Field Methods

Checking for Relationships across Domains Measured by Triads and Paired Comparisons

E. Paul Durrenberger and Suzan Erem

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

⑤SAGE Publications

Additional services and information for *Field Methods* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://fmx.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://fmx.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations (this article cites 11 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
http://fmx.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/17/2/150

Checking for Relationships across Domains Measured by Triads and Paired Comparisons

E. PAUL DURRENBERGER
SUZAN EREM
The Pennsylvania State University

The authors discuss an extension of the use of the triads test for judged similarity among various roles to measure union consciousness and paired comparisons techniques to assess the relative importance of structural versus personal characteristics for negotiating good contracts, the nature of obligations between stewards and staff, and tasks that stewards find most important to them. The authors show how they moved from the mapping of cognitive domains to testing for relationships among different domains to measure the strength of competing models of union organization in the stewards and staff of a single union. The authors suggest that the detection of patterns across domains can strengthen or question findings from each separate domain. They developed this method when an officer of one of the unions with whom they worked challenged an interpretation based on a single triads test.

We discuss an application of the use of the triads and paired comparison techniques from the mapping of cognitive domains to testing for relationships among different domains. While the example we discuss is necessarily substantive because it arose from our ethnographic work, we mean our discussion to be methodological rather than substantive in its import. In the process of developing tests of competing alternative theoretical models against empirical data, we develop a multimethod approach to triangulate on central conceptual structures of union staff and stewards.

When we proposed an interpretation of triads data on union consciousness that indicated that staff members were thinking in terms of an "organizing model" that the union strives to inculcate, an officer advanced an alternative interpretation, suggesting that they, in fact, were thinking in terms of a "ser-

150

vicing model" that the union strives to supplant. These two "models" are shorthand references to differences in approach to union members as we discuss in the next paragraphs. These are not formal models, but ways of dealing with members, outlooks that were formulated in the deliberations of union leaders on how best to use their resources. We developed the triads test as a measure of "union consciousness." We thought that more "union-conscious" individuals would adhere more to the organizing model. So organizing and servicing models are external constructs that come from union leaders, while union consciousness is a construct we developed and measured via a triads test. One question we asked was whether there was any association between our construct and that of the union leaders.

Staff members' responses to one triad to measure union consciousness did not meet our expectations based on theory and past experience. At a meeting with union officers, we pointed out the anomaly and wondered how best to interpret the staff responses to that one triad. A union officer provided one answer—that the staff see the union as separate from the work site—thus, they are thinking and operating in terms of the servicing model of unions that the leaders are trying to change. According to this interpretation, the union's program for change has failed.

We suggested an alternative interpretation of the same result—the staff think of the workplace as an important site for organizing; thus, they are thinking in terms of the organizing model, and the leaders have succeeded in getting them to do that. This conclusion is based on ethnographic experience. But we are sufficiently concerned with issues of reliability and validity—of "getting it right"—that we wanted to check that conclusion against some other evidence from other sources. We had other evidence in responses to several paired comparisons, and we had organized all of the data into a single data set so we could isolate those individuals who responded to the single triad in the unexpected way to see whether the triads' data indicated support for one or the other of these two alternative interpretations. Then we checked the responses to the paired comparisons tests one by one. Each one pointed to the same conclusion—that for those individuals who responded to the triads test in the anomolous way, it was because they were thinking in terms of the organizing model.

The organizing model suggests that unions should organize their members at work sites sufficiently well to be able to deal with their own problems without calling on union staff to help them. This allows the staff to concentrate on organizing unorganized work sites to spread the influence of the union and gain strength by controlling more of the market for labor in that area and in that industry. It aims to "have everyone in the industry organized." The organizing model sees the union's strength as based in workplaces,

inside the work sites the union represents by the members developing the power to help themselves.

In contrast, a servicing model emphasizes the union as a service provider to help members who pay for such services with their dues. Members need these services when they want to negotiate better contracts and when they need to handle grievances with management. Thus, members call on the union to help them when they feel they are unjustly disciplined or discharged. The servicing model sees the union as external to the workplaces, sometimes in a more or less explicit analogy with an insurance company.

We stress that these are not emic structures from the points of view of members, but ideal models that union leaders discuss with their staff in explaining different approaches to membership and how best to serve the long-term interests of their members.

We have worked with other unions that are more centralized in their organization (Erem 2001; Durrenberger and Erem 2004). The goal of our current project is to compare centralized and decentralized unions. A district of Service Employees International that represents healthcare workers in Pennsylvania, 1199P, recruits reps from among its stewards, trains them, and is very strong on organizing workplaces. Ethnographically, this is evident in the differences in the way it operates from officer-staff relations to negotiating contracts to labor-management relationships of many other kinds. Another way 1199P, is different from the centralized unions in the way it operates in work sites. For that reason, we thought they were succeeding. But union officers do not do ethnography. They do not see what goes on in workplaces, and one of the officers in charge of organizing was thinking that perhaps the program was not succeeding. For that reason, we thought it was important to check the validity of the two interpretations. One anomalous triad caught our interest. We then checked the individuals who responded in the unexpected way.

