9-2018

The Politics of Service: Affectivity, Social Relations, and the Power of Tipping in the Restaurant Industry

Jacqueline A. Ross
The Graduate Center, City University of New York

THE POLITICS OF SERVICE: AFFECTIVITY, SOCIAL RELATIONS, AND THE POWER

OF TIPPING IN THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY

By

Jacqueline A. Ross

A master's thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Political Science in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, The City University of New York

2018

The Politics of Service:

Affectivity, Social Relations, and the Power of Tipping in the Restaurant Industry.

By

Jacqueline A. Ross

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Political Science in satisfaction of the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Arts.

September 11, 2018   Leonard Feldman

                                                    Thesis Advisor

September 11, 2018   Alyson Cole

                                                    Executive Officer

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

The Politics of Service:

Affectivity, Social Relations, and the Power of Tipping in the Restaurant Industry.

By

Jacqueline A. Ross

Advisor: Leonard Feldman

Keywords: Tipping, Service, Gender Performance, Wage Exploitation, Sexual Harassment, Labour.

The *#MeToo* movement and the growing spotlight on sexual harassment and misconduct has increasingly brought industries and individuals into the public eye. The restaurant industry is one such industry to receive this spotlight. While most of the coverage has stemmed from celebrities, the misconduct of celebrity chefs has been paralleled by the stories of servers and their customers. The NY Times published several articles on harassment in the restaurant industry and some specifically focusing on the abuses that tipped workers face. Often these workers were women. When asked about experiences of harassment, responses were often that servers felt that they "had" to accept harassment. Having to undergo harassment is something more than a propensity to let things 'slide'. It is something which is far more insidious, it motivates bodies to continue to work under exploitative circumstances. In the restaurant industry, tipping is the tool which promotes the acceptance of harassment. It is a mechanism which uses this motivation to "have" to do something, but within a neoliberal rationality which responsibilizes, commodifies and incentivizes. It is within the neoliberal paradigm that we see the tipping mechanism capitalizing on relations, affect and emotion. To have to undergo harassment and accept it produces a particular subjectivity and it is *tipping* which incentivizes the relational nature of this experience as it places the server in a situation which makes them dependent in terms of

economic necessity. I will explore how tipping relies on specific relations to mobilize bodies and make

productive workers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

This research aims to problematize tipping within the restaurant industry by revealing the relational nature of tipping, and the power relations that are realized through it. This research does not aim at a normative investigation of tipping, although I do rely on this type of analysis for my research. Employing a critical mode, I will not focus solely on statistics around tipping to provide insight, but instead, for this investigation I look at the relations of tipping as being experiential, affective, 'neo-feudal' and bound up in the political rationality of neoliberalism, a course of action which might differ from epistemologies and procedures found in normative social science. Self-commodification, responsibilization, and the subjection of emotions to the market are epitomized in the 'entrepreneurial' work-form of the Server. The regulation and appeal of the Server's emotions, and their subsequent ability to evoke desired emotions in patrons, exhibits the optimization of personhood for wages or simply a commodification-of-the-self (Davis: 2003). This is not so much a work of manipulation but the consequence of the relations of tipping.

In what I call the 'three relations of tipping', I aim to highlight three relational vectors centered on the Server: 1) the Server-Customer relation – the gendered performance to the customer, appealing to the arbitrary proclivities of every patron; 2) the Server-Proprietor relation – the quasi-feudal work contract that involves rent-seeking techniques and wage-labor forms; and 3) The Server-Waged Co-Worker relation – the delineation between the tipped staff and the waged kitchen staff creates a rift in worker organization and cohesion within the workplace. It is my claim that in studying these three relations of tipping and the affective nature of tipping more generally, I will be able to illuminate the way in which the subjectivity of the server is constituted, a subjectification which is specifically formed according to neoliberal rationality. The emphasis of the research will focus on the female Server. As

an often sex-segregated occupation,[1] Serving in restaurants is a highly gendered occupation which demands the subordination of the Server to the customer as encapsulated in the maxim "the customer is always right". Central to this subordinating work is the mechanism of tipping, which upholds, reinforces and mobilizes the Server through patriarchal norms reproduced in the three relations of tipping that center on the figure of the Server. Enforced norms of performance, reinforced by tipping, produce subjectivities in which political existence mirrors the subjective formation at work with subservience as the norm.[2]

Why do we care about the Server? The Server offers an intense case of subject formation within neoliberal governmentality, this subjectivity is formed by the three relations of the Server and is indicative of, and can reveal wider currents and trends of, subject formation as work forms in the core states shift toward de-industrialized service work. There is a disciplinary power of gender (Oksala: 2011, 106), which produces a conduct or acceptable behavior, this feminine conduct is increasingly characterizing global work forms. This general shift to a *'feminization of labor'* (Oksala: 2013a, 42) runs parallel to the increase in the service industries in our post-industrial society. The consequences of the shift from industry to service can be better grasped by understanding the position of the Server because this position provides an almost caricature-like example of the conducts and behaviors of the feminization of labor within the service sector. This intervention is centered on an analysis of gender and class and seeks to problematize tipping in terms of a Foucauldian analysis of power relations, Feminist theories, and Marxian political economy. I contend that within the current neoliberal paradigm, the increase in precarious work, the ideological centering of entrepreneurialism, self-

---

[1] Sex-segregated occupation refers to the tendency of workplaces to have high concentrations or even exclusive employment of men or women. While men and women are both employed as servers, there is a tendency within individual restaurants to employ either mostly men or mostly women, this creates gendered work environments.

[2] The working definition for 'subjectivity' or 'subjectification' that I refer' to is a conceptualization of a sense of self which is 'shaped by prevailing social, cultural and political spaces' and is 'a part of an assemblage, an emergent conjunction and an evolving intertwining of self-ordering forces and diverse materialities' (Blackman, Cromby, Hook, Papadoulos, Walerdine, 2008).

commodification, and the service sector promotion of 'feminine' characteristics (Oksala: 2013a, 42), all need to be analysed in terms of specific work-forms. By analyzing the position of the tipped Server, I hope that insight into emerging work-forms more generally can be found.[3]

Currently, movements such as *#MeToo* or *Time's Up* have aimed to bring sexual harassment, misconduct and assault to the forefront of social consciousness while aiming to make accountable the perpetrators of such actions. It would seem as though these events occur behind closed doors, but sexual harassment etc. occurs openly, daily, and within the restaurant industry harassment is not only pandemic but also an unofficial part of the job description. The restaurant industry has the highest rate of reporting for sexual harassment claims of any industry in the United States. Female Servers are subject to sexual harassment not only from customers, but also managers and co-workers. It is essential to seize this moment of consciousness raising and to illuminate the ways in which the demand for a commodification-of-the-self in the work form of the Server promotes sexual harassment as well as complacency in addressing such occurrences. As work increasingly encompasses the entirety of our lives and the work/private distinction disappears (Weeks: 2017), the subordinating effects of work bleed into our daily lives. Understanding the ways in which harassment manifests in specific work experiences is therefore essential to grasping the ways in which work experience shapes individuals and citizens in society.

Research Methods

This research is intended to be a political theoretical intervention into the technique of tipping. There is a wealth of information on the occupation of 'waiter/waitress' available from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). This information will provide me with occupational numbers on

---

[3] It is another instance of C. Wright Mills' sociological admonition to translate and relate 'personal troubles' to 'public issues' (1959).

employment levels, gender, pay, full-time/part-time statistics, wages, areas of occupational concentration, etc. This data will focus specifically on the landscape of the restaurant industry in the United States and in utilizing these statistics I seek to ground the theoretical element of the research with an empirical basis for analysis.

In order to provide stark insights, I will use the case study of 'The Hamptons' in New York to investigate how the relations of the Server are manifested. This location is important for three strategic reasons: 1) The concentration of wealth and the atmosphere of leisure are the key forces driving the service economy in this area; 2) The levels of wealth in this area produce working class jobs which can demand higher wages, tips are also higher and a Server in this area can make a living wage; and 3) The Servers in this arena who make a living wage are often women. I will elaborate on the importance of the area of the Hamptons further below.

The research employs a mixed methodology. The first method is a deep textual analysis of the relevant literature pertaining to political theory, critical theory, political economy, feminist theory and labor data. The second element of the methodology is an auto-ethnographic study. The auto-ethnography will use my fifteen years of experience as a server (most of that being in the Hamptons) to illuminate the conditions and experiences of the Server. This combined methodology allows for a theoretical analysis of the experience of work which is the essential goal of the research.

The limits of the research, due to space and time focus mainly on a relational analysis of tipping in terms of gender and class but only provides a limited analysis in terms of race. This is because about 70% of Servers are white women (BLS) and the basis of the analysis will appeal to this majority within the occupation. This does not mean that a significant analysis of race is not necessary but it will be an analysis which is covered at another time. However, it should be noted that levels of harassment increase for women of color and transgender people.

The motivation for this research stems from: 1) a desire to unpack the technologies and terms by which bodies are governed and made productive within the neoliberal paradigm, 2) to align the newly emerging tide of feminist consciousness including those to do with the *#MeToo* movement and the wave of sexual harassment disputes particularly pertaining to work; and 3) to unpack Fordist and industrialized notions of work and their subsequent understandings of exploitation, as it is now necessary to discover and articulate how new modes of productivity in the post-industrial service sector economy affect workers. The point of this research is to establish the necessity of understanding the relations of work in our contemporary work forms. As we no longer live in an industrial society, the basic structure of work grounded in a Fordist model of employment is no longer relevant. Work relations, structures, hierarchies and modes and forms of domination have changed. I do not claim that the relations of tipping are exclusive to the practice of tipping, they could very well be applicable to other modes of work and their respective techniques of labor control. Likewise, these work relations are not the only relations of work. However, exploring work experiences, modes and relations of work will allow for a more political and sociological understanding of current forms of domination.

The methodology used for this research will be *Auto-Ethnography* (Ellis and Bochner, 2000), and more specifically an *Analytic Auto-Ethnography*, which seeks to develop "theoretical explanations of broader social phenomena" by analysis of a more specific object of analysis (Ellingson and Ellis, 2008). This method is "artfully scientific" (Ellis, Adams and Bochner, 2011) and fulfills the scholarly obligations of hypothesizing, analyzing, theorizing, and concluding. My use of the method here is inspired by Emma Dowling's study on the creation of the dining experience (2007). Analytic auto-ethnography seeks to work out from experience of cultural and social phenomena and I will critically analyze experience with data, political/sociological/historical literature, and with critical theory. In a nutshell, as is increasingly discussed in feminist theorizing (Oksala, 2004, 2011, 2014), I have theorized out from my own *experience* of the technique of *tipping*, rather than 'deploying' theory onto an observed

empirical object as is customary in conventional social science. My research is heavily predicated in critical theoretical research, and thus I employ a mixed methods approach which includes Auto-ethnographic analysis (Dowling, 2007; Ellis and Bochner, 2000), feminist theories of experience (Frye, 1983; Aptheker, 1989) and Johanna Oksala's theoretical intervention of experience (2004, 2011, 2014), which refers to Foucauldian and Kantian defenses of experience as objectively valid for social scientific analysis, alongside quantitative data.

Oksala's assumption, which my research follows, is that "self-reflexivity is not incommensurable with an objective analysis of experience" (2011). Analytic Auto-Ethnography is a critical and rigorous analysis of experienced cultural, social and political phenomena, which uses techniques of: 1) 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973), which allows the research to induct the reader into the cultural experience (The Server and The Hamptons); 2) data which provides a tangible background for the research; and 3) scholarly literature to apply to experience for purposes of analysis and critique. This tripartite procedural structure allows for objectively valid abstract analysis of assemblages of experience. Using comparative techniques to juxtapose experience against existing literature provides an additional force to the validity of the research.

This methodology is specifically helpful to my research as this research is a critical engagement with a technique that I have experienced personally. The experience is based on fifteen years of working in restaurants with most of that experience in the Hamptons. Through an understanding of theoretical literature, I have been better able reflexively to understand and articulate the experiences of everyday work, using new language, logic and insights in order to reframe the experiences of work in light of political imperatives of struggle and counter-conduct against subordination and exploitation in work. The analytic auto-ethnography method in my research will seek to make the experience generalizable and make connections with the wider world.

My case study will focus on 'tipping' in the setting of the restaurant industry of the Hamptons (Long Island, New York). This is because that setting acutely demonstrates the connection between massive concentrations of capital, as well as the formation of work forms that result in such concentrations, and the new techniques of affective labor control that are becoming increasingly common features of contemporary global political economy. Secondly, its familiarity to me makes it ideal for auto-ethnographic study.

Methodologically speaking, the auto-ethnographic method is controversial. Nevertheless, it is a legitimate method, which, if executed objectively, can provide profound insight into the "experience of oppression, exploitation, and domination, as well the everyday traumas of life and death' (Clough, 2000: 171). I want to emphasize that genuine conditions of existence are political – "It is in the knowledge of the genuine conditions of our lives that we must draw our strength to live and our reasons for acting" (Simone de Beauvoir). The Hamptons is a site of struggle but also of prospects, because it is here that we have an opportunity to politicize the work of the Server and of precarious work more generally.

The Tipping Dilemma

According to Archibugi (2004: 1), a tip is defined as "the price, determined unilaterally by the customer, for a service received; it is not obligatory, and its amount is not fixed in advance, except by a social code", thereby definitionally acknowledging the lack of constraints put on tips as something unfixed. Whereas wages are fixed and allow a worker to depend on income, tips are a precarious source of income. Tipping in the United States is a customary and expected practice in various service industries specifically within the restaurant business. The general ideal around the use of a tipping system is that it incentivizes workers to improve the quality of service provided and for an increased economic efficiency of work performed (Azar, 2007a: 2). However, the quality of service does not

necessarily or proportionally effect the tip given (Azar, 2007a: 5), and service quality is perpetually dependent upon the establishment and patron. The other component to tipping, which is often not discussed, is that it allows restaurant owners to pay their workers a lower wage, sometimes as low as the federal minimum of $2.13 an hour (Minimum Wage Tracker, 2018).

