THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

DEFERENCE IN WORK ORGANIZATIONS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

STEPHANIE L. ALEXANDER
Norman, Oklahoma
2007

UMI Number: 3291930

UMI®

DEFERENCE IN WORK ORGANIZATIONS

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

BY

_____
Craig St. John, PhD, Chair

_____
Wilbur Scott, PhD

_____
Ann Beutel, PhD

_____
Loretta Bass, PhD

_____
Dorscine Spigner-Littles, PhD

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I am grateful to God for giving me the opportunity to participate in a program that allowed me to express myself through writing. This dissertation is dedicated to my nieces, Crystal, Danielle, Taylor, Hannah, Cymia, and Anissah, and my nephews, Scot Jr. and Roman. Because of you, I was able to achieve one of my goals so that you will know that anything is possible. I love you all, and thank you for being my inspiration. This dissertation is also dedicated to my Godmother, Veter Baker, may God smile on you always.

There are numerous people who have inspired and helped me in various ways to achieve my goal to complete this dissertation. I would first like to thank my family, starting with my husband, Jeffery Mckinzie. Without you, I don't know how I would have paid for school all of these years. I am grateful to you now, forever and always. You are the best husband a girl could ever have. I would also like to thank my mommy, Jessie. You are a pushy one, but without your guidance and constant nagging, I may have never completed this dissertation. Thank you for believing in me, and loving me so much. To my daddy, William, you never really knew what I was going to school for, but you supported me anyway. Thank you for your support, I love you very much. To my big sissy, Regina, if mommy had not nagged me so much, I may not have ever completed my dissertation because you were always on my side, you never did believe in pressure, and I love you for that. I believe that you knew that I would complete this task, but you were also wise enough to know that I needed to work at my own pace. To my brothers, William and Scot, you two didn't do much to get me where I am, but I always knew that you were cheering for me.

Thank you for your support, I love you both. To Ma Ma, Pa Pa, Evelyn, and Freddie McKinzie, there are no words to express the gratitude that I feel for you. This is probably because my use of English language is not that great, but nevertheless you have always supported me, and I love you for it. You are the best in-laws a girl could ever ask for.

To my girls, Michelle Noble, Jacqueline Collins, Paulette Brown, Karen Moody, Kriss Slate, Ledresta White, and Teri Caldwell you are all special to me in different ways, but one thing that you all have in common is that you have loved me and supported me for many years. But, then again, how could you not love and support me? I am all you got, and plus I am unemployed. Thanks for your support. I love you all. To Dennis Williams, your assistance in the completion of this dissertation is invaluable. I would not trade you for the world, well maybe a bag of chips and a soft drink, but not the world. I love you so much, thank you for your support. To Barbara and Yndia, you two are the biggest pains, but you have always loved and supported me, and I love you for it. I would also like to thank Amelia Adams, Robert Bentley, Leslie Gillies, and Debra Hensley-Luczycki, and Allen Brown for your support and assistance. You are the best!

Finally, I would like to thank my committee members. This has been a long and trying process, but it was worth it. To Dr. St. John, you were a bit more hands off in regards to running the statistics for my dissertation than I would have liked, but I believe that your style of guidance will be more beneficial to me in the end. Thanks for throwing me in the water without a life preserver. Dr. Scot, I have a feeling that you were most instrumental in getting me admitted to the sociology program. Thanks

for getting me started and then abandoning me at the most critical time in my school career (smile!). I am so grateful, and I know that none of this would have been possible without you. To Dr. Littles, you have truly been an inspiration to me. Thank you so much for advising me, and providing comic relief when you should have been helping me with my statistics. I could not have done this without you. Thank you for advising and supporting me. To my silent committee members, Dr. Beutel and Dr. Bass, as you can see, there has been enough chaos in getting this dissertation completed, but I am grateful to you both for your support, and just knowing that you were there for me if I needed you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

**"This world is white no longer, and
it will never be white again (Baldwin, 2004 [1955])."**

During a period in which sociologists and other scholars believe that race and class are inextricably linked it has become increasingly difficult to maintain that race continues to be a key factor in social relations, especially those involving access to valued resources. However, I argue that race continues to be a significant factor in American society. While this paper is not chiefly concerned with differentiation in relation to how resources are distributed, it does focus on possible disparities in human responses based on the race and/or ethnicity of the actor (one who carries out an action) and the recipient (the benefactor of the actor's activity). Such disparities might, ultimately, lead to deleterious outcomes for some racial and/or ethnic groups.

In this paper, I will look at the effects of race and the amount of deference subordinates give to their supervisors, which to my knowledge this is the first study of its type on deference in workplace organizations. If racial differences exist in employee responses toward supervisors, it is probable race continues to be a determinant of differences in the receipt of other valuable resources since human actors are not simply passive agents within organizations that control these resources. I expect to find differences in how white employees respond to minority managers in comparison to how they respond to white managers.

My results indicate that race of the supervisor does have a limited effect on the amount of deference that supervisors receive from their employees, especially in social situations. In retrospect, the scales that I created to measure deference could

actually be measuring friendliness or the absence of friendliness, which is also critical in studies of race in work organizations. These findings suggest that employee responses are primarily influenced by their feelings about the relationship with their supervisor. However, race does have a limited effect on employee decisions to spend time with their supervisors in intimate settings, and it affects the amount of physical and verbal distance that employees tend to keep from their supervisors.

Chapter I

Introduction

On July 9, 2003, Doug Williams abruptly left an ethnicity and sensitivity

training course at the Lockheed Martin Aeronautics plant in Meridian, Mississippi,

and later returned from his pickup truck armed with numerous assault weapons

(Halbfinger, 2004 [2003]). When the shooting was over, nine people were wounded,

and five were dead, including the assailant. According to eyewitnesses, Williams was

known for making threatening remarks and racial slurs. In December 2001, he was

suspended from Lockheed and ordered to attend professional anger-management

counseling for two weeks at a psychology facility in Meridian after confronting an

African-American co-worker for complimenting a white woman. After the shooting

incident, co-workers stated that Williams' racial prejudices, along with a short

temper, were well known at the plant. Despite warnings of Williams' behavioral

patterns against racial/ethnic minority group members, Lockheed officials and co-

workers viewed Williams as a hard-working, but troublesome employee, who had

changed remarkably since the December 2001 incident. Whereas this incident may

be rare and an extreme case of prejudiced behavior, the history of race relations in

this country suggest that less serious events could be more commonplace.

Problems within organizations that result from racial and ethnic differences

may well take the form of overt or surreptitious remarks or behavior. However, in

contemporary society, where race is a prominent issue in public and private discourse,

individuals are more careful than they have been in the past to suppress negative

biases and/or acts of bigotry. Thus, during this period in our history, racial prejudice

and discrimination tend to take on a more subtle form, which can be difficult to detect. As a result of these changes, more subtle forms of discrimination and prejudice have changed the way studies of race and ethnicity are conducted (Pettigrew, 1985). According to Pettigrew, contemporary research and theory are now more complex and inferential than they were in the past. On occasion, a noteworthy event does occur where someone is either injured or killed as a result of prejudice leading to a violent act, such as the case of Doug Williams. However, I argue that subtle acts of racial prejudice and discrimination take place far more frequently in American society than do overt acts. In addition, evidence of continuing problems between racial and ethnic groups can easily be found in popular and scholarly literature on race and ethnic relations, regardless of claims that race is no longer an issue, or, at least, declining in significance (Wilson, 1978).

Some scholars believe race is a key component of the structure of American society. Along with class and gender, race is important in determining an individual's access to rewards, power and privilege (Davidson and Friedman, 1998; Beeghley, 2000; Rothman, 2002). According to Davidson and Friedman (1998), race is not the only basis for determining in or out groups, but for most Americans it is an important factor in developing our social identities, and determining how we relate to others. Thus, as noted by Davidson and Friedman (1998), race may be the foundation of negative stereotypes, which can lead to racial conflict.

According to Feagin and Sikes (1994), most white Americans do not see racial discrimination as a problem in our society or institutions, which is in contrast to how minority group members view the situation, possibly impeding progress toward

racial equality and harmony. Based on this observation, I suspect that relations in the labor force will mirror those found in the larger society. As noted by Feagin and Eckberg (1980), organizations, specifically large-scale bureaucracies, are miniature societies that reflect the historical and contemporary values and actions of the larger society. Racial discrimination often becomes a part of these organizations as a result of these values and actions. Thus, studies of the relations among employees within these organizations are critical to understanding the effects of people's values and actions on interracial relationships. I am particularly interested in the level of deference or respect that employees give to their immediate supervisor based on the race of the subordinate and that of the superordinate. I suspect that subordinates show more deference towards superordinates of the same race than they do superordinates of a different racial group.

As the American workforce continues to diversify, it is imperative for organizations to strive for a work environment in which racial and ethnic tensions are low, thus, minimizing workers' vulnerability and maximizing their productivity. According to Johnson (2001), most organizations fail to create an atmosphere conducive to successful teamwork among diverse groups because they either deal with diversity poorly or not at all until a crisis disrupts business as usual. When racial/ethnic problems do occur, the typical response is to deal with them just enough to minimize lawsuits and bad publicity (Johnson, 2001). Unfortunately, corporate actions are usually ineffective at eliminating the source of the problem.

As recommended by management experts for The Institute of Management and Administration (2004), the ideal work situation would include, at the very least,

an enforced equal opportunity policy and a nondiscrimination and sensitivity training program before a company ever hires its first employee. However, for organizations already established, these types of programs can appear to be unnecessary financial burdens unless employers are aware that racial and ethnic tensions are possible, and that subtle actions can significantly affect working relationships. Thus, a research tool measuring deference levels among workers, especially subordinates and superordinates, could be valuable to organizations hoping to identify potential problems before they surface in ways that are detrimental to the organization.

Chapter II

The Study of Deference by Erving Goffman

In "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor," Erving Goffman (1956) shares his observations of patients at a mental health facility where he attempts to explore types of symbolic acts that individuals display to one another. Consequently, Goffman's (1956) brief research project is a great starting point for measuring what he refers to as deference, and what I refer to interchangeably as respect or reverence. Goffman (1956) believes that a mental ward is a logical place to conduct research on conformity since mental institutions inevitably include individuals who fail to comply with socially accepted behavioral norms. He further contends that the rules broken within these facilities are common and that his approach to measuring deference can be applied toward a general study of "Anglo-American" society. Hence, I will apply Goffman's (1956) work to a multi-cultural American society in public work organizations.

Based on the work of Goffman (1956), deference can be defined as an activity in which an actor celebrates or confirms his or her relationship with another. The most obvious forms of ceremonial expressions, which are referred to as rituals, are salutations, compliments and apologies. According to Goffman (1956), the term ritual refers to the way in which individuals must create and protect the symbolic meaning of their actions in the immediate presence of the recipient that is special to him or her. In other words, the intent of the actor is concealed from the recipient. This becomes particularly vital if the individual rendering deference is doing so out of obligation, which will be discussed in greater detail shortly. According to Goffman

(1956), an act of deference implies some sort of sentiment or regard for an individual in which a general evaluation of that person has been made. Thus, these emotions can be expressed through ceremonial rituals.

Another way of looking at deference is to view it as rituals of obedience, submission, or ways of appeasing one in authority. Based on this idea, some individuals regard deference as something that subordinates owe superordinates. Under these circumstances, subordinates might feel compelled to perform acts toward the superordinate out of obligation that are more complimentary than their true sentiments. Actors rendering deference out of obligation are not necessarily doing so as a result of positive feelings about the recipient; these rituals are also performed in spite of negative sentiments. The contention is that if actors can easily show positive regard for an individual, they maintain some sort of inner autonomy by upholding the ceremonial order. In this respect, an actor is free to insinuate disregard for the recipient by modifying intonation, pronunciation, pacing, and so on.

Other variations of deference rituals include symmetrical deference, which refers to social equals showing regard for one another, and deference that does not require reverence as a basis for action, such as individuals welcoming strangers into their homes. Regardless of the circumstances, deference, for the most part, tends to be honorific, politely toned, and a pledge to treat recipients in a way that is acceptable to the recipients according to the structure in which they work.

As noted earlier, some actors render deference in spite of what they think of the recipient because they conceptualize it as something that subordinates owe superordinates. If an individual's actions are based purely on obligation, and this is

detected by superordinates, these rituals could be viewed as insincere, which could complicate and/or impair the relationship. I am particularly interested in this aspect of deference for future research on race and ethnicity in organizations because establishing positive relationships is important in forming cohesive groups. Although Goffman does not refer to the term "respect" (which is more commonly used among laypersons) in his definition of deference, the ways in which actors identify recipients worthy of receiving respect or reverence is critical to future studies on differences in levels of deference by race and ethnicity. Goffman's use of deference is far more detailed than my current interest, but in future writings on this topic I will consider further examination of his ideas.

A Model for Operationalizing Deference

Erving Goffman provides a starting point for operationalizing deference in his work on "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor" (1956). Goffman defines deference as an activity with symbolic meaning that is regularly conveyed to a recipient. He identifies this ritual as a form of appreciation in which the actor confirms his or her relationship with the recipient. The actor renders deference and the recipient acknowledges this action by either affirming or disapproving of the action. Goffman (1956) proposes that all societal institutions have codes that govern our behavior, which he refers to as rules of conduct (substantive rules and substantive expressions are codes that encompass the law, morality and ethics, and ceremonial rules and ceremonial expressions consist of codes relating to etiquette). According to Goffman (1956), all American institutions consist of both kinds of codes. However, the chief concern of this paper will be rules of conduct that focus on etiquette.

There are many forms of deference. However, using Goffman's (1956) study as a starting point, I will only consider two broad forms, presentational rituals and avoidance rituals. Presentational rituals specify what should be done. They show a concrete appreciation for the recipient and substantiate how the recipient will be treated. Presentational rituals include salutations, compliments, and providing minor services and invitations. Avoidance rituals specify actions that should not be taken. These are rituals actors must refrain from doing to prevent violating the rights of the recipient. Avoidance rituals include keeping one's distance and verbal care, which refers to watching what one says to another.

Goffman (1956) contends that ceremonial messages may be conveyed through linguistics, gestures, use of space, tasks, and through parts of the communication structure. Goffman borrows from Garvin and Risenberg (1952) to define linguistics as a tone of voice or use of a particular language when making statements about one's self or another. Gestural messages refer to the physical manner of a person such as showing insolence or a lack of respect or reverence. Spatial messages refer to social distance or the distance that one keeps from another, and/or how space is used to the advantage or disadvantage of the recipient. Task-embedded messages refer to individuals accepting tasks graciously and performing those tasks with self-assurance, confidence, readiness, and grace. The final way in which messages can be conveyed is through part of the communication structure as when an individual is given more consideration or exchanges words more frequently than do others. The survey questions I designed to measure Goffman's concept of deference will attempt to

capture each of these ceremonial idioms (forms of expression) with the exception of the last one due to potential difficulties in measuring this concept.

