

Tokenism, Organizational Segregation, and Coworker Relations in Law Firms

Jean E. Wallace, *The University of Calgary*

Fiona M. Kay, *Queen's University*

Although occupational segregation by sex has declined in recent decades with the rising numbers of women entering traditionally male occupations (e.g., law and medicine), the achievement of women within male-dominated occupations continues to lag behind that of their male colleagues. In this article, we draw on theories of proportional rarity, expectations states, and social support as three dimensions that provide a structural understanding of tokenism. We examine tokenism in the legal profession through: (1) organizational context in terms of gender composition and gender ratios at upper echelons of the organizational hierarchy; (2) status characteristics of the minority and dominant groups; and (3) the content of communications (emotional and informational support) that women receive from their colleagues. These communications may act to integrate, or conversely, through their absence, exclude women and heighten boundaries to women's career advancement within the traditionally male profession of law. We used questionnaire data collected from a sample of 740 married lawyers working in law firms to examine these aspects of tokenism. The results reveal that women's rising representation in law firms leads to enhanced communication through informational and emotional support, benefiting both men and women lawyers. Yet, a more gender balanced organizational context, in terms of gender composition, does little to shift the expectation states associated with women lawyers and the professional disadvantage women face when they have family responsibilities. Keywords: professions; occupational segregation; gender; tokens; expectation states; law firms.

Although occupational segregation by sex has declined in recent decades with the rising numbers of women entering traditionally male occupations (e.g., law, engineering, and medicine), the upward mobility of women within these occupations continues to lag behind that of their male colleagues (Bolton and Muzio 2008; Crompton and Lyonette 2011; Gorman and Kmec 2009). These professions are regarded as male-dominated not only in terms of numerical representation, but also in terms of the traits they possess that are argued to be organized by men for men (Davies 1996; Sommerlad 2007). Moreover, career success appears dependent upon exhibiting masculine traits, such as competitiveness and aggression, and professionals are assumed by their colleagues to be free of family responsibilities such that work is expected to come before family (Gorman 2005; McBrier 2003). Despite the fact that more women than men are graduating from professional schools (Bolton and Muzio 2007), higher proportions of men advance to leadership positions (Beckman and Phillips 2005; Dencker 2008; Gorman 2006; Lyness and Schrader 2006) and higher proportions of women are leaving the professions (Becker-Blease, Elkinawy, and Stater 2010; Percheski 2008; Stone 2007). Although women have been acquiring the necessary level of expertise in terms of the formal educational and professional requirements to be successful, a "masculinist vision"

This study was funded by a research grant from the Law School Admission Council (LSAC). The opinions contained in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of LSAC. The authors wish to thank Julie Kmec for her helpful and constructive comments on an earlier draft of this article. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association in Atlanta, Georgia. Direct correspondence to: Jean E. Wallace, Department of Sociology, The University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4; E-mail: jwallace@ucalgary.ca.

Social Problems, Vol. 59, Issue 3, pp. 389–410, ISSN 0037-7791, electronic ISSN 1533-8533. © 2012 by Society for the Study of Social Problems, Inc. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website at www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo/asp. DOI: 10.1525/sp.2012.59.3.389.

(Davies 1996:669) of many professions, including expectations of particular gender norms of behavior, linear uninterrupted careers, and long hours, appears to be intact. This vision may prevent women's full and equal participation. That is, the masculine gendering of many professions makes it difficult for women who attempt to fit into work roles on the same terms as their male counterparts (McKenzie Leiper 2006; Stone and Lovejoy 2004). Moreover, a woman's success in masculine-typed professions may simultaneously signal that she is competent but also violating prescriptive gender norms, and as a result she may be penalized by negative stereotypes and excluded from the workplace (Benard and Correll 2010; Roth 2006). This normative discrimination is exacerbated further for successful career women who are also mothers. These women may be seen to be violating the norm of "intensive mothering" (Hays 1996) that demands mothers invest extremely high amounts of time and energy into raising their children. Women occupational minorities are held accountable for violating gendered ideals of behavior—they are treated differently (Pierce 1995; Taylor 2010), they encounter personal hostility (Heilman et al. 2004) and are disliked (Roth 2006), and they feel less supported by their colleagues (Kanter 1976).