Tipping creates a system of distorted incentives (Archibugi, 2004: 2) by which service is geared toward every individual patron, leaving the server lacking a structure by which to base their rights and treatment. Service is also subject to situations beyond the server's control such as issues with the kitchen, management, seating arrangements, other patrons, activities of co-workers etc., creating an unpredictably volatile environment to base payment on performance. We must also ask at what point does social convention relieve a business owner of the responsibility to compensate employees?

Despite their consistency of showing up to work, the Server's daily wage is entirely inconsistent and tipping subjects servers to "tremendous gender inequality and sexual harassment" and "sexual harassment – from customers, coworkers, and management – can be traced back to this whole culture of forcing women to make their income based on pleasing the customer" (Ferdman, 2016). Sexual harassment in the restaurant industry is reported at rates five times higher than any other industry, an industry that consists of seventy percent women (Ferdman, 2016). The sexual-division of labor inherited within this economy reinforces and extends patriarchal relations from the private domestic sphere to the public space of industry (Hartmann, 1978: 19) in complacent affirmation of exploitative practices. This division of labor relies on personal relations between workers and customers as well as owners and coworkers as an incentivizing mechanism, it is the imperative "had" that I discussed earlier. The history of the sexual division of labor and the emergence of tipping in the service economy must be explored, in order to shed light on the contemporary structure of tipping in the restaurant industry.

The Historical Context

Tipping as a form of labor remuneration began as a 19th Century custom for those "in service" in stately homes, but still exists because it aligns with a neoliberal political rationality as tipping itself is imprinted with both the neoliberal and the neo-feudal. I will elaborate on this tension further down. In order better to understand how we have arrived at customary, common, and controversial tipping in the 21st century, I would like to explore two histories in parallel to one another: 1) The emergence of 'women's work' and the transference of domestic work to the market; and 2) The historical emergence of tipping in Europe and the subsequent transfer of tipping to the United States. By exploring two seemingly separate histories, I would like to illuminate how these histories unite in our contemporary understanding of service work and specifically of tipped service work. This paralleled analysis will allow me to then discuss how the political rationality of neoliberalism is applicable to the contemporary custom of tipping and its relational nature, which has emerged from domestic work. The implication is that a history of tipping alone will not allow me to explore such a complex discussion, but must place tipping into a broader field of social phenomenon. The historical tracings allow for a paralleled exploration of two sets of developments which are both necessary to an understanding of tipping in its complex contemporary form. What I hope to illuminate is that tipping today has a certain relational nature that has emerged from the domestic sphere, as well as from feudal rent-seeking relations generally but in a 'dynamic', 'entrepreneurial', neoliberal form.

Emergence of Women's Work

As Foucault stated, 'we have to know the historical conditions which motivate our conceptualization. We need a historical awareness of our present circumstances' (Foucault, 1982: 778). In order to illuminate the present circumstances that I am discussing, I must begin with the transition from feudalism to capitalism and the enclosure of women and the emergence of industrial Western

society. This analysis focuses on the capitalist exploitation of women that Hartmann explains as 'maintaining…control of over the labor power of women [in terms of] the division of labor between the sexes and techniques of hierarchical organization and control' (1976; 138). It is my intention to connect the contemporary work-form of 'the Server' with this sexual division of labor and a hierarchical organization of control. By investigating the position of the Server and the relations of tipping it will be possible to provide insight into *biopolitical* instantiations of power sought to control women[4] and more generally how the "feminization of labor" is controlled.

Exploring specific work forms and experiences is part and parcel of understanding how bodies are controlled in our contemporary moment. Historically, by utilizing women's enclosed domestic labor and the exploitation of their biological and material reproduction, bodies became the 'machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic processes' in the rise of capitalism (Foucault, 1978:140-141). According to Foucault, the body and its very 'biological existence' became political through the passage into 'knowledge's field of control and power's sphere of intervention' within the administrative 'calculated management of life' (Foucault, 1978: 142, 140). As the site of industrialization, England and the move to a market society created shifts and changes in how its populations were controlled. The move from feudal society to capitalist society involved the use of enclosures as control. Populations were managed through social enclosures and restriction in the means of subsistence, peasants were moved off previously common held lands and often resorted to vagrancy. Vagrancy became illegal and peasants could be forced into work houses or shipped abroad to perform similar tasks. Enclosures removed people from using the common land for farming and grazing their animals but if someone was in a favorable position to produce goods

---

[4] 1) on the individual 'body as a machine, its disciplining the optimization of it capabilities [biological reproduction, and domestic reproduction] …the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls' and; 2) 'focused on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births' (Foucault, 1978: 139).

for the market, they found they were able to function in an ever increasingly marketized society. In this dynamic women were often relegated to the home and their work within this domestic space reproduced the ability to produce goods for the market or reproduced the male individual who would become a wage laborer.

A hierarchization of wage-work dominated over the domestic enclosure of women and their reproductive yet 'unproductive' roles of work performed in private domestic settings. In this transition, women became private property and 'in the new capitalist regime *women themselves became the commons*, as their work was defined as a natural resource, laying outside the sphere of market relations' (Federici, 2004: 97). Land was previously seen as something which was commonly used for the benefit of the population, women's labor was now seen as something which benefited the population of a capitalist society as it allowed for the reproduction of the laborer, the production of new laborers and the production of goods for the market. The position into women are thus placed is a dialectical contradiction, as both the private property of their closest male relative as a public good. Their bodies are a part of 'knowledge's field of control' (Foucault, 1990: 142) and are part of the commons as women's bodies are the sight of reproduction of population and are therefore monitored and controlled according to broader social imperatives.

Although the exploitation of women has occurred globally and, in several forms, the focus of the research is a Western perspective of neoliberal capitalist relations so I will focus on the historical transitions to this conclusion. Silvia Federici in her historical exploration of the transition from feudalism to capitalism pinpoints the household as 'the basic unit of exploitation' (Meiksins Wood, 2002: 286). In the coercion of populations from commonly held land to enclosed spaces in the creation of private property out of that common land, women were subsequently enclosed in the domestic sphere, a domestic enclosure (Federici, 2004; Hartmann, 1976). While men maintained their position of power in the transition from feudal domestic relations to the public economic sphere of wage-

labor, women were closed off from public legitimacy into domestic reproduction or sex segregated wage-labor. The transition from feudalism to capitalism, the use of enclosures to isolate populations from the means of subsistence, the growing dependence on wage-labor, and the securing of women within the domestic realm, resulted in a hierarchical differentiation of the sexes between male wage-work and the *femina domestica* (Federici, 2004: 75)[5].

The move to wage labor under capitalism utilized the feudal structure of society: a 'nuclear, patriarchal peasant family [was] the basic production unit of society' (Hartmann, 1976: 147), and this male power structure was reinforced by the church and the state. The patriarchal family structure kept women and children subordinate to male power and in the transition to wage labor and industrialized factory work, women and children were the most vulnerable to 'capitalists [who] took advantage of this authority structure' (Hartmann, 1976: 150). Larger scale production was demanded under the new system of capitalism and women were removed from domestic production as the home was no longer the site of production (Hartman, 1976: 151). Male domination of labor production did exist before the rise of capitalism. However, this domination was maintained through into the capitalist society and influenced 'the direction and shape that capitalist development took' (Hartman, 1976: 152). Women were either relegated and moralized into the domestic or exploited in wage-labor. A perpetuation of patriarchal domination in wage-labor occurred through the strategic alienation of women from guilds, unions, training programs and sexed job segregation, which allowed men's work to be deemed skilled, of better quality, and worthy of better pay (Hartmann, 1976).

The creation of job segregation by sex followed and allowed for a hierarchal maintenance of male dominance. Segregation raised the prestige and technicality of male jobs while lowering the social value, pay and recognition of female dominated jobs. This allowed patriarchal positions of power over

---

[5] Heidi Hartman also writes that 'the capitalist organization of industry, in removing work from the home, served to increase the subordination of women, since it served to increase the relative importance of the areas of men's domination' (1976;152).

women even as they entered the wage labor force. Economic independence and equality of work would not be possible for women as the social value of their work, and the historical lack of training provided to women (Hartmann, 1976: 157) would allow the slogan of 'equal pay for equal work' to be a sham. Women were not as skilled because they did not have the same training opportunities as men or the access to all the same jobs as men thus perpetuating a system where women's work was less skilled, underpaid, concentrated in particular sexed occupations or relegated to the domestic sphere.

Gender specific task assignments arise out of the removal of 'conditions of subsistence' (Illich, 1980: 16) and the 'apartheid between the sexes: he, primarily the producer; she, primarily private-domestic' arose from modern 'XIX century work ideology' (Illich, 1980: 16). In the movement away from a subsistence economy to the 'monetary regime' of capitalism, all work done by women in the domestic sphere, even if it directly contributory to market exchange and the ultimate realization of value, was deemed 'unproductive work' or 'non-work' (Federici, 2004: 92). Only work performed by men in 'production-for-market was defined as a value-creating activity' (Federici, 2004: 74-75). 'Valueless' was the reproduction of labor in the domestic sphere, the production of subsistence, food, drink, the maintenance of the household and the family, childbirth and even production of goods for market were unrecognized as value (unvalorized) if the production was by women. Even if this work was paid for outside of the domestic home, and in the homes of the elites, it was done so at the lowest rates (Federici, 2004: 75), signifying the acute undervalue of such 'domestic' work. The emergence of the housewife and the labeling of "women's labor" coincided with, and was facilitated by, the fading visibility of domestic reproductive work and its subsequent exploitation in the accumulation of capital (2004: 75). These domestic tasks are today performed predominantly by women, whether it is nursing, care-taking, child minding, cleaning or serving, occupations that mimic tasks performed in the domestic sphere, and which have an emotional or affective element to them, are occupations where women are predominantly employed and consequently are often less well paid.

My intention here is to illuminate the how the domestic is a basic unit of exploitation in capitalism and to discuss the resulting devaluation of work done within this sphere, and, by extension and implication, work performed by women generally. 'Women's work', through cultural and historical disciplinary techniques, has been marked and perpetually devalued as work which lacks exchange value. This devaluation and prejudice is maintained in current forms of work done within the rising service industry. This analysis aims to connect the tasks of domestic work with similar tasks performed for the economic market and seeks to specifically connect to the work done by the Server in restaurants (Paules, 1991: 170), in order to uncover the complexities of the relations established in tipping. These tasks are never fully removed from their domestic connotations and relations, especially when performed by women, and it is this extension from the domestic realm into the market that maintains the subordinate and exploited position of many jobs performed predominantly by women.

The political economy of the private/domestic realm extends into the service industry and the relational and economic circumstances of this extension enlarge the patriarchal oppressions originally implicit within the public/private divide. A perpetuation and dilation of forms of oppression, exploitation, and social domination occur in what I refer to as a "domestic extension" or an extension of patriarchal norms, expectations, tasks and relations from the domestic, realm which occur and recur in specific work forms of wage-labor. Work forms that are a part of this domestic extension contain potent power relations, which operate according to patriarchal and capitalist logics and the use of tipping cements these logics within the work form of the Server. The concomitant gendered expectations of the service industry, buttressed by these logics and the technique of tipping, position the work form of the Server as a specific nodal point to investigate the exploitative nature of patriarchal and capitalist power relations within the neoliberal paradigm, the booming service economy, and the decline of industrial work forms.

I have just established that the current work performed by women in the service industry has its roots in domestic work which arose from the transition from feudalism to capitalism and that the shaping of capitalist work structures and hierarchies is explicitly patriarchal in character. This exploration of work has established that work performed in the domestic, or with connection to the domestic, has little to no financial value in terms of wages and social recognition. I would now like to connect the historical emergence of tipping in restaurants to our current moment because it is the twofold emergence of the undervalue placed on women's work with the emergence of the mechanism of tipping which brings us to the relational nature of tipping that I would like to explore.

The Emergence of Tipping

What exactly is 'Tipping'? Tipping is a customary form of payment in the United States that is a legally recognized form of remuneration. Tips are received and counted as though they were wages, but they are not wages in the structured sense of employer-labor remuneration. Wages are 'a fixed regular payment, typically paid on a daily or weekly basis, made by an employer to an employee, especially to a manual or unskilled worker', whereas tips are 'a sum of money given to someone as a reward for their services'. I will call the recognized form of tipping taken as a replacement or addition to wages "*Tip Payment*" or the "*Tip Pay System*". Conversely, in Europe, tipping as payment is an antiquated practice, and not a legally recognized form of employer remuneration for labor in many countries. However, tips are still welcomed by workers and are received in restaurants and cafes outside of the official pay structure (Dowling, 2007). The important point is that wages and tipping are two discrete methods of remunerating labor that have profoundly different effects on the behavior, status, and relational positionality of those who are subjected to them as a technique of labor control. This makes the difference between them a highly *political* matter.

Tipping has a history of setting up remuneration systems that are exploitative.

> In nineteenth-century restaurants and cafes, customers' tips provided the income of an increasing number of waiters and waitresses. Not only did employers refrain from paying serving staff a fixed wage, the latter had to share their employers' general expense, while some even had to pay a fee for the privilege of working. (Van Den Eeckhou, 2015: 349-350).

The customary employee and employer wage relation often did not exist in restaurants. Rather, what existed was a rent-seeking relation where the owner of the restaurant controls access to the space of employment and charges access to this space. This is done either by charging workers to work within the space as presented in the quote above or by not paying workers, both of which was reinforced by tips. This relation allowed for the owner of the restaurant (the landlord) not only not to pay workers but to charge employees (rent) to work in that space. The worker was subject to the landlord in terms of paying them and pleasing them, in order to stay in the workspace, but also was subject to the will of every individual patron. This created a very volatile and contradiction-ridden workspace among an already overcrowded labor market. Without tips this rent-seeking relation could not have existed, so, in order to understand the intimate connection of tipping to rent, I must investigate what exactly a "tip" is.