The Relevance of Deference in Culturally Diverse Contemporary Organizations

Levels of deference are key in determining the quality of relationships among superordinates and subordinates, especially in cases where race might be an issue. One might argue that the ways in which individuals show respect differ according to the sentiment behind the action, whereas others may view this behavior as culturally motivated. Whatever the case, there are times when what people say and what they actually do is contrary to one another, and any attempt to capture and/or explain these inconsistencies are invaluable to studies on interactions between racially diverse groups.

It is likely that the history of race relations in America dictates the type of relations that might be found in organizations. If racial/ethnic minority groups are held in high-esteem in the larger society, it is highly probable that this sentiment would be duplicated in organizations. However, as noted in my introduction, the United States remains divided by racial lines, which is a product of our turbulent past. A review of the literature reveals that race and ethnicity continue to be deciding factors for how people are treated within organizations. And, experts agree that for race relations to improve within the labor force, specific policies that affect the structure of the organization must be implemented (IOMA, 2004). But before implementing change, it is important to be able to identify the true sentiment, and the basis of the actions taken by the individuals working within these organizations.

Chapter III

The Significance of Race and Ethnicity as they May Affect Work Organizations

Defining Race and Ethnicity

My exploration of the literature has revealed a need for additional research in the area of race relations in organizations, specifically the relationship between race and the interactions of subordinates and superordinates. Due to there being more literature focusing on African Americans in comparison with other racial/ethnic minority groups, many areas of this paper will specifically address their experiences. However, the overall focus is to develop a better understanding of all racial/ethnic minority groups in organizations.

In the past, the terms race and ethnicity were often viewed as having the same meaning, which grouped together a large number of people with diverse cultural characteristics (Marger, 2000). Today, race and ethnicity are distinct terms capturing all social groups in one category or another. As defined by Marger (2000), ethnicity refers to groups that share unique cultural traits, a sense of community, ethnocentric behaviors such as the "we" feeling, membership by ascription, and the tendency for group members to occupy the same territory.

Race refers to hereditary and biological characteristics such as skin color, hair texture, and body and facial shapes that distinguish one group from another. However, it is important to note that that there has been little agreement among social scientists on the true characteristics of race. For the purpose of this paper, ethnicity will refer to groups' cultural characteristics, and race will pertain to the aforementioned physical characteristics. In addition, throughout this paper, I often

interchange the term racial/ethnic minorities with minorities, and non-minority White ethnics with Whites, and non-minority Whites.

Assimilation Processes: Past and Present

If you accept the idea that African Americans and other racial and ethnic minority groups living in the United States can be categorized into subcultures as a result of experiencing life differently from the dominant culture, it should be just as easy to accept the proposition that their experiences as leaders in the labor force will also differ. For various reasons, some racial and ethnic minority groups, especially African Americans, have not assimilated into the dominant culture at the primary structural level, intimate or formal group interaction, to the same extent as other minority and ethnic groups, which is a probable cause for racial tensions that continue to permeate our society. In my estimation, primary structural assimilation is most desirable for strengthening and improving race relations through close and long lasting relationships. However, secondary structural assimilation, primarily large and impersonal groups, is crucial for securing equal access to power and privilege within society's major institutions, which in its ultimate stage eliminates minority status (Marger, 2000).

For some groups, assimilation efforts are limited as a result of cultural differences because assimilation is more favorable for groups that are culturally similar to the dominant group. Other groups have distinct physical traits, in addition to cultural dissimilarity, which are significant impediments to establishing high levels of assimilation for racial and ethnic groups (Marger, 2000; Parks, 1950). Individuals with obvious physical traits, such as African Americans with darker skin tones,

coarser hair textures, broader noses, and darker eye colors, are more visible. Thus,

they are less likely to assimilate into American society at the primary and secondary

structural levels. Throughout American history, obvious physical dissimilarities

between African Americans and non-minority White ethnics have contributed to

discriminatory practices, such as exclusion. In turn, exclusion contributed greatly to

reduced levels of assimilation for African American group members (Marger, 2000).

Modern day discrimination, which continues to impede assimilation processes

for African Americans and other minorities, is purportedly unrelated to race, more

subtle in nature, and circuitous (Pettigrew, 1985). Pettigrew (1985) argues that

exclusionary discrimination based on racial characteristics begins at an early age for

African Americans. To explain this phenomenon, Pettigrew (1985) relies on the work

of numerous researchers to describe the processes of exclusionary discrimination.

According to Pettigrew (1985), early school segregation for African Americans,

increases the probability of attending a segregated high school, which lowers the

likelihood of college entry (especially at predominantly white institutions). In

addition, segregation decreases one's chances of working in an integrated institution,

thereby reducing opportunities for secondary structural assimilation, which could be

critical to the future success of African American group members. Consequently,

African Americans who attend segregated schools are unable to establish important

cross racial friendship networks that are crucial for obtaining vital information about

higher education and job opportunities. They are unable to obtain credentials, such as

reference letters from interracial institutions, which are granted greater weight. And,

finally, they do not acquire the necessary interpersonal skills for successful interracial

interaction that integrated schools can provide (Pettigrew, 1985). When individuals from segregated schools do gain access to integrated organizations, they find workgroups to be less friendly, which could lead to difficulties in adapting to their environment (Braddock and McPartland, 1983).

Indirect discrimination can also have a negative impact on other minority groups such as Hispanics, Native Americans, some Asian ethnics, and others who are segregated by housing, school and occupation, thus affecting secondary structural assimilation processes for those group members. Pettigrew's analysis (1985) focuses primarily on Northern states. But the work of Beeghley (2000) and Marger (2000) confirms the continued existence of racial segregation, which has been identified as a key factor in determining assimilation patterns and societal members' life chances. Following in this vein, comparing actions and attitudes of societal members based on obvious physical traits will be the central focus of this paper as it relates to the proposition that people are treated differently according to their race.

Contemporary Race Relations in Organizations and Society at Large

Due to an ominous history of racial and ethnic relations in the United States, conflict and hostility continue to infiltrate these relationships. While the incident described in the introduction involving Doug Williams is an extreme case of racial and ethnic problems in the workplace, there are also subtle acts that can affect harmony and lead to animosity in diverse groups. Acts of this nature may include not giving eye contact, looking away when someone is speaking or when speaking to someone, failing to acknowledge a person's presence, or not being inclusive of certain groups. However, an important point that must be made is that not everyone

will interpret all behaviors in the same way. Therefore, some individuals may overlook some modes of conduct, where others may view these same behaviors as offensive. Based on his search of the literature on non-verbal behavior, Feldman (1985) concludes that African Americans and non-minority white ethnics may interpret non-verbal behavior differently, which suggests that even a positive sentiment may be translated as something negative. As noted by Johnson (2001), the choices that people make regarding how they interact with one another can affect whether or not individuals feel welcome and valued, or like outsiders.

According to management experts at The Institute of Management and Administration (2004), race is often considered a key divider in the workplace, which can affect employee productivity, motivation, cooperation, and loyalty. Employees who experience negative racial interactions may exhibit "passive-aggressive behavior," such as neglecting tasks, taking unwarranted sick leave, and/or reducing their level of productivity. This can be averted with knowledge regarding the types of problems that exist in the workplace and effective interventions. In an experiment on the effects of punitive black supervision on white and black subordinates, Mayhand and Grusky (1972) found that white subjects were more likely to present a positive attitude towards the black supervisor, black experimenter, and the experiment itself than were their black counterparts. However, white subjects were less cooperative in their physical response to the supervisor's demands, which was obvious when their productivity declined. In contrast, black productivity increased. According to Mayhand and Grusky (1972), a tentative explanation for an increase in black productivity and a decrease in white productivity is that although the physical

environment was alien to both black and white respondents, the social environment was familiar to black respondents, but foreign to whites. Therefore, white subjects were more likely to experience high levels of stress than were their black counterparts. As this experiment reveals, employees who verbally express their approval of other racial groups and work conditions may have other sentiments under the surface and, in extreme cases such as that of Doug Williams, racial tension and hostile work environments can lead to mass murder.

To prevent these and more subtle incidents of racial conflict, experts agree that organizations must establish an enforced equal opportunity policy, institute nondiscrimination and sensitivity training, respond to acts of discrimination, and diversify organizations at every level of management (IOMA, 2004). These recommendations are consistent with Perrow's (1970) conclusions on designing and managing the structure of organizations. According to Perrow (1970), far too often problems within organizations are wrongfully attributed to the characteristics of individuals when the focus should be placed on the structure of the organization. However, based on the nature of our racially stratified society, there are no guarantees that even in the best of environments some individuals will not harbor hostilities towards others as a result of physical differences.

Many people face prejudice and discrimination as a result of their physical characteristics, such as race, sex, and disabilities. But what is most important for social scientists is how prejudicial and discriminatory acts are defined (Myers, 2003). When attempting to explain prejudice and discrimination some scholars focus on social psychological theories, which attribute these behaviors to individual

characteristics. Numerous sociology introductory textbooks include individual explanations of prejudice, such as the authoritarian personality, frustration aggression and scapegoat theories (Henslin, 2005; Macionis, 2003; Andersen and Taylor, 2002; Kendall, 2005). However, theories in this category tend to suggest that these behaviors occur in a vacuum, ignoring the effects of the social structure on people's attitudes toward others.

Myers (2003) argues that hatred, oppression, and indifference are simply part of our culture, which implies that prejudice and discrimination may be linked to more than just individual behaviors. Archibald (1978) argues that focusing on prejudice as an individualistic problem deflects attention from exploitation and competition in the labor market. Archibald's (1978) point is that individualistic theories of prejudice do not explain massive patterns of discrimination and centuries of black enslavement. Thus, in a society driven by economic competition, more focus needs to be placed on the cultural characteristics of society as opposed to the personal traits of individuals living within the social structure, whereby the environment shapes their attitudes.

Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Management

Since the history of African Americans and other minorities in management is relatively brief, and because their occupation of these positions is uncommon in comparison to that of their white ethnic counterparts, it is worthwhile to examine their progress, especially within interracial workgroups. As noted by Reskin and Ross (1992)**,** white males are more likely to exercise job authority than are both African American males and females. When African Americans are placed in a position of authority they are often assigned to positions in which there is a lack of opportunity

for advancement (Irons and Moore, 1985). Based on these observations and due to their short history in management positions, it is likely that subordinate responses and treatment of racial/ethnic minority managers are different from that received by their non-minority white ethnic counterparts. Minorities are also more likely to supervise employees in economic structures where the subordinates are of the same race and/or ethnicity as they are (Elliot and Smith, 2001; Smith, 2002; McGuire and Reskin, 1993). As a result, African Americans are more likely to supervise other African Americans, and Hispanics are more likely to have authority over other Hispanics (Elliot and Smith, 2001). As noted by Tomaskovic-Devey (1993), the majority of non-minority white ethnics work in organizations where many, if not most, of the workers are of their own racial group. These findings are similar for African Americans. However, they are also more likely to have non-minority white ethnic co-workers due to their minority status in the labor force. Therefore, conflict among racial/ethnic groups is conceivable, particularly when minority group members are new to an organization and sensitivity training is non-existent. Thus, future studies might also consider minority superordinate responses toward subordinates as a result of their unfamiliarity with the co-ethnic work experience.

Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibiting discrimination by race, color, national origin, sex and religion in employment, and Title VI of this bill prohibiting discrimination against students on the grounds of race, color or national origin, ushered in an era of new opportunities for racial minorities (The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2004; Legal Foundation for Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action, 1995). Title VII prevents discrimination

on the basis of race-related characteristics and conditions, harassment, segregation and classification of employees, and pre-employment inquiries (The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2004). Title VI ensures that students will not face discrimination on the basis of race in student admissions, access to courses, programs, activities, and other education-related policies. Penalties for violations of this act included a loss of funding, a loss of government contracts, and/or fines. Thus, colleges, universities, and professional schools began to open their doors to African Americans (Dickens and Dickens, 1982).

Private industries also played a significant role in higher education for African Americans after Title VII was implemented, by establishing programs that encouraged hiring group members in more varied professional fields (Dickens and Dickens, 1982). For the first time in American history, African Americans entered predominantly non-minority white universities in large numbers. During this period, African Americans made significant gains, but gross inequalities continued to exist (Dickens and Dickens, 1982). In 1975, African American workers occupied only 9 percent of 41,738,000 white-collar jobs, despite the fact that African Americans made up 11.5 percent of the population during that period (Dickens, 1982; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1976). The majority of African Americans worked in the service sector of the labor market occupying 19 percent of 29,776,000 jobs. Nevertheless, a small percentage of African Americans working in white-collar jobs continued to move into higher levels of management despite the fact that many companies felt they were lowering their standards by hiring members from this group (Dickens and Dickens, 1982). Due to these new opportunities emerging for minority group members in

management and professional positions, one might assume that vast amounts of literature would be available on subordinate responses and attitudes toward minorities in management. However, this is not the case.

Finding Related Literature on Race and Ethnicity in Work Organizations

Recent literature in the area of intercommunication between racial/ethnic groups in organizations is scarce. Consequently, the range of research topics surrounding minorities in management positions and their subordinates is limited. Based on my research of numerous academic data bases using blacks, African Americans, Hispanics, minorities, affirmative action, race, managers, subordinates, superordinates, employees, race and organizational management, authority, discrimination, and prejudice as key descriptors, I can say that literature in this area primarily focuses on discrimination against minorities in hiring practices and promotions, limited job responsibilities, and the coping strategies of both minority managers and minority subordinates in the workplace.

In a review of journal articles on racial issues in organizations, Cox and Nkomo (1990) also found limited research on the effects of race on communication within organizations. They examined twenty well-known academic journals, including (journals listing the highest number of publications):

- Journal of Applied Psychology (59)
- Personnel Psychology (32)
- Public Personnel Management (26)
- Industrial Labor Relations Review (23)

Cox and Nkomo (1990) focused on the amount of research that has been done since the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the quantity and type of research, the research questions being addressed, and the research topics being emphasized. Attention was also given to which racial groups were studied, and what has been learned about the experiences of racial minorities in organizations. The results of Cox and Nkomo's research suggest that more literature on the effects of race in organizations is warranted.

