Almost twenty years ago, Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim predicted that conscientious and hard-working women would find it difficult to get out of middle management because their performance was geared to formal training and bureaucratic responsibilities. They felt that if women knew that senior management relies on informal networking, gathering extensive sources of knowledge from areas other than one's own, planning, policy-making, and delegating responsibility to reliable subordinates, they would be able to move up corporate career ladders (1976, 55–68). Career mobility, however, does not depend only on competent performance and other efforts by the ambitious individual. To move up, a young person's worth has to be recognized and encouraged by those in the upper echelons. Promising young men of the right social characteristics are groomed for senior management by “godfathers” or “rabbits”—sponsors who take them under their wing and see to it that they learn the informal organizational rules for getting ahead. Promising young women are left to fend for themselves (Lorber 1981).

Brotherly trust among men who are business associates goes back to the nineteenth century. Before the creation of the impersonal corporation, each partner in an enterprise was personally responsible for raising capital and making a profit. Credit depended on personal trustworthiness; bankruptcy was a personal tragedy (Davidoff and Hall 1987, 198–228; Silver 1990). In these transactions, the active players were all men. Women were passive partners; their money was used by kinsmen and men friends who acted as trustees. In order to cement the brotherly bonds among men who were in business together, women were encouraged to marry cousins or their brothers' partners; two sisters often married two brothers, or a brother and sister married a sister and brother: “Free choice marriage controlled in this way provided a form of security in binding together members of the middle class in local, regional and national networks, a guarantee of congenial views as well as trustworthiness in economic and financial affairs” (Davidoff and Hall 1987, 221).7

In twentieth-century businesses, professions, and politics, trust and loyalty are built not through kin ties (which is considered nepotism) but through homosociality—the bonding of men of the same race, religion, and social class background (Lipman-Blumen 1976). These men have the economic, political, professional, and social resources to do each other favors. Women with the same social characteristics may be included in men's circles when they have equivalent wealth, power, and social position (C. P. Epstein 1981, 265–302; Lorber 1984, 57–63). Most men and women, however, relate to each other socially only in familial or sexual roles (G. Moore 1990).
Homosociality starts early. In childhood play, boys separate themselves from girls and become contemptuous of girls' activities in their efforts to keep themselves apart. This segregation, attributed to boys' needs to establish their masculinity, makes friendship between girls and boys difficult because it is discouraged by same-gender peers. Gender grouping is not perfect in mixed-gender schools but is breached by social class and racial ethnic cross-currents and sometimes by the organizing activities of teachers (Thorne 1990). In adulthood, whenever men and women come together as equals, in coed schools and workplaces that are not gender-segregated, cross-gender friendships are undermined by intimations of sexual attraction (O'Meara 1989). One study of white middle-class young adults found that the women preferred same-gender friendships more than the men did because the men were more interested in them sexually than as companions (S. M. Rose 1985). The men invested more time and attention in their friendships with men than they did in their friendships with women, while the women gave as much emotional support to their men friends as they did to their women friends. Letty Cottin Pogrebin (1987, 311–40) feels that the main reason that women and men are rarely intimate friends is that they are rarely true equals.

Many working women are expected as part of their job to smile, be cordial, sympathetic, agreeable, and a bit sexy. Men workers are supposed to display masculine emotions—coolness under fire, rationality, and objectivity, which are part of the performance of power (Satter 1976). The qualities men want in women in the workplace as well as in the home—sympathy, looking out for the other person, understanding the nuances and cues of behavior, caretaking, flattering them sexually—keep women out of the top ranks of business, government, and the professions. Such qualities are gender-marked as "womanly"; they are also subordinating (Ridgeway and Johnson 1990).

Much of men's workplace small talk is about sports or sex. Replaying the weekend's games gives men the chance to compete and win vicariously (Kemper 1990, 167–206). Sexist jokes establish the boundaries of exclusion, and if the men are of the same race or religion, so do racist and anti-Semitic or anti-Catholic jokes. Sexist joking also keeps men from revealing their emotional bonds with each other and deflects their anger from their bosses onto women. Women who can talk and joke like men may be allowed entry into the men's brotherhood, as honorary men, but then they cannot protest against sexism and sexual harassment, even if they themselves are the victims.