We found that every other measure shows that those individuals are thinking in terms of the organizing model, not the servicing model. We designed and tested those paired comparisons in many other contexts, so we are confident that they are good measures of whether someone is thinking in terms of organizing versus servicing. Each paired comparison provided an independent line of evidence to adduce along with our ethnographic observations. All bring us to the same conclusion—that 1199P's staff are thinking in terms of the "organizing" model rather than the "servicing" model and that our interpretation of the anomalous triad was valid.

As we discuss later, the triads test was based on an etic grid of workplace and union relationships that is established by law and practice. These laws and practices establish relationships among stewards, union representatives or reps, other workers, managers, and supervisors. But different people may

think about these relationships in different ways. As we discuss below, we designed a triads test to indicate how people were thinking about these relationships. We distinguished one of these as showing "union consciousness" if people consistently emphasized the distinction between union and management. A second possibility is based on workplace proximity—closer or farther from the work process. A third is based on hierarchic distinctions.

In the particular case we discuss here, union staff members consistently showed a high degree of union consciousness. That is, their understanding of the relationships we discussed in the previous paragraph was in terms of union/management distinction. But there was one exception. On one triad, they answered in terms of workplace proximity.

This led to two differing interpretations. The union officer advanced an interpretation that the staff were thinking in terms of the union as something outside and apart from the workplace, consistent with the servicing model discussed above. We advanced the interpretation that the pattern this one triad indicated was based on understanding the workplace as the most significant unit for staff member's work. This would be evidence of an organizing model with its emphasis on workplace organizing.

Both interpretations of the anomalous triad were equally salient. The one carried the weight on authority and long union experience as well as a background in labor studies, history, and sociology from a former academic. The other carried the weight of our observations and experience with this and several other union locals with the same and different internationals in different locales.

To test the two interpretations of the responses to this one triad—ours, which suggested consistency with the "organizing model," and the union officer's, which suggested consistency with the "servicing model,"—we checked the analysis of perceptions of role similarities from a triads test to other indicators we derived from paired comparisons tests. One asked about negotiating strategies (what makes the union strong?); another asked about concepts of obligation among members, staff, and stewards (who owes whom?). Each of these paired comparisons tests provides an indicator of whether staff members are thinking in terms of the organizing or the servicing model, as we will explain later.

We repeated the exercise for stewards with the addition of a third paired comparison question that asked stewards about their concepts of what is most important for their work with the union. Like the other two paired comparisons tests, this one also indicates whether respondents are thinking in terms of an organizing or servicing model.

Thus the exercise deals with one sample of staff and their triads and paired comparisons responses and a second sample of stewards and their triads and paired comparison responses.

We show how to use existing methods to gain further insight into ethnographic observations by linking the responses to triads and paired comparisons questions that measure the organization of different cognitive domains. This triangulation of results from different methods contributes to the validity of the interpretations.

If union stewards and staff members are thinking in terms of an organizing model, then the union leaders have been successful in inculcating the changes the wish to instill. If union stewards and staff members are thinking in terms of a servicing model, then the union leaders have failed to inculcate the changes they wish to instill. Thus the validity of the findings is of some importance to them. That is what led to the discussion with the union officer with which we started this essay.

TRIADS

Triads tests to measure perceived similarity among items arrange terms into all possible combinations of three and ask people which term is most different from the other two. The two items in each triad that are not selected are assigned one point for similarity. The ratings for all pairs of items are cumulatively tabulated into a similarity matrix. This matrix can be represented as a multidimensional scaling diagram to show the conceptual closeness or distance among the various items of the matrix. Weller and Romney (1988) and Bernard (1988) discuss this procedure and its history in anthropology. For recent applications of the multidimensional scaling representations of triads, and further citations to the methodological and substantive literature on the topics, see Romney et al. (1996); Romney, Moore, and Rush (1996); Moore et al. (1997); Romney and Moore (1997); and Romney et al. (2000).

The triads technique to measure conceptual similarity assumes that the two items in each triad that a respondent does not select are somehow similar. This rests on the assumption that all of the items included in the triads are somehow conceptually related to one another as a cultural domain and are more or less similar according to some criteria.