Cox and Nkomo's (1990) review yielded several startling results on research relating to race in organizations. First, only 201 articles were identified for a twenty-five year period, from 1964-1989, which is relatively few considering the impact that race may have on the stability of organizations. Second, most of the articles written between 1964 and 1989 focused on equal employment opportunities/affirmative action (46 publications), hiring practices (34 publications), fairness in testing (26 publications), and performance evaluation (21 publications). Other topics relevant to this project, such as leadership (11 publications), communication (3 publications), perception (4 publications), and power and influence (2 publications) yielded fewer results. Studies on deference or respect and employee responses toward minority superordinates did not appear on Cox and Nkomo's (1990) list. Third, African American and white racial groups were more likely to be included in empirical studies than were Hispanics or what Cox and Nkomo refer to as "all others."

Limited studies on Hispanics and the lumping together of other racial groups continue to be common in academia, despite the fact that the number of minorities living in the United States has increased dramatically over the past twenty-five years.

This is unfortunate, yet reasonable when you consider the small number of minorities found in organizations that have been targeted for study. Finally, Cox and Nkomo (1990) also found that of 127 job types, studies on management only accounted for 9.4 percent of these studies. Due to the brief timeline of minority workers in management, this percentage might be justified. However, it is still essential that there are more studies on minority group members' progress to determine their effectiveness and whether or not the commonplace discussion of the declining significance of race is defensible.

Attitudes on Racial/Ethnic Minorities in the Workplace

Until the middle to late nineteen sixties, women and minorities were routinely denied access to numerous employment opportunities in both government agencies and private companies, which suggests that adjustment to these groups in professional and managerial positions may be ongoing (Feagin and Feagin, 1986). Thus, it is highly likely that middle class African American employees continue to face high rates of discrimination and indifference since they are pioneers in many workplace settings. In the past, these positions were occupied by an all white staff, which sheds light on the importance of contact and assimilation theories (Feagin and Sikes, 1994; Jackman and Crane, 1986). According to Jackman and Crane (1986), the separation or segregation of African Americans and white ethnics leads to erroneous and oversimplified negative beliefs about African Americans, which generates feelings of hostility and discriminatory social predispositions toward African Americans. Thus, the negative attitudes that white ethnics have toward minorities are partially attributed to the mental images that they have of these groups (Sigelman and Tuch, 1997). As a

result, a major road block for minorities is overcoming stereotypes that contribute to a hostile climate and shape white ethnics' thinking on a range of racially relevant issues (Sigelman and Tuch, 1997).

Stereotyping or categorizing racial/ethnic groups based on presumed social characteristics can lead to the unfair treatment of individuals who are highly qualified to fill a particular position. According to Fernandez (1981), 55 percent of non-minority white ethnics expressed some form of stereotyped opinion about minorities, which can have a negative effect on the working relationships between racial/ethnic groups, especially when these sentiments are felt by racial/ethnic minorities. Many minority group members believe that non-minority whites see them as undeserving of their positions. In fact, 36 percent of Native American, 43 percent of Asian, 74 percent of African American, and 57 percent of Hispanics either strongly agreed or agreed that most non-ethnic white managers made racial/ethnic minorities feel as if they received their job because they were equal employment opportunity targets (Fernandez, 1981). In more recent literature, Sigelman and Tuch (1997) also found evidence that African Americans felt unfavorably stereotyped by white ethnics. In their survey of 504 African Americans on metastereotypes, Sigelman and Tuch (1997) found at least two-thirds of this group felt white ethnics viewed them as unintelligent, immoral, lazy, and undisciplined whiners.

In in-depth interviews of 209 African Americans, Feagin and Sikes (1994) note the difficulties African Americans have in breaking new ground as managers or supervisors. According to one respondent who was the first African American supervisor for her company, workers treated her as if she was a temporary aberration.

She further described subordinates as unwilling to abandon ethnocentric feelings and racial stereotypes. Based on this supervisor's experience, it seems likely that ethnocentric sentiments and stereotypes about the capabilities of African Americans could easily be transformed into resistant behaviors and lower levels of deference toward minority workers in authoritative positions. Goffman (1956) makes reference to this type of reaction in his writings on the nature of deference. According to Goffman (1956), people can meet an obligation in spite of what they think of the individual personally, but can insinuate disregard by modifying intonation, pronunciation, pacing, and other subtle physical reactions. However, identifying resistance and lower levels of deference based on these characteristics could be difficult to detect even in observational research. But, employee responses to questions regarding their verbal and non-verbal reactions to specific encounters with minority managers may assist in identifying resistance and deference levels.

In a representative study of 4,202 Native American, Asian, African American, Hispanic, and white ethnic managers, Fernandez (1981) concluded that stereotypes about minority group members have been carried over into the corporate world. Although Fernandez' research is dated, other scholars confirm the thesis that race-based stereotypes found in the workplace are a product of the larger culture, which shape individuals' interactions with one another (Ely and Thomas, 2001). Thus, people's ideologies of race and/or ethnicity have not changed as quickly as the demographics of the workforce. Virtanen and Huddy (1998) provide further contemporary evidence to this claim in their research on the distinction between old fashioned racism and new forms of racial prejudice. According to their findings,

although negative stereotypes are partly grounded in socialization, these ideologies flourish in work environments where African Americans and white ethnics work in competition for scarce resources (Virtanen and Huddy, 1998). Thus, it should not be a surprise that even at this point in our history people continue to suffer from cultural lag, in which their attitudes toward diversity have not changed in spite of the fact that the labor force is more diverse than any other time in our history as a result of contemporary laws and technological advances calling for a larger workforce (Ogburn, 1964). Despite the need to adhere to regulations and meet production demands, people's attitudes toward particular groups remain relatively unchanged. As noted by Johnson (2001), we continue to see these types of problems because people simply cannot get along and overcome their prejudices toward others.

Unveiling the Effects of Racial and Ethnic Disputes by Way of Lawsuits

Recent reports of discrimination lawsuits against large corporations and state agencies further support researchers' claims that there are unresolved racial problems in America that follow individuals into the workplace. According to Hicks (2005), racial discrimination charges increased by 484 percent between 1980 and 1999 and charges based on national origin increased by 112 percent between 1992 and 2001 (these figures only account for lawsuits handled by the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission).

In the year 2000, Coca-Cola settled the largest racial discrimination suit in American history, paying out $192 million dollars to plaintiffs (Responsible Wealth, 2004). On May 24, 2001, eleven African American and Hispanic current and former employees of the New York City Parks Department filed a lawsuit against their

employer claiming discriminatory policies and practices based on race, and eight Spanish speaking former employees of Watlow Batavia, a metal-casting and assembly plant, were awarded $190,000 for their claim that they were discriminated against based on the employer's English-only policy (NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., 2005; Workplace Answers, 2005). Other companies that have been sued within the past five years, as a result of alleged racial and ethnic discrimination, are Cracker Barrel Old Country Store, Universal Studios, Supercuts, Applebee's, Abercrombie and Fitch, Eastman Kodak, and Denny's among numerous other corporations (Workplace Answers, 2005; ASA News, 2005; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., 2005).

Today, discrimination lawsuits are commonplace, which is costly to employers and suggests that a problem larger than individual indiscretion exists within our society. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2005), in 2004 it had 27,696 active race-based discrimination complaints and it successfully collected $61.1 million dollars for plaintiffs without litigation (monetary benefits obtained through litigation were undisclosed). These figures do not include cash settlements won by private attorneys. In addition to costs, these lawsuits could, potentially, lead to further animosity between racial/ethnic groups within organizations. In conjunction with the literature on stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination, these lawsuits further underscore racial tensions that exist within our work places.

Chapter IV

Identifying a Population for a Study on Deference in Work Organizations

Restating the Issue

It is my contention that ethnocentrism, prejudice, negative stereotyping, hostility, disrespect, and other negative sentiments continue to permeate organizations, which can affect the working relationships of minority managers and their subordinates. I attribute this problem to the overall structure of the organization, based on the premise that if diversity is not respected at the upper levels, it is likely that lower-level employees will mirror the attitudes and actions of their employers. However, before focusing on the organizational structure, more thorough studies on individual interactions between racial and ethnic groups is essential. Thus, a study on differences in levels of deference based on the race and ethnicity of the superordinate and the subordinate is a great starting point to determine the types of problems that exist among racial and ethnic groups. According to Feagin (1991), negative reactions toward a particular group based on race reflect the history of our society. Hence, I am particularly interested in the level of deference given to minority managers by their subordinates based on the supposition that people internalize and react toward others in ways that can be harmful to organizations and individuals as a result of their intolerance and preconceived ideologies.

Identifying an Ideal Population for Study

State employees are an ideal population for a study on subordinate deference toward superordinates since American government agencies are obligated to diversify their workforce according to mandatory Affirmative Action policies. As noted

previously, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that all institutions with fifty or more employees and have government contracts must comply with Affirmative Action policies to protect individuals from employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, and national origin (The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2004; Legal Foundation for Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action, 1995; Fox Performance Training and Human Resource Services, 2004). This law not only applies to private industries, but also to local, state, and federal government agencies. To ensure that government agencies adhere to Title VII, local and state agencies must periodically provide a written plan substantiating actions taken to improve diversity within these organizations and to affirm that this policy has not been breached. Written testimony of Affirmative Action plans is also required for organizations associated with government agencies before they can receive various forms of funding allocated by the government. For example, independent contractors must be able to show they are in compliance with state and federal laws in order to receive funds allocated by the state and/or federal government, which ensures that these organizations will attempt to diversify their staff.

Since the passage of Affirmative Action, the public sector has led the way in improving diversity in the workforce (Moore and Scott, 1983). Thus, there are numerous employment and management opportunities in the public sector for minority workers (Wilson, 1997). As noted by Ely and Thomas (2001), organizations operating according to the discrimination and fairness perspective (in which employers attempt to ensure equality and eliminate discrimination) are more likely to

hire from traditionally under-represented groups. Therefore, government agencies are ideal settings for studies on racial interaction as a result of their historically higher rates of diversity. However, I remain aware that prejudice and negative stereotypes do not disappear as a result of laws that abolish legalized discrimination (Smith and Welch, 1984). According to Ely and Thomas (2001), minorities working in organizations with discrimination and fairness policies report more direct negative experiences than do employees of organizations in which integration and learning (a desire to learn and enhance work processes) or access to legitimacy (a way to gain access to diverse markets and clients) are the primary basis for diversifying their workforce. They further contend that minority employees working for agencies with discrimination and fairness policies feel disrespected and devalued as a result of their race and/or ethnicity (Ely and Thomas, 2001). In fact, these agencies are less likely to have open discussions regarding racial and ethnic differences and they are more likely to experience race-related conflict stemming from status and power imbalances (Ely and Thomas, 2001). Thus, I suspect that forced integration only suppresses an individual's biases, leaving them to be revealed in more subtle ways, which is a primary focus in this paper.

Chapter V

Hypotheses

To test my hypothesis that subordinate responses toward superordinates vary according to race, I pose the following two questions, based on the work of Erving Goffman on the nature of deference (1956): 1) Do employee's physical responses differ toward supervisors according to the respondents' race or ethnicity and the race or ethnicity of the supervisor? 2) Do employee's verbal responses differ toward supervisors according to their race or ethnicity and the race or ethnicity of the supervisor?

The survey used to test my hypothesis is based on Goffman's two broad forms of deference, presentational rituals and avoidance rituals. According to Goffman (1956), deference or a lack of deference can be conveyed in a number of ways. Based on Goffman's prototypes of deference, the following types of ceremonial rituals are used to test my hypotheses:

- presentational gestural salutation rituals are the circumstances and the ways in which subordinates greet their supervisors,

- presentational gestural minor service rituals are types of services that subordinates extend to their supervisors,

- presentational gestural invitation rituals are social invitations that subordinates extend to their supervisors,

- presentational linguistic rituals are praise or forms of appreciation that subordinates extend to their supervisors,

- presentational task embedded rituals refer to subordinates accepting and performing tasks confidently, willingly and graciously when requested by their supervisors,

- avoidance spatial and physical distance rituals are circumstances in which subordinates should refrain from invading their supervisors' physical and personal space,

- avoidance task embedded rituals refer to circumstances in which subordinates might resist completing tasks, or express their displeasure in performing certain tasks, and

- avoidance spatial and verbal care rituals are conversations about one's personal life that subordinates should avoid when interacting with their supervisor.

I will develop scales measuring each of the presentational and avoidance rituals. I will determine the extent to which the race of the employee and the race of the supervisor interact to influence the level of deference employees extend to their supervisor in terms of these rituals. In particular, I hypothesize that white employees will extend less deference to their supervisors if their supervisors are non-white than if they are white. I expect to find the opposite effect for black employees.

Finally, I will also look at mediating factors that may alter the ways in which subordinates respond. These factors may increase or decrease deferent behavior as described by Goffman. These factors include:

- subordinates perceptions of their supervisors' actions,

- subordinates feelings about their relationship with their supervisor, and

- subordinates overall feelings about their supervisor.

Chapter VI

Methods

Pre-test

A pre-test was administered to staff employees at the University of Oklahoma to assist in creating valid and reliable scales. I distributed paper copies of the survey questionnaire to two of the largest departments on campus. The completed questionnaires were addressed and returned to me at the Department of Sociology in sealed envelopes. Respondents were asked primarily the same questions as described in tables 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, and 21. Respondents were asked to select their answers from two variations of a Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and always to never. I received responses from approximately 40 employees. The results from the pre-test were used for the sole purpose of revising some of the questions that were presented in an on-line survey questionnaire and administered at a state agency in the United States.

Sample

Original data were collected from a state agency in the southern region of the United States. An online survey questionnaire, created by the author of this paper, was administered in-house by the Office of Planning, Policy, and Research, a division within the state agency. The agency was also solely responsible for providing me with potential respondents based on my specifications requesting employees who report directly to supervisors. Prior to posting the questionnaire on-line, a senior researcher employed by the state agency sent an e-mail on my behalf, inviting a

31

random sample of employees to participate in the study. Subsequently, all

prospective respondents received a hyperlink giving them access to the questionnaire.

Potential respondents also received a disclaimer disconnecting the state agency from

all association with the survey questionnaire, with the exception of its distribution and

collection. Employees also received a brief summary of the purpose, confidentiality

and voluntary nature of the study, and a statement requesting their consent. An SPSS

data base was used to pull the sample from a statewide list including all employees as

of January 24th, 2006 that had the following job titles, including training positions:

adult protective service specialist I-IV, case manager I-IV, child welfare specialist I-

IV, social service specialist I-IV, social worker I-II, and social worker aide. The

roman numerals (I-IV) represent the level of pay and number of years within these

positions. However, due to the nature of their work and the nature of this study (each

supervisor is responsible for a small group of workers), the various levels should not

affect interaction between subordinates and superordinates due to the hierarchy in

authority at state offices.