Although men or women may be "odd fellows" in their workplace or job, the pressures of being a woman in a man's job and a man in a woman's job are quite different. Men nurses can talk cars and sports with men physicians. In doing so, they affiliate with a higher status group, affirm their masculinity, and gain a benefit from these informal contacts in more favorable evaluations of their work. Men physicians' status is too high to be compromised by chatting with men nurses (or flirting with women nurses). Men who are openly homosexual, however, may face discrimination from men supervisors (C. L. Williams 1992, 259). Women physicians socialize with women medical students, interns, and residents, but not with men nurses. Women physicians' status is more tenuous, and they end up in a bind. They need to get along with the women nurses so that their work proceeds efficiently, yet they lose status if they bond with a lower-status group as women. Women physicians need to build colleague relationships with the men physicians who are their peers, but these men may not treat them as equals. They also need to seek sponsors among senior men who can help them advance their careers, but these men may not want them as protegées.

Because men know the power of homosocial bonding, they are discomforted when women do the same thing and often accuse such women of lesbianism, particularly because women's attentions are turned to each other and not to them. As Carol Barkalow said of the military:

They often appear to possess an irrational fear of women's groups, believing that, in their midst, men will be plotted against, or perhaps worst of all, rendered somehow unnecessary. If women soldiers do try to develop a professional support network among themselves, they are faced with the dilemma that something as simple as two women officers having lunch together more than once might spark rumors of lesbianism—a potentially lethal charge, since even rumored homosexuality can damage an officer's career. (1990, 167–68)

Women officers who want to bond without incurring denigration of homosexuality often turn to sports, which is as legitimate a place to build trust and loyalty among women as it is among men.

For the most part, as colleagues, friends, and wives, women are relegated to acting as audience or sex objects for men. According to Kathryn Ann Farr (1988), who studied a group of upper-class white men whose bonding preserved their race and class as well as their gender privileges, wives and girlfriends were needed to serve as foils for the men's exclusive sociability. The women listened as the men talked about their exploits. When the men went off on an escapade, their women warned them against getting into too much trouble, prepared food for them, and stayed behind. The men defined the boundaries of their homosocial world by excluding women, just as they main-
tained its racial and class exclusivity by keeping out the “wrong” kind of men. The irony is that they built their superior status in a direct and immediate way by denying their own wives and girlfriends the privileges of their race and class. In this way, the domination of men over women in their own social group is sustained, and the women collude in the process:

These men do not view themselves as sexist, and they do not appear to be viewed by the women with whom they interact as sexist. In their choice of wives and girlfriends, the majority of these men seem to value independent and intelligent women. Yet their socialization into a male-dominated environment and a culture in which male sociability is highly valued causes them to think and act in ways that conflict with their intellectual assessments of the worth of and the value of social relationships with women. (Farr 1988, 269)16

By excluding women who share their social characteristics from their social space, these men never have to treat women as equals or as serious competitors for positions of power.17

The “Mommy Track”

If they could not exclude women completely or relegate them to subordinate positions, men have reduced competition and encouraged turnover by refusing to hire married women or mothers and by encouraging women employees who get married or have children to quit. Marriage bars were used against women schoolteachers, stewardesses, and other occupations in the United States well into the twentieth century and are still used today in other countries (Brinton 1989; Goldin 1990, 160-84). When the marriage bar fell out of use in the United States in the late 1950s, partly because there was a dearth of young single women workers, it was replaced by what Claudia Goldin calls “the pregnancy bar” (1990, 176). The ideology that children need full-time mothering produced turnover not at marriage but at first pregnancy.

Discriminating against women workers and job applicants who are married, pregnant, or mothers is now illegal in the United States; informally, however, these practices have been replaced by a tacit or openly acknowledged “mommy track.” Ostensibly intended to make it easier for married women with children to continue managerial and professional jobs, the “mommy track” offers flexible working hours and generous maternity leave to women but not men in dual-career marriages to ameliorate the pressures of family and work (Rodgers and Rodgers 1989). But women are penalized for taking adv-

antage of these policies, because once they do, their commitment to achieving top-level positions is called into question (Kingson 1988). The secondary result and, I would argue, latent function of these “mommy tracks” is to derail women who were on fast tracks to the top. As Alice Kessler-Harris says: “To induce women to take jobs while simultaneously restraining their ambition to rise in them required a series of socially accepted constraints on work roles. Unspoken social prescription—a tacit understanding about the primacy of home roles—remained the most forceful influence. This is most apparent in professional jobs where the potential for ambition was greatest” (1982, 231).