Triads tests can also be used to test the assumption that the items are related as a cultural domain. If there is no consistency among respondents' choices, then the items may not be related to one another in any systematic way. While the triads test itself does not directly indicate the dimensions of similarity or difference, a multidimensional scaling representation of the similarity data can be used to infer these dimensions. Also, to describe dimensions of comparison and contrast within a domain, we can ask respondents why they chose particular items as different, or what the other two have

in common that makes them similar. This may reveal different possible organizations for the same set of items, as in this example.

PAIRED COMPARISONS

Paired comparisons arrange all possible combinations of a set of terms into pairs and ask people which of the two is "more" or "less" along some dimension of contrast. The example that Weller and Romney (1988) use is the assessment of elephants, mice, and goats on the dimension of size. People would usually select elephants as being larger than mice and goats—in the pairs elephant-mouse and elephant-goat. They would usually select goats as being larger than mice in the pair goat-mouse. The score for each term is incremented by 1 each time it is selected so elephants would score 2, goats 1, and mice 0 to define a scale of size.

The advantage of this technique is that it does not assume that people rank the items in the domain along the scale, but allows them to do so. There is no necessary transitivity relationship such that if elephants are larger than goats and goats are larger than mice, elephants must necessarily be larger than mice. However, the technique rests on the assumption that the scale is culturally meaningful, that it makes sense to respondents to ask them to compare items in terms of a scale such as, in this example, size.

Such an assumption may be verified by ethnographic observation or by interviewing respondents about their responses. Lack of agreement among respondents may suggest lack of a culturally meaningful scale. So while the technique does not assume ranking, it does assume the cultural relevance of the dimension of scaling, in this example, size of animals. It is conceivable that size might not be culturally relevant for comparing animals. Perhaps color is. Then, we might imagine that respondents would indicate a scale of mouse-elephant-goat on the basis of their "grayness." But the scale "furriness" might produce goat-mouse-elephant. The technique has nothing to tell us about the salience of the scale. That must be determined independently.

UNION CONSCIOUSNESS

We used both triads and paired comparisons techniques in our studies of unions. In a triads test to measure union consciousness we used the terms "steward," "union representative," "another worker," "manager," and "supervisor" to define the domain of role relations people who unions represent in their work (Durrenberger 1997, 1998, 2002, 2003; Durrenberger and Erem 1999a).

FIGURE 1
The Etic Grid

Union Side	*Management Side*
Worker	
Steward	Supervisor
	Manager
Representative	Human relations director
	Vice president for human relations

Law and practice define an etic grid in which there is a union side of workers or union members, their representatives to management in the work site (stewards), and the representatives of their union who provide support to the stewards (reps). Stewards may deal with supervisors to resolve workplace problems with members, but if they cannot resolve an issue, stewards can deal with managers. If they still cannot resolve the matter, they can call a representative from the local union who can deal with the manager, the director of human relations, and the vice president of human relations. As Figure 1, illustrates, this etic grid defines a union side and a management side as well as a hierarchy on each side.

Union members do not establish the roles of steward, representative (rep), supervisor, manager, and coworker, but rather conduct their work lives in terms of these roles and construct various representations of these categories. Using these five terms, we created ten unique sets of three terms each. We asked, "Please circle the word in each line that is MOST DIFFERENT from the other two. Please circle one word in every line and do not skip any. If you don't know for sure, just give it your best guess." We have argued that the organization of these terms in a way that is more similar to the organization of the etic grid indicates union consciousness or awareness, and organization of them in a way that is less like that of the etic grid indicates lack of union consciousness (Durrenberger and Erem 1999a).

One way of organizing these roles in a domain includes a workplace proximity model of work relationships (the dimension of similarity is proximity to the workplace) in which respondents select as most different in each triad that category that is most different in terms of distance from or closeness to the work process. Another is a hierarchy model (the dimension of similarity is hierarchy) in which respondents select that category that has more or less power or prestige than the other two. In the third, union consciousness, model, respondents select the role that is most different according to whether

it is involved in the union or management (the dimension of similarity is union-ness verses management-ness). These are three emic possibilities for sorting the roles in the triads test. We argued that the "union consciousness" possibility would be related to the "organizing model" that emphasizes the importance of the union and its members. These are two separate constructs. The "organizing" and "servicing" models derive from the union's leadership and are not necessarily emic from the points of view of staff, stewards, or members. We were trying to ascertain to what extent the outlooks of stewards and staff were consistent with the organizing model that the leadership was attempting to enact.

If respondents consistently used only a single criterion to judge similarity, there would be three "pure" models based on three more or less unique different ways of organizing the domain. As an example, consider the following triad: "supervisor, union rep, other worker." If a person selected "supervisor" as the most different, indicating similarity between workers and reps, it would imply "union consciousness." The respondent is distinguishing in terms of union versus nonunion affiliation. The choice of "another worker" would indicate a conceptual scheme based on hierarchy as "workers" are less powerful than supervisors and reps. Picking "rep" would indicate a workplace proximity scheme as that is the feature that supervisors and coworkers share while reps do not work at the same place.