Organizations where professionals work reproduce gender inequalities through practices, policies, culture, and interaction (Huffman, Cohen, and Pearlman 2010; Irvine and Vermilya 2010). These work contexts appear to foster a "chilly climate" for women, where women feel they are treated differently and it is difficult for them to feel truly accepted by their male colleagues as equals and share the same opportunities for career success (López 2008). Furthermore, while women have been entering the professions in critical masses, their numerical representation is clearly not a sufficient condition for gender equality (Longo and Straehley 2008). As Sharon Bolton and Daniel Muzio (2007) contend, the analysis must go beyond focusing on the numerical representation of women in the professions to examine how women are included in the professions "but in an exclusionary way" (p. 52).

One important way women professionals may be excluded is by the interactional disadvantage they may face in terms of isolation from informal social and professional networks and support from their colleagues (Kay and Hagan 1998). We contend that greater attention to the coworker relationships within organizations can broaden our understanding of gender stratification (Schieman 2006). Much of the literature tends to focus on gender inequality at the individual level and relatively few studies examine inequality within the context of the organizational environment (McTague, Stainback, and Tomaskovic-Devey 2009).

The purpose of this article is to examine three aspects of women's underrepresentation within the professions: (1) organizational context in terms of gender composition and gender ratios at upper echelons of the organizational hierarchy; (2) status characteristics associated with minority and dominant groups; and how these two factors are related to (3) emotional and informational support that women receive from their colleagues. The supportiveness of coworker relations may act to integrate, or conversely, through their absence, exclude women and heighten barriers to women's career advancement.

In addressing these aspects of women's token status in the professions, we selected the masculine-typed occupation of law to examine whether it is the gender of the lawyer, the gender representation of the lawyers within a workplace, or the combination of the two that is most relevant to explaining the amount of social support received from one's colleagues (Glass 1990). Also, we explore whether the gender composition of the upper echelons is relevant to the support offered to men and women lawyers of the firm. Some research suggests that while it is difficult for minorities who are present only in token numbers to overcome negative stereotypes and discrimination, entry of minorities to positions of power may be key to transforming expectations, hiring practices, and promotion criteria (Carbado and Gulati 2004; Chambliss and Uggen 2000). These scholars suggest that if minorities have access to managerial authority, they may act as "change agents" by fostering the careers of their similar subordinates. In contrast, others suggest minorities in positions of organizational power may act as "cogs in the machine" by supporting the careers of the majority at the expense of the minority subordinates (Maume 2011). We examine

how minorities' ascent to positions of power influences the minority members' standing within organizations.

Our study contributes to the literature in two important ways. First, we examine coworker support as an outcome variable in contrast to previous work on tokenism, which usually examines career outcomes such as hiring, promotions, and pay (though see Taylor 2010). Much research measures perceived support at work in a single scale that encompasses various types and sources of support, such as help and listening from coworkers and supervisors (Thoits 1995). We refine this measurement to distinguish between *informational* and *emotional* support received from colleagues. Access to information has been demonstrated to be important to organizational mobility, including promotions and pay increases (Kanter 1977a, 1977b; Pierce 1995; Roth 2006), while emotional dynamics of collegial relations are related to job performance, organizational commitment, and turnover (Wu and Hu 2009). Earlier work suggests emotions are a neglected aspect of the labor process (Pierce 1995) and therefore we contend that the distinction between emotional and informational support is an important one.

Second, we build on the literature that documents a "motherhood penalty," which may be a double penalty for women's career success when they are both mothers as well as tokens in professions (Benard and Correll 2010; Budig and England 2001; Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007). By examining women's experiences in an historically masculine profession, such as law, we provide a more rigorous test of women's success in overcoming stereotypes associated with motherhood than if we examined a more feminine occupation (Benard and Correll 2010). We begin by developing the theoretical framework of gender, proportional rarity, and expectations of competence and interpersonal support.

Proportional Rarity and Expectations States Theory

A structural explanation of sex differences in occupational achievement is Rosabeth Moss Kanter's (1977a) theory of proportional rarity. Kanter focused on tokenism, a situation in which individuals of one social group (e.g., women) are in an extreme minority—less than 15 percent of the organization. Kanter's theory posits that the proportional rarity of tokens is associated with perceptual tendencies that create a set of interaction processes with negative career consequences for token women. As a result, token women are likely: (1) to have their missteps noted and the significance of these amplified ("heightened visibility"); (2) to be isolated as a social out-group and therefore miss out on informal and professional networks ("contrast"); and (3) to be encapsulated into roles that undermine their status ("assimilation") (Fløge and Merrill 1986; Pazy and Oron 2001). A considerable body of research is consistent with Kanter's predictions, demonstrating that underrepresented women in male domains experience the greatest prejudice and discrimination compared with women in more balanced gender settings (Hewstone et al. 2006; Pazy and Oron 2001).