Until quite recently in many Westernized countries, the more prestigious professions, such as medicine, law, and the sciences, and the upper-level managerial sector of business were thoroughly dominated by men.18 Men were easily able to keep women out because they were gatekeepers in several ways: They determined admissions to professional and managerial training schools; they controlled recruitment to and from such schools; and they determined promotion policies. With the advent of affirmative action in the United States, many women have become doctors, lawyers, scientists, and administrators, and they have become formidable competition for men. The “mommy track” keeps women professionals and managers in lower-paid, lower-prestige ranks. This exclusion from top-level positions is considered legitimate because they are mothers. The assumption is that women could not possibly handle the responsibility of leadership and the responsibility for their children’s welfare at the same time, but they are never given the chance to try (Cowin and Brush 1991). It is also taken for granted that mothers, never fathers, will supervise their children’s day-to-day care.19 “Mommy tracks” thus reinforce and legitimate the structural glass ceiling, the processes of exclusion, and the justifying stereotypes.

Paradoxically, “mommy tracks” are not the way most married women professionals and executives with children organize their careers. Such women order their lives so they can be productive.20 Jonathan Cole and Harriet Zuckerman’s interviews with seventy-three women and forty-seven men scientists, eminent and rank and file, who received their doctorates between 1920 and 1979 found little difference in the rates and patterns of publication of the men and women, the married and single women, and the childless women and those with children (1991). A woman with an endowed chair in a major department of behavioral science was married four times, divorced three times, and had four children by three different husbands, but the largest dip in her publication rate came in a year when there were no changes in her personal life (167). The rate of publication for all these scientists depended on stage of
career, extent of collaboration, and the completion of projects. The women
they interviewed were successful scientists as well as wives and mothers not
because of a "mommy track" but because they carefully timed both marriage
and childbirth, had child care and household help, and cut out leisure-time
activities that had no professional payoff.21

When women put their families before their careers, they are often
responding to a generalized cultural mandate that is mediated through direct
pressures from their husbands at home and other women's husbands in the
workplace (Cockburn 1991). These men, according to Mirra Komarovsky,
have inconsistent ideas about their women peers:

Some of the revealed inconsistencies are: the right of an able
woman to a career of her choice; the admiration for women who
measure up in terms of the dominant values of our society; the lure but
also the threat that such women present; the low status attached to
housewifery but the conviction that there is no substitute for the
mother's care of young children; the deeply internalized norm of male
occupational superiority pitted against the principle of equal oppor-
tunity irrespective of sex. (1976, 37)

These inconsistencies are resolved by rewarding men's efforts to move up in
their careers but not rewarding women's efforts, and both rewarding and
punishing women for taking care of their families—rewarding them as women
and punishing them as professionals, managers, and politicians. Should any
woman not make the appropriate "choice" to put her family before her career,
both she and her husband often face subtle and not-so-subtle harassment from
their men colleagues. African-American women and men may have more
egalitarian norms and expectations about women's ambitions, but these
women face discrimination from white men on two counts and may be com-
peting with African-American men for the same few "minority" positions
(Fullbright 1987). Women may feel it is their choice to stay home with their
small children and to limit their career commitments, but their choices are
constrained by real and direct social pressures (Gerson 1985; Komarovsky
1985, 225-68).

The Salieri Phenomenon and the Matthew Effect

What happens when women can't be excluded from the workplace and don't
choose to put family before career, but instead become men's competitors?

The unspoken practices of the informal organization of work make women
particularly vulnerable to the covert undercutting I have called the Salieri
phenomenon, after the highly placed composer who allegedly sabotaged
Mozart's career (Lorber 1984, 8-10). In Peter Shaffer's play Amadeus, Salieri
never openly criticizes Mozart to the emperor who employs both of them; he
simply fails to recommend him enthusiastically. Salieri also suggests that
Mozart be paid much less than the musician he is replacing. Mozart later thanks
Salieri for his help in getting a position; he blames the emperor for the low
salary (P. Shaffer 1980, 71-72). Salieri's damming with faint praise is one way
women are undermined by their men colleagues and bosses, often without
being aware of it.

Nijole Benokraitis and Joe Feagin (1986) describe other ways men subtly
undercut women: condescending chivalry, where a boss protects a woman em-
ployee from what could be useful criticism; supportive discouragement, where a
woman is not encouraged to compete for a challenging position because she
might not make it; friendly harassment, such as being joked in public when
visibly pregnant or dressed for a social occasion; subjective objectification, or
being grouped with "all women"; radiant devaluation, when a woman is given
extravagant praise for doing what is considered routine when men do it—the
"dancing dog" effect; liberalized sexism, such as inviting a woman for an after-work
drink but not letting her pay for a round; benevolent exploitation, where a woman
is given all the detail work so she can learn the job, but a man takes credit for
the final product; considerate domination, such as deciding what responsibilities
a married woman can and cannot handle, instead of letting her determine how
she wants to organize her time; and collegial exclusion, thoughtlessly scheduling
networking meetings for times women are likely to have family respons-
ibilities. These practices undermine a woman's reputation for competence in
the eyes of others and her abilities in her own eyes, making it less likely that she
will be visible to gatekeepers or considered a legitimate competitor for a
position of power.