Tipping first emerged in Europe, and its etymological routes stem out of practices of gift-giving and servitude. "Tip" means "a small act of generosity as a mark of satisfaction" (Van Den Eeckhout, 2015: 349). Tips have also been referred to as "le profit", "pourboire", "etrennes", "gratifications", "Trinkgeld", "Drinkgeld" and "fooi" (Van Den Eeckhout, 2015: 349). Tipping was originally practiced in the Tudor period in England, when in private homes visitors were expected to give 'vails' to the host's servants at the end of a visit for the service they provided (Segrave, 1998: 1).

In wealthy homes, which entertained often, tips would significantly increase the servants' incomes (Van Den Eeckhout, 2015: 352). It was from these 'vails' that tipping spread to restaurants and hotels in Europe, as a public hospitality sector grew in the modern era. Serving grew out of domestic service into a distinct occupation of its own, with tipping as its main form of remuneration.

In Europe, tipping as a popular form of wage remuneration emerged in the 19th Century due to an overcrowding of the labor market in the hospitality sector, what this resulted in was essentially 'cost-free' labor. On occasion, allowing workers to work in one's establishment required a payment by the workers, a form of rent-seeking. This is to say that "serving staff paid for the opportunity to collect tips" sometimes referred to as *frais d'entrée* or "admission fees" (Van Den Eeckhout, 2015: 349-350) a custom that mimics rent-seeking. Rather than being characterized by an employer-employee contract, or "bilateral employment relationship" (Albin, 2011: 181-206), there was instead a "worker-employer-customer triangle" (Ditton, 1977: 39-71), which still exists today in the United States.

In pre-war Europe Men had an easier time as Servers than women. A man could be seen as being more professional, whereas a woman would be seen as walking a thin line between waitressing and prostitution. Data on the occupation is limited from this time but an investigation in 1893 in Germany revealed that nearly half of Servers were women. There were variations by country as well as regional differences in employment in terms of gender. For example, women comprised 85.8 percent of serving staff in Munich, but only 17.5 percent in north-west Germany (Van den Eeckhout, 2015: 354). The discussion of gender in the rise of the occupation paralleled with tipping is important because many men felt threatened in an already competitive labor market and often excluded women from waiters' unions and complained that the employment of women led to "male unemployment and a deterioration of morals' (2015: 354), a tactic to remove or undervalue women's work in a highly competitive labor market. In the Proudhonist traditions of French socialism, spokespersons from the Amalgamated Waiters' Society and the *garcons de café* (a Belgian socialist union) spoke out against

women workers as degraders of the profession, although the latter changed its tune in 1912 and established a female section called the *serveuses de brasseries* (Van den Eeckhout, 2015: 356).

As the United States has had a close cultural and social relationship with Europe, it can trace its adoption of tipping back to European origins. However, it was not well received initially. Ironically, the custom was seen as "despicable, undemocratic, and wholly un-American" (Shanker; 2016). On the consumer end, customers thought that they should be treated well regardless of how much they were able to tip (Jayaraman, 2016: 33). So how did tipping become such an insidious part of the restaurant structure in the United States? The railroad (The Pullman company particularly) and Hospitality industries fought to keep tipping through the 19th Century as they argued that they should not have to pay their employees wages, because many workers were former slaves and they received tips (Jayaraman, 2016: 33-34). This continued the economic subjugation of African Americans, and it is a contemporary custom based in hangovers of slavery, racism, exploitation, and a society predicated upon a political economy of servitude and subordination. A two-tiered wage system eventually emerged, cementing a "highly racialized system of economic exclusion" when in 1938 New Deal legislation allowed for a minimum wage law which "stated that employers were not obligated to pay a base wage to workers whose minimum wage was met through tips" (Wann, 2016). Additionally, this shows how tipping itself is problematic and undemocratic most of the time, but for some, particularly those like former slaves whom are looked upon with lower social value, tipping is acceptable.

Although tipping is a hangover from the 19th Century we still see it present in the 20th and 21st Centuries. The number of industrial jobs shrank between 1961 and 1988 (Gorz, 2012: vii) while the rise of service-sector employment rose. These service positions are usually 'part-time and/or precarious, low-skilled jobs, which offer no opportunities for career development' (Gorz, 2012: vii), so while the often full-time and properly waged/salaried positions in industry decreased, precarious and unstable employment forms within the service sector increased. Services provided in this field

have emerged as an extension of the work 'traditionally' performed within the private domestic realm, and thus whose 'prototype is modern housework' (Illich, 1981: 113). The work of the Server in the restaurant finds its origins in domestic housework and it is this origin that allows for the perpetuation of wage exploitation, sexual harassment and the productive potencies of neoliberal ideology.

The emergence of Serving in the restaurant cannot be divorced from domestic work, it emerged directly out of the domestic realm and tipping coincided with the emergence of this profession. Tipping was a form of labor remuneration from customers, employers were able to exploit this labor not only by simply not paying their employees but by charging them rent to work in a space within their restaurant. This relationship is feudal in origin as owners of restaurants were not so much employers as they were rent-seekers. This feudal relationship is not so far in the past as the current Trump administration is suggesting a change in the labor laws which would allow employers to take tips from workers and redistribute them as they see fit (Paquette: 2017) this would include taking tips for themselves and subsidizing the low wages they provide to 'back of the house' staff.

The history of women's labor under capitalism and the history of tipping are coterminous in our contemporary forms of tipping. By establishing the emergence of 'women's work' and tipped restaurant work it is clear that the two share a historical tradition of exploitation and a relation to the domestic space. Before I establish the relationship of these histories to a neoliberal political rationality, I would like to set the stage for the contemporary climate of the restaurant industry in the United States.

The Restaurant Industry

In order to clarify what is to follow, some information setting the scene of the Server and the restaurant industry is now necessary. The restaurant industry is a complicated system. It is, however, currently an industry that is experiencing growth, even despite the most recent economic recession.

Half of the people in the United States have been employed or are currently employed in the restaurant industry (Catherine Barnett: ROC-NY). It is often a gateway into the working world for many young people, especially immigrants, and is also a career path to which greater numbers are joining.

According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) there is no 'restaurant industry' per se, being in fact a more complex structure than it would seem. What we find in the BLS is a hierarchy of categorization. Restaurants, as we have come to know them are actually a part of the following hierarchy, listed from largest body to smallest and most defined: 1) The Service-Providing Industries, a so-called "supersector group"; 2) the Leisure and Hospitality "supersector"; 3) the Accommodation and Food Services "sector"; 4) the Food Services and Drinking "subsector"; and finally 5) the "industry groups" of Full Service Restaurants, Limited-Service Eating Places, and Special Food Services and Drinking Places (Alcoholic Beverages).

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics as of October 2017, there were 11,732,500 workers employed in the Food Services and Drinking subsector, seasonally adjusted. As of 2016, 1.6% of these workers were members of unions. The total employment by occupation/mean hourly wages/annual earnings of said occupations are as follows:

Table 1. <u>Restaurant Industry Wage and Occupation Statistics</u>

Occupation	Total Employment	Mean Hourly Wage	Annual Earnings
Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers (including fast-food)	2,909,670	$9.60	$19,960
Cooks-Fast Food	495,500	$9.85	$20,490
Cooks-Restaurants	1,079,960	$12.03	$25,010
First-line Supervisors/ Managers of Food Prep and Serving Workers	721,130	$16.28	$33,850
Waiters and Waitresses	2,238,990	$11.61	$24,140

The average hourly earnings in the subsector are $12.59 per hour, as of September 2017, with average weekly hours of 24.0. Given the number of average hours per week, one can deduce that workers in this industry work either part-time, seasonally, or both. Now, it must be noted that many workers do not work 'on-the-books', therefore there are more employees than reported, and the average wages and annual salaries cannot be entirely accurate or consistently reflect a standard experience. It is also worth noting that the difference in pay between 'back of house' workers (i.e., line cooks/prep cooks etc.) is only marginally different from tipped 'front of house' workers (please note this from the information in the chart above). Tips can often be divisive among workers as there is a perception that the tipped Servers are making exponentially more money than their non-tipped back-of-house co-workers. Whilst this can be the case, this is not the norm as we can see by the statistics from the BLS in the chart above.

This industry is predominately a private industry. As of the first quarter of 2017, there were 620,208 private establishments out of a total of 620,941 establishments. In terms of gender, race and ethnicity, the BLS has no data, so I have used *Datausa.io* for this information. This data is from 2015 and varies slightly from the above-mentioned data, but it does serve a purpose in establishing a differential in terms of gender and pay. In the US, the gender composition of Servers is 1.56 million females and 675,769 males, 69.7% of Servers are female. The average salary (pay and tips declared) of a Server was $15,814, the average salary for a male was $18,793 while the average salary for a female was $14,521. In terms of Race and ethnicity, 74.6% Servers are white and 8.45% of Servers are Black or African American. These figures and data show us that of total Servers, the predominant group employed in this occupation are white women, and that men employed as Servers make more than their female counterparts on average.

The Serving Occupation

In the restaurant, it is the Server(s) who receives the lion's share of the tips taken by the restaurant in a given shift. This occupation requires taking orders and serving food and beverages to patrons (Bureau of Labor Statistics). This definition might seem simple enough. However, the requirements for this occupation are far more complex and vary from establishment to establishment. Although women are the majority of workers in this category, men on average earn more, principally because they tend to work in higher revenue generating restaurants and 'fine-dining' establishments (Jayaraman, 2016:14-15). Servers receive a 'tipped minimum-wage' from their employers, which is usually considerably lower than the state minimum-wage, but earn tips from customers in addition. The "tipped minimum wage" varies from state to state, so long as the state's wage mandate meets the federal minimum of $2.13 an hour (Minimum Wage Tracker, 2018). There are several states, including Alaska, California, Hawaii and Oregon, which do not have a different minimum wage from tipped

workers. In such cases, all workers receive the same state minimum wage. However, most states do have a tipped-minimum wage and a regular minimum wage. It is important to note that not only Servers and bartenders receive tips, but also nail salon workers, parking lot attendants, car washers etc. The requirement to be a "tipped employee" under the law is to receive $30 or more in tips per month ("Tips", n.d.). Tips are not only a customary form of payment, but, due to the pay structure and implementation of a tipped-minimum wage, they are also a legally recognized form of payment in the United States. This is what I refer to as a 'Tipped Pay Structure'. Servers receive menial wages from employers, while making the bulk of their income from the arbitrary and subjective tips left by customers.

The data on tipping from institutions such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), lack critical depth and a full interrogation of the occupation of Serving, as the published data only reports annual mean wages on full-time workers, and does not report specifically on part-time workers. The fine print states, "annual wages have been calculated by multiplying the hourly mean wage by a 'year-round, full-time' hours figure of 2,080 hours; for those occupations where there is not an hourly wage published, the annual wage has been directly calculated from the reported survey data" ("Occupational Employment and Wages, Waiters and Waitresses", 2017). According to a study performed by the Economic Policy Institute in 2014, 41.5% of all waiters and bartenders were employed full-time (35+ hours per week) (Allegretto and Cooper, 2014:) Not accurately reporting differences in full and part-time employees and the differences in annual wages creates inaccurate portrayals of occupations. Saru Jayaraman is one of the co-founders of the Restaurant Opportunities Center – New York (ROC-NY), and has written extensively on the restaurant industry. In her books, *Behind the Kitchen Door* and *Forked*, Jayaraman confronts the unfair work practices and exploitative conditions of the Restaurant Industry. In *Forked*, Jayaraman focuses on the pay policies in the United States for tipped workers, alluding in particular to the degrading federal tipped minimum-wage of $2.13 an hour. The idea behind a tipped

wage being that tips will make up the difference toward the general federal minimum wage of $7.25/hour providing employers with less of a wage burden. She writes that this wage policy was influenced by the lobbying power of the National Restaurant Association (NRA), which represents some of the largest restaurant owners and corporations in the country (Jayaraman, 2016). Congress passed this wage legislation in 1996, in accord with which essentially 'the NRA would not oppose a modest increase in the overall minimum wage as long as the minimum wage for tipped workers would in turn stay frozen *forever*' (Jayaraman, 2016: 8-9). The federal wage of $2.13 an hour for tipped employees has remained constant since then (twenty-two years). This policy directly benefits owners and employers and was passed with their interests in mind, and not the interest of workers. Tips are a secondary income which may or often may not make up for the differential between the tipped and regular federal minimum wage. What results is a work environment in which workers are working for tips, with any income they receive through wages being taken out in taxes. It is therefore common for a Server to receive a $0.00 or "void" paycheck. In a direct monetary sense, this structure makes individual customers the Server's indirect employer, with their real and direct employers taking the position of the neo-feudal landlord who simply allows employees to work on their property, at specific tables, with the surplus of their labor realized as a rent. The outcome is a political economy that confuses the usual distinctions between categories like Land, Labor and Capital, and so opens the door to both interesting techniques of control, but also of political critique.

Many workers in the restaurant industry are living at, near, or below poverty levels, which contradicts a prevalent assumption that Servers make great sums of money. One often finds that this assumption paves over great disparities, especially when it comes to gender disparities in the industry.[6]

---

[6] There is a prevalent misconception among the public that the National Restaurant association has painted, it is based on the fine dining male server earning an $18 an hour wage and 'living the high life'. This painting in false, especially since two thirds of servers are women working in casual restaurants with an average hourly wage of $8.77 (Jayaraman: 2016: 9-10).

ROC research shows that although 80 percent of restaurant workers occupations provide poverty-level wages, up to 20 percent of the jobs in the industry *can* provide a livable wage. These are largely server and bartender positions in fine dining restaurants…the majority of servers in America do not work in fine dining restaurants and suffer from three times the poverty rate of the rest of the U.S. workforce. However, servers and bartenders in fine dining restaurants can earn a livable wage; unfortunately, jobs are held in vast majority by white men (Jayaraman, 2016: 14-15).

White men in fine dining establishments are the biggest beneficiaries of the tipped pay system. However, the majority of Servers are women. Combatting wage differentials directly effects the well being of the majority of the occupation, while also illuminating the gender pay gap, which benefits men in an occupation in which women are predominantly employed. Tip pay systems also subject women disproportionately to sexual harassment by customers, and even co-workers and managers. If a tip pay system in the restaurant industry is so discriminatory, how does it remain intact and where did it come from?