Some authors suggest that the token effects observed by Kanter may be the result of homophily processes that define "in-group" and "out-group" members (Roth 2004:192). According to theories of homophily, individuals who share certain status characteristics also tend to share common interests and communicate with ease (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001). Preferring to work and interact with similar others has the deleterious effect of excluding outsiders, causing those who differ from the majority to feel isolated and, at the same time, feel that they stand out or do not fit in the organization (Roth 2004). The categorization of individuals as out-group members may lead managers and supervisors to dismiss or devalue the contributions of tokens and minorities (Westphal and Milton 2000). At the same time, coworkers may offer little assistance and encouragement to token and minority 'outsiders' in their workplaces (Kanter 1977a; Roth 2006; Taylor 2010). Professionals lacking access to workplace information and support incur limited opportunity to receive promotions, pay raises, and benefits (Pierce 1995; Roth 2006; Taylor 2010).

In *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977), Kanter argued that the numeric imbalances between groups constitute the primary cause of the negative effects of tokenism. Therefore, by balancing numbers, negative effects will diminish. Kanter (1997b) also stated that when proportions become less extreme (i.e., from skewed to tilted), women as the “minority” (representing 16 to 45 percent of the membership), as opposed to when they are “tokens” (representing 15 percent or less), “begin to become individuals differentiated from each other” (p. 966). She predicted that growing representation improves the situation for minorities over tokens because visibility, assimilation, and contrast are reduced, with the result that stereotyping subsides. Subsequent research has supported these claims, specifically with regard to low status minorities (Pazy and Oron 2001; Stichman, Hassell, and Archbold 2010).

However, a rival position predicts that as token minorities of low status rise in representation, they will encounter a backlash by majority members. According to Hubert Blalock (1967), growing minority representation in a firm or occupation threatens the majority and is expected to produce increased resistance by the dominant group, thus heightening barriers to minorities’ career attainment. The logic behind this perspective is threefold: (1) job authority is a coveted social resource over which groups compete; (2) the majority group has a vested interest in mobilizing their power to limit or exclude minority members from gaining access to job authority; and (3) this interest in barring minorities from positions of power increases with rising presence of minorities in an organization (Smith and Elliott 2002).

Several critiques of Kanter’s theory remain. The most damaging critiques refer to Kanter’s confounding numerical proportions with three factors: status, occupational inappropriateness, and intrusiveness (Hewstone et al. 2006:511). Not all tokens or minorities may experience disadvantage, depending on the social status of their distinguishing characteristics (Zimmer 1988). The gender inappropriateness of members of a profession refers to gender stereotyping. Janice Yoder (1991) concluded that distinctive women in gender-inappropriate occupations tend to experience performance pressures, isolation, and role encapsulation, but men do not when they are found in gender-inappropriate occupations. To the extent that women are seen as “intruders,” the benefits of decreased distinctiveness may be gained at the cost of a backlash from the majority. As Blalock (1967) suggested, increased proportions of minority group members might worsen the situation for these individuals if the majority views them as a threat to their status, and then react with increased discrimination—something that does not level off until the minority proportion of the whole group reaches about 30 to 40 percent (Allmendinger and Hackman 1995).

In most Western countries, women’s representation has surpassed 30 percent in the legal profession (American Bar Association Commission on Women in the Profession 2011; Federation of Law Societies of Canada 2010) though there is some evidence that women’s representation in the legal profession may have reached a plateau. For example, women’s presence among law students has declined in recent years from its peak of 50 percent in 1993 to 44 percent in 2009 in the United States (American Bar Association 2011). As women’s representation within traditionally male professions has risen beyond that of tokens, new questions emerge regarding what is the critical level where obstacles to women’s career advancement might be dismantled.

Group Status and Expectations of Competence and Giving

Eliminating the effects of tokenism involves more than balancing numbers. Status also matters. The relative status of and power differentials between token women and majority men is important to mobility prospects (Irvine and Vermilya 2010; Sørensen 2004; Wingfield 2009). Status conferred by society permeates social interactions and plays a powerful role in determining leadership positions and evaluations of group members’ work performance (Heilman 2001; McDonald, Toussaint, and Schweiger 2004).