Once out of the fast track for advancement, it is very difficult to accrue
the necessary resources to perform valued professional activities. Those who have
access to personnel, work space, and money have the opportunity to do the
kind of work that increases their reputation, brings the approval of superiors,
and garners additional rewards and promotions. The circular proliferation of
prestige, resources, and power is the Matthew effect. As attributed to Christ in
the Gospel according to Matthew, those who have faith become more and
more favored and those who do not sink lower and lower: "For whosoever
hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." (Bible, King James version, 25:29).

The Matthew effect in science was first described by Robert Merton (1968) and Harriet Zuckerman (1977) to explain the "halo" that winning the Nobel Prize confers. The process of accumulating advantages in science, however, starts with the scientist's working at a prestigious university or laboratory that encourages the kind of research and productivity that wins Nobel Prizes. Women scientists are disadvantaged by positions that give them fewer resources and less encouragement to do high-quality work and by a lesser payoff for their achievements in recognition, rewards, and additional resources. Citations of published papers by others in a field are a form of visibility that adds to the researcher's or scholar's reputation (Astin 1991). According to Marianne Ferber (1986, 1988), women tend to cite other women more than men cite women, and the fewer women in a field, the greater the citations gap. As a result of the accumulation of disadvantages, women often have stop-and-go careers that may start out well, but then founder (Lorber and Ecker 1983).23

Two brilliant twentieth-century women scientists who were loners had totally different fates that had little to do with the value of their scientific work. One of them, Rosalind Franklin, was a well-born Jewish woman scientist who launched a productive career in England in the 1950s. Her crucial contribution to the discovery of the double-helix structure of DNA was minimally acknowledged in the initial announcement by James Watson and Francis Crick in 1953.24 She herself was denigrated by Watson in his widely read book, The Double Helix (1968). His description of her and her work is a classic example of the Salieri phenomenon: "Rosy ... spoke to an audience of about fifteen in a quick, nervous style. ... There was not a trace of warmth or frivolity in her words. And yet I could not regard her as totally uninteresting. Momentarily I wondered how she would look if she took off her glasses and did something novel with her hair. Then, however, my main concern was her description of the crystalline X-ray diffraction pattern" (68–69).25 What Franklin was describing was nothing less than a clear X-ray picture of the DNA molecule that actually showed its helical structure! Watson paid little attention to what she had reported for over a year. Working alone, Franklin tried to envisage the three-dimensional structure her photographs of DNA suggested; she alternately played with and rejected a helical model. Watson subsequently was shown her best picture without her knowledge by the man who ran the laboratory she

worked in, Maurice Wilkins; to Watson, "the pattern shouted helix" (Judson 1979, 135).

Wilkins could have been the collaborator Franklin needed to help her make an inductive leap, but according to Franklin's biographer, they "hated each other at sight. ... Only too evidently the antipathy was instant and mutual" (Sayre 1975, 95). Horace Freeland Judson calls the conflict between Wilkins and Franklin "one of the great personal quarrels in the history of science" (1979, 101), noting but underplaying the gendered overtones. Wilkins insisted he hired Franklin to do the X-ray diffractions on DNA; Franklin's friends insisted that she thought she had been given control of the project and "was profoundly angered" by being treated as an assistant rather than a colleague by Wilkins (148).26 At thirty-one, she was eight years older than Watson and a little younger but "much further along professionally than Crick" (148). Yet Wilkins, Watson, and Crick regularly corresponded, conversed, and ate together (139); Franklin's only associate was a graduate student, and as a woman, "she was denied the fellowship of the luncheon club organized by the senior common room" at King's College, Cambridge, where her laboratory was located (148).

Franklin died of cancer in 1958, at the age of thirty-seven; Watson, Crick, and Wilkins were awarded the Nobel Prize in physiology or medicine in 1962. Only in a contrite epilogue to his book, published in 1968, did Watson pay tribute to Franklin:

The X-ray work she did at King's is increasingly regarded as superb. ... We both came to appreciate greatly her personal honesty and generosity, realizing years too late the struggles that the intelligent woman faces to be accepted by a scientific world which often regards women as mere diversions from serious thinking. Rosalind's exemplary courage and integrity were apparent to all when, knowing she was mortally ill, she did not complain but continued working on a high level until a few weeks before her death. (225–26)27

Another woman scientist, also a loner but luckier because she lived to see her work rewarded with science's highest honor, was Barbara McClintock. She published a landmark paper in 1931 that established the chromosomal basis of genetics and, in 1945, was elected president of the Genetics Society. In the 1950s, the field became dominated by the Watson-Crick model of genetics, in which DNA produces RNA, and RNA produces protein. The research that McClintock published in that decade, which showed that the process was not
so straightforward and that genes could "jump," or transpose, was ignored: "In spite of the fact that she had long since established her reputation as an impeccable investigator, few listened, and fewer understood. She was described as "obscure," even "mad."" (Keller 1983, 10).