As mentioned above, the transition of 'feminine' work from the household to the market retains its low-value position socially, politically, and most crucially, economically. This is epitomized in the low-wages of women's work (Graves et al.: 2014; 3),[7] and the differentiated wage structure for tipped workers in the restaurant industry, an occupation dominated by women. This legal wage framework is politically patriarchal and structurally allows for the exploitation of women workers and remains intact to the benefit of owners, employers and white male workers in the industry. The

---

[7] The National Women's Law Center (NWLC) did a study which found that more than 75% of those employed in the ten worst-paid low-wage jobs were women (Graves et. Al.: 2014; 3).

capitalist and patriarchal structure of the industry relies on the value production of the Server and the reinforcement of gender norms alongside an exploitative tip-pay system. By focusing on the Server as the site of value production within the service economy, I hope to articulate out from this position and explain the relations of tipping within a neoliberal political rationality. But first I must elaborate on the production of value within the service industry.

Value Production in the Service Industry

In postindustrial societies we see the emergence of "global cities" which demand 'low-wage service labor to maintain the lifestyles of their professional inhabitants' (Salazar-Parrenas, 2001: 210). These global cities and their surrounding areas have vast concentrations of wealth which support an entire economy and a workforce that seems to operate subterraneously, unrecognized and often precariously, without consistency or protection (Standing, 2016). Service labor is often filled by women, immigrants and minorities and can be dangerously exploitative. My particular focus will be on Eastern Long Island, located outside of New York City as an area of intensification, though within the Metropolitan region. 'The Hamptons' is an extension of the vast concentration of the wealth of that city and the multi-million-dollar homes of the rich and famous require an entire service industry to cater to any and all of their needs, wants and desires. This includes domestic labor, nannies, groundskeepers, maids, drivers, assistants, pool attendants, etc. It also requires a social scene of restaurants, bars and clubs.

Personal services like those I have just listed, allow for the creation of 'free-time' for those willing and able to pay another individual to perform activities, which they are nevertheless able to perform themselves in so-called 'equivalent substitution' (Görz, 2012: 48). In 'freeing up' this time a "service society" is created, and freed time is created by those who serve to the benefit of those who pay (Gorz, 2012: 47). Economic growth and the production of 'extra wealth' for those privileged

enough to pay for 'services' such as food preparation, child care, house cleaning and maintenance etc., is possible because more time is created for them to devote to work in traditional capacities of wealth creation by the employment of those who are providing personal services. This has been referred to as "productive substitution" and are described as 'tasks which people had for centuries performed in their domestic sphere [which] were progressively transferred to industry and service industries...' (Gorz, 2012: 48). This 'freeing' up of time is merely the paying of someone else as substitute for work that one could perform for oneself. This latter work has been categorized as "unproductive", and therefore 'to buy someone else's time to increase your own leisure or comfort is merely to purchase the work of a servant' as an 'equivalent substitute' (Gorz, 2012: 48-49). However, whilst the work is equivalent, the wages of the those employed within this substitution are never equivalent (or even close) to the wealth created for those who pay, illuminating precisely the lack of value recognized in domestic personal services and the glorifying value placed on wealth creation as value *realization*, which would not be possible without the maintenance and reproduction of the domestic space.

This work is thus transformed and is no longer visible through the lens or label of 'work', but counts more as a 'satisfaction of needs' for those with the power of being able to pay (Illich 1980: 8). What transformation occurs when this 'satisfaction of needs' becomes employable work? I suggest that this work becomes the perfect arena of exploitation of a New Servant labor, which in its very existence allows for further wealth creation by and for privileged classes in a circular reproduction of power through the limitlessness of monetary accumulation. This historical tracing of the domestic sphere that I elaborated earlier is traced to this type of work, domestic work, which is performed in the form of services becomes a paid satisfaction of needs. The payment for the satisfaction of needs and crucially for the time freed up from having to perform these needs is easily and often exploited. This exploitation occurs through the use of several techniques and mechanisms, but one in particular highlights the *relations* of this employment. Those employed within this sector find themselves bound

to very personal and semi-stable relationships with their bosses. Work is something which is fixed, there is a measurable task to perform for a set monetary remuneration. By basing labor upon unstable relations, the task of "work" becomes unfixed, abstract and blurred. This is a contradictory understanding of work, if we take the common historical notion of "work" to be

> the name of an activity fundamentally different from the activities for subsistence, reproduction, maintenance and care performed within the household. This is not so much because "work" is a paid activity, but because it is done in the public domain and appears there as a *measurable, exchangeable and interchangeable performance;* as a performance which possesses a use-value for others, not simply for the members of the household community carrying it out: *for others in general,* without distinction or restriction, not for a particular, private person (Gorz, 2012: 53).

Alongside rising employment in services, wage-work originally understood as performed within the social medium, is increasingly being performed in the quasi-domestic or pseudo-private sphere directly for private individuals. Similar to a return to domestic service, we see house-cleaners, nannies, personal chefs, landscapers, personal assistants and (outside of the home) people performing tasks similar to those performed in the domestic realm, like Servers. I claim that this blurred distinction of "work" allows and perpetuates the exploitation, lack of recognition and invalidity of those employed in this sphere and that the relations present within this work capitalizes on the '*feminization of labor*' (Oksala: 2013a, 42) including, precarious work situations, an emphasis on emotional and affective labor, and low pay. The Server, and the relations of tipping in which the Server exists, is an exemplary site to unpack the ways in which the feminization of labor in the service industry not only exploits labor but also produces neoliberal subjectivities.

Dining in a restaurant is a multi-faceted experience. Investigating where value is created and paid for (exchanged) in food, drink, and service is important. Items ordered from the menu are bought and paid for at face value, this covers the cost of overhead, owner/manager compensation, food and drink products, food preparation and labor, but not the preparation of drinks or service labor provided. Value is created in the preparation of drinks, likewise in services performed from the beginning to the end of the meal, yet this value is not directly compensated. For example, the Server does "side-work", before, during and after their shifts to ensure smooth service, they have interactions with customers, they must maintain a working knowledge of products, they take food and drink to tables, open wine, etc. It seems strange to think that one could pay for a part or portion of goods and services through direct buyer choice, with knowledge of cost, and then arbitrarily to decide the cost of the remainder of those goods and services through 'tipping'. A clear expectation of service with the option of payment and choice over the degree of payment creates a serious power relation that exposes the server to inferiority and manipulation as a product of the service economy within which they are employed. Tipping is a non-traditional economic transaction that leaves the person to be tipped in a vulnerable space because

> most economic transactions involve the exchange of goods, services, and money, between two or more parties. It is usually clear to all parties what they are entitled to receive in the transaction, and what they are obligated to give. Tipping, while still being an exchange of services for money, is less clear about the obligations of the parties. There is no explicit contract between the consumer, the worker, and the employer about the tip to be given (Azar, 2007b: 255).

A poll taken in 2004 asking "Would you [as a customer] tolerate higher prices at a restaurant in order to do away with tips?" revealed that 75% of those polled answered negatively or with uncertainty (Azar, 2007b: 254). To be clear, in order to do away with tipping the price of a fair and steady wage would have to be reflected in the cost of items on the menu and only 25% of those polled would be in favor of this, clearly showing the obvious lack of recognition afforded to those who serve and the importance of individual patron decisions on how much to pay in the form of a tip. Furthermore, the services that are arbitrarily paid for by tipping are those which are and have been conventionally performed within the domestic realm, leading to a clearly sexed division of labor which ranks what has normatively been 'women's work' to be unworthy of regular wages and the social recognition and value that comes along with them. The acceptance of patrons of non-contractual and blatantly arbitrary payment for work comes from the connection of this work to the domestic sphere and the acceptable gendered relations of that space. The gendered relations of this work have affects not only on the employer and customer undervaluing of this work, but also on the workers subjectivity formation.

Gendered relations in the restaurant industry are exemplary of social conditioning. The differences in servers' behavior accepted and expected by patrons run along culturally conditioned gendered lines. Men are permitted to have 'instrumental traits', while women are expected to comply with 'expressive traits', such as being 'affectionate, obedient, responsive to sympathy and approval, cheerful, kind, and friendly' (Eisenstein, 1983: 8). These expectations dictate roles of 'conformity and obedience' for waitresses (1983: 8). Patriarchal relations are widely accepted throughout personal services and particularly the restaurant industry and the knowledge that the customer has of the expectation to tip creates a strategic power relation which 'maintains the material base of the patriarchal system' from the private to the public (Hartmann, 1978: 19). The implicit patriarchy present within the industry relegates women to accepting inferiority, harassment and abuse through

'disciplinary practices that engender the "docile bodies" of women' (Bartky, 1990: 448). Servers have little or no recourse because patrons, bosses, coworkers and even the internal self-perception of Servers is bound to the horizon of a 'traditional' sexual division of labor.

The Emergence of Neoliberal Subjectivity

In comprehending the service industry in this manner, I will explore the notions of 'being as commodity' and 'gender performativity', that is, concretely how enthusiasm, compliance, body language, coded appearance and physical presentation are all aspects of the commodity. Does this 'personal services' economy engender a self-commodification of the subject, which therein creates a postmodern or capitalist object out of the modern subject, entailing a new kind of 'political subjectivity' that is 'precarious' (Gill &Pratt, 2008: 3)?

The power relations within the service industry are undeniable and a critical examination of these relations is necessary to pinpoint modes and sites of exploitation for the future pursuit of struggle. The objectification of the subject that I will cover is specifically that of the Server, who the majority of the time is female. The Server's objectification is realized through the three modes discussed by Foucault: First, through the modality of scientific status the server is: a) defined and categorized by their productive status; b) analyzed under the categories of wealth and economics as a subject who labors; and c) as a biologically gendered subject (Foucault, 1982: 777). Second, the server is objectivized through their internal and external division of themselves both to themselves and comparatively with others. Thirdly, they are objectivized through the server's own self-subjectification (1982: 777).

The productive capacities of the server align themselves with the reproduction of the domestic sphere, and in an extension of the private to a public market setting, create value through servility and

affective experience. Thus, the server's very being becomes a part of the service commodity that they provide. The "body" of the female Server holds within it societal and historical objectification because

> the concept of the "body" …[is] key to an understanding of the roots of male dominance and the construction of female social identity. Across ideological differences, they have realized that a hierarchical ranking of human faculties and the identification of women with a degraded conception of corporeal reality has been instrumental, historically, to the consolidation of patriarchal power and the male exploitation of female labor (Federici, 2004: 15).

Under often intense scrutiny the labor performed by "the body" is assessed through normative and cultural structures including 'natural' gendered biological appearance and behavior. Divisive objectification occurs within the server as they internally compare appearance, behavior and class with those they serve. The result of which is an assessment of socially acceptable structures, in which the Server is placed and must navigate through their own self-commodification and subjectification. The extension of undervalued domestic production into the restaurant industry designates the server to an inferior rank societally and embodies a dual subjectivity within a Foucauldian notion of 'power' in everyday application through the self-commodification of the subject and their subjection to tipping.[8]

As assessed, the productive capacities of the Server within the restaurant are undervalued, yet highly scrutinized, with the power of assessment and payment in the hands of every individual patron. The work performed, already undervalued as it is with its relative similarities to domestic work and lack of guaranteed wages, leaves the Server productively objectivized. Through their own presentation

---

[8] 'This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individual subjects. There are two meanings of the word "subject": subject to someone else by control and dependence; and ties to his own identity by a conscience of self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to' (Foucault, 1983: 781).

of themselves (often flexibly geared towards individual customers), knowledge of goods to be purchased and physical work performed, the Server produces the *experience* of 'dining out'. Their labor is an affective and physical *performance* and their means of wealth accumulation and economic subsistence, while every patron is a critic who holds the Server's economic means of social and material reproduction to ransom. The relationship of patron and Server aligns more with a mercenary dynamic, rather than with a traditional employment relationship. The Server is left to perform to the individual needs, affinities, and norms of every patron; the patron holds money needed by the Server to ransom during their subjective assessment of *experience* and *performance*. The assessment process varies from individual patron to patron, based on sheer temperament, class, gender, and arbitrary proclivities, resulting from this. The Server undergoes a commodification-of-the-self, as the Server's labor transforms from the production of a use-value to the Server's subjectivity as an exchange-value.

In what Davis describes as 'commodification-of-the-self', he begins with the market as the measurement of all that is non-economic (Davis, 2003: 41). The neoliberal individual, *homo oeconomicus* (Foucault), is a subject of "branding" and "imaging" (Davis, 2003: 44) that 'sells' its identity in the search for social acceptance, recognition and economic advancement. In the productive performance of *experience*, the Server "sells" not only the products of the restaurant but importantly their commodity too (ie. themselves). Through the normative social constraints on gender, race and class, Servers subject themselves to the socially acceptable presentation and behavior that will afford them the greatest financial outcome from patrons. Normative gender performativity becomes a crucial tool in securing the financial means of social and material reproduction of the Server. The 'image' a Server portrays directly correlates to a financial outcome. Societal discipline has maintained the woman inside and outside of the domestic sphere through accepted inferior performance roles in public industrial settings such as the restaurant.

Exuding "femininity", it is the case that pleasant, accommodating, caring and subservient behavior are commonplace in the gendered roles of "service with a smile". "Gestures, postures, and movements" of the Server are all part of the minutia of detail within the performance and "display of this body as an ornamented surface" (Bartky, 1990: 449). Gender is a social construction that is acted out with and among others. In this sense singular self-authorship of gender is impossible (Butler, 2004: 1). Gearing oneself, one's attitudes and behaviors to the private individuals and parties encountered in this arena, gender roles play heavily within this performance. I argue that the perpetuation of normative gender roles within the restaurant subjects the Server to "thinghood" in appealing to superiors and individual bosses who hold wages as ransom, "for what the bondsman does is really the action of the lord" (Hegel, 1977: ¶191). Work performed is not one of Hegelian self-actualization (*poesis)* (Gorz 2012: 55), but more closely resembles the song and dance of the master/slave or of the lord and bondsman.[9] Granting and withholding recognition is a source of power (Butler, 2004: 2), and in the Hegelian lord and bondsman relation (like the servile relation of the Server through the mechanism of tipping), a certain level of socially recognized and accepted gender performance is expected. If one does not conform to expectations such as practices of female attractiveness, submissiveness, objectification and even flirtation, tipped wages can be, and are often, withheld, creating a great source of power for the patron.

