job? A new Measure of Labor-Market Success." *American Journal of Sociology* 93: 1322-1357.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kalleberg, Arne L., Barbara F. Reskin and Ken Hudson. 2000. "Bad Jobs in America: Standard and Nonstandard Employment Relations and Job Quality in the United States." *American Sociological Review*, 65: 256-278.

Kalleberg, Arne and Aage Sorensen. 1979. "The Sociology of Labor Markets." *Annual Review of Sociology* 5: 351-379.

Kalleberg, Arne L. 2003. "Flexible Firms and Labor Market Segmentation: Effects

of Workplace Restructuring on Jobs and Workers." *Work and Occupations* 30: 154-175.

-----. 2009. "Precarious Work, Insecure Workers: Employment Relations in Transition." *American Sociological Review* 74: 1-22.

Kennelly, Ivy. 1999. "'That Single Mother Element": How White Employers Typify Black Women." *Gender & Society* 13: 168-192.

-----. 2002. "'I would Never Be a Secretary": Reinforcing Gender in Segregated and Integrated Occupations.' *Gender & Society* 16: 603-624.

Kim, Marlene, Susan Moir and Anneta Argyres. 2009. 'Gaming in Massachusetts: Can Casinos bring "Good Jobs" to the Commonwealth?' *Labor Resource Center Publications*. Paper 3.

Kimmel, Michael. 2000. *The Gendered Society* . New York: Oxford University Press.

Kmec, Julie A., Steve McDonald and Lindsey B. Trimble. 2010. 'Making Gender Fit and "Correcting" Gender Misfits."' *Gender & Society* 24: 213-236.

Leidner, Robin. 1993. *Fast Food, Fast Talk: Service Work and the Routinization of Everyday Life.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lamont, M. and V. Molnar. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167-195.

Lerum, Kari. 2004. "Sexuality, Power, and Camaraderie in Service Work." *Gender & Society* 18: 756-776.

Lyman, Peter. 1987. "The Fraternal Bond as a Joking Relationship: A Case Study of the Role of Sexist Jokes in Male Group Bonding." In *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinlity,* edited by Michael Kimmel.

Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Martin, Susan E. 1994. "'Outsider within' the station house: The impact of race and gender on Black women police." *Social Problems* 41:383-400.

McCall, Leslie. 2001. *Complex Inequality: Gender, Race and Class in the New Economy.* New York: Routledge.

McDonald, Steve, Nan Lin, and Dan Ao. 2009. "Networks of Opportunity: Gender, Race and Job Leads." *Social Problems* 56: 385-402.

McGuire, Gail M. 2002. "Gender, Race and the Shadow Structure: A Study of Informal Networks and Inequality in a Work Organization." *Gender and Society* 16: 303-322.

Morgan, Laurie A. and Karin A. Martin. 2006. "Taking Women Professionals Out of the Office: The Case of Women in Sales." *Gender & Society* 20: 108-128.

Moss, Philip and Chris Tilly. 2001. *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill and Hiring in America.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

National Restaurant Association. 2013. "Restaurant Industry Forecast." Retrieved June 13, 2013 (http://www.restaurant.org/News-Research/Research/Forecast-2013).

Nelson, Joel. 1994. "Work and Benefits: The Multiple Problems of Service Sector Employment." *Social Problems* 41: 240-256.

Newman, K. 1999. *No Shame in My Game: the Working Poor in the Inner City.* New York: Knopf and the Russell Sage Foundation.

Paap, Kris. 2006. *Working Construction: Why White Working-Class Men Put Themselves and the Labor Movement in Harm's Way.* Ithaca: ILR Press.

Peck, Jamie. 1996. *Work-Place: The Social Regulation of Labor Markets.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Pierce, Jennifer. 1995. Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reich, Michael, David M. Gordon, and Richard C. Edwards. 1973. "Dual Labor Markets: A Theory of Labor Market Segmentation." *Economics Department Faculty Publications,* Paper 3.

Reid, Lesley Williams and Beth A. Rubin. 2003. "Integrating Economic Dualism and Labor Market Segmentation: The Effects of Race, Gender, and Structural Location on Earnings, 1974-2000." *The Sociological Quarterly* 44: 405-432.