In 1960, McClintock described the parallels between her own work and that of other scientists, but these scientists did not reciprocate and cite her work. Except for two other women scientists, she was ignored at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory where she had worked since 1941 (Watson became director in 1968), but she had nowhere else to go. McClintock lived long enough to see "startling new developments in biology that echo many of the findings she described as long as thirty years ago" (Keller 1983, x), and she was awarded the Nobel Prize in medicine in 1983, when she was eighty-one years old. She died on September 2, 1992, at the age of ninety, her work "widely celebrated as president" (Kolata 1992b).

The Salieri phenomenon and the Matthew effect are two sides of the same coin. Those who benefit from the Matthew effect receive acknowledgments from their colleagues for good work, which builds their reputation and brings them financial and professional rewards. The work of those subjected to the Salieri phenomenon is not recognized; they do not get credit for good performance, and their careers are stymied. But reputations must be constantly maintained; even those who have built up social credit can lose it, and reversals of fortune are not uncommon. Because women do not have a protective "status shield," they are easy targets for jealous, threatened, or hostile Saliers. Certainly, not all women are future Mozarts, but even those who are may never be heard. 28

**Inner Circles, Friendly Colleagues, and Tokens**

The discriminatory aspects of the sorting and tracking that occur in every occupation and profession with long career ladders are obscured because colleagues who are not considered for the top jobs are not hired. They simply fail to make it into the inner circle. Colleagues are organized, informally, into three concentric circles—**inner circles, friendly colleagues, and isolated loners**. 29 Power is concentrated and policy is made in inner circles, which are usually homogeneous on gender, race, religion, ethnicity, social class, and education or training. Friendly colleagues usually have some, but not all, of the social characteristics members of the inner circle have. Although they are not totally excluded from the informal colleague network, they are rarely groomed to be part of the inner circle. Women with excellent credentials and work perfor-

manship in occupations and professions dominated by men tend to end up friendly colleagues if they are of the same race and social class as the men of the inner circle and do similar kinds of work; otherwise, they become loners. Women professionals have formed their own separate colleague or professional networks, but many ambitious women do not want to be professionally segregated. They often try to fit in with the men or work on their own and hope that their work will eventually be recognized by the gatekeepers of their profession or occupation.

Although inner circles tend to be homogeneous on gender, religion, race, ethnicity, education, and class background, a few people with different social characteristics may be accepted if they have a respected sponsor and demonstrate that in all other ways, they are just like the others. They are the true "tokens" (J. L. Laws 1975). They are actively discouraged from bringing more of their kind into the inner circle or from competing for the very top positions in the organization. Tokens usually are eager to fit in and not embarrass their sponsor, so they do not challenge these restrictions or the views, values, or work practices of the inner circle. Indeed, they may outdo the others in upholding the prevailing perspectives and exclusionary practices. That is why token women tend to be "one of the boys."

In order to get support from senior men, a senior woman may end up in the paradoxical position of making a stand for women by proving she is just like a man. A woman physician I interviewed was passed over by one set of gatekeepers in favor of her younger brother for the top position in a hospital department. She went over their heads to more powerful men, who vouched for her "manliness." She said:

I do give a hoot about titles and I'm enough of a feminist not to let them promote my brother over me. I have put in many years more of service, and I'm a far better dermatologist than my brother. They tried to do this to me because I'm a woman. Those, excuse the French, a**holes, said to me, "Do you mind us promoting your brother over you? He needs the honor." And I said, "For the sake of the women who follow after me, I mind. . . . And they said, "Well, if you come to our meetings, we can't tell dirty jokes, and we can't take off our shoes." I said, "Bull to that one. I know just as many dirty jokes as you do, and I always take off my shoes." All the board of trustees laughed like hell when they heard about it. They all said, "For God's sake, promote her." Most of them were patients of mine anyway. It's a stupid thing to say to a woman doctor. I don't care for me, but I want to make sure that the
next generation gets a fair shake and doesn't get it in the eye. (Lorber 1984, 61–62)

Unfortunately, token junior women cannot afford to be so outspoken.