Nine hundred and six (906) state workers fit the aforementioned job

descriptions. Of that number, five hundred (500) were randomly selected, and fifty

(50) were dropped as possible respondents as a result of erroneous job title listings,

leaving four hundred and fifty (450) possible subjects. Of all possible prospective

respondents, the final sample size is one hundred and eighty one (181), a response

rate of approximately thirty six percent (36%). The demographics of the final sample

consist of 69.1 percent non-Hispanic whites in comparison to 65.5 percent in the

target population and 75.1 percent in the U.S. population, 11.6 percent African

American or blacks in comparison to 22.3 percent and 12.3 percent in the U.S., 2.2 percent Hispanic or Latinos in comparison to 2.8 percent and 12.5 percent in the U.S., 2.2 percent Asian or Pacific Islander in comparison to 3.6 percent and 3.7 percent in the U.S., 11.6 percent American Indian or Native American in comparison to 4.4 percent and 0.9 percent in the U.S., and 2.8 percent other in comparison to 1.4 percent in the target population and 7.9 percent in the U.S. Twenty three percent of the respondents in this sample are male in comparison to 25.2 percent in the target population, and 77.3 percent are female in comparison to 74.8 percent in the target population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). It is important to note that percentages from the United States census data do not add up to 100 percent due to rounding and Hispanics being counted in more than one category.

Survey Questionnaire Format

The demographic section of the questionnaire was created by the author of this paper. The non-demographic questions were also created by the author, based on the work of Erving Goffman (1956), Nagel ([1953] 1969), Draper ([1955] 1969), and Schmid, Morsh, and Detter ([1957] 1969). The questionnaire consists of four parts to measure differences in levels of deference using the ceremonial idioms as suggested by Erving Goffman.

The first part of the questionnaire asks demographic questions about respondents and their supervisors. These questions provide crucial information about the respondents and their supervisors such as their race, sex, age, number of years respondents have known their supervisor, and the number of years subordinates have worked at their current location. They also provide an option to control for variables

that might influence subordinates' responses, such as educational attainment, age, and sex. Answers in this section were acquired by asking respondents to click on the appropriate answer, and/or select the answer most suitable to their situation.

The second and third parts of the questionnaire attempt to capture the ceremonial idioms (forms of expression) as outlined by Erving Goffman. The second part of the survey addresses questions related to Goffman's (1956) definition of presentational rituals, in which a "concrete appreciation" for the recipient is expressed through the actions of the actor. According to Goffman (1956), such rituals might include salutations, compliments, and extending minor services and invitations. This section of the questionnaire incorporates the above stated rituals into three of five prototypes described by Goffman as ways of conveying messages (gestural, linguistic, and task embedded). Based on this design, twenty-one questions were formulated to test subordinates' appreciation for their supervisors. The end result is a series of questions created by the author, according to Goffman's definition of presentational rituals and his suggestions for ways in which these rituals can be expressed. The following scales were created to improve the likelihood of capturing Goffman's examples of ceremonial rituals, which may be indicators of subordinates' genuine appreciation or higher levels of deference for their supervisors:

- The gestural salutation scale consists of five questions. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to be cordial towards their supervisors.

- The gestural minor service scale consists of five questions. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to show their appreciation for their supervisors by providing gifts and support.
- The gestural invitation scale consists of four questions. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to show their appreciation for their supervisors by inviting them to various events.

- The linguistic compliment scale consists of three questions. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to show their appreciation for their supervisors by complimenting them for various deeds.

- The task embedded scale consists of four questions. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to show their appreciation and compassion for their supervisors by their willingness to perform certain tasks.

Positive responses to presentational ritual questions indicate higher levels of deference among subordinates. Actual questions used for each scale are presented in the tables to follow. I developed these scales by categorizing the questions according to the form (in this case presentational rituals) and types (gestural, linguistic, and task embedded) of deference as described by Goffman (1956). The questions were grouped according to how they related to these categories. I conducted a pre-test of the survey to validate the reliability of the scales prior to administering the questionnaire to my target population. Some questions in the presentational and avoidance ritual sections were revised to improve reliability.

The third section refers to avoidance rituals or things you should not do, such as inquire about a supervisor's personal life, or invade a supervisor's personal space. Questions in this part of the questionnaire incorporate acts that typify the above stated categories into two of five prototypes described by Goffman as ways of conveying messages (spatial and task embedded). Eleven questions were formulated to test subordinates' avoidance of acts that might offend their supervisors. This series of questions was created by the author, according to Goffman's definition of avoidance rituals and his suggestions for ways in which these rituals are expressed. The following scales were created to improve the likelihood of capturing Goffman's

reference to avoidance rituals, which may be indicators of subordinates' lack of appreciation or lower levels of deference for their supervisors:

- The spatial physical distance scale consists of four questions. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to violate the personal space of their supervisor.

- The task embedded scale consists of four questions based on Goffman's definition of avoidance rituals. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to show insolence or sabotage tasks related to work.

- The spatial verbal care scale consists of three questions. The intent of this scale is to capture subordinates' desire to attain personal information about their supervisors' life.

Positive responses to avoidance ritual questions indicate lower levels of deference among subordinates. Actual questions are presented in the tables to follow. I developed these scales by categorizing the questions according to the form (in this case avoidance rituals) and types (spatial, and task embedded) of deference as described by Goffman (1956). The questions were grouped according to how they related to these categories.

Answers in sections two and three of the questionnaire were acquired by asking respondents to choose the most appropriate answer from two types of Likert responses. The first of the two types ranges from strongly agree, agree, disagree, to strongly disagree and the second ranges from always, often, seldom, to never.

The final part of the questionnaire includes questions on subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors' style, subordinates' personal relationships with their supervisors, and subordinates' overall opinions of their supervisors. Inquiries of this nature provide necessary control variables that could affect behavioral patterns as they are related to deference levels. This is especially important because Goffman

believes that some actors could show high levels of deference out of obligation, regardless of their true sentiment about the recipient. The questions in this section are used to ascertain what respondents actually think of their supervisors. Thus, the following scales were created:

- Subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors' actions consist of six questions. The intent of this scale is to establish subordinates' perception of how they are treated by their supervisors.

- Subordinates' feelings about their relationships with their supervisors consist of five questions. The intent of this scale is to determine if subordinates' consider their relationships with their supervisors to be friendly.

- Subordinates' overall opinions of their supervisors consist of three questions. The intent of this scale is to establish subordinates' opinions of whether or not their supervisors are doing a good job.

This section of the questionnaire (with the exception of two friendship questions on the second scale) was created by using a compilation of questions categorized as satisfaction with a specific job. The questions were grouped based on how they fit into the categories relating to perceptions, feelings, and opinions. Answers for this section of the questionnaire were acquired by asking respondents to choose the most appropriate answer based on a Likert scale ranging from strongly agree, agree, disagree, to strongly disagree.

Dependent Variables

The following variable descriptions encompass both presentational rituals (things that people should do), and avoidance rituals (things that people should not do). Eight scales based on four types of ceremonial idioms (forms of expression) were created to emulate the broad forms of deference (presentational and avoidance rituals) as illustrated by Erving Goffman (1956) in his work on the nature of

deference. Goffman refers to five types of ceremonial idioms, but for the purpose of this study the following four will be employed to measure levels of deference: linguistic, gestural, spatial, and task embedded. Data transformations and analysis for the entire study were performed with SPSS version 12.0. Cases with missing data were not included in any analyses.

Presentational Rituals

  Gestural Salutation Scale. Respondents were presented with five items designed to measure gestural salutations. The five gestural salutation items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 1. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 1 about here]

  Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these five items. Table 2 reports the results from the factor analysis. The five eigenvalues for these items are 2.917, .786, .736, .380, and .181. The difference between the first and second eigenvalue is 2.131 in comparison to a difference of .05 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 2. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .553 to .853. A reliability test was performed on the five items. Cronbach's alpha for the five items is .812. The mean and standard deviation for the gestural salutation scale are .0314 and 3.78968. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the five items.

[Table 2 about here]

38

Gestural Minor Service Scale. Respondents were presented with five items designed to measure gestural minor services. The five gestural minor service items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 3. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 3 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these five items. Table 4 reports the results from the factor analysis. The five eigenvalues for these items are 2.792, .748, .554, .515, and .390. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 2.044 in comparison to a difference of .194 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 4. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .618 to .811. A reliability test was performed on the five items. Cronbach's alpha for the five items is .798. The mean and standard deviation for the gestural minor service scale are .0301 and 3.73182. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the five items.

[Table 4 about here]

Gestural Invitation Scale. Respondents were presented with five items designed to measure gestural invitation. The four gestural invitation items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 5. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 5 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these four items. Table 6 reports the results from the factor analysis. The four eigenvalues for these items are 2.331, .830, .559, and .280. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 1.501 in comparison to a difference of .271 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 6. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .552 to .862. A reliability test was performed on the four items. Cronbach's alpha for the four items is .758. The mean and standard deviation for the gestural invitation scale are -.0046 and 3.01856. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the four items.

[Table 6 about here]

Linguistic Scale. Respondents were presented with three items designed to measure linguistics. The three linguistic items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 7. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 7 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these three items. Table 8 reports the results from the factor analysis. The three eigenvalues for these items are 2.142, .569, and .289. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 1.573 in comparison to a difference of .28 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported

in Table 8. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .769 to .891. A reliability test was performed on the three items. Cronbach's alpha for the three items is .799. The mean and standard deviation for the linguistic scale are .0143 and 2.52812. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the five items.

[Table 8 about here]

Task Embedded Scale. Respondents were presented with four items designed to measure task embedded activities. The four task embedded items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 9. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 9 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these four items. Table 10 reports the results from the factor analysis. The four eigenvalues for these items are 2.196, .848, .547, and .409. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 1.348 in comparison to a difference of .301 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 10. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .663 to .817. A reliability test was performed on the four items. Cronbach's alpha for the four items is .720. The mean and standard deviation for the task embedded scale are -.0315 and 2.95778. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the four items.

[Table 10 about here]

Avoidance Rituals

Spatial Verbal Care Scale. Respondents were presented with five items designed to measure spatial verbal care. Based on a factor analysis, the eigenvalues suggested that there were two factors present. To improve this scale, two spatial verbal care items were removed. The remaining three verbal care items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 11. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 11 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from the three remaining items. Table 12 reports the results from the factor analysis. The three eigenvalues for these items are 2.180, .461, and .359. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 1.719 in comparison to a difference of .102 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 12. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .827 to .868. A reliability test was performed on the three items. Cronbach's alpha for the three items is .811. The mean and standard deviation for the spatial verbal care scale are .0090 and 2.57026. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the four items.

[Table 12 about here]

Spatial Physical Distance Scale. Respondents were presented with five items designed to measure spatial physical distance. Based on a factor analysis, the eigenvalues suggested that there were two factors present. To improve this scale, one spatial physical distance item was removed. The remaining four physical distance

items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 13. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 13 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from the four remaining items. Table 14 reports the results from the factor analysis. The four eigenvalues for these items are 1.657, .935, .812, and .597. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is .722 in comparison to a difference of .123 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 14. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .530 to .772. A reliability test was performed on the four items. Cronbach's alpha for the four remaining items is .512. The mean and standard deviation for the spatial physical distance scale are -.0003 and 2.56489. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the four items.

[Table 14 about here]

Task Embedded Scale. Respondents were presented with four items designed to measure task embedded activities. The four task embedded items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 15. I recoded these items so that high scores represent higher levels of deference.

[Table 15 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these four items. Table 16 reports the results from the factor analysis. The four eigenvalues for these items are 2.023, .840, .724, and .414.

43

The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 1.183 in comparison to a difference of .116 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 16. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .583 to .825. A reliability test was performed on the four items. Cronbach's alpha for the four items is .647. The mean and standard deviation for the task embedded scale are .0245 and 2.83221. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the four items.

[Table 16 about here]

Independent Variables

Goffman (1956) believed that his study of deference at a mental facility could be applied to a general study of Anglo-American society. Based on this idea, I will attempt to apply Goffman's approach to studying deference on a culturally diverse group at a state agency. The survey includes two main independent variables, race of the respondent (subordinate), and race of the supervisor (superordinate). The following are descriptions of the independent variables (not necessarily in the order in which the questions were presented in the questionnaire).

Race of Respondent. The primary independent variable for this study is race of the respondent. Respondents were asked "How would you describe your racial background?" Possible answers for this question were 1=non-Hispanic white, 2=African American or black, 3=Hispanic or Latino, 4=Asian or Pacific Islander, 5=American Indian or Native American, and 6=other, with a space for respondents to complete their answers. I will measure race two different ways. Thus, two dummy variables were created for race of the respondent. The first dummy variable includes

only blacks, or African Americans, and whites because their numbers were greatest among respondents for this variable. For this dummy variable blacks or African Americans=0, whites=1, and all others=missing. The second dummy variable makes all minorities, including blacks or African Americans =0, and whites=1. The initial plan was to include all minorities in this study. However, the second dummy variable was not used because there were not enough minority respondents who were not black to produce valid results.

Supervisor's Race. This independent variable was acquired by asking respondents "Which category best describes your supervisor's race?" Respondents were asked to select one of six possible answers, 1=non-Hispanic white, 2=African American or black, 3=Hispanic or Latino, 4=Asian or Pacific Islander, 5=American Indian or Native American, 6=other, with a blank space to complete their answer. I will measure race two different ways. Thus, two dummy variables were created for race of the supervisor. The first dummy variable includes only blacks or African Americans, and whites because their numbers were greatest among supervisors. For this dummy variable whites=0, blacks or African Americans=1, and all others=missing. The second dummy variable makes whites=0, and all minorities, including blacks or African Americans=1. The initial plan was to include all minorities in this study. However, I did not use the second dummy variable because there were not enough supervisors among minorities other than blacks to produce valid results.

Control Variables: Demographics

There are two types of control variables. The first includes demographics, and the second pertains to respondents' perceptions, feelings and overall opinions of their supervisors. There are two control variables being used to determine the demographics of the population being studied (respondents or subordinates), and two questions related to the demographics of respondents' supervisors. This section also consists of a question establishing respondents' relationships with their supervisors prior to current employment. To follow is a description of demographic control variables (not necessarily in the order in which the questions were presented on the questionnaire).

Sex of Respondent. For the purpose of this study, sex will be used as a control variable. But, in future studies sex may be used as the primary independent variable. To determine respondents' sex, they were asked "What is your biological sex?" Two possible answers were 1=male and 2=female. A dummy variable where 0=female and 1=male was created for sex of the respondent.