The following list (Table 1) represents these three possibilities. Items marked in bold indicate the union consciousness alternative; items in italics indicate the hierarchy possibility; and items with underscoring, whether plain, bold, or italics, indicate workplace proximity. While the hierarchy and union alternatives are distinct, the workplace proximity one overlaps the union model (three items) and the hierarchy model (four items) and has only three unique items. Thus, the various alternatives are not apparent from any single triad.

Notice that these are not direct measures of organizing or servicing models. They are, rather, indicators of whether respondents think in "union" terms. We could, for instance, assign scores for each alternative to any triad. If someone always selected the union consciousness alternative, the score for that alternative would be 10. But because in three triads, the "union" choices also indicate "workplace proximity," that same set of responses would be a score of 3 for workplace proximity: in triads 2, where manager is nonunion and farther from stewards and other workers from the work process (most distant on both dimensions), in triad 4, where union rep is farther from managers and supervisors from the work process and the only one that is union, and triad 5, where supervisor is farther in terms of both dimensions of close-

TABLE 1
List of Triads

Manager	*Other worker*	<u>Union rep</u>
Steward	**<u>Manager</u>**	*Other worker*
<u>Manager</u>	**Steward**	Supervisor
Supervisor	**<u>Union rep</u>**	Manager
Steward	*Other worker*	**<u>Supervisor</u>**
Manager	Steward	*<u>Union rep</u>*
<u>Union rep</u>	**Other worker**	Steward
Supervisor	<u>Union rep</u>	*Other worker*
Supervisor	<u>Manager</u>	**Other worker**
Supervisor	*<u>Union rep</u>*	Steward

NOTE: rep = representative. Items marked in bold indicate the union consciousness alternative; items in italics indicate the hierarchy possibility; and items with underscoring indicate, whether plain, bold, or italics, workplace proximity.

ness to the work process and to the union. A respondent could likewise score 10 for hierarchy but also have a score of 4 for workplace proximity.

There are the three alternatives inherent in the conjunction of the triads test we developed with the etic grid. Based on the relationships of particular work sites, there may be other models based on race (which person is racially most different) or gender or some other factor that would be apparent only from the ethnography of that workplace. Different production processes may be related to different choices for workplace proximity as well. There may also be some variation in local terminology. For instance, work-site leaders known as stewards in many unions are called "delegates" in 1199P because of their process of selection and their relationship to the larger union local.

In this set, the anomalous triad that elicited the discussion with the union officer with which we started this article is number 7. The choice of item 1, rep, indicates the respondent is thinking in terms of a discrimination based on hierarchy or workplace proximity. Like the union officer, based on our experience, we assumed that staff were thinking in terms of workplace proximity rather than hierarchy. This could indicate that the workplace is more important than the union as a social unit, the locale of reps' work, and thus indicate that the person is thinking in terms of the importance of workplace organizing and thus the organizing model.

Alternatively, it could be interpreted as suggesting that the person is thinking in terms of the workplace model instead of the union model and thus could be taken as evidence that, conceptually, the union is external to the workplace, a mode of thought consistent with the servicing model.

We argued the first interpretation while the union officer advanced the second.

CONCEPTS OF WHAT MAKES UNIONS STRONG, OBLIGATION, AND WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO STEWARDS

In question 1, we used paired comparisons to assess the factors members, stewards, and union staff think give the power to negotiate good contracts. We established through ethnographic observation, interviewing, and other paired comparisons tests the coherence and salience of five items (Durrenberger 2002, 2003; Durrenberger and Erem 1999a, 1999b):

1. Having everyone in the industry organized.
2. The speaking power of the negotiator.
3. The legal skill of the negotiator.
4. The ability and willingness to strike.
5. Having friendly relations with management.

The five items formed ten pairs. We found that paired comparisons can elicit comments like "These are all the same thing" and "Everything is like everything else" and "I already did that one," so we used this statement to introduce the paired comparison items in our surveys:

> The next questions are either-or. There are two things on each line. In the either-or questions, please circle one thing on each line. They seem like they repeat a lot or are all the same, but each one is different. Please do not skip any lines. If you aren't sure, just give it your best guess.

Here, there is no particular etic grid, but there are two competing models of how unions should operate: the organizing model and the servicing model that we described earlier. We included all of these items to check our ethnographic observations.

If respondents think in structural terms (1 or 4), then they would see organizing as reasonable in line with the leaders' "organizing model." If, on the other hand, they think in personal terms (2 or 3), then they would not find organizing a reasonable way to gain the power to get better contracts—they might argue for hiring lawyers to negotiate for them rather than putting resources and effort into organizing for strikes. This would be consistent with the leaders' servicing model.