In 1977, Rosabeth Moss Kanter predicted that as the number of workgroup peers with different characteristics significantly increased, they would lose their token status and characteristics and be better integrated into the group. They would be able to express individual differences and sponsor others with similar social characteristics for leadership positions. When they became almost half of the group, they could become a recognized subgroup, with alternative views and work practices and their own inner circles. Subsequent research on what came to be called the "Kanter hypothesis" showed that as the numbers of women approach 15 percent, paradoxically, they are not less isolated, as she had predicted. They are cut off from organizational information flows, are not able to acquire the loyal subordinates that leaders depend on, and are not central in the organizational structure (Olson and Miller 1983; South et al. 1982a, 1982b). Because they lack the protection of a sponsor that tokens have, they may be subject to open and covert harassment. When the occupation is symbolically masculine, such as police work or the military, additional numbers of women rarely break down the interactional barriers, and they continue to be loners. Being few in number, therefore, may result in a more favorable position than a more balanced gender mix, since an increase may be seen as a threat to those in the majority (Toren and Kraus 1987; Wharton and Baron 1987).

Why are men professionals and managers reluctant to allow substantial numbers of women into elite inner circles or to support the ambitions of more than a select few for leadership positions? Competition is one reason. Yet other men are competitors, too. Catholic and Jewish men physicians, once also subject to discriminatory quotas in American medical schools, are more successfully integrated than women into the prestigious ranks of the medical profession. It could be that men feel their profession will "tip" and become feminized if too many women are in high-paid, high-prestige, and high-power positions (Lorber 1991). Just as one group seems to fear the neighborhood will go downhill when too many of a devalued group move in, men professionals may be afraid that if too many women become leaders, their profession will become women's work, and the men in it will lose prestige, income, and their control over resources (Blum and Smith 1988; Reskin 1988).

People from subordinate social groups do not become half of the work group unless the occupation, profession, or job specialty loses its prestige and power (Carter and Carter 1981). The leaders, however, tend to stay on and continue to choose successors to the top positions who are like themselves, not like the new people who outnumber them. The men in colleague groups of mostly women and the whites in groups of mostly people of color (at least in the United States) tend to remain the supervisors and administrators. As administrators, dominant white men need to keep productivity high and costs low. If the members of formerly excluded groups can be relegated to the necessary lower-paid and less prestigious jobs (such as primary care in medicine), administrators can keep costs down and use the increasing numbers of white women and women and men of color who are highly trained professionals and managers without disturbing the status quo.

Gender and Authority

Are men so much more acceptable in positions of authority because women "do power" differently? There tend to be two models of women's leadership styles: women are exactly like men, and women are different, but equally competent (Adler and Israel 1988a). How women or men act does not give the whole picture; women's and men's leadership styles are socially constructed in interaction and heavily influenced by the situational context and how others perceive them. If women in positions of authority tend to be more accessible, to grant more autonomy, but also to be more demanding of subordinates to perform well, the reason may be that they are in weaker positions in the organization and have fewer resources. They need subordinates' help but may be unable to reward them with raises or other perks. As a result, they ask more of subordinates but are also more likely to give concessions to those who are loyal to them, which may be perceived as contradictory behavior.

Authority in a woman is granted in a woman-dominated situation, such as nursing, but questioned where authority is defined as a masculine trait, such as in police work or the military. In 1986, 10.4 percent of all uniformed U.S. Army personnel were women, but they were underrepresented in the higher ranks. In 1988, there were nine women who were one-star generals in the U.S. military, 1.2 percent of the total, and none of higher rank. Women constituted 2 percent of the colonels, 3.5 percent of the lieutenant colonels, and 7.1 percent of other officer ranks (Barklow and Raab 1990, 280–81). In 1991, a woman, Midshipman Juliane Gallina, was chosen the U.S. Naval Academy's brigade commander, student leader of 4,300 midshipmen. Ironically, her appointment came six months after a survey found that a "considerable segment" of students, faculty, and staff believed women had no place in the Naval Academy (New York Times 1991b).

A woman leader is expected to be empathetic, considerate of other's feel-
ings, and attuned to the personal (Lorber 1985). If she is not, she is likely to be called “abrasive.” As the editor of the prestigious Harvard Business Review, Rosabeth Moss Kanter has been publicly faulted for her confrontational management style by her associates, even though her predecessor, a man, had similar problems in his first year (A. L. Cowan 1991). Her high status as a Harvard Business School professor, corporate consultant, and author of internationally known books on management did not protect her from open criticism by her colleagues.