Educational Attainment of Respondent. The control variable, current education status was obtained by asking respondents "What is the highest education level you have completed?" The Southern state in which this survey was administered requires that all prospective employees in this target population have at least a bachelor's degree, unless they were hired and performing certain tasks prior to changes in educational requirements. Respondents were asked to select the most appropriate answer from the following: 1=high school or GED, 2=vocational or trade school, 3=some college or two-year associate degree, 4=four year college degree,

5=graduate or professional school. Educational attainment was not used in the analyses since at the very least a bachelor's degree is required for most of the positions held by subordinates and superordinates (only three employees have educational levels lower than a bachelor's degree). Thus, there is too little variation in level of education to make it a meaningful central variable. However, education may be taken into account in future studies.

Supervisor's Sex. For the purpose of this study, the supervisor's sex will be used as a control variable, but in future studies may be used as the primary independent variable. To determine the supervisors' sex, respondents were asked "What is your supervisor's biological sex?" Two possible answers were 1=male and 2=female. A dummy variable where 0=female and 1=male was created for sex of the supervisor.

Age Group of Supervisor. This control variable, age of the supervisor, was obtained by asking respondents "Which category best describes your supervisor's age group?" Respondents were provided with their choice of the following possible answers: 1=twenty-nine years or younger, 2=thirty to thirty-nine years, 3=forty to forty-nine years, 4=fifty to fifty-nine years, 5=sixty years and older.

Status of Relationship Prior to Current Job. This control variable ascertains an employee's relationship with his or her supervisor prior to employment in his or her current position by asking the question, "Did you know your supervisor prior to being hired by this agency?" Respondents were provided with two possible answers to this question, 1=yes, 2=no. A dummy variable where 0=no and 1=yes was created for status of relationship prior to current job.

Control Variables: Perceptions, Feelings, and Opinions

The control variables in this section of the questionnaire were designed to assist in determining if subordinates' perceptions, feelings, and overall opinions of their supervisors are related to their physical and verbal responses about their supervisors. This section consists of three scales that measure subordinates' perceptions, feelings, and overall opinions of their supervisors. The first scale asks questions about subordinates' perception of their supervisors' actions, the second scale focuses on subordinates' feelings about their supervisors, and the final scale assesses subordinates' overall opinions of their supervisors. These scales are primarily a compilation of items created by Nagel (Robinson et al. (eds.) [1953] 1969), Draper (Robinson et al. (eds.) [1955] 1969), and Schmid et al. (Robinson et al. (eds.) [1956] 1969), with the exception of two friendship questions completing the second scale.

Perception of Supervisors' Actions. Respondents were presented with six items designed to measure perceptions of supervisors' actions. The six items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 17. I coded these items so that high scores represent a favorable perception of supervisors' actions.

[Table 17 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these six items. Table 18 reports the results from the factor analysis. The six eigenvalues for these items are 3.778, .624, .518, .479, .376, and .224. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 3.154 in comparison to a difference of .106 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that

a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 18. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .744 to .869. A reliability test was performed on the six items. Cronbach's alpha for the six items is .879. The mean and standard deviation for perceptions of supervisors' actions are -.0368 and 4.79020. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the six items.

[Table 18 about here]

Feelings about Relationship with Supervisor. Respondents were presented with five items designed to measure feelings about relationships with their supervisors. I developed three of the five items based on a compilation of items as noted above. I created the two items on friendship to make sure that intimate relationships are not a possible cause for some of the differences in deference that might be observed among respondents. The five items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 19. I coded these items so that high scores represent a favorable feeling about respondents' relationships with their supervisors.

[Table 19 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these five items. Table 20 reports the results from the factor analysis. The five eigenvalues for these items are 3.862, .687, .231, .160, and .060. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 3.175 in comparison to a difference of .456 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 20. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from

.822 to .913. A reliability test was performed on the five items. Cronbach's alpha for the five items is .926. The mean and standard deviation for perception of supervisors' actions are -.0328 and 4.41039. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the five items.

[Table 20 about here]

Overall Opinion of Supervisor. Respondents were presented with three items designed to measure respondents' overall opinions of their supervisors. The three items, their means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 21. I coded these items so that high scores represent a favorable overall opinion of supervisors.

[Table 21 about here]

Factor and reliability analyses were conducted to determine if a single scale could be constructed from these three items. Table 22 reports the results from the factor analysis. The three eigenvalues for these items are 2.509, .323, and .168. The difference between the first and second eigenvalues is 2.186 in comparison to a difference of .155 between the second and third eigenvalues. This indicates that a single factor solution is appropriate. The loadings on the one factor are also reported in Table 22. The loadings from the principal component analysis range from .882 to .935. A reliability test was performed on the three items. Cronbach's alpha for the three items is .899. The mean and standard deviation for overall opinion of supervisors are -.0085 and 2.74472. I created this scale by summing the z-scores of the three items.

[Table 22 about here]

Chapter VII

Analyses

Bivariate Analyses

      This paper examines how race of the subordinate and race of the supervisor affect the levels of deference that supervisors receive from their subordinates. I began by looking at bivariate relationships between race of the supervisor and presentational and avoidance ritual scales. These analyses represent white and black respondents' level of deference toward their supervisors. The dependent variables for this analysis are: presentational gestural salutations, presentational gestural minor services, presentational gestural invitations, presentational linguistics, presentational task embedded, avoidance spatial physical distance, avoidance task embedded, and avoidance spatial verbal care. The independent variables are race of the subordinate and race of the supervisor for white and black respondents. Also included in these analyses are the results of bivariate analyses for the following three control variables: respondents' perceptions of their supervisors, respondents' feelings about their relationships with their supervisors, and respondents overall opinions of their supervisors.

      I performed the analyses for this research using SPSS 12.0. The specific number of cases varied according to the number of responses received for each dependent variable as noted on Tables 23 and 24. Significance for the coefficients was determined by performing a t-test. Significant coefficients are indicated by asterisks. Table 23 shows the bivariate regression analyses for white respondents only. The following are the results of these analyses.

[Table 23 about here]

In the first line of Table 23, presentational gestural salutation is regressed on race of supervisor. The unstandardized coefficient is -1.107. This coefficient is negative as predicted, but is not statistically significant.

In line two of Table 23, presentational gestural minor service is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is -.897. This coefficient is negative as predicted, but is not statistically significant.

In line three of Table 23, presentational gestural invitation is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is -1.350. This coefficient is negative as predicted, and is statistically significant. This finding indicates that white employees are less inclined to invite their black supervisors to various events.

In line four of Table 23, presentational linguistics is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is -.339. This coefficient is negative as predicted, but is not statistically significant.

In line five of Table 23, presentational task embedded is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is .649. This coefficient is positive, the opposite of what I predicted, but is not statistically significant.

In line six of Table 23, avoidance spatial physical distance is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is .914. This coefficient is positive, the opposite of what I predicted, and is statistically significant. This finding indicates that white employees are less inclined to violate the personal space of their black supervisors.

In line seven of Table 23, avoidance task embedded is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is .320. This coefficient is positive, the opposite of what I predicted, but is not statistically significant.

In line eight of Table 23, avoidance spatial verbal care is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is 1.053. This coefficient is positive, the opposite of what I predicted, and is statistically significant. This finding indicates that white employees are more inclined to show restraint regarding the attainment of personal information about their black supervisors.

In line nine of Table 23, perception of supervisor's actions is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is -2.036. This coefficient is negative as predicted, and is statistically significant. This finding indicates that white employees approve less of black supervisors' treatment of their subordinates than they do of white supervisor's treatment of subordinates.

In line ten of Table 23, feelings about relationship with supervisor is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is -2.299. This coefficient is negative as predicted, and is statistically significant. This finding indicates that white employees do not consider their relationships with their black supervisors as friendly as they do their relationships with white supervisors.

In line eleven of Table 23, overall opinion of supervisor is the dependent variable. The unstandardized coefficient is -.600. This coefficient is negative as predicted, but is not statistically significant.

In Table 24, presentational gestural salutation, presentational gestural minor service, presentational gestural invitation, presentational linguistic, presentational task

embedded, avoidance spatial physical distance, avoidance task embedded, avoidance spatial verbal care, perception of supervisor's actions, feelings about relationship with supervisor, and overall opinion of supervisor are regressed on race of the supervisor for black respondents only. None of the coefficients was statistically significant, but this may be the result of a small sample size for black respondents. However, black respondents were either more positive or less negative on every scale than were their white counterparts. These findings suggest that black employees are less negative in their responses or more deferential toward their black supervisors than are their white counterparts. However, analyses showed none of these interactions were significant.

[Table 24 about here]

Multiple Regression Analyses

Tables 25 through 32 examine the effects of race of supervisor on presentational gestural salutations, presentational gestural minor services, presentational gestural invitations, presentational linguistics, presentational task embedded rituals, avoidance spatial physical distance, avoidance task embedded rituals, and avoidance spatial verbal care, controlling for age of the respondent, supervisor's age, supervisor's race, respondent's sex, supervisor's sex, status of the relationship prior to hire, length of time respondent has known supervisor, perception of supervisor's actions, feelings about the relationship with supervisor, and overall opinion of supervisor. These analyses are for white respondents only. The small number of black respondents in my data limited my ability to perform OLS analyses for this group.

I will perform the analyses for this section using SPSS 12.0. The specific

number of cases will vary according to the number of responses with valid data

received for each dependent variable as noted on Tables 25 through 32. Significance

for the coefficients was determined by performing a t-test. Significant coefficients

are indicated by asterisks.

In Table 25, presentational gestural salutations is the dependent variable. The

coefficients for race of the supervisor are not statistically significant, but the

coefficients in columns one through six are negative as predicted. The coefficient in

column seven is nearly zero, while controlling for feelings about relationship with

supervisor, which is positively related to presentational gestural salutations. This

finding indicates that employees' feelings about their relationship with their

supervisor reduce whatever negative effect there is for supervisor's race. Employees

who feel more positive about their relationship with their supervisors give them more

gestural salutations. Employees' perception of their supervisor's actions also slightly

reduces whatever negative effect there is for supervisor's race. Employees' overall

opinion of their supervisor increases the negative effect of supervisor's race.

Employees who have more positive overall opinions of their supervisors give them

fewer gestural salutations. Of all of the control variables, feelings about relationship

with supervisor have the strongest effect on gestural salutations.

In Table 26, a presentational gestural minor service is the dependent variable.

The coefficients for race of the supervisor are not statistically significant, but in

columns one through three, five, and seven they are negative as predicted. The

coefficients in columns four and six are positive, the opposite of what I predicted, and

the coefficient in column six is nearly zero. This finding indicates that employees'

feelings about their relationship with their supervisor reduce what little effect there is

for supervisor's race. Employees who feel more positive about their relationship with

their supervisor give them more minor services. Of all of the control variables,

feelings about relationship with supervisor has the strongest effect on presentational

gestural minor services.

In Table 27, presentational gestural invitations is the dependent variable. The

coefficients for race of the supervisor are statistically significant, and negative as

predicted in columns one, two, and five. The coefficients in columns three, four, six,

and seven are not statistically significant, but are negative as predicted. The effects of

supervisor's race are reduced by half when feelings about relationship with supervisor

are taken into account. This finding indicates that employees' feelings about their

relationship with their supervisor decrease the effect of supervisor's race. Employees

who feel positively about their relationships with their supervisors give them more

invitations to various events. The coefficients for respondent's sex are also

statistically significant, and are negative. These findings indicate that male

employees are less inclined to invite their supervisors to various events. The

coefficients for supervisor's sex are also statistically significant, and are negative in

columns three through seven. These findings indicate that male supervisors are less

often invited to various events. Of all of the control variables, feelings about

relationship with supervisor has the strongest effect on presentational gestural

invitations.

In Table 28, presentational linguistics is the dependent variable. The coefficients for race of the supervisor are not statistically significant, but in columns one, two, and five they are negative as predicted. The coefficients in columns three, four, six, and seven are positive, the opposite of what I predicted. Of all of the control variables, feelings about relationship with supervisor has the strongest effect on presentational linguistics.

In Table 29, presentational task embedded rituals is the dependent variable. The coefficients for race of the supervisor are not statistically significant, but in columns one through three and five they are negative as predicted. In columns four, six, and seven they are positive, the opposite of what I predicted. The coefficients for supervisor's age are statistically significant, and negative in columns one through three, but are no longer statistically significant when feelings about relationship with supervisor and overall opinion of supervisor are added as control variables in columns four through seven. The coefficients for respondent's sex are statistically significant, and are negative. These findings indicate that men less often show their appreciation and compassion for their supervisors by accepting and performing tasks confidently, willingly and graciously. Of all of the control variables, feelings about relationship with supervisor has the strongest effect on presentational task embedded rituals.

In Table 30, avoidance rituals spatial physical distance is the dependent variable. The coefficients for race of the supervisor are not statistically significant, and are positive, the opposite of what I predicted. The coefficients for perception of supervisor's actions are statistically significant, and are positive. Feelings about relationship with supervisor and overall opinion of supervisor are also statistically

significant, and are negative. Based on these findings, the better the perception of supervisor's actions, the more inclined employees are to avoid violating or, "respect" the personal space of their supervisor. Also, the less friendly employees feel their relationships are with their supervisors, and the worse their overall opinions of their supervisors, the more inclined they are to avoid violating the personal space of their supervisors. The avoidance rituals spatial physical distance scale was designed to measure deference. Coefficients for respondents' age are statistically significant, and positive. These findings indicate that the older the employees the more inclined they are to avoid violating the personal space of their supervisor.

In Table 31, avoidance task embedded rituals is the dependent variable. The coefficients for race of the supervisor are not statistically significant, and are positive, the opposite of what I predicted. The coefficients for respondent's gender are statistically significant in columns two and three and five through seven, and are negative. These findings indicate that men are more inclined to resist completing tasks, or express their displeasure in performing certain tasks. In columns one and three they are not statistically significant, but are negative. Controlling for perception of supervisors' actions and feelings about the relationship with the supervisor, which are both significant, increases the effect of gender.

In Table 32, avoidance spatial verbal care is the dependent variable. The coefficients for race of the supervisor are not statistically significant, and are positive, the opposite of what I predicted. The coefficients for age of respondent are statistically significant, and are positive. These findings indicate that the older the employees, the more inclined they are to avoid obtaining personal information about

their supervisor's life. The coefficient for perception of supervisor's actions is statistically significant, and negative in column three, but becomes positive in columns six and seven. Feelings about relationship with supervisor is also statistically significant, and is negative. Of all the control variables, feelings about relationship with supervisor have the strongest effect on avoidance spatial verbal care.