The interiorization of discipline in normative gender performance and subservience through self-commodification creates severe conflict in the Server. Whether or not this conflict is recognized,

---

[9] 'The lord relates himself mediately to the bondsman through a being [a thing] that is independent, for it is his chain from which he could not break free in the struggle, thus proving himself to be dependent, to possess his independence in thinghood. But the lord is the power over this thing, for he proved in the struggle that it is something merely negative; since he is the power over this thing and this again is the power over the other [the bondsman], it follows that he holds the other in subjection. Equally, the lord relates himself mediately to the thing through the bondsman; the bondsman, *qua* self-consciousness in general, also relates himself negatively to the thing, and takes away its independence; but at the same time the thing is independent *vis-à-vis* the bondsman…Desire failed to do this because of the thing's independence; but the lord, who has interposed the bondman between it and himself, takes to himself only the independent aspect of the thing and has the pure enjoyment of it. The aspect of its independence he leaves to the bondman, who works on it' (Hegel, 1977: ¶190).

criticized or articulated depends entirely on the individual and their location. To gear oneself or to change one's subjectivity so frequently and at the whim of others is no small feat, it requires observation of individual patrons, their needs and wants and an ability to anticipate the needs of another in advance of their own articulation of such desires. Be more friendly; smile more, or less; laugh more often; wear tighter, looser, sexier, or more professional clothes; act motherly; flirt, or do not; articulate using more advanced vocabulary; be more relaxed. The possibilities and combinations of pleasing the Lord are endless.

In gearing behavior and self-commodification to the individual patron, it may seem alarmingly manipulative, but it is more like self-preservation (Goffman, 1956). In order to operate in one's social placement, there is an often unconscious movement between the identified self and the self subjected. In this case, to the patron. To know one's captor is to create a situation of protection and possible escape (critically), although what often occurs is a kind of Stockholm Syndrome in which the captive strives for the status of the captor, especially when that captor epitomizes Western capitalist economic success. After all, the desire for recognition is the desire to be a socially viable being. Our social articulation changes and is dependent on many factors including terms, situation, and culture (Butler, 2004: 2), which currently places attributes worthy of recognition on those who articulate economic success.

One is constituted within a space and time not of one's choosing, and 'agency does not consist in denying this condition of [one's] constitution'. However, this agency is paradoxical, 'it means only that [this] paradox is the condition of possibility' (Butler, 2004: 3). If we are able to recognize our condition within a paradoxical performance of work it becomes the site of potential progress. This recognition and this stage is the first step; consciousness building is the next. Working hours consist of a great proportion of time spent *doing*. In abiding by social norms within the restaurant workplace, I argue that the ability to create a critical relation and distance from norms that are performed at work,

for money, becomes increasingly difficult: 'if I am someone who cannot *be* without *doing,* then the conditions of my doing are, in part, the conditions of my existence' (2004: 3). These conditions of existence are taxing on the psyche of the worker who in their *doing* (work performance) must take on imposed norms in order to reproduce their material existence.

The creation of critical distance to this performance can become demanding, if not impossible, for some, and 'the terms by which [one is] recognized [can] make life unlivable' (Butler, 2004: 4). The solution then should not be to change jobs, but to change the conditions in which one works, to initiate a movement toward 'interrogation of the terms by which life is constrained', and to resist 'models of assimilation' (2004: 4). In order to interrogate the terms and conditions of one's existence, specifically in the instance of the Server, I must now articulate what the rationality of neoliberalism is, as this rationality defines the hegemonic conditions in which we live and therefore are.

The Political Rationality of Neoliberalism

In order to provide clarity to the argument, I must define what the political rationality of neoliberalism is in order to situate tipping and the position of the Server within such a rationality. Neoliberal Governmentality should be understood as 'a culmination of a historical development that redrew the ontological boundary between economy and politics. Economic rationality becomes the rationality of the entirety of human action' (Oksala, 2013: 331). Foucault's conception of governmentality (2007, 2010a), or the organized governing of society, creates societies in which bodies and populations are ordered through practices, mentalities, rationalities and techniques. Neoliberalism is, according to Johanna Oksala, a 'rationally reflected and coordinated way of governing: a form of governmental rationality or governmentality' (2011: 476). The organized practices, strategies and techniques within a society, which makes human beings/bodies governable and recognized, constitutes the governmentality of society with specific objectives (Oksala, 2011: 476). Neoliberal

rationality renders all things subject to market ideology, competition and disparity, or the commodification of everything and the necessity of inequality and difference. I argue that tipping is a technique of neoliberal governmentality because it establishes an organized practice (the replacement of wages/wage law and subsequent protections), through the strategic utilization of particular relational dynamics, so as to assess, code, and organize labor in terms of biopolitically 'correct' criterion.

Governmentality seeks to produce citizens and individuals whose behaviors and rationale align with the internal logic of the way society is governed. Within neoliberal governmentality the art of government conflates democratic (Liberal) and capitalist thinking. Democracy and capitalism are no longer two different systems (Brown, 2015, 155). Rather, a *neo*-liberal democratic system emerges that binds Liberal discourse to capitalist logic. The economized and commodified self is the emergent body or political actor. The rationality of this political actor, or the political rationality of society is in tune with the combination of liberal and capitalist logic. Rather than a direct or tangible governing of societies, Liberalism has shifted government onto society, individuals are internally self-governing according to the hegemonic logic, in this case, of neoliberalism. The relational nature of tipping incentivizes individuals along this logic. The Server commodifies themselves and their very personhood becomes something to be sold. However, their person must be a commodity worth selling, it must align itself within a specific knowledge complex, in order to be desirable. The desirability of a person stems from their willingness to exemplify societal norms; these norms and behaviors are learned.

The family is the instrumental social machine, reproducing hegemonic rationality and thus producing individuals according to this rationality. In order to reinforce this rationality, the family enforces codified behaviors according to patriarchal and capitalist ideology. Individuals must be productive within society and any techniques necessary to capitalize on productive potencies and

potentials will change and emerge according to the needs of production. As I previously discussed, we are in a post-industrial moment that focuses on an ever-expanding service industry. Service, being the key word. In order to be of service, one must adhere to hegemonic norms of relations or interactions with others. The relations and interactions of service are translations of relations originally produced in the home. The relations of service demand servility, patriarchal relations, gender norms and an emphasis of pleasure in performing the work task or what Maria Mies would refer to as the internalization of violence and oppression which manifests as "voluntariness" or "love" (Mies, 2014: 70).[10] One must never seem to be unhappy while performing one's service. One's relational dynamic must appear positive.

Productive individuals of the service industry use the relational and communicative knowledge of the home (and the subsequent self-repression of this sphere) and deploy familial relations, which become the commodity. So, in terms of productive practices of this rationality, 'communication, knowledge, affects and relationships…play a foundational role in the production process… since the production of services results in no material and durable good' (Oksala, 2016: 283), but rather of feelings of familiarity, comfort, connectivity and pleasure. The affective relations of care, the service to each other provided in the home and the way in which we establish meaningful communication with others, i.e. a pleasant reassuring voice, the ability to calm others etc., becomes a good in itself. This behavior is learned in the household, in the family. Behavior is not only shaped in the family but reaffirmed in society which is governed by a neoliberal rationality. Additionally, in larger corporate structures, this training is reaffirmed in human resources "customer service" training. But more generally, those with the ability to communicate and produce affective relationships at work will be the most successful in the service industry.

---

[10] Mies refers to this self-repression of violence, expressed as voluntariness as "the necessary ideological mystification of their own self-repression [and that the] institutional and ideological props necessary for the maintenance of this self-repression were provided by the church, the state, and through the *family*" (emphasis added) (2014, 71).

Jensen and Prieur highlight how "the neoliberal state regulates and intervenes in societies and in the life of human beings… in three ways" (2015: 98). First the market is *state* created, not naturally occurring. There is no 'free-market'. Second, the state creates subjects, it creates "a specific form of subjectivity… a specific historical form of subjectivity". Third, the state intervenes and assigns values and standards, deeming human beings valuable or not. The cognitive, affective and emotional labor of the domestic sphere has historically been assigned little value, ironically, in cognitive capitalism, newly emerging 'personal skills' are sought after in 'professional' and 'valuable' work.

Jensen and Prieur write that

Neoliberalism implies a recommodification of labour as well as an individualization, making the individual the prime site of intervention for increasing overall national competitiveness…In cognitive capitalism, as well as in connexionist or emotional capitalism, subjectivity *in itself* becomes (viewed as) a means of production (2015: 96).

Two sites are merging, the personal and emotional side of connectivity is merging with the "learning of the impersonal nature of capitalist, economic relationships of exchange" (Jensen and Prieur, 2015: 96). The current emphasis on personal skills seeks a hybridization of feudal relations with a market economy. However, the main difference in feudal relations was that 'the personal was not subject to an evaluation of monetary labour market value. In other words, the personal was not commodified' (2015: 97).

The process of alienation, which occurs in this new post industrialized capitalism, varies in nature from Marx's analysis of the physical labor performed in "practical' and 'technical' skills of workers and their adaptation to 'the rhythms of the machines" (Jensen and Prieur, 2015: 96). Perhaps the rhythms of the machines are now the rhythms of behavior, love, affection and empathy and will

be dictated by norms, biopolitically. Knowledge, power and subjectification dictate the rhythms of our existence, society is the machine. The potency of industrial and consumer capitalism has been criticized also by Herbert Marcuse "for corrupting workers into political passivity" (Jensen and Prieur, 2015: 97). What will be the extent of our political passivity, if our emotions are commodities? Will we be reduced to emotional machines, to robots whose calculative prowess and affective abilities seek nothing other than personal advancement and economic prosperity? Will we become purely economic subjects, will everything, even our very selves be "for sale"?

The Hamptons

Specific instantiations of what I would like to explore in the working conditions and power relations of the restaurant industry are articulated acutely when focusing specifically on Eastern Long Island. This example is chosen for reasons of personal working experience, and because 'The Hamptons' offer a highly illuminating example in stark relief to more general trends and transformations in 21st century capitalist society. As the playground of the new rich, the hospitality sector on the Twin Forks of Long Island has become the perfect site for reflection and analysis regarding capital and class in neoliberal capitalism. Class hierarchies and gendering are implicit components of this industry, but a particular constellation of class relationships has emerged in this context over recent decades that requires discussion. I will describe the social environment of this region as it exemplifies an almost caricatured example of trends in neoliberal capitalism and epitomizes in a microcosm the "service society" that Görz has described (2012: 47).

Regionally, the hospitality industry in the five Townships of Eastern Long Island, New York, exemplifies the service economy, as it is without doubt *the* economy of the "East End". The oppressive, exploitative apparatuses of servility there proliferates gender and race inequality, class hierarchy and the productive power relations implicit within these inequalities. As a playground for

New York City's, and more recently a Global, elite of rich and famous, Eastern Long Island has created an entire economy that flourishes in providing services to this class. A flourishing economy, however, does not indicate equitable and fair treatment to those who are involved, nor does it secure the visibility of those who work within the economy in often only a semi-visibility, rendering their position precariously susceptible to exploitative structures and practices.

By the turn of the twentieth century Eastern Long Island was increasingly being settled by immigrants, and by 1920 the region had the highest percentage of foreign-born and native-born children of immigrants nationally (Dolgon, 2004: 29). Work was sought in farming and, more importantly, in the "growing, summer colony-inspired service economy that provided opportunities in domestic work… and seasonal labor" (2004: 29). Unlike the more recent influx of immigrants to the region, the mostly European immigrants would find an advantage as they tried to position themselves "in a society that privileged whiteness" (2004: 29). Currently the immigrant labor that is being employed, exploited and opposed by local fractions of the older working class is mostly from Central and South America. There are also Jamaican, Eastern European and Irish workers who come for the summer seasons to fill 'voids' in the labor market, but are often exploited with lower wages and payments made to summer work visa programs and questionable accommodations.

The service industry thrives in 'The Hamptons' and is the basis for the local economy. There is an endless list of personal services including servers and bartenders, personal chefs, nannies, au pairs, babysitters, dog-sitters, private instructors, housekeepers, maids, gardeners, landscapers, personal assistants, drivers, pool cleaners, housemen, domestic couples etc., all of whom tend to the basic reproduction of private and individual needs. This work is part of the "domestic extension", which, with the rise of personal services, creates paid work for those performing domestic labor and satisfying private needs to private individuals who could perform this work themselves ('equivalent substitution'), but instead pay to have others do so in order to increase their leisure time and time

dedicated to further wealth creation. Some private individuals will employ the entire list of employees above for their summer season, actualizing the Master-Servant dynamic in shockingly comprehensive terms. If individuals can pay to have all of their needs and wants met without a moment's hesitation, their expectation of servility for payment is imbedded within their behavior and furthermore made durably implicit within the social structures of this setting.

Restaurants (along with many other businesses) in this region accrue the greatest profits and base much of their income on the crucial summer months. This in turn means increasing employment and production to almost unfulfillable levels. The highs and lows of seasonal business are extreme. Working time in the summer is nearly constant, while in the winter months many restaurants must close their doors. Employment is significantly affected by this seasonality. There is an understanding amongst workers and businesses that the majority of money made for the year will be acquired in the summer months. This understanding is accompanied by long working days with little to no regulations on hours worked per day or week, resulting in serious overworking of individuals. Some might say that this decision to overwork to the extent of exhaustion is made on the part of the employee herself, but it is only a Hobbesian choice.[11] If in order to live in the region one *must* choose to succumb to the terms of this environment and behavioral demands, then it is no choice at all.