Widely held beliefs about gender confer unequal status on women and men. As Cecilia Ridgeway and Shelley Correll (2004) point out, “gender beliefs are in effect cultural rules or instructions for enacting the social structure of difference and inequality that are understood to be

gender" (p. 511). And while these cultural beliefs about gender are stereotypes, they hold broader social significance. These stereotypes constitute a cultural schema by which people perceive gender difference and inequality (Ridgeway 2001b). Further, these stereotypes offer a cultural script of how to communicate and collaborate (Ridgeway and Correll 2004, 2006; Sommerlad 2007). For example, women are often viewed as less competent, yet "nicer" and better at tasks that involve cooperation, though these tasks tend to be valued less (Benard and Correll 2010; Fiske et al. 2002).

Clearly, status and competence components of gender beliefs are consequential for gender inequality within professions (Zimmer 1988). Expectation states theory (EST) has developed a rich account of the impact of gender status and competence beliefs in social contexts that we draw on for our explanatory schema. According to EST, members of groups "assign to each other, and hold corresponding task-related expectations, on the basis of knowledge of either status characteristics, or the quality of prior task performance, or both" (Foschi and Valenzuela 2008:1023). These expectations are often unconscious and taken-for-granted beliefs about group members and their capabilities. Those with high performance expectations will be granted more opportunities to perform, perform more often, receive more positive evaluations, and have greater influence in their organizational context (Kalkhoff and Thye 2006; Ridgeway, Johnson, and Diekema 1994).

In addition, gender confers status expectations even when these are unrelated to a particular task. As a result, employers and colleagues may expect superior performance from men as compared to women on a wide, indeterminate number of tasks (Fiske et al. 2002). These expectations shape the experiences of token women and reinforce status distinctions through self-fulfilling processes involving stereotypes, biased evaluations, and double-standards (Castilla 2008; Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999), with women held to a stricter standard for competence than their male colleagues (Foschi 2009). Often unconscious biases affect how work is distributed to the disadvantage of women. Meanwhile, career rewards, such as pay, are determined through performance reviews that are biased by nonmerit factors rooted in gender beliefs (Roth 2006).

EST predicts that in occupations where tasks are sex stereotyped for males, expectations states associated with femaleness will be disadvantageous (Burke, Stets, and Cerven 2007). Women's success in male-typed fields may violate prescriptive norms of how women should behave in terms of being helpful, warm, and empathetic. These traits are often at odds with positions of leadership where displays of assertiveness and competitiveness are valued (Benard and Correll 2010). It is important to note that the degree to which individual women actually possess particular traits is less important than the fact that these inferior traits are expected (Foschi 2009). As Liliane Fløge and Deborah Merrill (1986) argue, "It is these expectations that affect the tokenism processes in a gender specific manner" (p. 945). It is also the case that these expectations are not exclusively held by men; women too may share these expectations of their gender (Ridgeway 2001a).

So far we have discussed gender as a diffuse status characteristic, however, motherhood, as a specific role, brings its own status implications. The two statuses, however, are often confounded where there is an automatic assumption in workplaces that all women will have children, even when they work full time in high-status occupations (Schwartz 1989). This "maternal profiling" (Kmec 2011) affects perceptions of competence and commitment because contrary schemas define conceptions of family devotion and work devotion (Blair-Loy 2003:5). Contemporary cultural beliefs about the mother role include a normative expectation that mothers will engage in "intensive" mothering that prioritizes the needs of dependent children above all other activities (Hays 1996). This cultural norm exists in tension with another widely held normative belief that the "ideal worker," particularly a professional, demonstrates intensive effort on the job and is unencumbered by outside demands (Correll et al. 2007; Williams 2001). This perceived tension between incompatible cultural schemas leads evaluators, perhaps unconsciously, to expect mothers to be less competent and less committed to their jobs (Blair-Loy 2003; Correll et al. 2007; Kmec 2011; Wallace 2004). Conversely, mothers who are highly successful, particularly in male-typed jobs, may be viewed as competent and committed but also seen as more interpersonally hostile, less warm and likable, and as a result more likely to be excluded and denied salary increases,

promotions, and other rewards (Benard and Correll 2010). In high-powered jobs with expected around-the-clock availability, like those of business executives and lawyers, we would expect the status implications of motherhood to shape expectations about performance, ability, and suitability for positions of authority to a greater extent than they would in some less intensive, more structured "9 to 5" jobs (Ridgeway and Correll 2004). These expectations are perhaps most heavily imposed on women following maternity leaves and on mothers of preschool-aged children.¹