I performed the analyses described above using listwise deletion of missing data. The results did not differ appreciably from those presented.

Chapter VIII

Summary and Conclusion

Summary

In "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor," Erving Goffman (1956) shares his observations on the types of symbolic acts that institutionalized individuals display to affirm their relationships with their doctors and other individuals. According to Goffman, specific acts reflect the level of deference that an individual has for someone. He describes deference as an activity in which an individual celebrates or confirms his or her relationship with another. According to Goffman, there are many ways in which these sentiments can be expressed. In addition, he believes that this type of study could be applied towards a general study of deference in "*Anglo*" American Society.

In this dissertation, I considered two of the many forms of expressions or rituals (ways in which individuals attempt to conceal the symbolic meaning of their actions) to measure deference in multi-cultural work organization; presentational rituals that specify the types of actions that should be taken, such as greetings and invitations, and avoidance rituals that specify actions that should not be taken, such as violating one's personal space or failing to complete a task. Based on the work of Goffman, I examined the relationship between race of the subordinate, race of the supervisor, and the level of deference supervisors receive from their subordinates. I hypothesized that race of the subordinate and race of the supervisor do affect the level of deference that supervisors receive, especially for black supervisors with white subordinates.

The survey questionnaire used to collect the data was administered online and in-house by a senior researcher at a state agency in the southern region of the United States. An SPSS database was used to draw a sample from a statewide list of all employees with specific job titles. Job titles were used as a criterion to target employees who are in work groups and report directly to their supervisors. Based on this criterion, nine hundred and six (906) employees fit the description, and five hundred (500) were randomly selected. From this sample, I received one hundred and eighty one (181) responses, or a 36 percent rate of response. The racial composition of this sample is 69.1 percent non-Hispanic whites, 11.6 percent African American or blacks, 2.2 percent Hispanic or Latinos, 2.2 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, 11.6 percent American Indian or Native American, and 2.8 percent listed as other. The composition of respondents by sex is 23 percent male and 77.3 percent female.

I designed a questionnaire to test my hypothesis that employee physical and verbal responses differ according to the respondents' race or ethnicity and the race or ethnicity of their supervisor. Respondents were asked to complete a questionnaire that consists of four parts. The first section of the questionnaire included demographic questions about respondents and their supervisors. The second and third parts of the questionnaire consisted of questions that were designed to measure deference as defined by Goffman (1956). The second part of the questionnaire focused on questions related to presentational rituals, which are acts that reflect one's appreciation for another. I developed the following five scales using the questions from the presentational ritual section to improve the likelihood of measuring

deference: presentational gestural salutation rituals, presentational gestural minor service rituals, presentational gestural invitation rituals, presentational linguistic rituals, and presentational task embedded rituals. The third part of the questionnaire asked questions related to avoidance rituals, or acts that individuals should avoid. I developed the following three scales using the questions from the avoidance ritual section to improve the likelihood of measuring deference: avoidance spatial physical distance rituals, avoidance task embedded rituals, and avoidance spatial verbal care rituals. The final part of the questionnaire includes questions that ascertain subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors' style, subordinates' personal relationships with their supervisors, and subordinates' overall opinions of their supervisors. I developed three scales using the above titles and questions from this section to ascertain employees' feelings about their supervisors.

Summary of Bivariate Results

Table 23 shows the bivariate regression analyses for white respondents. Race of the supervisor is negative as predicted on four of the eight scales measuring deference, but only one is statistically significant. Race of the supervisor for the presentational gestural invitations scale is negative as predicted, and it is statistically significant. This finding indicates that white respondents are less inclined to invite black supervisors to various types of events, which may suggest that white employees have lower levels of deference for black supervisors when it comes to primary relations (small and intimate groups).

Race of the supervisor for avoidance spatial physical distance and avoidance spatial verbal care scales are positive, and statistically significant. These findings

indicate that white employees are more inclined to avoid violating the personal space, and inquiring about the personal life of their black supervisors. This might suggest that white employees have high levels of deference for black supervisors on these dimensions of deference. These findings could be related to the idea that blacks and whites are less inclined to socialize in small and intimate groups.

Race of the supervisor has an effect on the perception of supervisor's actions, feelings about the relationship with supervisors, and overall opinion of supervisor scales; all show negative effects, but only the first two are statistically significant. These findings indicate that white employees are less approving of their supervisors' treatment of their subordinates, and consider their relationships with their supervisors to be less friendly when their supervisors are black.

Table 24 shows the bivariate regression analyses for black respondents. The analyses for this group may have been different if the number of respondents was greater. Nevertheless, the findings for these analyses suggest that black respondents are less negative in their responses or more deferential toward their black supervisors than are their white counterparts. This may also suggest that race of the supervisor does not matter for black respondents.

Summary of Multiple Regression Results

Tables 25 through 32 show the results of the OLS regression analyses for white respondents. Low response rates among black respondents limited my ability to perform OLS analyses for this group. Most of the analyses for race of the supervisor for white respondents were not statistically significant, with the exception of the results presented in Table 27. In this table supervisor's race is statistically

significant, and it is negative as predicted until perception of supervisor's actions and feelings about the relationship with supervisor are added to the analysis. Supervisor's race is statistically significant and negative, as predicted, when perception of supervisor's actions and feelings about the relationship with supervisor are removed and overall opinion of supervisor are added to the analyses, but is no longer statistically significant once feelings about the relationship with supervisor are taken into account in the final two columns. Of all the control variables, feelings about the relationship with supervisor most strongly influence the effect of the race of the supervisor. These findings indicate that white employees are less inclined to invite their black supervisors to various events because they have less positive feelings about their relationships with their supervisors if their supervisors are black.

Overall, race of the supervisor is not a statistically significant factor in determining the level of deference supervisors receive from their subordinates. However, respondents' sex does seem to have some effect on the level of deference that supervisor's receive on many of the scales, and feelings about the relationship with the supervisor was consistently statistically significant on all of the scales.

Conclusions

For the most part, my hypothesis that race of the employee and race of the supervisor affect the amount of deference that supervisors receive was not substantiated. However, the large number of negative coefficients suggests that race of the supervisor does have a limited effect on the ways in which employees respond to their supervisors or the amount of deference that supervisors receive from subordinates. These scales were designed to measure deference, but it in some cases,

such as the avoidance ritual questions in which white employees responded positively or showed deference, could also be measuring friendliness or the absence of friendliness. This observation is based on white respondents' lower scores on their feelings about the relationship variable, and the fact that whites and blacks rarely interact on personal levels preventing them from getting to know one another well enough to be comfortable. As noted by Marger (2000, p. 261), "With continued segregation in housing, whites and blacks do not interact at personal levels," which is essential for creating friendships between groups of people.

Based on my review of existing literature on employee behaviors toward their supervisors, I am the first to attempt to measure deference among subordinates toward their superordinates in work organizations. In this study, I attempted to find a way to measure how subordinates respond to their supervisors based on their race. As a result of this study, I recognize that focusing on people's behavior and their verbal responses may be the most effective way to determine an organizations need for more aggressive diversity programs since it is difficult to recognize problems that are not overt. Thus, the scales that I created should serve as a valuable starting point for future studies on deference, and/or other types of studies on employee behavior.

A major limitation to this study may have been the way in which it was administered to employees. As a result of the questionnaire being administered in-house by a researcher at the state agency, it is possible that employees may have been concerned that their supervisors would have access to their answers, which could have affected their responses, and in turn my final results.

Based on the results of this study, I believe that future studies on deference in work organizations are warranted. However, future studies should include a national sample to provide the ability to perform full scale analyses for all racial and ethnic groups, including Hispanic or Latinos, Asian or Pacific Islanders, American Indian or Native Americans, and the group that we always refer to as others. In addition, the questionnaire used in this study should be redesigned to represent the perception of deference or respect in the general population. Finally, surveys of this nature should be administered directly to employees by the researcher in order to encourage employees' true sentiments.

References

Andersen, Margaret L. and Howard F. Taylor. 2002. (2nd Ed.). *Understanding a Diverse Society: Sociology*. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning. Belmont: California.

Archibald, W. P. 1978. *Social Psychology as Political Economy*. McGraw Hill. Toronto.

ASA Centennial. (2005). "Proving Inequality is Alive and Well in U.S. Workplaces." Retrieved February 25, 2005, from http://www.asanet.org/media/discriminate. html.

Baldwin, James. (2004) [1955]. Stranger in the Village. Retrieved January 15, 2004, from http://www.uwm.edu/~gjay/Whiteness/stranger.htm.

Beeghley, Leonard. 2000. *The Structure of Social Stratification in the United States*. Allyn and Bacon. Needham Heights: Massachusetts.

Cox, Taylor, Jr. and Stella M. Nkomo. 1990. "Invisible Men and Women: A Status Report on Race As A Variable In Organization Behavior Research." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 11:419-431.

Davidson, Martin and Raymond Al Friedman. 1998. "When Excuses Don't Work: The Persistent Injustice Effect Among Black Managers." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:154-183.

Dickens, Floyd Jr. and Jacqueline B. Dickens. 1982. *The Black Manager, Making It In The Corporate World*. American Management Association. New York: New York.

Draper, Richard D. (1955). Higher Levels of Management and Employee Attitude Toward the Foreman. In John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiou, and Kendra B. Head (Eds.), (1969). *Measures of Occupational Characteristics* (pp.171-172). Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research: Library of Congress.

Elliot, James R. and Ryan A. Smith. 2001. "Ethnic Matching of Supervisors to Subordinate Work Groups: Findings on "Bottom-up" Ascription and Social Closure." *Social Problems* 48:258-276.

Ely, Robin J. and David A.Thomas. 2001. "Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects Of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46: 229-273.

Feagin, Joe R. 1991. "The Continuing Significance of Race: Anti-Black Discrimination in Public Places." *American Sociological Review* 56:101-116.

Feagin, Joe R. and Clarece Booher Feagin. 1978. *Discrimination American Style, Institutional Racism and Sexism.* Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co. Malabar: Florida.

Feagin, Joe R. and Douglas Lee Eckberg. 1980. "Discrimination: Motivation, Action, Effects, and Context." *Annual Review of Sociology* 6:1-20.

Feagin, Joe R. and Melvin P. Sikes. 1994. *Living With Racism, The Black Middle-Class Experience.* Beacon Press. Boston: Massachusetts.

Feldman, Robert S. 1985. "Non Behavior, Race, and the Classroom Teacher." *Theory into Practice* 24:45-49.

Fernandez, John P. 1941. *Racism and Sexism in Corporate Life.*   Lexington Books. Lexington: Massachusetts.

FindLaw For the Public. 2005. Retrieved on February 25, 2005, from http://public.finlaw.com/employment_employer/life events/le9_8lessons.html.

Fox Performance Training and Human Resource Services. 2004. Retrieved on February 22, 2005, from http://www.foxperformance.com/affirmative.html.

Garvin, P. L. and S.H. Riesenberg. 1952. "Respect Behavior on Ponape: An Ethnolinguistic Study**."** *American Anthropologist* 54:201-222.

Goffman, Erving. 1956. "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor." *American Anthropologist* 58:473-502.

Halbfinger, David. (2003, July 10). "Factory Killer Had a Known History of Anger and Racial Taunts." *The New York Time*s. Retrieved on January 15, 2004, from Wysiwyg://4/http://www.uwm.edu/~gjay/Whiteness/factory shooter.htm.

Hicks, Jennifer. 2005. "Number of Discrimination Suits Soar." Retrieved on February 22, 2005, from http://www.imdiversity.com/Villages/Career/articles/ hicks_discrimination_soars.asp.

Irons, Edward and Gilbert Moore. 1985. *Black Managers: The Case of the Banking Industry.*   Praeger Publishing. New York: New York.

Jackman, Mary R. and Marie Crane. 1986. "Some of My Best Friends are Black…": Interracial Friendship and Whites' Racial Attitudes." *The Public Quarterly* 50:459-486.

Johnson, Allen P. 2001. *Privilege, Power, and Difference.* Mayfield Publishing Co. Mountain View: California.

Kendall, Diana. 2005. (5th ed.). *Sociology in Our Times*. Thomson Wadsworth.
Belmont: California.

Legal Foundation for Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action. (1995). Retrieved
On February 22, 2005, from http://www.eoa.uiuc.edu/laws_list.html.

Legal Monitor. (2005). Retrieved on February 22, 2005, from http://www.
Restaurant.org/legal/lm/lm2001_09.cfm.

Macionis, John J. 2003. (9th ed.). *Sociology*. Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River:
New Jersey.

McGuire, Gail M. and Barbara F. Reskin. "Authority Hierarchies at Work: The
Impacts of Race and Sex." *Gender and Society* 7:487-506.

Marger, Martin N. 2000. (5th ed.). *Race and Ethnic Relations*. Wadsworth
Publishing Company. Belmont: California.

Moore, Michael L. and K. Dow Scott. 1983. "Installing Management by Objectives
in a Public Agency: A Comparison of Black and White Managers, Supervisors,
and Professionals." *Public Administration Review* 43:121-126.

Myers, John P. 2003. *Dominant-Minority Relations in America.* Allyn and Bacon.
Boston: Massachusetts.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (2005). Retrieved February 25,
2005, from http://www.naacpldf.org/content.aspx?article=49.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (2005). Retrieved February 25,
2005, from http://www.naacpldf.org/content.aspx?article=55.

Nagle, B. (1953). Productivity, Employee Attitude, and Supervisor Sensitivity. In
John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiou, and Kendra B. Head (Eds.), (1969)
Measures of Occupational Characteristics (pp.169-170). Survey Research
Center, Institute for Social Research: Library of Congress.

Ogburn, William F. 1964. *On Culture and Social Change.* The University of
Chicago Press. Chicago: Illinois.

Perrow, Charles. 1970. *Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View.* Wadsworth
Publishing Company. Belmont: California.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1985. "New Black-White Patterns: How Best to
Conceptualize Them?" *Annual Review Sociology* 11:329-46.

Reskin, Barbara F., and Catherine E. Ross. 1992. "Authority and Earnings Among Managers: The Continuing Significance of Sex." *Work and Occupations* 19:342-65.

Responsible Wealth: A Project of United for a Fair Economy. (2004). Retrieved February 25, 2005, from http://www.responsiblewealth.org/press/2004/ExxonMobil.html.

Rotham, Robert A. 2002. (4th ed.). *Inequality and Stratification.* Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River: New Jersey.

Schmid, J., J. Morsh, and H. Detter (1957). Analysis of Job Satisfaction Research Report. In John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiou, and Kendra B. Head (Eds.), (1969). *Measures of Occupational Characteristics* (pp.173-174). Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research: Library of Congress.