What is idiosyncratic about this region for people who work in the service industry, specifically the restaurant business, is the ability of some to make a decent living wage. I must emphasize the idiosyncratic nature of this phenomenon because the majority of those who are employed within the restaurant industry nationally are not privileged to such income levels,[12] but both are subject to similar exploitation and power relations. It is an example of local variations in the relative surplus exploitation

---

[11] In forcing workers into a situation where they must choose between subjection to overwork and exploitation or an inability to make a living wage, they are confronted with a Hobbesian choice, both alternatives are unattractive.

[12] The Mean Annual Wage for waiters and waitresses nationally is $25, 280 per year and in the state of New York the Mean Annual Wage is $31,310 per year (Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Occupation Employment and Wages, May 2017, Waiters and Waitresses) https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes353031.htm).

of workers, regardless of the regional variations in absolute surplus extraction. Because of the excessive wealth located on the "East End", surplus wealth makes its way into the service industry provided by the super-rich, and thus into the pockets of those strategically located in this regional industry, albeit as (admittedly substantial) crumbs. Profiting from this wealth surplus does not occur for everyone in the industry nationwide, it is often those with social, class and racial privilege who benefit the most from such dynamics. If the few who can make a living wage within the service industry are complacent in their privileged local or social positionality, they can perpetuate a much larger system of oppression whose majority struggles even for subsistence levels. Often those hired within these positions are young, attractive, white females, and although there are exceptions it is these attributes that are sought after. Despite the diversity of the area, the majority of individuals hired within this sector adhere to this formula,[13] establishing a stratified denial of access to this particular industry alongside a racial hierarchy. Immigrant labor and minority labor are often (not always) employed unseen in the kitchen of restaurants, or as domestic house workers and landscapers etc., although they are geographically close in the area, and have a shared experience of servility, a racial segregation is creating division amongst workers who might otherwise come together in common struggle. However, more on that further down.

Tipping takes on an increasingly manipulative and exploitative form within the presence of such excesses of wealth and power. In a *New York Times* article titled "Harassment and Tipping in Restaurants: Your Stories" from March 18, 2018, readers wrote in about the pressure to accept inappropriate behavior and harassment from customers because "the money made it worthwhile". Servers exemplify servility in their work performance and exemplary performance is rewarded with handsome tips. This performance, as discussed previously takes on highly gendered roles, which are

---

[13] Approximately 70% of Servers nationally are women and about 67% are white (Allegretto and Cooper: 2004). Accessed: https://www.epi.org/files/2014/EPI-CWED-BP379.pdf.

promoted by the industry and perpetuate a sexist discourse within the economy at large. This is not dissimilar from dynamics in the sex industry. The necessity to submit to normative roles and subjugate oneself as an inferior being to a superior wealthy master, repeatedly throughout the working day, brutalizes the individual and dictates internalized behavioral standards. Submission, servility and gender performance are all requirements for the successful working day and a failure to perform can impact the server financially and socially. This behavior and acceptance of abuses translates itself into the very being of the individual, this learned submission impacts those within the industry in their private and public life, making sexual harassment in other arenas accepted or minimized in comparison to previous experiences at work, extending patriarchal oppression. It all just becomes too normal.

In order for the rich and powerful to play, their every need must be met and accommodated, especially with a smile. Despite the picturesque estates lined by privet hedges and the lavish parties of the glamorous, rich, famous and beautiful, the social environment of Eastern Long Island, especially on the South Fork and increasingly on the North Fork, is one of social hierarchy and class stratification. Although social class is often eliminated from dominant public discourse within the United States (except during campaign season), there is an obvious hierarchy resulting in distinct power relations. The wealth and power of patrons in this region is notorious and their social rank is understood by those who serve. This significant wealth has markedly impacted the region and the shared mentality of the social sphere is often one of servility, dependence and resentment. A contradiction occurs in this space: the potential (but not guaranteed) monetary gain for complacency and hard work is highly motivating and productive. However, the servile expectations of the rich, high costs of living and the limited time constraints on making money puts workers is a position where their choice is really no choice at all. This makes 'The Hamptons' a particularly peculiar and almost caricature-like environment to study the productive potencies of neoliberal rationality. Studying

tipping within this setting also allows for an investigating into the dynamics that tipping creates, specifically the relations of tipping.

The Three Relations of Tipping

As discussed earlier, relations can be potent forces which motivate or demand specific behavior from individuals. The appropriation of the behavior of individuals can and does affect their day to day lives. In the Hamptons we see a specific set of relations based on extreme wealth and the expectation of service. In this section I want to employ an autoethnographic mode in order to elaborate on three relations of tipping as I have experienced them in this setting (and in others). Further down I will formulate what the three relations of tipping are in sections and describe them each in turn while also providing anecdotal narrative and an analysis of the experience. In focusing on my experience of three relations of tipping I hope to illuminate the way in which these relations serve to control individuals based on hegemonic expectations of class and gender. Relations are potent mechanisms of control and, if dissected, analyzed and discussed, I hope to elucidate the exploitative capacities of such relations. To do so I must first tie in this discussion of the three relations on tipping with my previous discussion on the neoliberal rationality and the family and elaborate on what I mean by a "relation".

By focusing on the familial, on relationships and relations, I am pointing to an articulation of the *techniques* of neoliberal rationality and governmentality in the burgeoning service industry and cognitive capitalism. Tipping allows for an investigation into the technique of social relations within work, as tipping commodifies the Server based on their relations to customers, owners and co-workers mired in the codified behaviors produced in the family. This is biopolitical because tipping aligns itself as a technique to subjugate bodies and normalize behavior (Oksala: 2013: 321), but to the benefit of market rationality. Serving as an occupation exists within the paradigm of domestic labor (Oksala:

2016: 285), because it not only requires "repetitive material tasks… but also involves producing affects, relationships and forms of communication" (2016: 285). To be tipped as a form of remuneration while performing these tasks demands that the individual use their emotional and affective being as a productive tool to an everchanging client base. Forcing workers into situations where their emotional being is a product produces an incentivization outside of ethical bounds. The extent to which a worker can affectively relate or emote to a customer incentivizes their productivity, they rely on their internalized subordination. Bodies are then made productive through relating or emoting. A productivity which is arbitrarily reimbursed through tipping and structured into the dynamics of work.

By looking at the three relations of tipping – 1) the Server's relation to the customer; 2) the Server's relation to the Owner/Rent-Seeker; and 3) the Server's relation to their co-workers – it is my intention to articulate tipping as both a neo-liberal *and* neo-feudal custom which still exists because of its dialectically paradoxical character. Tipping is not simply a historical relic of 19th century domestic service, but rather a rejuvenated and reactivated technique in the current neoliberal moment. It uses hegemonic political rationality, which depends on techniques of reinforcement (relations), to make productive bodies geared toward service. The very relations of the home, the dominant patriarch, the servile mother, etc., are reproduced at work depending upon, connected relations, emotions and affective abilities. The ability to reproduce relations is a sought-after skill, but in the reproduction of relations and the subsequent affects and emotions that are internal to them, these relations and emotions are not absolutely alienated for the market but instead *depend* on the very real and emotional connections of human beings as a productive tool. Affects, emotions and relation become a productive driving force at work and when incentivized through tipping, the commodification of people becomes all too apparent.

For Servers there is a "sense of connectedness with their work and customers: 'You know when you get up in the morning, put a cup of coffee on the table for your husband? That's the kind

of relationship it was with the customers,' explained one veteran of the coffee shop" (Cobble, 1991: 1). It is this "connectedness", this "internal subordination" that incentivizes workers, and which plays upon the sexual division of labor under capitalism. Capitalizing on the power of emotion and affectivity, tipping creates a self-responsibilizing system which makes the Server the commodity and source of value production, but all the while providing no security in the form of guaranteed wages. This creates a particularly precarious and neoliberal space of work which feeds off of "women's jobs" (Cobble, 1991: xii) of the domestic sphere. According to Dorothy Sue Cobble, the Server is the "professional nurturer" (1991: 2) and it is this sense of nurturing which allows for a particularly volatile and precarious situation which allows for a distinctly relational form of exploitation.

Under capitalism women have been defined by their relation to the 'domestic', the space of the production of life, with human interaction, within a space of non-work or being outside of work (Mies, 2014: 45-46). This has created a general sense of domination over the domestic sphere and over women generally as it has been deemed "natural" for women to be caretakers, nurturers and to be *the* center of the domestic sphere. Women's work in this sphere has tended to be viewed outside of the purview of 'work' or 'labor' and more closely aligned with nature. Subsequently, the domestic space has been a space of male domination and female duty and of the "natural" (Mies, 2014: 45-46, 51-52). In transition to a service economy and post-industrial society there has also been a transition and transformation of labor or work. The work of the service economy is heavily feminine, or rather we see a "feminization of labor" (Oksala, 2013a: 42). Emerging from the feminization of labor and the exploitation and domination of the 'traditional' sexual division of labor[14] in the domestic sphere, relations of this sphere are transferred to the market. If there has been little recognition of domestic work within the home as 'work', this same lack of recognition and validity will transfer to the market,

---

[14] In discussing the sexual division of labor Mies writes, "we have to make clear that we mean this asymmetric, hierarchical and exploitative relationship, and not a simple division of tasks between equal partners" (2014, 46).

allowing for a maintenance of this relation of domination. The work of service is one in which feminized work is seen as natural or dutiful or performed because of a sense of pleasure in doing. It is far from what are, as Mies calls it, "men's tasks", which are "truly human ones (that is, conscious, rational, planned, productive, etc.)" (2014: 46). This creates an exploitative social relation where service work still holds onto social conventions of being "natural" and therefore able to be exploited and dominated. By looking at the relations of tipping we can see an example of such asymmetric relations and the ways in which domination takes shape when transferred to the market, specifically within the service economy.

Service work and specifically the work of the Server (reinforced by tipping) finds itself in between the exploitation of laborers and the *"superexploitation"* of non-wage laborer's.[15] Service work is in-between: 1) subsistence production; and 2) the appropriation of time and labor. It is subsistence production because it is the performance of tasks which are typically performed in the domestic space for the necessary survival of oneself, or within the family of said person, performing the task. The performer of this task, in the case of service work is performing this task for *another*, relieving them of performing this task for themselves. In the case of the tipped worker, they are not compensated by a wage which reproduces the laborer but is instead compensated mainly by tips. Tips are a part of a "coercive institution" (see footnote 15) which relies on relations to make the laborer productive.

Relations are created within societies with accepted forms of communication, knowledge, affection and expression, and the relation within the sexual division of labor is no exception.[16] These

---

[15] Mies discusses the paradigm of *superexploitation* when criticizing Marx's narrow view of labor. She writes, "In contrast to Marx, I consider the capitalist production process as one which compromises both: the *superexploitation* of non-wage labourers (women, colonies, peasants) upon which wage exploitation then is possible. I define their exploitation as superexploitation because it is not based on the appropriation (by the capitalist) of the time and labour over an above the 'necessary' labour time, the *surplus* labour, but of the time and labour necessary for people's own survival or subsistence production. It is not compensated for by a wage, the size of which is calculated on the 'necessary' reproduction costs of the labourer, but is mainly determined by for coercive institutions" (2014, 48).

[16] Quoting Mies again, "we should no longer look at the sexual division of labour as a problem related to the family only, but rather as a structural problem of a whole society. The hierarchical division of labour between men and women and

relations contain motivating capacities because they rely on emotions and it is these emotions which act as a driving force behind producing "service". In the case of the United States, tipped-workers legally receive a sub-minimum wage (a wage below the minimum wage) and rely on tips to make the majority of their money. How and why do owners, workers, and customers accept this customary behavior which reduces protections for workers? A minimum wage provides a guarantee, a structure by which individuals can understand their rights. For example, if a worker has a traditional employee/employer wage contract, they know that they will be paid per hour a said amount for their work. If they are not paid, this is breaking with the agreement of the contract and the employee can make a formal case or complaint. For the tipped worker, if they work for a customer for an hour and the customer decides not to tip, there is no contract or structure of recourse for the worker. I contend that in the value production of the 'experience' of dining out and within the relations of tipping, exploitation is easily disguised, and the productivity of the laborer is coerced through emotional, affective means. I intend in this section to highlight relations as techniques of not only reinforcing neoliberal political rationality but also exploitation.

The Server and the Customer

"The customer is always right", the old adage of successful retailers such as Harry Golden Selfridge, John Wanamker and Marshall Field was part of a movement to advocate for taking the complaints of customers seriously (Wikipedia: The customer is always right). The term has taken on a far more disturbing meaning, paralleling the Japanese singer Haruo Minami's similar adage "*Okyakusama wa kamisama desu*" or "The customer is a god" (Wikipedia: Haruo Minami). If the customer is a god, then workers are mere mortals. What this expression exemplifies is the extent to

---

its dynamics form an integral part of the dominant production relation, that is, the class relations of a particular epoch and society, and of the broader national and international divisions of labour" (2014, 49).

which *servility* has become the demand of the service industry. There can be no disagreement with the customer and no appeal to reason. No matter the circumstance, make the customer happy, or else. In the case of tipped workers, this 'or else' consists in the potential to not be paid for their labor. In this relation the customer holds the Server at ransom, with docility and subordination being key to the relationship of patronage. This is exemplified in the "Okyakusama wa kamisama desu" depiction in the manga scene of the same name (see link in footnote).[17]

There are many variables as to what kind of person the Server must be. They must gear themselves to each customer within just a few moments of encountering them. This flexibility to the needs of customers creates a relation that is servile. This relation parallels the Master/Slave dynamic. The customer is the one who decides the Server's value in terms of what they tip, and, in turn, the Server sees themselves in the customer's assessment, in the monetary assessment of themselves commodified. This relation creates the incentive for a "commodification-of-the-self" as discussed previously. In gearing the affective and emotional capacities of themselves, the Server commodifies themselves to the needs and desires of individual customers. This is not something that is blatantly done or even something which is conscious in the mind of the Server. Instead, it is something small and insidious and in a recent *New York Times* article a contributor wrote that "you numb yourself because dealing with inappropriate behavior from customers is just part of the job" (NY Times March 18, 2018).