It transpired that statements 1 and 5 are irrelevant to this issue because all agree that 1 is utopian and that 5 is not found in practice. A servicing orientation would be indicated if items 2 or 3 precede item 4; an organizing orientation would be suggested if item 4 precedes items 2 and 3. Virtually all staff, members, and stewards of all locals agree that friendly relations with management is not an important variable. Union members, staff, and stewards alike tended to scoff at this statement as irrelevant. "Nothing," they were likely to comment, "depends on having good relations with management. If they had their way, we wouldn't have a union at all." Thus, the following pairs (5-4, 5-3, 5-1, 5-2) do not contribute to this discussion.

Similarly, there is virtually universal consensus that having everyone in the industry organized would give locals the power to negotiate good contracts. Union people took this statement as utopian, something like, "if all people were good there would be no need for laws." So the following pairs (1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5) do not contribute.

In question 2, we also used paired comparisons to assess the strength of feelings of obligation among stewards, staff, and members in three common scenarios that ethnographic work suggested would entail a sense of obligation: when stewards resolve a grievance without the help of a rep, when reps resolve a grievance a steward has not been successful in resolving, and when the local negotiates a good contract on behalf of its members (for details of the presentation of this paired comparison, see Durrenberger [2003]).

We were interested in assessing the political relations among stewards, members, and reps that depend on obligation. Indicating that stewards are obliged to reps in the three scenarios suggests a servicing model, while indicating that reps are obliged to stewards indicates an organizing model. Stewards are obliged to reps if they see the rep as coming from outside with greater power than they have to achieve a goal—resolving a grievance or negotiating a contract. However, if reps feel obliged to stewards, it is because the stewards have organized the members at their work site to achieve the objective without external help.

In question 3, we developed a measure of what is important to stewards in their daily work as stewards. We established the salience of the scale of important tasks and the tasks by interviews with union staff, stewards, and members. Here, we used a paired comparison test consisting of all pairs of the following terms:

1. Organizing other work sites.
2. Handling grievances.
3. Getting friendly politicians elected.
4. Negotiating contracts.

We observed that while staff of locals trying to implement the organizing model thought it a good practice for stewards to help organizing other work sites and get friendly politicians elected, stewards were not anxious to take on these responsibilities in addition to their jobs and their duties as stewards. Handling grievances and negotiating contracts are services every union must provide for its members by law under threat of lawsuits by discontented members. Four items were compared in six pairs and we asked,

> EITHER-OR. Please circle the thing on each line that is most important on the job for your work as a steward.

In the pairs that compare grievance handling (2) or negotiating contracts (4) with organizing other work sites (1; with the pairs of 2-1 and 4-1) or getting friendly politicians elected (3; with the pairs of 2-3 and 4-3), selecting 2 or 4 indicates a servicing model, while selecting 1 or 3 is evidence of an organizing model.

The other two pairs (1-3 and 2-4) do not entail contrasts between the two models but assess the relative importance of elements within each model.

COMPARING ACROSS
DOMAINS AND SAMPLES

We have been interested in measuring these cultural domains and understanding why they have the forms they do and their relationships to action (Durrenberger 1997; Durrenberger and Erem 1999a, 1999b). When we required a means for comparing the union consciousness of different bargaining units, we used the proximity matrix of the staff triads test, which closely resembled the etic grid, as the measure. To assess the matrices from various bargaining units, we used the correlation of their matrices with the staff matrix as a measure of similarity (Durrenberger and Erem 1999a).

In our most recent work, we set out to compare union consciousness more widely to address the question of whether organizational forms (more or less centralized or more or less democratic) affect cultural models. We thus required a more convenient way of comparing the union consciousness of different groups. To do this, we made a direct comparison to the etic grid by assigning each person's responses a score of 1 point for each of the ten possible triads if their choice agreed with the etic grid for a union model as we discussed above. Thus each respondent received a score of 0 to 10. This allowed us to characterize the union consciousness of groups of people on a scale of 0 to 10 as well as to develop a binary scoring of more (8–10) and less (0–7)

union conscious. This allows us to assess union consciousness across, for instance, job classifications. In the example we are discussing, for instance, 1199P, among the stewards, registered nurses (RNs; $n = 49$) and certified nursing assistants (CNAs; $n = 32$) share with service workers ($n = 25$) high union consciousness (84% of RNs, 63% of CNAs, 88% of service workers), while licensed practical nurses (LPNs; $n = 12$) do not (50% of LPNs). Thus we can suggest a difference in level of union consciousness by job classification.