Sigelman, Lee and Steven A.Tuch. 1997. "Metastereotypes: Blacks' Perceptions of Whites' Stereotypes of Blacks." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61:87-101.

Smith, RA. 2002. "Race, Gender, and Authority in the Workplace: Theory and Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:509-543.

Smith, James P. and Finis Welch. 1984. "Affirmative Action and Labor Markets." *Journal of Labor Economics* 2:269-301.

The Institute of Management and Administration. (2004). Retrieved January 14, 2004, from http://www.ioma.com/ezines/archives.php?eissueid=52&ezineid=2.

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2004). Retrieved February 22, 2005, from http://www.eeoc.gov/types/race.html.

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2005). Retrieved February 22, 2005, from http://www.eeoc.gov/stats/race.html.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald. 1993. *Gender and Racial Inequality at Work.* ILR Press. Ithaca: New York.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1976. (97th ed.) Washington, D.C., 1976.

U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder. 2000. Retrieved July 3, 2007, from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=01000US&-qr_name=DEC_2000_.

Virtanen, Simo V. and Leonie Huddy. 1998. "Old-Fashioned Racism and New Forms of Racial Prejudice." *The Journal of Politics* 60:311-332.

Workplace Answers. 2005. Retrieved February 25, 2005, from
http://www.workplaceanswers.com/news.asp.

Table 1. Gestural Salutation Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=179)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
How often do you greet your supervisor when you arrive at work? 1) always 2) often 3) seldom 4) never	2.9721	.93874
At the end of the day, how often do you acknowledge your supervisor? 1) always 2) often 3) seldom 4) never	2.8156	.88342
If your supervisor were not in clear view upon your arrival at work, you would make an attempt to locate him or her in order to extend a greeting. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.284	.82948
If your supervisor were not in clear view upon your departure from work, you would make an attempt to locate him or her to say goodbye. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.3073	.84833
If you were to encounter your supervisor at an event outside of the office, you would greet him or her with a handshake or a hug. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.7318	.89043

Table 2. Gestural Salutation Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N= 179)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	2.917	
Factor 2	.786	
Factor 3	.736	
Factor 4	.380	
Factor 5	.181	

Item		
Item 1		.720
Item 2		.806
Item 3		.853
Item 4		.845
Item 5		.553

Table 3. Gestural Minor Service Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=176)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
If you knew your supervisor needed help with a task outside of work, you would volunteer to help him or her do it. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.7898	.78275
If your supervisor were upset, you would make an effort to do or say something that would make him or her feel better. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.3239	.61663
If you went out to lunch with your supervisor, you would offer to pay the bill. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.0341	.64052
If you had extra tickets for an outside event, you would offer them to your supervisor at no charge. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.5284	.82759
If your supervisor's vehicle was unavailable to him or her for whatever reason, you would volunteer to take him or her to and from work. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.7500	.85189

Table 4. Gestural Minor Service Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=176)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	2.792	
Factor 2	.748	
Factor 3	.554	
Factor 4	.515	
Factor 5	.390	

Item		
Item 1		.760
Item 2		.768
Item 3		.618
Item 4		.764
Item 5		.811

Table 5. Gestural Invitation Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=178)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
How often do you extend invitations to your supervisor for lunch? 1) always 2) often 3) seldom 4) never	1.8820	.76107
If you and your co-workers were celebrating a special event at the office such as a birthday party, bridal shower, or baby shower, you would make sure that your supervisor was invited. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.5112	.63990
If you were having an event outside of the office, such as a birthday celebration or graduation party for a family member or friend, you would invite your supervisor. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.1348	.81914
If you were having a casual dinner or some other casual event at your home, you would invite your supervisor. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.0955	.74172

Table 6. Gestural Invitation Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=178)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	2.331	
Factor 2	.830	
Factor 3	.559	
Factor 4	.280	

Item		
Item 1		.764
Item 2		.552
Item 3		.836
Item 4		.862

Table 7. Linguistic Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=180)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
How often do you make appreciative comments about your supervisor to others? 1) always 2) often 3) seldom 4) never	2.8111	.76069
How often do you compliment your supervisor for the work he or she does in your office. 1) always 2) often 3) seldom 4) never	2.5611	.74866
How often do you give your supervisor written notes, emails or cards to show your appreciation for anything that you feel he or she has done well. 1) always 2) often 3) seldom 4) never	1.9722	.63800

Table 8. Linguistic Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=180)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	2.142	
Factor 2	.569	
Factor 3	.289	

Item		
Item 1		.870
Item 2		.891
Item 3		.769

Table 9. Gestural Task Embedded Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=178)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
If you knew your supervisor needed help with a task at work, even if it was not part of your job description, you would volunteer to assist him or her with that project. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.1966	.65578
If your group or department failed to meet a deadline or goal, you would volunteer to assist in completing the task, no matter who is at fault. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.3146	.60311
You always try to do exactly what your supervisor wants you to do. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.2753	.56002
If you failed to meet a deadline or goal, you would apologize to your supervisor for the role that you may have played in missing the deadline or goal. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.4157	.63440

Table 10. Gestural Task Embedded Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=178)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	2.196	
Factor 2	.848	
Factor 3	.547	
Factor 4	.409	

Item		
Item 1		.723
Item 2		.817
Item 3		.753
Item 4		.663

Table 11. Avoidance Spatial Verbal Care Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=176)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
You joke with your supervisor about various events that have occurred in his or her personal life. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.6761	.86368
You ask your supervisor personal questions about his or her life. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.8409	.79837
You discuss with your supervisor, personal issues about your life that are unrelated to work. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.5682	.85918

Table 12. Avoidance Spatial Verbal Care Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings
         (N=176)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	2.180	
Factor 2	.461	
Factor 3	.359	

Item		
Item 1		.827
Item 2		.868
Item 3		.862

Table 13. Avoidance Spatial Physical Distance Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=179)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
If you were in your supervisor's office for any reason and needed a pen, piece of paper, paper clip, etc., you would help yourself to your supervisor's supplies. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.4302	.91147
Even if his or her door were open, you would knock on your supervisor's door before entering. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.5363	.88214
When speaking with your supervisor, you are always careful not to stand too close. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.9274	.65367
If you wanted to meet with your supervisor, and his or her door was open, you would still ask if he or she had time to meet with you. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.1341	.63944

Table 14. Avoidance Spatial Physical Distance Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=179)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	1.657	
Factor 2	.935	
Factor 3	.812	
Factor 4	.597	

Item		
Item 1		.530
Item 2		.772
Item 3		.581
Item 4		.665

Table 15. Avoidance Task Embedded Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=179)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
If you were angry or upset with your supervisor, you would take your time completing tasks that have been assigned to you. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.1397	.73251
If you were angry or upset with your supervisor, you would turn in work that might be considered of poor quality. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.5922	.56702
If you were angry or upset, you would refuse to perform tasks that have been been assigned to you by your supervisor. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.5698	.56028
If you were unhappy with the work assignments given to you by your supervisor, you would complain to co-workers about the assigned tasks. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.7095	.72241

Table 16. Avoidance Task Embedded Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=179)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	2.023	
Factor 2	.840	
Factor 3	.724	
Factor 4	.414	

Item		
Item 1		.642
Item 2		.768
Item 3		.825
Item 4		.583

Table 17. Perception of Supervisor Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=172)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Your immediate supervisor frequently criticizes you in front of others. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.4070	.69042
If your immediate supervisor knew that you wanted to see him or her about a problem, he or she would avoid you. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.3953	.68020
If you had a complaint, your immediate supervisor would delay in taking care of the problem. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.1512	.77259
Your immediate supervisor always gives you recognition for work well done. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.9186	.86808
Your immediate supervisor ignores opinions of those who disagree with him or her. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.9244	.74149
Your immediate supervisor always backs up his or her employees. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.8256	.88115

Table 18. Perception of Supervisor Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=172)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	3.778	
Factor 2	.624	
Factor 3	.518	
Factor 4	.479	
Factor 5	.376	
Factor 6	.224	

Item		
Item 1		.750
Item 2		.805
Item 3		.869
Item 4		.818
Item 5		.769
Item 6		.744

Table 19. Feelings about relationship with Supervisor Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=175)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Your immediate supervisor is always courteous and friendly toward you. 1) strongly agree　　2) agree　　3) disagree　　4) strongly disagree	3.2171	.67700
Your immediate supervisor takes an interest in you as a person as well as in how well you do your job. 1) strongly agree　　2) agree　　3) disagree　　4) strongly disagree	3.0571	.77840
You always feel at ease around your immediate supervisor. 1) strongly agree　　2) agree　　3) disagree　　4) strongly disagree	2.9543	.80813
You consider your supervisor to be a friend. 1) strongly agree　　2) agree　　3) disagree　　4) strongly disagree	2.5200	.81537
You believe that your supervisor considers you to be a friend. 1) strongly agree　　2) agree　　3) disagree　　4) strongly disagree	2.5429	.76349

Table 20. Feelings about Relationship with Supervisor Eigenvalues, and
Factor Loadings (N=175)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loading
Factor 1	3.862	
Factor 2	.687	
Factor 3	.231	
Factor 4	.160	
Factor 5	.060	

Item		
Item 1		.822
Item 2		.899
Item 3		.913
Item 4		.886
Item 5		.871

Table 21. Overall Opinion of Supervisor Items: Means, and Standard Deviations (N=177)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
Generally speaking, your immediate supervisor is a good supervisor. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.2542	.78175
Your immediate supervisor is admired and respected by all of his or her employees. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	2.7740	.82902
Your supervisor usually treats his or her employees well. 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) disagree 4) strongly disagree	3.2655	.70919

Table 22. Overall Opinion of Supervisor Eigenvalues, and Factor Loadings (N=177)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Factor Loadings
Factor 1	2.509	
Factor 2	.323	
Factor 3	.168	

Item		
Item 1		.935
Item 2		.882
Item 3		.925

Table 23. Bivariate Regression of Deference Scales on Supervisor's Race for White Respondents Only

Dependent Variable	Constant	b/B	Standard Error	T-Test
Presentational Gestural Salutations (N=119)	.220	-1.107/-.125	.806	-1.373
Presentational Gestural Minor Services (N= 116)	.098	-.897/-.112	.740	-1.212
Presentational Gestural Invitations (N=118)	.376	-1.350*/-.205	.595	-2.269
Presentational Linguistics (N=119)	-.031	-.339/-.065	.481	-.706
Presentational Task Embedded (N=120)	.099	.649/-.096	.611	1.061
Avoidance Spatial Physical Distance (N=119)	-.314	.914*/.153	.541	1.691
Avoidance Task Embedded (N=119)	-.049	.320/.051	.580	.552
Avoidance Spatial Verbal Care (N=118)	-.446	1.053*/.180	.530	1.988
Perception of Supervisor's Actions (N=116)	.680	-2.036*/-.194	.954	-2.134
Feelings about Relationship with Supervisor (N=116)	.685	-2.299*/-.229	.909	-2.529
Overall Opinion of Supervisor (N=117)	.216	-.600/-.101	.545	-1.100

*= p<.05

Table 24. Bivariate Regression of Deference Scales on Supervisor's Race for Black Respondents Only

Dependent Variable	Constant	b/B	Standard Error	T-Test
Presentational Gestural Salutations (N=18)	.587	-.539/-.069	1.841	-.293
Presentational Gestural Minor Services (N=19)	.166	.039/.005	1.929	.020
Presentational Gestural Invitations (N=19)	-1.189	2.233/.298	1.639	1.362
Presentational Linguistics (N=19)	.167	-.223/-.035	1.448	-.154
Presentational Task Embedded (N=18)	-.469	-.405/-.067	1.433	-.283
Avoidance Spatial Physical Distance (N=19)	.427	1.299/.287	.993	1.308
Avoidance Task Embedded (N=19)	-.374	.126/.019	1.546	.081
Avoidance Spatial Verbal Care (N=17)	1.560	-1.050/-.872	1.205	-.872
Perception of Supervisor's Actions (N=17)	-1.519	1.402/.153	2.204	.636
Feelings about Relationship with Supervisor (N=18)	-1.459	.421/.045	2.209	.191
Overall Opinion of Supervisor (N=19)	-.953	.172/.026	1.509	.114

*= p<.05

Table 25. OLS Regression with Presentational Rituals Gestural Salutations Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	-.026/-.081 (.030)	-.020/-.064 (.033)	.005/.015 (.031)	.015/.046 (.028)	.007/.024 (.030)	.014/.046 (.029)	.015/.048 (.030)
Supervisor's age	-.403/-.094 (.401)	-.344/-.080 (.423)	-.240/-.056 (.388)	-.359/-.083 (.362)	-.193/-.045 (.385)	-.353/-.082 (.373)	-.373/-.086 (.379)
Supervisor's race	-.846/-.096 (.831)	-.825/-.093 (.839)	-.265/-.030 (.777)	-.062/-.007 (.728)	-.921/-.103 (.769)	-.045/-.005 (.756)	.004/.000 (.774)
Respondent's sex	-.845/-.089 (.882)	-.860/-.091 (.893)	-1.151/-.121 (.824)	-.337/-.035 (.755)	-.555/-.058 (.819)	-.386/-.041 (.791)	-.387/-.041 (.794)
Supervisor's sex	.518/.056 (.862)	.564/.061 (.874)	.014/.001 (.825)	.128/.014 (.740)	-.091/-.010 (.790)	-.001/.000 (.781)	.004/.000 (.785)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		.023/.001 (2.057)	.258/.012 (1.860)	1.034/.048 (1.714)	.514/.024 (1.836)	.937/.045 (1.743)	.949/.045 (1.751)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		-.003/-.051 (.007)	.003/.045 (.007)	-.002/-.025 (.006)	-.001/-.019 (.006)	.000/-.004 (.006)	.000/-.004 (.006)
Perception of supervisors actions			.386*/.465 (.078)			.116/.140 (.120)	.141/.170 (.143)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				.506*/.577 (.073)		.402*/.454 (.125)	.419*/.474 (.136)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					.690*/.461 (.132)		-.081/-.054 (.244)
Intercept	2.442	-2.177	.480	.402	.561	.338	.341