On the other hand, a more conciliatory style may be criticized by men and women colleagues as insufficiently authoritative. Despite the increase in women managers in the past twenty years, men and women at all career stages, including undergraduate and graduate business students, stereotype the good manager as “masculine” (Powell 1988, 145–50). Nonetheless, there are situations where a nonconfrontational approach is highly appropriate. In medicine and police work, quintessential masculine professions in American society, being able to listen and take the role of the other person may be more productive than a distancing, authoritative stance in eliciting information or deflecting conflict (S. E. Martin 1980; West 1984, 51–70). Conciliation and using the other person’s views can be threatening to men in police work who have learned to rely on physical force and to men doctors for whom medical expertise is the ultimate authority.

If the goal for women in men-dominated situations is to be treated as if they were men, they are in a double bind, and so are the men (Chase 1988). If the women act like men, they challenge men’s “natural” right to positions of power. If the women act like women, they don’t belong in a situation where they have to take charge (that is, act like a man). As Susan Ehrlrich Martin says of policewomen on patrol: “The more a female partner acts like a police officer, the less she behaves like a woman. On the other hand, the more she behaves like a woman, the less protection she provides, the less adequate she is as a partner—although such behavior preserves the man’s sense of masculinity. The way out of the bind is simple: keep women out of patrol work” (1980, 93–94).

**Producing “Face”**

All these processes of legitimation and validation that build the reputations of stature and ability needed by a competitor for a position of power and prestige take place in face-to-face interaction. In everyday encounters, people present themselves the way they would like to be responded to—as powerful leaders, cooperative colleagues, deferential underlings, more or less intimate friends, possible sexual partners. The ways people dress, gesture, talk, act, and even show emotion produce social identities, consciously or unconsciously crafted for different arenas and a variety of occasions. Ritual behavior, such as bows and handshakes, and the rules of protocol—who goes through a door first, who sits where, who calls whom by their first name—reproduce status hierarchy or create status equality. Ordinary conversations become covert battlegrounds: Who talks more, who interrupts, whose interests are discussed, who gets sustained attention or short shift, all indicate who has the social upper hand. Whom one walks with or stands with—or puts space between—demonstrates affiliation, hostility, or respect, as does eye contact, touching, and other forms of “body politics.” These “face” productions are such delicate balances of power and deference that they can easily be disrupted by rudeness or embarrassment (Goffman 1967, 97–112; Schef 1988). Secret stigmas, such as deviant behavior in the past or present, or even by members of one’s family or by intimate friends, can contaminate a seemingly upright identity if revealed (Goffman 1963a). In face-to-face interaction, accidental attributes, such as beauty or height, may add to social status, and obvious physical deformities often detract from it.

These presentations of self take place in social contexts, and the responses of others validate, neutralize, deny, or subvert them. Status signals, whether they are verbal or nonverbal, practical or symbolic, can be understood only in the social context and only by people who have learned their meaning (Hodge and Kress 1988). You need to know the symbolic language of everyday social interaction to be able to tell who is the boss and who is the employee, who are friends and who are enemies. Signals can be manipulated to shore up or subvert the status quo, or they can be used deliberately in open resistance or rebellion.

These status productions are part of “doing gender” (or of doing race, ethnicity, religion, or social class). In doing gender, as West and Zimmerman point out, “men are also doing dominance and women are doing deference” (1987, 146). That is, in face-to-face interaction, what is being produced, reinforced, or resisted is the society’s whole system of social stratification. This system endows women and men, people of different racial ethnic groups and religions, and those with greater or lesser economic resources with different social worth. Everyday interaction reenacts these power and prestige differences because people with different status characteristics are seen as legitimately superior or inferior by the others in the situation. When people are evaluated highly, the others take what they have to say seriously, follow
their suggestions, and defer to their judgment. Those who have low status in
the eyes of the others are not listened to, their advice is ignored, and their bids
for leadership are simply not acknowledged. Status superiors are granted the
benefit of the doubt if they make a mistake; status inferiors have to prove their
competence over and over again.

The pattern of structured power and prestige in face-to-face interaction
replicates the ranking of social characteristics in the larger society because
people are seen not as individuals but as representatives of their race, religion,
gender, education, occupation, and so on. If everyone in a group has the same
social characteristics, then natural leaders and followers emerge; in a group of
friends, there is usually one person who is the ringleader. But when the social
characteristics of people in a group differ, the social characteristics have more
salience than personal characteristics—the woman who leads other women
follows when men are present. The solo man does not dominate in a group of
women, but he is listened to more than the solo woman is in a group of men
(Johnson and Schulman 1989). The size of the group, its status mix, endu-
crance, and purpose determine its structure of power and prestige, but the
patterns are constant: Status superiors lead because others feel they have the
right to lead; they don’t have superior status because they lead. Most of the
time, the building up and tearing down of “face” goes unnoticed, but conflicts
and confrontations reveal that the vital subtext is the social production of
prestige and power (Morrill 1991).
of all classes, in every work setting, and in many countries. See Collinson 1988; Lyman 1987; Peña 1991. These verbal acts of sexual aggression can easily turn into sexual assault if the woman is alone with a group of men and physically or psychologically vulnerable. For the concept of a continuum of sexual violence, see Liz Kelly 1987.