These procedures led to a number of interesting results that we are still analyzing. One unexpected relationship came to light as we analyzed the data from the staff of one of the more democratic locals, 1199P. We found that virtually all of the union staff disagreed with the etic model in their assessment of triad number 7, "rep, worker, steward." This is an empirical finding. We did not select this triad to discuss, but the fact that so many union staff people selected "rep" was anomalous and required some explanation. That is what sparked the discussion with the union officer with which we began this essay. These responses were doubly anomalous because they were divergent from the etic grid and from the responses of the staffs of other union locals. In the etic model, "worker" is most different because the rep and the steward are both officers of the union while the worker is not. The staffs of other locals had verified this pattern, as did the stewards of 1199P. Most of the 1199P staff (60%, $n = 50$), however, selected "rep" as the most different. Only 34% selected "worker." In terms of our discussion of the three possible alternatives for discriminating among these relationships, this would indicate a workplace proximity alternative rather than a union consciousness one. The characteristic that stewards and workers share is their workplace, and this is more salient than the fact that stewards and reps are officers of the union. Thus the anomalous triad seven for 1199P staff deserves some discussion.

In line with their ideals of democracy, this local has attempted to inculcate a model of the members at a work site being the union, as the union being of the workplace, not an external third body (in addition to members and management) that the members call in to solve their problems for them. The members are supposed to organize together to solve their own problems. This is consistent with the organizing model of unions, as opposed to the servicing model (Durrenberger and Erem 1999b).

In all other respects, the staff followed the etic model, so most of their scores for union consciousness were 9s, with the anomalous triad number 7 being the exception. We interpreted this as a success of the local in inculcating the organizing model in the staff because staff were seeing the workplace as a more salient unit for organization than the union.

When we presented the results to the officers of the union, however, one of them challenged our interpretation, suggesting that perhaps the staff were seeing the union as a force external to the work sites, as something apart from and peripheral to the work sites in accordance with the servicing model because they indicated that reps are different from workers and stewards. He offered an alternative interpretation based on a different scale. In other words, instead of assuming, as we did, that the workplace was the important unit of organization, some other feature was more salient. In spite of a long group conversation, just what the scale might be remained unarticulated.

In triad 7, "rep, worker, steward," if one selects "steward," then it might suggest the irrelevance of stewards in the organizing process at work sites. If one selects "worker," it might indicate that the union is separate and different from the work site. So we could not assess an alternative view based on triads evidence alone. But we could try to determine whether other evidence supported our interpretation that the selection of "rep" indicated an organizing rather than servicing model of unions.

Because they were consistent with the etic model, the other components of the triads test could not address this question. It was not a question of the strength of union consciousness but what kind of union, which this instrument could not measure.

At that point, we needed some method of comparing across the various domains we had measured instead of treating each one as separate. To do this, we defined a sample of those thirty staff members who had made the anomalous response and compared their responses to other questions that would also suggest that the union is external to the work site in accordance with the servicing model.

These were the responses to the paired comparisons questions about the power of the union to negotiate good contracts and obligation. We also reasoned that in the three scenarios of obligation, respondents who indicated that stewards owe reps were thinking in terms of the external or servicing model, while those who suggested that reps owe stewards were thinking in terms of the internal or organizing model.

Our hypothesis was that if we were correct and the anomalous responses of those staff members who selected item 1 in triad 7 indicated that they were thinking in terms of an organizing model, the answers to the specific paired comparisons in questions 1 and 2 would be the ones we identified with that model rather than being equally distributed or the ones associated with the servicing model. Table 2 shows that on question 1, virtually all the staff that selected item 1 on triad 7 agreed that the ability to strike (item 4) is more important than the speaking power (item 2) or the legal skill of the negotiator (item 3). Not all thirty completed question 2 because many commented that

TABLE 2
Staff Responses to Questions 1 and 2

	Number Selected			
Pair	1	2	χ^2	s
Question 1 (item number from text in parentheses)				
1 2				
Speaking power (2) / ability to strike (4)	3	27	19.20	.00
Legal skill (3) / ability to strike (4)	0	30		
Question 2[a]				
1 2				
Scenario 1, rep/steward	8	6	0.29	.59
Scenario 2, rep/steward	10	3	3.77	.05
Scenario 3, rep/steward	10	3	3.77	.05

NOTE: rep = representative.
a. A substantial number of staff members objected to the question on obligation on ideological grounds and did not answer it. Anticipating this, we allowed them space to write their comments, hence our conclusions about this question.

"this is a union, nobody owes anyone anything," or an equivalent statement of no mutual obligation. Again, this is good union ideology, but our experience with other locals suggests that in spite of ideology, a sense of obligation is often entailed in steward-rep interactions. Opinion on whether the rep owes the steward or the steward owes the rep in scenario 1 of question 2 is evenly split, but most who responded agree that in scenarios 2 and 3 the rep owes the steward. This distribution of responses is consistent with the organizing model.