Reskin, Barbara. 1993. "Sex Segregation in the Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 241-270.

Reskin, Barbara, and Patricia Roos. 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Restaurant Opportunities United. 2012. "Tipped Over the Edge – Gender Inequity in the Restaurant Industry." Retrieved June 13, 2013 (http://rocunited.org/tipped-over-the-edge-gender-inequity-in-the-restaurant-industry/).

Rogers, Jackie Krasas. 2000. *Temps: The Many Faces of the Changing Workplace.* Ithaca: ILR Press.

Roth, Louise Marie. 2004. "Engendering Inequality: Processes of Sex-Segregation on Wall Street." Sociological Forum 19: 203-228.

Roos, Patricia A. and Barbara F. Reskin. 1992. "Occupational Desegregation in the 1970s: Integration and Economic Equity?" *Sociological Perspectives* 35: 69-91.

Royster, Deirdre. 2003. *Race and the Invisible Hand: How White Networks Exclude*

    Black Men from Blue-Collar Jobs. Berkeley, CA: University of California

    Press.

Sallaz, Jeffrey. 2002. "The House Rules: Autonomy and Interests Among Service

    Workers in

    the Contemporary Casino Industry." *Work and Occupations* 29: 394-427.

Schilt, Kristen. 2006. "Just One of the Guys?: How Transmen Make Gender Visible

    at Work." *Gender and Society* 20: 465-490.

Segal LM and DG Sullivan. 1997. "The Growth of Temporary Services Work."

    Journal of Economic Perspectives 11: 117-136.

Smith, Ryan A. and James R. Elliott. 2001. "Ethnic Matching of Supervisors to

    Subordinate Work Groups: Findings on "Bottom-up" Ascription and Social

    Closure." *Social Problems* 48: 258-276.

-----. 2002. "Does Ethnic Concentration Influence Employees' Access to Authority?

    An Examination of Contemporary Urban Labor Markets." *Social Forces* 81:

    255-279.

Stainback, Kevin. 2008. "Social Contacts and Race/Ethnic Job Matching." *Social*

    Forces 87: 857-886.

Star Chefs. 2011. "Salary Survey Report." Retrieved June 14, 2013

    (http://www.starchefs.com/cook/trends/chef-salary-report-2011).

Taylor, Catherine J. 2010. "Occupational Sex Composition and the Gendered

    Availability of Workplace Support." *Gender & Society* 24: 189-212.

Texeira, Mary Thierry. 2002. "'Who Protects and Serves Me?' A Case Study of

    Sexual Harassment of African American Women in One U.S. Law

Enforcement Agency." *Gender and Society* 16: 524-545.

Treas, Judith. 2010. "The Great American Recession: Sociological Insights on

Blame and Pain." *Sociological Perspectives* 53: 3-18.

Tilly, Chris. 1996. *Half a Job: Bad and Good Part-Time Jobs in a Changing Labor
Market.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Tilly, Chris, and Charles Tilly. 1998. *Work Under Capitalism*. Boulder, CO:

Westview Press.

Vallas, Steven P. 2003. 'Rediscovering the Color Line within Work Organizations:

The "Knitting of Racial Groups" Revisited.' *Work and Occupations* 30: 379-
400.

Voss, Kim and Fabiana Silva. 2013. So Goes the Nation? A Preliminary Report on

How Immigration is Reshaping the Identites of Workers in California. *Labor

Market Policy Research Reports.* Center for Economic and Policy Research.

Waldinger, Roger and Michael I. Lichter. 2003. *How the Other Half Works:

Immigration and the Social Organization of Labor.* Berkeley, CA: University

of California Press.

West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender and

Society* 9: 8-37.

West and Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1: 125-151.

Williams, Christine L. 1992. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in

the 'Female' Professions." *Social Problems* 39: 253-267.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2009. "Racializing the Glass Escalator: Reconsidering

Men's Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 23: 5-26.

Yoder, Janice D. and Patricia Aniakudo. 1997. "'Outsider Within' the Firehouse:

Subordination and Difference in the Social Interactions of African American Women Firefighters." *Gender and Society* 11: 324-341.