I would like to provide an example of the pressures brought to bear on the Server of patronage, this pressure is something which I and coworkers of mine have felt many times. This pressure is one in which the Server feels pressured to commodify themselves and to bend their behavior to the desires

---

[17] Meiji and Merou (2015) Manga illustration of "Okyakusama wa kamisama desu" https://www.bing.com/images/search?view=detailV2&ccid=jcD0EE8k&id=51EDCD52AD918E5BC91B36869E57 862C6FE512A7&thid=OIP.jcD0EE8kxSGpj10_AjxQ0wHaKd&mediaurl=https%3a%2f%2fmyanimelist.cdn-dena.com%2fimages%2fmanga%2f1%2f169301l.jpg&exph=600&expw=425&q=Okyakusama+wa+kamisama+desu &simid=608041464467558185&selectedIndex=0&ajaxhist=0.

of the customer. There are customers which come in frequently, these people are call "regulars". When regulars come in they like to get to know the Servers and even happily ask personal questions which they genuinely feel they are entitled to have the answer to. A "relationship" develops, however, there is always the monetary power of the tip that the customer has over the worker. There is no mutually accepted desire to see one another and when the customer arrives, the Server must look as though they are genuinely happy to see that customer, answer questions, and even appeal to their needs and behaviors even if they are inappropriate. I have had customers begin to kiss me on the cheek and hug me when they see me, I have never initiated this behavior but have felt pressured to oblige. Eventually the situation is one in which no matter my condition, my mood etc. I *have* to greet these individuals in this manner. Working outside in the hot summer months, I tend to perspire quite a bit. In addition to this physical discomfort I tend to work overtime in the summer resulting in significant fatigue and degeneration of an upbeat mood. I have to greet customers with cheer and physical affection despite being tired, sweaty and at best indifferent to their arrival.

The Server is put into a situation where they *must* be affectionate because if they do not, they run the risk of offending and worse, not being tipped (paid) according to the work performed. Customers feel entitled to the personhood of the Server, details about their life etc. This relation is one of power, the Server does not agree to a convivial meeting with the customer but they are forced to behave as though there is an open personal relationship there. This relation incentivizes the Server to commodify themselves and to subordinate their immediate emotions to the desired emotions of customers with the tip as the monetary reinforcement of the relation.

This relation creates a dynamic where the customer has the power. They decide their patronage to restaurants, so the owner is more than happy to accommodate them and their behavior. The customer decides on how much the Server will be paid for their labor, no matter how long or difficult their job for a patron can be, thus making the Server subservient and accommodating. Additionally,

the Server has no mode of recourse, they are not protected by traditional wage contracts and patrons are not obliged to tip. Additionally, Servers find that they have no recourse in dealing with harassment from customers. Bringing a suit against an owner or co-workers has a legal arena but making customers legally accountable for their behavior does not have much precedent, especially in terms of sexual harassment.

Owners participate in and benefit from a tipped pay system and allow customer's misconduct in order to maintain this system. The owner of a restaurant owns a property. This property is a space of business and profit. Typically, owners must pay for expenses to conduct business but in the case employing tipped workers the typical expense of wages becomes confused. Tipping relieves the employer from paying a full wage to a pool of their employees, allowing them to increase their profits. If employers do not pay their employees it sets up a system whereby the employer is exploiting the labor of the business by paying very little in wages to workers, as if their work were valueless. The employer can become a co-conspirator (often unwittingly) in the oppressive practices of patrons because employers need to maintain the status of this oppressed labor and so do little about unacceptable patron behavior. The server internalizes this dynamic. Without pay from their employer they must appeal to the individual patron, and through their appeal as a part of what is being sold, they become part of 'the experience' of dining out. The structure that this creates is one in which customers become the quasi-employer of the Server. The real employers take on a role which is similar to the feudal landlord. Employees work on the property of the employer, their labor performed for reduced wages is the rent that is paid to the employer. Increased profits from reduced wages is the rent-profit of the owner.

The Server and the Rent-Seeker

"Landlordism is now the disease of our profit system… it destroys all human values and tries to make people like it" – Frank Lloyd Wright (cited in Einbinder, 1986: 2).

The Server's relation to the owner/proprietor is complicated and somewhat contradictory. It is both, a capitalist wage-relation as well as a relation between a landlord and a renter, a typically feudal relation. I shall discuss the latter in greater detail. With a tipped-pay-system, owners are legally allowed to pay some of their workers less than the standard minimum wage. Although owners do pay *some* kind of wage, it is so minimal that employees could not live off of their wage and instead depend on their wages from tips. The difference between the regular minimum wage and the tipped minimum wage is to the benefit of the owner, they make more profits as a result. For example, the Federal Tipped Minimum Wage is $2.13 an hour while the regular Federal Minimum Wage is $7.25 an hour. The difference of $5.12 cents may seem marginal but employing multiple employees over days, months and years this $5.12 an hour difference yields significant profits for owners. The landlord wants to exploit their property to its fullest potential and by employing workers and paying them a tipped minimum wage, the exploitation of their property (the restaurant) realizes a fuller potential. In this relation the Server is in the position of renter, they work without a guaranteed minimum wage (their lack of wages is the rent that they pay) in a 'section' of the restaurant, similar to strip farming in feudal farms of England. They are permitted to work in this section, and to make tips so long as their wages are not on par with the general minimum wage.

By laboring in this section or on their 'plot' this is where the Server makes their means of subsistence. This situation is similar to feudal rent-seeking in that the Server has duties to the Owner or the Lord, they must provide a 'rent' to labor in the space of the restaurant. While making tips from customers, the Server must also comply with and obey the rules of the owner, this is a space of often

blurred boundaries. Service work is often work which blurs the distinction between personal relations and professional work relations. Workers in this arena are often incentivized to comply with what are sometimes gendered, sexist or exploitative rules by the personal nature of these work relations. The unprofessional nature of the expectations put onto the Server, requirements of dress and behavior, compliance receiving less than the minimum wage, pressure to accept harassment, etc. are linked back to these relations. The power of the patriarchal nature of this relation creates a power relation which subjects predominantly young women to a work position in which they do not receive direct payment from employers or the protections that that affords, their position is precarious. The pressure to commodify themselves according to gender norms in order to make tips reinforces this precarious and subordinate position. The Server can't question the behavior of patrons or of their employers. They are rendered impotent, unable to question the precariousness of their position.

The Server is given the opportunity to labor in the space of the restaurant with the *potential* to make tips. As tips do not come from employers, the main source of income for these workers is derived from patrons. The current federal sub-minimum wage for tipped workers is $2.13 an hour. Employers only have to pay this tipped minimum wage and allow their workers to make the majority of their income elsewhere. Although, individual states can change their tipped minimum wages, the basic level of compliance is the federal minimum and the basic logic of a "sub-minimum wage" applies. Paying workers such a minimum amount allows employers to make increased profits by leaving their workers in the precarious position of relying on tips. Not only do workers not have recourse if they are not tipped 'appropriately' but they must also stay in good graces with their employer in order to maintain their position of working in the space of the restaurant. Although the majority of income comes from customers, Servers must appeal to their landlords, as business must be conducted within the terms set by the owner. If the Server does not comply with the terms (demeanor, dress, acceptance of harassment, lack of wages, etc.) they will be removed from their plot.

The Server must work in their section of the restaurant or their plot on the landlord's manor. In return, the Server gains the opportunity to make tips while the owner makes money from patrons with very little expense on labor. This dynamic puts the responsibility of making an income on the worker, the owner is removed from the responsibility of compensating their employees. Ironically, even though the Server's income is not the responsibility of the employer, the Server must remain in the good graces of the owner because they need the 'space' within the restaurant to conduct their business. The relation between the Server and the owner is not strictly economic, there is often a personal relation which further subjects the Server to wanting to please the landlord. This is reminiscent of feudal relations, and this is highlighted by Jensen and Prieur,

> feudal relationships [as they] were in a sense also personal and characterized by a complex set of duties between the parties. They were not strictly economic, as they were permeated by power and reciprocity, as well as honour and loyalty. Early capitalist relationships were, in contrast, characterized by their strictly economic and impersonal nature – at least in principle (2016, 96).

Servers work in establishments where the majority of their pay comes from whomever might walk in the door that day. Their work is precarious. It can also be competitive. Servers make more money in tips in some restaurants than in others and to work at a prime location is an achievement. Maintaining one's economic prosperity as a tipped employee depends on their ability to maintain good standing with the owner of the restaurant as well as the customer(s). In the space of "The Hamptons" this is all too true. With the short window to make money in the height of "the season", or the summer, and the competition for a "plot", pressure to comply with the business structure is intensified. Workers

are easily replaced as the potential to make large sums of money in a short period of time attracts workers from outside of the region.

This relation between Server and owner is complex. As a worker in this position, I have a personal relationship with the owner of the establishment but little to no capacity to professional standards of recourse. I am indebted to the owner for being hired and being allowed to work in the establishment and make significant tips. I pay this debt in sub-standard wages and in the acceptance of my position, I can't complain about the establishment or have any recourse against the behavior or lack of payment by customers. When discussing harassment from customers with the owner of an establishment one response was, "we can't kick them out". The customer serves a dual function for the owner of a restaurant, first they purchase food and drink, secondly, they supplement the wages of their employees. This makes the owner also reliant on the customer in an extraordinary way which removes a critical distance from the customer, the owner must also allow the misbehavior and harassment by customers. Sometimes work practices imposed on workers (i.e. dress, codes of conduct etc.) promote misbehavior by customers. There is a restaurant in the Hamptons in which the owner required an all-white uniform underneath which female Servers were required to wear colorful thongs which would show through their white pants. This promotion is from the owner with an intention of increased profit. The Server works for the owner and must stay in their good graces because the owner has the power to remove them from their plot and potentially to significantly affect their possibility to earn and reproduce the social and material conditions of their lives. What is deemed 'good for business' must be what is good for everyone. In the relation between Server and Owner we can parallel the relation to an intern pleasing a boss. The direct wage contract is not there but the power over the worker is extreme.

The Server and the 'Back of House'

Those who work directly with customers, Servers, bartenders, hosts, etc. are known as the "front of the house" and those who work in the kitchen are known as "the back of the house". There is often a significant division between these two worlds and tipping plays a significant part. The front of the house, and Servers specifically are predominantly female, at least within the restaurant industry generally and the "back of the house" is generally male dominated (Benner and ROC). The gendered division itself gives way to tensions between the two but the unregulated practice of tipping only adds to this tension.

To the back of the house, who are waged or salaried workers, the prospect of earning cash tips seems all to appealing. The 'positive' side of tipping is the most visible component to non-tipped workers. Cash at the end of the night and the potential to make large sums of money in short periods of time creates a rift between coworkers. On busy evenings when Servers make large sums of money, the kitchen makes the same amount whether it is busy or not. By not receiving monetary incentive to work harder in busier moments, and seeing their coworkers benefit from this same situation, resentment arises. The kitchen sees their work as crucial and necessary to the running of the restaurant. These workers also see tips as given for the entirety of the service, including the food. Often, what is not taken into consideration by the kitchen is the precarity of the position of tipped workers. On slow days, severs make minimal tips and this can depend on the time of year, the weather and the tips given by customers. I have worked a shift in which one customer came in and left a $2 tip, which I had to share with the bartender on that day. I can't be guaranteed that customers will come in and that I will make money in tips, this is not something which the back of the often takes into account. The back of the house does not see the benefits of a structured and guaranteed wage or salary, especially on very busy shifts when their income does not increase. This causes a relation of combat, infused with gendered power relations. Often Servers must be subservient to the kitchen staff. The relation between

the front of the house and back of the house is a power relation where the kitchen, a heavily male

dominated occupation uses their power over the flow of service, fueled often by a sense of resentment,

to hold control and power over the largely female serving staff. The Server's relation to the kitchen

is often one of combat but also of subservience.

Coworkers, as well as customers can be the source of sexual harassment, especially when the

power over, when, how and what food goes out is in the hands of this power. Problems with the

kitchen and with food can lead customers to reduce the tip they leave or leave no tip at all even though

this has nothing to do with the Server. Complaints of food taking too long have all too often

corresponded with a less than desirable tip. The kitchen holds power to affect the Server's shift, and

their pay. Accepting and laughing off harassment or mistreatment allows for an easier service, if one

contested such harassment there could be repercussions for that shift and beyond. Growing

accustomed to being mistreated and commented on has been part of the learning process in working

in restaurants. By being subservient and complacent about mistreatment, there is less of a likelihood

that there will be issues with orders, resulting in a better flow of service for the Server's tables and

better tips. Despite harassment or difficulties which stem from the back of the house, the Server often

feels that those working in the kitchen are still their coworkers and the relation here is one which is

almost sibling-like.

The sexed division of labor in restaurants between the front of the house and back of the

house and between male dominated restaurants and female dominated restaurants is part of labor-

market segmentation theory.[18] By creating a division between coworkers, reinforced by tipping, the

---

[18] Hartmann writes that according to this theory, "one mechanism which creates segmentation is the conscious, though not necessarily conspirations, action of capitalists: they act to exacerbate existing divisions among workers in order to further divide them, thus weakening their class unity and reducing their bargaining power. The creation of *complex internal job structures* [emphasis added] is itself part of this attempt. In fact, the whole range of different levels of jobs served to obfuscate the basic two-class nature of capitalist society. This model suggests, first, that sex segregation is once aspect of the labor-market segmentation inherent in advanced capitalism, and, second, capitalists have consciously attempted to exacerbate sex divisions" (1976; 166).

tension allows for disunity among workers (who would likely be unified in the common experience of the workplace) rather than unification. By maintaining difference among workers, gendered relations are magnified, harassment is tolerated, and the Server finds a third relation of tension.

The triangular relations that tipping creates for the Server result in a specific positionality. The result is the Server as; 1) commodity to the customer, 2) as exploited renter appealing to the landlord and 3) in combat and submission with their coworkers. This precarious work situation capitalizes on relations and engender exploitation based on hegemonic social relations; women are exploited in relation to men, workers are exploited by employers and by workers establishing a hierarchy and power over lesser workers. The relational exploitation is the incentivizing factor at play. Self-commodification allows the Server to establish conducive relationships to customers. Finding the appropriate appeal to the landlord creates a relation which allows the Server to conduct their work. Combatting and submitting to the will of coworkers allows for a smoother service, establishing a relation of dominance and submission. All three of these relations center on the Server and are reinforced by tipping.