Therefore, we concluded that the evidence from paired comparison questions 1 and 2 indicated that we were correct to suppose that the selection of "rep" in triad 7 was indicative of an organizing rather than a servicing orientation among staff.

Those staff members who selected "worker" (item 2) rather than "rep" (item 1) from triad 7 showed no pattern of preference on any of the items on question 2 to assess obligation but did agree with their fellow staff members on their assessments of what gives the union power in their responses to question 1.

To check the consistency of the relationship between the two sets of data that we posited for staff, we examined the data for stewards. Of that group, 62% confirmed the etic union model in their responses to the same "rep, worker, steward" triad (triad 7) by selecting "worker" (item 2) as the most dif-

TABLE 3
Stewards' Responses to Questions 1, 2, and 3

	Number Selected			
Pair	1	2	χ^2	s
Question 1 (item number from text in parentheses)				
1 2				
Speaking power (2) / ability to strike (4)	46	28	4.38	.04
Legal skill (3) / ability to strike (4)	65	9	42.38	.00
Question 2				
1 2				
Scenario 1, rep/steward	17	32	4.60	.03
Scenario 2, rep/steward	20	27	1.04	.31
Scenario 3, rep/steward	14	33	7.68	.01
Question 3				
1 2				
Grievances (2) / organize (1)	56	17	20.14	.00
Grievances (2) / elect (3)	54	18	18.00	.00
Negotiate (4) / organize (1)	61	12	32.89	.00
Negotiate (4) / elect (3)	52	22	12.16	.00

NOTE: rep = representative.

ferent. If it was credible to suggest that staff's selecting "rep" (item 1) indicated that people were thinking in terms of the servicing model, as the union officer suggested, what could we make of stewards selecting "worker," presumably more in line with the union model and, by inference, the organizing model? Again, we could not answer this by reference to the data from the triads test alone.

For stewards, in addition to question 1, the paired comparison concerning the power to get a good contract, and question 2, the questions regarding obligation, we could check question 3, in which we asked which element is most important to them as stewards.

As Table 3 shows, stewards that selected item 2 in triad 7 consistently selected items that indicated the servicing rather than the organizing model (in question 1, items 2 and 3 over item 4—speaking power and legal skill over ability to strike; in question 2, for the two scenarios for which there is agreement, stewards owe reps; in question 3, they selected grievances (item 2) and negotiations [item 4] over organizing [1] and elections [3]).

TABLE 4
Comparison of Staff and Stewards

	Staff		Stewards	
Pair	*Organize*	*Service*	*Organize*	*Service*
Question 1 (item number from text in parentheses)				
Speaking power (2) / ability to strike (4)	+	−	−	+
Legal skill (3) / ability to strike (4)	+	−	−	+
Question 2				
Scenario 1, rep/steward	−	+		
Scenario 2, rep/steward	+	−		
Scenario 3, rep/steward	+	−	−	+
Question 3				
Grievances(2) / organize (1)	−	+		
Grievances (2) / elect (3)	−	+		
Negotiate (4) / organize (1)	−	+		
Negotiate (4) / elect (3)	−	+		

NOTE: For comparison of staff and stewards, the plus sign (+), the item indicates evidence for this model; for the minus sign (−), the item does not indicate evidence for this model.

Those stewards that agreed with staff and selected the alternative "rep" (item 1) on triads number 7 showed the same pattern as those who selected "worker" (item 2) on the measures of what is important to stewards (question 3), but there was no pattern of preference for the items measuring power of the union to get a good contract (question 1) or obligation (question 2).

Table 4 compares the findings of Tables 2 and 3.

These findings contribute to the robustness of the conclusion, drawn from the consideration of each triads test and each paired comparison separately along with ethnographic observation, that stewards think in terms of a servicing model while staff think in terms of an organizing model.

To ascertain whether the background of staffers made a difference, we checked to see if there was a difference in the frequencies of selecting "worker" (item 2) or "rep" (item 1) in triad 7 between those who came from outside the local to join the staff and those who were members at work sites the union represents or had positions in other locals of the same union before they came to their staff positions. There was none.

Because about half of the staff are male while most of the members are women, we checked for a relationship with gender but found none.

Some have commented that the finding that RNs are highly union conscious is anomalous to them, given their experience organizing. We therefore checked just that group of stewards who are highly union conscious to see if there might be an association between job classification and the way they responded to the "rep, worker, steward" triad (number 7). Union conscious RNs ($n = 41$) were equally divided. CNAs ($n = 20$) selected "worker" (item 2) by 95% to 5%. Service workers ($n = 22$) selected "worker" by 77% to 23%. LPNs ($n = 5$) selected "worker" by 60% to 40% ($\chi^2 = 16.2$, $s = .01$).