EST extends beyond expectations of skill competence and performance to expectations about the ability and inclination of group members to help each other out. In particular, EST would suggest that women, as a group, are expected to offer more support, especially emotional support, to coworkers and subordinates than otherwise similar men. Women are assumed to be more communicative, caring, and concerned with the establishment and maintenance of close relationships (Beutal and Marini 1995; Crompton and Lyonette 2010). Motherhood may represent a more extreme version of the general stereotype of women in that mothers are seen as even more nurturing and communal than women in general (Cuddy, Fiske, and Glick 2004; Fiske et al. 2002). In professional settings, women may be assumed to also be more expressive and therefore spend more time in conversation with others, lending emotional support to those experiencing difficulties (Burlinson et al. 2011). Therefore, workers in organizations with a greater representation of women would expect to receive more support.

So according to EST, women, and perhaps mothers especially, will be expected to *give* more support to others. But who is the likely *recipient* of support? EST hypothesizes that employers and coworkers expect superior competence and performance from men more so than from women, which may lead managers to invest more in men, whom they perceive as having greater potential to be successful (Kay and Gorman 2012). Similarly, colleagues may prefer to share valuable information and lend emotional support to those individuals they perceive as competent and deserving of their professional support. EST further hypothesizes that in the context of time-demanding professional work such as law, mothers are perceived to be torn by their responsibilities to dependent children and less committed to the profession (Wallace 2008). These unfavorable, though often unconscious, impressions of women lawyers and lawyers who are mothers, will lead coworkers to extend support, through information sharing and encouragement, more often to male lawyers, colleagues they perceive to be more deserving and dedicated professionals.

Therefore, in addition to proportional rarity and status expectations, behavioral responses of lending support on the part of men (as well existing women within organizations) represent a third important dimension to a social-relational (Ridgeway and Correll 2004) understanding of tokenism. In particular, emotional support, involving the provision of empathy and encouragement to others in coping with the stresses of their job (Minnotte, Pedersen, and Mannon 2010), and informational support, involving the sharing of knowledge and expertise to assist workers in their job performance (Madjar 2008), may be valued commodities in the context of demanding professional careers.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Gender and Coworker Support. Based on these arguments regarding the token status of women in law, homophily preferences, and expectation states theory, it is predicted that: *Female lawyers will report less supportive collegial relations than male lawyers (H₁).* To test this hypothesis we estimate the direct effect of gender on the amount of emotional and informational coworker support lawyers receive.

1. It is important to keep in mind that this negative connection between the roles of motherhood and committed worker exists at the level of normative cultural assumptions rather than at the level of mothers' actual commitment to their work roles. Numerous studies find no differences between mothers and other married women or men in work commitment (Bielby and Bielby 1988) and some studies find mothers report similar or even greater commitment (Wallace 2008), job engagement, and work intensity than fathers (Kmec 2011).

Hypothesis 2: Gender Representation and Coworker Support. In addition to the gender of the individual lawyer, the gender composition of the workplace may affect the working climate for women and the supportiveness of coworker relationships. As suggested above, Kanter (1977a) argues that tokenism reflects a system-level or structural characteristic of the workplace rather than an individual characteristic of the person and as such relative numbers or gender composition can strongly impact an individual's fate within the organization. We follow Kanter's (1977a) typology where the proportions of women-to-men are coded into five different categories. As argued above, it is hypothesized that: *If women as a group hold a token status in a firm, then it is expected that individual women in that firm will report less supportive relationships than men in the firm (H₂).* To test this hypothesis, we compute an interaction term for "gender-by-women's firm representation" to see whether the effect of an individual's gender on coworker support depends on whether women represent token, minority, or more balanced groups.

Hypothesis 3: Gender, Power, and Coworker Support. We also examine the influence of gender composition of partners in the firm on the support extended to lawyers of the firm. While Kanter did not address whether tokens benefit by their increased representation in leadership positions, others have found that increased presence of token or minority individuals at upper-level positions may be change agents who are key to bringing about more opportunities for hiring and promotion among token or minority applicants (Chambliss and Uggen 2000; Ely 1995; Gorman 2006; Huffman et al. 2010; Kay and Wallace 2009; Maume 2011). In law firms, the hierarchy of positions is reflected by the basic distinction between associates and partners. Partners are more senior lawyers who are co-owners of the firm and share in the firms' profits and losses. Associates are junior lawyers who are hired as employees on a probationary basis on a partnership track that typically lasts 6 to 10 years. We hypothesize that: *If few women are represented at the key decision-making level as partners in the firm, women will report less supportive relationships compared with men (H₃).* We use Kanter's (1977a) same proportions to capture the representation of women at the partnership rank. We test this hypothesis by estimating the "gender-by-female partners' representation" interaction to determine whether the effect of gender on coworker support depends on whether women partners represent a token, minority, or balanced group in the firm.