Conclusion: Governable Subjectivities and Organized Counter-Conducts

According to Gill and Pratt (2008, 5), we live at present in a capitalist system "in which life is arranged around, and subordinated to work". Our very existence, affect, emotions and relations become 'things' which are subjected to the contrivance of work, and it is this part of our lives which "becomes the grounds of its mode of domination" (Weeks, 2005). The Server as a subject exemplifies this domination in both micro and macro sociological terms. They are responsible on an individual level for their wages in the sense that through self-commodification they produce a commodity at an individualized and internal level as they gear themselves specifically towards many different customers. They are also rendered macroscopic and external through social instantiations of normative notions

of gender and success. They are deemed valuable by their performance of hegemonic roles of gender and held to normative values of success, responsibilized for their precarious position within a labor market that lacks the appropriate recognition of their systemic position while also creating said position. A political and economic world that emphasizes an increasingly unattainable ideal of work, while minimizing the reality of employment, blames the individual laborer for their circumstance. In this precarious work, there are no benefits, no sick days, no vacation, just the new hyper-individualized neoliberal subject.

A platform for cohesive struggle of the precarious worker can begin regionally with the service worker and that is why focusing specifically on the Hamptons becomes important. Although job descriptions, sex, race, legal status etc. might differ, many experiences are shared, regionally. The Server, the pool maintenance man, the nanny, the housekeeper, the landscaper all serve the same people. Interrogating their terms of existence, the exploitative nature of their work position and engaging in *parresia* to confront power is the first moment for the possibility of industrial democracy that would break from the current norm. Struggle itself is a contested word and thinking about *resistance* to the power of new work forms becomes crucial. Lars Cornelissen writes, "how must resistance to neoliberalism be thought?" (2018: 133). I would take this, at least in part, as an endeavor to think through resistance. By looking into the technique of tipping as a component of neoliberal rationality and exploring the potent power that it has in governing conduct we can attempt to find potentials for critical resistance. Cornellisen goes on to write that "critique, in other words, is the practice of challenging power in its technologies…the aim of critique is emphatically not the replacement of the rationality that governs us and that makes us into the subjects that we are by an alternative one" (2018: 142-143). It is not about replacing the neoliberal rationality with some other utopian rationality. It is rather a call to think about our conditions and to critique the terms and structures that place and render us into specific positions. If we do this, possibilities for resistance may arise. This analysis of

tipping, and the relational nature of service work more generally, is not an attempt to replace the neoliberal rationality in which it is situated. It is however, a critique, a laying out of forms of exploitation in order to illuminate them and to expose them to further critique.

By looking at specific work situations and the conditions that govern them, we can aim to address how the material reproduction of living beings in a social system are governed more generally. Work, jobs and career dominate Western society and in order to think about resistance it is necessary to confront our work situations and new instantiations of marketization. Especially if that marketization is of things which have been outside of the purview of 'work'. To begin thinking about resistance we can begin to critique the ways in which individuals are commodified to the benefit of work situations, the market or under capitalism more generally.

Work is the first place after formal schooling where individuals meet and interact with others in an ordered structure. This workplace interaction has a social function for the individual but it also has a socializing and constructive mechanics. The people we meet and the roles we play in work are socially normative and learned roles from childhood. These roles and relations are then cemented as young individuals begin to encounter their adult lives. Ethics, obedience and discipline are reinforced at work as work-life increasingly dominates the *whole* of our lives and our experience of work influences and produces subjectivity. Work has expanded beyond the assembly line, and the mechanisms of precarious, flexible and 'temp' work etc., married with the advances in technology and work centered leisure and pleasure, result in a life-world dominated by work. One's self perception, participatory proclivities and behaviors are constructed in the realm of work as codified behavior of the family is reinforced. Work environments are politically, economically and socially produced spaces that are classed, gendered and racialized according to a neoliberal political rationality. This rationality is specifically apparent within the personal services industry.

The personal services industry relies heavily on employment to perform tasks which one could do oneself and 'we have to ask to what extent it is right to substitute the services of paid professionals for activities which each of us could just as easily perform ourselves if we had the free time to do so' (Gorz, 2012: 51). The further this profession extends the more individuals lose the ability to care for themselves – to what end? At what point is there a conflict of subject autonomy? The contrast in the creation of a new infantilized power-class in society that holds the keys to finance, wealth creation and the means by which we define the success of society, while lacking the ability to provide themselves with the very basic needs of subsistence and daily reproduction is striking. The master-slave dialectic is apparent here, and the master's need for the slave, in order to define and reproduce himself is obvious. To what end does this loss in ability also create a further loss of awareness and appreciation for these services? An appreciation for daily life is lost if we lose the awareness of our social and material reproduction. If we do not address the personal services industry with these questions, the growing division of labor will continue to create a rift between two new classes of a *dualized* or *apartheid* society: On one hand, the "the new servants", as André Gorz refers to them, and a new elite yet infantilized leisure class, on the other. To study and critique this dynamic I propose that the situation that tipping creates exemplifies such the dualized society under a neoliberal rationality.

Bibliography

Allegretto, S and Cooper, D. (2014) "Twenty-Three Years and Still Waiting For Change: Why It's Time to Give Tipped Workers the Regular Minimum Wage". *Economic Policy Institute*. July 10, 2014.

Andreescu, F. (2016) "Embodied subjects in late capitalism," *Subjectivity* Vol. 9, 2: 145-150.

Aptheker, B. (1989) *Tapestries of Life: Women's Work, Women's Consciousness, and the Meaning of Daily Experience*. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.

Archibugi, D. (2004) "Tips and Democracy". *Dissent* 50: 59-64.

Azar, O. (2007a) "Incentives and Service Quality in the Restaurant Industry: The Tipping-Service Puzzle". *Applied Economics,* Munich Personal RePEc Archive, Paper No.4457.

Azar, O. (2007b) "Why Pay Extra? Tipping and the Importance of Social Norms and Feelings in Economic Theory". *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 36(2): 250-265.

Baert, P. and Silva, F. (2010) *Social Theory in the Twentieth Century and Beyond.* Cambridge: Polity.

Benner, C. and the Restaurant Opportunities Center. (n.d.) "Ending Jim Crow in America's Restaurants: Racial and Gender Occupational Segregation in the Restaurant Industry". Berkeley, California: Food Labor Research Center.

Blackman, Cromby, Hook, Papadoulos, Walkerdine. (2008) "Creating Subjectivities", *Subjectivity,* 22, (1-27), Palgrave Macmillan.

Bowman, J. and Cole, A. (2009) "Do Working Mothers Oppress Other Women? The Swedish "Maid Debate" and the Welfare State Politics of Gender Equality" *Signs,* Volume 35(1): 157-184.

Brady, M. (2014) "An Appetite for Justice: The Restaurant Opportunities Center of New York" in *New Labor in New York: Precarious Workers and the Future of the Labor Movement.* Edited by Milkman, R. and Ott, E. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Brown, W. (1995) *States of Injury,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Brown, W. (2015) *Undoing the Demos,* ZONE BOOKS, Brooklyn, New York.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Troubles.* New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004) *Undoing Gender.* New York: Routledge.

Cobble, D. S. (1992). *Dishing it out: Waitresses and their unions in the 21st century.* Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Davis, J.E. (2003) "The Commodification of Self". *The Hedgehog Review* 5(2): 41-49.

Deleuze, G. (1992) "Postscript on the Societies of Control". *October* 59: 3-7.

Dolgon, C. (2006) *The End of the Hamptons: Scenes from the Class Struggle in America's Paradise.* New York: New York University Press.

Dowling, E. (2007) "Producing the Dining Experience: Measure, Subjectivity and the Affective Worker". *Ephemera* 7(1): 117-132.

Dowling, E. (2012) "On Affect, Method and (Re)presentation" *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies* 12(2): 109-117.

Dowling, E. (2013) "The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries". *Women & Performance* 23(2): 312-313.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1994) *The Souls of Black Folk.* New York: Dover Publications.

Ellingson, L. and Ellis, C. (2008). "Autoethnography as constructionist project". In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 445-466). New York: Guilford Press.

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. (2000) "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject". In, Denzin, N. & Lincoln Y (Eds.), The Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd ed.) (pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C. and Adams, T., & Bochner, A. (2011) "Autoethnography: An Overview" *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* volume 12(1). Retrieved from:http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095.

Einbinder, H. (1986) *American Genius: Frank Lloyd Wright.* New York: Philosophical Library.

Federici, S. (2008) "Precarious Labour: A Feminist Viewpoint" In the Middle of a Whirlwind: 2008 Convention Protests, Movement and Movements. Retrieved from: https://inthemiddleofthewhirlwind.wordpress.com/precarious-labor-a-feminist-viewpoint/.

Federici, S. (2012) "On Affective Labor" in Bulut, E., Peters, M. (Editors) *Cognitive Capitalism, Education and Digital Labor.* New York: Peter Lang.

Foucault, M. (2003) *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-1978.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2010a) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France, 1978-1979.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2010b) *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the College de France, 1982-1983.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Frye, Marilyn. (1983) *Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory.* Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.

Geertz, Clifford. (1973) "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York: Basic Books.

Gill, R. (2014) "Academics, Cultural Workers and Critical Labour Studies". *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 7(1): 12-30.

Gill, R., and Pratt, A. (2008) "In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work". *Theory & Society* 25(1): 1-30.

Goffman, E. (1956) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Penguin Random House.

Gorz, A. (2012) *Capitalism, Socialism, Ecology.* New York: Verso.

Graham, J. and Safri, M. (2010) "The Global Household: Toward a Feminist Postcapitalist

International Political Economy". *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 36(1): 99-125.

Hardt, M. (1999) "Affective Labor". *Boundary 2* 26(2): 7-46.

Hardt, M. (2007) Forward- "What Affects are Good For" in Clough, P. and Halley, J. (Editors) *The Affective Turn: Theorising the Social.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hardt, M and Negri, T. (2000) *Empire.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hegel, G.W.F. (1997) *Phenomenology of Spirit.* Translated by Miller, A. V. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hochschild, A. (2012) *The Managed Heart.* 3rd Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Illich, I. (1980) "Shadow-Work". *Philosophica* 26(2): 89-100.

Jayaraman, S. (2016) *Forked.* Oxford University Press, New York, New York.

Jensen, S.Q. and Prieu, A. (2016), "The commodification of the personal: labour market demands in the era of neoliberal postindustrialization", *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory* 17(1):94-108.

Kapur, A.R. (2017) "A Faulty Federal Standard: A Call for a Federal Minimum Wage that is Actually "Fair" Under the Fair Labor Standards Act. *University of Miami Business Law Review.* 25 Review.137.

Kim, M. (2000) "Women Paid Low Wages: Who They Are and Where They Work," *Monthly Labor Review*, September. https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2000/09/art3full.pdf.

Lazzarato, M. (2006) "Immaterial Labor". In Virno, P., and Hardt, M. (ed) *Radical Thought in Italy.* Minneapolis, MS: University of Minnesota Press. 133-150.

Lordon, F. (2014) *Willing Slaves of Capital.* London: Routledge Classics.

Marx, Karl. (1990) *Capital: Volume 1.* London, UK: Penguin.

McFadden, Paul. (2015) "The Production of Politics in Front-Line Service Work: "Body Work" in the Labour Process of the Call Centre Worker" *Global Society* volume 29(1): 89-106.

Meiksins-Wood, E. (2002) "Capitalism and Human Emancipation: Race, Gender and Democracy".

In *The Socialist Feminist Project*. Holstrom, N (ed.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Meiji and Merou. (2015) "Okyakusama wa kamisama desu". Accessed: https://myanimelist.net/manga/89963/Okyakusama_wa_Kamisama_desu

Mies, M. (2014) *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London: Zed Books.

Mills, C. Wright. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, J. and Oakley, A. (1986) *What is Feminism?* Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Moore, J. (2016) *Capitalism in the Web of Life*. New York: Verso.

Occupational Statistics, May 2017, Waiters and Waitresses (2017) United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes353031.html.

Oksala, J. (2004) "Anarchic Bodies: Foucault and the Feminist Question of Experience". *Hypatia* Volume 19(4): 99-121.

Oksala, J. (2011) "Sexual Experience: Foucault, Phenomenology, and Feminist Theory". *Hypatia* volume 26(1): 207-223.

Oksala, J. (2013a) "Feminism and Neoliberal Governmentality". *Foucault Studies*, No. 16:. 32-53.

Oksala, J. (2013b) "From Biopower to Governmentality". *A Companion to Foucault*, First Edition. Edited by O'Leary, F. and Chichester, S. Hoboken: Blackwell.

Oksala, J. (2014) "In Defense of Experience". *Hypatia*, Volume 29(2): 388-403.

Oksala, J. (2016) "Affective Labor and Feminist Politics". *Signs,* Volume 41(2): 281-303.

Ranciere, J. (2015) *Dissensus: Politics and Aesthetics*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Reich, R. B. (1992) *The Work of Nations*. New York: Vintage Books.

ROC United, "Forward Together, The Glass Floor: Sexual Harassment in the Restaurant Industry". (New York, NY: ROC United, 2014)

Sennett, R. (1998) *The Corosion of Character.* New York, New York: Norton.

Shaw, E., Hegewisch, A.., Williams-Baron, E., and Gault, B. (2016) "Undervalued and Underpaid in
America: Women in Low-Wage, Female-Dominated Jobs," *Institute For Women's Policy Research.*

Standing, G. (2016) *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class.* London: Bloomsbury.

Van Den Eeckhout, P. (2015) "Waiters, Waitresses, and Their Tips in Western Europe before World
War I," *International Review of Social History* 60(3): 349-378.

Weeks, K. (2011) *The Problem With Work.* Durham: Duke University Press.

.