So we can say that job classification shapes people's responses and that the RNs are less centered on their jobsite than the other job classifications. So while they may be very union conscious, it may not be according to the organizing model, as the leadership would hope. The interpretation of the finding about the other job categories requires further ethnographic elucidation, but it may be related to the fact that while nurses are in great demand and therefore can either change work sites easily or simply work as temps or "agency nurses" not associated with any jobsite, other job categories are less portable and more vulnerable. Additional ethnographic observation during contract negotiations and a strike with 1199P suggests that these factors are important.

PROCEDURE

To make such comparisons possible, we entered the responses to triads and paired comparisons tests into a single data set along with responses to the other survey items. This allowed us to see the patterns among those stewards who responded to the union consciousness triad item in the expected way, as well as those staff who did not. This led us to the further conclusion that, indeed, the staff who answered in the anomalous way on triad 7 were thinking in terms of an organizing model of unions while the stewards who responded in the expected way to triad 7 were thinking in terms of a servicing model.

CONCLUSION

The point of this article is methodological rather than substantive. That is, one can gain a deeper understanding of cultural domains by systematically examining the relationships among them. Furthermore, one can do that by examining dimensions that crosscut domains as we have done here.

REFERENCES

Bernard, H. R. 1988. *Research methods in cultural anthropology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Durrenberger, E. P. 1997. That'll teach you: Cognition and practice in a Chicago union local. *Human Organization* 56 (4): 388–92.

———. 1998. Explorations of class and consciousness in the U. S. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 57 (1): 41–60.

———. 2002. Structure, thought, and action: Stewards in Chicago union locals. *American Anthropologist* 104 (1): 93–105.

———. 2003. Using paired comparisons to measure reciprocity. *Field Methods* 15 (3): 271–88.

Durrenberger, E., and S. Erem. 1999a. The weak suffer what they must: A natural experiment in thought and structure. *American Anthropologist* 101 (4): 783–93.

———. 1999b. The abstract, the concrete, the political, and the academic: Anthropology and a labor union in the United States. *Human Organization* 58 (3): 305–12.

———. 2004. *Class acts: An anthropology of urban service workers and their union*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Erem, S. 2001. *Labor pains: Inside America's new union movement*. New York. Monthly Review.

Moore, C. C., A. K. Romney, T. -L. Hsia, and C. D. Rusch. 1997. The universality of the semantic structure of emotion terms: Methods for the study of inter- and intra-cultural variability. *American Anthropologist* 101 (3): 529–46.

Romney, A. K., J. P. Boyd, C. C. Moore, W. H. Batchelder, and T. J. Brazill. 1996. Culture as shared cognitive representations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 93:4699–705.

Romney, A. K., and C. C. Moore. 1997. Toward a theory of culture as shared cognitive structures. *Ethos* 6 (3): 314–37.

Romney, A. K., C. C. Moore, W. H. Batchelder, and T. -L. Hsia. 2000. Statistical methods for characterizing similarities and differences between semantic structures. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 97 (1): 518–23.

Romney, A. K., C. C. Moore, and C. D. Rush. 1996. Cultural universals: Measuring the semantic structure of emotion terms in English and Japanese. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 94:5489–94.

Weller, S. C., and A. K. Romney. 1988. *Systematic data collection*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

E. PAUL DURRENBERGER is a professor of anthropology at the Pennsylvania State University. He has worked in northern Thailand with highland tribal and lowland peasant peoples, in Iceland on medieval and modern topics, in Mississippi and Alabama on fisheries, in Iowa on agriculture, and most recently in Chicago and Pennsylvania with Suzan Erem on labor unions. A few recent publications include State Power and Culture in Thailand *(1996, Yale University Press);* State and Community in Fisheries Management*, with Tom King (2000, Bergen and Garvey); and* Class Acts *(2005, Paradigm). He has published many academic papers; in the past few years, he has published articles with Suzan Erem on labor unions. Their most recent project is about longshoremen in Charleston, South Carolina.*

SUZAN EREM studied journalism and has worked as a union organizer, a union representative, and a director of communications for Chicago's largest Service Employees International Union local. Her book Labor Pains: Inside America's New Union Movement *(2001, Monthly Review) is an account of those years. After working as a newspaper editor, she published a second book with Diana Dell,* Do I Want to Be a Mom? A Woman's Guide to the Decision of a Lifetime *(2003, McGraw-Hill). She is now a freelance writer for nonprofits and labor unions and has been working with Paul Durrenberger studying unions in Chicago and Pennsylvania.*