13. For men nurses, see C. L. Williams 1989, 118–19; on women physicians, see Lorber 1984, 60–61.
15. See Booth-Butterfield and Booth-Butterfield 1988 for cooperation and support among women teammates.
16. See Remy (1990, 45) for a more general statement of “fratriarchy based . . . on the self-interest of the association of men itself.” He equates this age-graded bonding with men’s huts, blood brotherhoods, and all-male secret societies.
17. Bourdieu 1989; Coser 1986; C. E. Epstein 1988, 215–31. Because bathrooms are gender-segregated, they are used by women as well as men for networking, but women also use them for letting out anger against “them,” and as places of refuge from men (Barkalow 1990, 65; Reskin 1988; Quinlin 1988, 30–33).
18. C. E. Epstein 1981; Kanter 1977a; Lorber 1984; Zuckerman 1991. In some countries, such as the former Soviet Union, most doctors are women because it is not a high-prestige profession; in some Arab countries, women doctors are needed because women patients are not allowed to be examined by men doctors.
21. Lorber 1984, 60–98, found that married women physicians tended to combine their social life with networking, and since many were married to physicians, their networks were larger than those of single women.
22. The process actually starts in childhood, with differential treatment of girls and boys in grade schools, and proliferates in the higher grades, with only bright middle-class boys being encouraged to take math and science courses (AAUW Report 1992).
24. Freeland Judson says that with Linus Pauling, James Watson, and Francis Crick, “she was one of the four people closest to the discovery of the structure of DNA” (1979, 147). His account discusses the personalities and interchanges of all the players (1979, 100–98).
25. "Rosy" was a nickname used behind her back (Judson 1979, 148).
26. Freeland Judson cites a letter that he feels indicates "she had good reason to think she headed an independent team" (103).
27. According to Freeland Judson, Crick and other readers of the manuscript forced the apology; Wilkins still had feelings of animosity toward his "dear, dead colleague" (1979, 102).
28. Mozart's own sister, Nannerl, was also a pianist, composer, and child prodigy. She and Mozart traveled around Europe together until she was fifteen and married. She may even have written some of the early works attributed to Mozart (Steinem 1992). Actually, Mozart wasn't "Mozart, the great composer," in his own day, nor was he in the nineteenth century. Mozart's high status is a modern phenomenon. The term status shield in Hochschild's (1983, 162–81).
29. Oswald Hall (1946, 1948, 1949) developed these concepts for medical communities, I extended them to women physicians' careers (Lorber 1984), but the concepts are valid for all kinds of colleague groups.
30. In 1977a, 206–42; also 1977b. The effects of imbalanced numbers in work situations are boundary maintenance by dominants, role encapsulation (assigning or defining the work tokens as appropriate), performance pressures because of tokens' heightened visibility, and stereotyped informal roles, such as, for token women, mother, mascot, seductress, and "iron maiden." (I have not seen similar roles identified for token men, such as men nurses, or for Black women or men in white groups or vice versa.)
33. For a psychological approach to women's leadership styles, see Cantor and Berkey 1992. For an anthropological perspective, see Power 1991, 166–67, who notes that among chimpanzees in the wild, "a charismatic leader . . . is any of a number of animals of either sex who are, to varying degrees, confident, self-assured, normally nonaggressive, but fearless when roused, tolerant of others, approachable and responsive, with a 'presence' through posture and bearing (rather than through size and strength) and who carry out leader-role related behaviors." For female leadership, see pp. 196–203 and De Waal 1984.
36. Also see C. L. Williams 1990, 48–87, on the official obsession with masculinity and femininity when women entered the Marine Corps.
37. Formal theories and experiments on how status organizes interaction, particularly how beliefs about actors' social characteristics govern evaluation of performance, allocation of rewards, and the structure of power and prestige in small groups, document many of the processes described in this section. For overviews and recent developments in the field, see Fiske, Berger, and Norman 1991; Ridgeway and Berger 1988; Wagner and Berger 1991. For studies specifically on gender, see Carli 1991; Lockhead 1985; Molm 1998; Pugh and Wahlman 1983; Ridgeway 1988; Ridgeway and Dickeman 1989; Stewart 1988; Wagner 1988.