R²	.038	.040	.224	.346	.242	.334	.335
N	113	111	106	106	107	101	100

*= p<.05

Table 26. OLS Regression with Presentational Rituals Gestural Minor Services Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	-.037/-.127 (.028)	-.026/-.091 (.030)	.005/.018 (.028)	-.001/-.003 (.026)	-.001/-.005 (.028)	.005/.016 (.027)	.004/.013 (.027)
Supervisor's age	-.539/-.134 (.377)	-.423/-.106 (.396)	-.476/-.122 (.358)	-.432/-.108 (.340)	-.225/-.056 (.357)	-.527/-.136 (.342)	-.507/-.131 (.346)
Supervisor's race	-.737/-.092 (.763)	-.686/-.085 (.765)	-.432/-.055 (.698)	.134/.017 (.672)	-.818/-.100 (.702)	.030/.004 (.682)	-.025/-.003 (.697)
Respondent's sex	-.832/-.092 (.842)	-.904/-.100 (.847)	-1.326*/-.149 (.774)	-.696/-.078 (.719)	-1.109/-.121 (.773)	-.820/-.094 (.739)	-.816/-.093 (.743)
Supervisor's sex	-.327/-.039 (.788)	-.238/-.028 (.793)	-.528/-.063 (.740)	-.795/-.095 (.682)	-.769/-.092 (.720)	-.715/-.086 (.703)	-.722/-.087 (.707)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		-.972/-.049 (1.863)	-.690/-.036 (1.666)	-.099/-.005 (1.579)	-.543/-.028 (1.672)	-.063/-.003 (1.570)	-.078/-.004 (1.577)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		-.007/-.114 (.006)	-.002/-.026 (.006)	-.004/-.059 (.006)	-.004/-.059 (.006)	-.003/-.054 (.006)	-.003/-.054 (.006)
Perception of supervisors actions			.333*/.437 (.072)			.025/.033 (.110)	-.004/-.005 (.130)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				.438*/.544 (.068)		.404*/.507 (.113)	.384*/.482 (.123)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					.639*/.458 (.122)		.091/.067 (.219)
Intercept	3.423	2.981	1.472	1.469	1.262	1.438	1.443

	R²	.050	.065	.235	.334	.264	.328	.329
	N	110	108	103	104	105	99	108

*= p<.05

Table 27. OLS Regression with Presentational Rituals Gestural Invitations Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	-.039*/-.164 (.022)	-.030/-.126 (.024)	.000/-.001 (.021)	-.005/-.020 (.019)	-.003/-.011 (.020)	.002/.007 (.019)	.001/.003 (.019)
Supervisor's age	-.153/-.046 (.296)	-.065/-.020 (.310)	-.019/-.006 (.262)	-.033/-.010 (.242)	.174/.053 (.257)	-.055/-.017 (.243)	-.033/-.010 (.247)
Supervisor's race	-1.208*/-.183 (.602)	-1.180*/-179 (.605)	-.819/-.126 (.518)	-.524/-.078 (.485)	-1.278*/-.190 (.511)	-.605/-.092 (.491)	-.661/-.100 (.501)
Respondent's sex	-1.271*/-175 (.649)	-1.304*/-.180 (.655)	-1.616*/-.225 (.558)	-1.033*/-143 (.506)	-1.415*/-.193 (.547)	-1.164*/-.163 (.518)	-1.164*/-.163 (.519)
Supervisor's sex	-.962/-.136 (.635)	-.878/-124 (.642)	-1.361*/-.195 (.554)	-1.256*/-.177 (.504)	-1.371*/-.195 (.535)	-1.342*/-.191 (.512)	-1.349*/-.192 (.513)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		-.202/-.012 (1.489)	.066/.004 (1.247)	.672/.041 (1.150)	.257/.016 (1.227)	.677/.043 (1.142)	.661/.042 (1.146)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		-.006/-107 (.005)	.000/-.008 (.004)	-.003/-.066 (.004)	-.004/-.068 (.004)	-.003/-.054 (.004)	-.003/-.054 (.004)
Perception of supervisors actions			.340*/.546 (.053)			.080/.128 (.079)	.050/.079 (.093)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				.420*/.632 (.049)		.352*/.531 (.082)	.331*/.499 (.089)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					.627*/.551 (.088)		.097/.087 (.159)
Intercept	2.923	2.531	.870	.978	.649	.737	.735

R²	.112	.122	.373	.490	.414	.489	.491
N	112	110	106	106	107	102	101

*= p<.05

Table 28. OLS Regression with Presentational Rituals Linguistics Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	-.032*/-.169 (.018)	-.029/-.154 (.019)	-.005/-.024 (.018)	-.012/-.064 (.016)	-.010/-.050 (.016)	-.004/-.023 (.017)	-.009/-.046 (.016)
Supervisor's age	-.146/-.056 (.241)	-.114/-.044 (.255)	-.035/-.013 (.227)	-.177/-.068 (.216)	.038/.014 (.206)	-.157/-.059 (.220)	-.066/-.025 (.211)
Supervisor's race	-.124/-.024 (.494)	-.113/-.022 (.498)	.216/.041 (.450)	.448/.084 (.431)	-.028/-.005 (.407)	.439/.082 (.442)	.197/.037 (.427)
Respondent's sex	-.753/-.130 (.535)	-.770/-.133 (.542)	-1.083*/-.184 (.488)	-.614/-.106 (.455)	-.895*/-.150 (.443)	-.680/-.115 (.469)	-.717/-.122 (.447)
Supervisor's sex	.228/.041 (.515)	.252/.045 (.522)	-.198/-.035 (.481)	-.102/-.018 (.440)	-.281/-.050 (420)	-.275/-.048 (.458)	-.306/-.054 (.436)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		-.248/-.019 (1.230)	-.025/-.002 (1.084)	.350/.027 (1.019)	.080/.006 (.977)	.408/.032 (1.022)	.334/.026 (.974)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		-.002/-.047 (.004)	.002/.043 (.004)	.001/.017 (.004)	.001/.033 (.003)	.001/.021 (.004)	.001/.025 (.003)
Perception of supervisors actions			.271*/.535 (.046)			.062/.123 (.071)	-.083/-.163 (.080)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				.315*/.593 (.044)		.283*/.520 (.074)	.188*/.345 (.076)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					.587*/.638 (.071)		.460*/.499 (.136)
Intercept	1.793	1.674	.226	.797	.309	.424	.442

	.051	.053	.290	.363	.421	.385	.448
R²							
N	118	111	106	106	107	101	100

*= p<.05

Table 29. OLS Regression with Presentational Rituals Task Embedded Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	-.037*/-.152 (.022)	-.036/-.151 (.024)	-.018/-.074 (.024)	-.025/-.105 (.023)	-.027/-.114 (.024)	-.019/-.077 (.025)	-.018/-.074 (.025)
Supervisor's age	-.576*/-.177 (.296)	-.570*/-.175 (.312)	-.507*/-.155 (.302)	-.446/-.134 (.304)	-.363/-.110 (.306)	-.426/-.128 (.312)	-.445/-.133 (.317)
Supervisor's race	-.458/-.069 (.611)	-.448/-.067 (.615)	-.154/-.023 (.601)	.094/.014 (.608)	-.336/-.050 (.608)	.021/.003 (.630)	.069/.010 (.644)
Respondent's sex	-1.296*/-.179 (.652)	-1.354*/-.187 (.659)	-1.563*/-.213 (.642)	-1.429*/-.197 (.635)	-1.555*/-.211 (.652)	-1.582*/-.215 (.664)	-1.582*/-.215 (.667)
Supervisor's sex	-.453/-.064 (.638)	-.439/-.062 (.645)	-.731/ -.101 (.643)	-.633/-.090 (.623)	-.702/-.100 (.630)	-.702/-.097 (.657)	-.695/-.096 (.660)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		-1.213/-.073 (1.520)	-1.060/-.064 (1.451)	-.768/-.047 (1.443)	-1.033/-.061 (1.463)	-.871/-.054 (1.466)	-.857/-.053 (1.472)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		-.001/-.021 (.005)	.002/.044 (.005)	.000/.010 (.005)	.001/.014 (.005)	.001/.027 (.005)	.001/027 (.005)
Perception of supervisors actions			.230*/.359 (.061)			.143/.221 (.101)	.169/.262 (.120)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				.233*/.348 (.061)		.112./163 (.105)	.130/.190 (.114)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					.336*/294 (.105)		-.084/-.073 (.204)
Intercept	3.638	3.699	2.580	2.618	2.638	2.312	2.314

| R² | .085 | .091 | .202 | .202 | .173 | .210 | .211 |
| N | 114 | 112 | 107 | 107 | 108 | 102 | 101 |

= p<.05

Table 30. OLS Regression with Avoidance Rituals Spatial Physical Distance Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	.050*/.234 (.019)	.050*/.236 (.021)	.058*/.278 (.022)	.040*/.187 (.021)	.042*/.196 (.022)	.058*/.278 (.022)	.060*/.291 (.021)
Supervisor's age	.001/.000 (.261)	.004/.001 (.276)	.084/.030 (.277)	.030/.010 (.278)	-.037/-.013 (.279)	.164/.057 (.273)	.095/.033 (.273)
Supervisor's race	.649/.109 (.540)	.645/.109 (.545)	.507/.087 (.553)	.511/.086 (.555)	.679/113 (.556)	.285/.049 (.551)	.459/.078 (.555)
Respondent's sex	.499/.078 (.572)	.532/.083 (.579)	.401/.064 (.584)	.342/.053 (.580)	.380/.058 (.590)	-.023/-.004 (.580)	-.022/-.004 (.575)
Supervisor's sex	-.751/-.121 (.559	-.753/-.121 (.567)	-.781/-.126 (.586)	-.613/-.098 (.569)	-.572/-.093 (.570)	-.734/-.118 (.574)	-.710/-.114 (.568)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		.711/.049 (1.334)	.714/.050 (1.320)	.408/.028 (1.319)	.546/.038 (1.323)	.281/.020 (1.281)	.331/.024 (1.269)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		.000/.005 (.005)	-.001/-.026 (.005)	.000/.002 (.005)	.000/.001 (.005)	.000/.002 (.005)	.000/.001 (.005)
Perception of supervisors actions			.001/.003 (.055)	.		.209*/.377 (.088)	.304*/.548 (.103)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				-.129*/-.218 (.056)		-.282*/-.480 (.092)	-.216*/-.367 (.099)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					-.198*/-.196 (.095)		-.306*/-.308 (.176)
Intercept	-2.320	-2.384	-2.766	-1.927	-1.912	-2.851	-2.843

R²	.102	.105	.113	.141	.138	.182	.205
N	113	111	106	107	107	102	101

*= p<.05

Table 31. OLS Regression with Avoidance Rituals Task Embedded Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	.005/.023 (.021)	.007/.032 (.023)	.024/.108 (.023)	.015/.066 (.023)	.020/.089 (.023)	.034/.149 (.023)	.032/.142 (.023)
Supervisor's age	-.557*/-.185 (.278)	-.533*/-.177 (.292)	-.433/-.143 (.287)	-.500*/-.163 (.301)	-.428/-.140 (.291)	-.375/-.121 (.293)	-.329/-.107 (.296)
Supervisor's race	436/.070 (.581)	.458/.074 (.583)	.601/.096 (.582)	.710/.112 (.613)	.395/.062 (.588)	.394/.062 (.604)	.275/.043 (.614)
Respondent's sex	-.989/-.148 (.613)	-1.066*/-.160 (.617)	-1.341*/-.199 (.612)	-1.033/-.153 (.630)	-1.145*/-.167 (.621)	-1.514*/-.222 (.623)	-1.513*/-.222 (.623)
Supervisor's sex	-.024/-.004 (.599)	.004/.001 (.604)	-.313/-.047 (.613)	-.162/-.025 (.618)	-.242/-.037 (.599)	-.398/-.059 (.616)	-.413/-.061 (.616)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		-1.510/-.099 (1.422)	-1.383/-.091 (1.382)	-1.318/-.087 (1.431)	-1.305/-.086 (1.392)	-1.555/-.103 (1.375)	-1.587/-.105 (1.375)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		-.002/-.048 (.005)	.000/.005 (.005)	-.002/-.046 (.005)	-.001/-.024 (.005)	.000/-.005 (.005)	.000/-.005 (.005)
Perception of supervisors actions			.187*/.315 (.058)			.345*/.578 (.095)	.283*/.473 (112)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				.090/.145 (.061)		-.197*/-.309 (.099)	-.241*/-.378 (.108)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					.285*/.268 (.100)		.201/.188 (.191)
Intercept	1.464	1.476	.400	1.009	.621	-.006	-.016

| R² | | .060 | .072 | .156 | .094 | .140 | .198 | .206 |
| N | | 113 | 111 | 106 | 106 | 107 | 101 | 100 |

*= p<.05

Table 32. OLS Regression with Avoidance Rituals Spatial Verbal Care Scale as the Dependent Variable, White Respondents.

Independent Variable	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)	b/B (Std. Error)
Age of respondent	.048*/.228 (.019)	.053*/.254 (.021)	.045*/.216 (.021)	.038*/.183 (.019)	.042*/.200 (.021)	.051*/.247 (.019)	.051*/.246 (.019)
Supervisor's age	.174/.061 (.262)	.234/.082 (.276)	.269/.095 (.272)	.135/.046 (.251)	.059/.020 (.272)	.262/.091 (.241)	.272/.094 (.245)
Supervisor's race	.824/.142 (.536)	.846/.146 (.541)	.700/.121 (.540)	.278/.047 (.501)	.845/.143 (.538)	.118/.020 (.489)	.094/.016 (.499)
Respondent's sex	.573/.092 (.566)	.560/.090 (.573)	.675/.109 (.568)	.487/.078 (.514)	.707/.111 (.569)	.179/.029 (.504)	.179/.029 (.507)
Supervisor's sex	-.039/-.006 (.554)	.006/.001 (.560)	.020/.003 (.569)	.232/.038 (.504)	.211/.035 (.549)	-.020/-.003 (.498)	-.023/-.004 (.500)
Status of relationship with supervisor prior to hire		.060/.004 (1.318)	-.017/-.001 (1.282)	-.530/-.037 (1.167)	-.168/-.012 (1.274)	-.740/-.054 (1.111)	-.746/-.054 (1.116)
Length of time respondent Has known supervisor		-.003/-.076 (.005)	-.006/-.126 (.005)	-.005/-.113 (.004)	-.004/-.098 (.004)	-.004/-.087 (.004)	-.004/-.087 (.004)
Perception of supervisors actions			-.111*/-.205 (.054)			.270*/.494 (.077)	.257*/.470 (.091)
Feelings about relationship with supervisor				-.287*/-.493 (.050)		-.499*/-.857 (.081)	-.509*/-.873 (.088)
Overall opinion of Supervisor					-.285*/-.288 (.091)		.042/.043 (.154)
Intercept	-3.053	-3.320	-2.900	2.088	-2.292	-2.835	-2.837

R²		.092	.097	.143	.316	.178	.381	.381
N		112	110	105	105	106	100	99

*= p<.05