Hypotheses 4 and 5: Work and Family Involvement and Coworker Support. The literature suggests additional factors that may account for women being less supported by their colleagues and these variables are also included in the analysis. Fundamentally, if men and women differ in their involvement in their work and family lives it may provoke different degrees of supportiveness from their colleagues at work. It is generally assumed by coworkers and employers that men are more involved in their work because they typically work longer hours, participate in more career enhancing activities (particularly those outside of regular work hours), and have more continuous work histories than women (McMurray et al. 2002; Young and Wallace 2009). In contrast, women tend to have fragmented careers, work fewer or part-time hours, and take maternity leaves, all of which are interpreted as indicators of lower career involvement and commitment (Bolton and Muzio 2007; McKenzie Leiper 2006; Wallace 2004). Moreover, women, even those with professional careers, continue to be the ones who are primarily responsible for child care and household responsibilities and most likely to scale back their careers to accommodate family demands (Blair-Loy 2003). As well, child care responsibilities tend to reduce the amount of time available for work activities and socializing, particularly after regular work hours. If the institutional arrangements of professional work do not provide inclusionary strategies that allow combining work and family responsibilities, coupled with an organizational culture that supports employees' use of these arrangements, women will continue to face obstacles to being fully integrated and supported by their professional colleagues (Longo and Strachley 2008; Major et al. 2008; Stone and Lovejoy 2004). Based on this literature, we hypothesize that: *If lawyers are more involved in their careers, they will report greater coworker support (H₄), particularly if they are men; and if lawyers have greater involvement with their family, they will report less support from coworkers (H₅), particularly if they are women.*

Data and Methods

Sample

The data are from the 2000 "Juggling It All Survey" that collected information on practicing lawyers' work and family experiences and attitudes. The survey was distributed to all practicing lawyers in the Province of Alberta. Of the 5,921 lawyers contacted, 1,829 completed the survey, yielding a 31 percent response rate. This rate is consistent with average response rates for surveys of managers and executives, and is in the upper fiftieth percentile of response rates for surveys of managerial respondents, according to a recent meta-analytic review of response rates in organizational science (Anseel et al. 2010:341–2). We also obtained official population data from the Law Society of Alberta and compared population and survey data across gender and work settings. Our analysis provides confidence that the survey data are representative of the larger population of Albertan lawyers along several key variables, such as gender and work setting.²

We restrict our sample to married lawyers who were working in law firms at the time of the survey. The analyses that follow include 740 lawyers where 69 percent ($N = 517$) are men and 31 percent are women ($N = 223$). More than half of the respondents (60 percent) had children under the age of 18 living with them at the time of the study and 28 percent had one or more preschool-aged children. On average, they worked 49 hours a week at the office, including evenings and weekends and they had close to 14 years experience practicing law, although some lawyers were in their first year of practice and others had almost 50 years of experience. The average firm size was 33 lawyers, which varied significantly with law firms consisting of between 2 and 170 lawyers.

Measures

Dependent Variable: Coworker Support. Support from one's colleagues was examined in terms of two different subscales representing the individual's perceived emotional and informational support that they received from their coworkers. *Emotional support* was measured by four items from James House (1981) where respondents indicated how often they felt the lawyers they usually talk to about the stresses of their job: listen to their work-related problems, empathize with their stresses, offer support and encouragement, and show concern ($\alpha = .88$). *Informational support* was measured by four items from House (1981) where respondents indicated how often they felt the lawyers they usually talk to about the stresses of their job: offer suggestions or solutions, share ideas or advice, share relevant difficulties they experienced in their job, and helped them to figure out how to solve a work-related problem ($\alpha = .85$). The response categories for both scales included: never (coded 1), not very often (coded 2), often (coded 3), and most of the time (coded 4). The scores were summed and divided by the number of items, where a higher mean score indicates greater perceived support.³

2. For example, in the population, 67 percent of the men worked in law firms, 16 percent as solo practitioners, 9 percent in corporations, and 7 percent in government, and in the sample, 59 percent of the male respondents worked in law firms, 24 percent as solo practitioners, 9 percent in corporations, and 7 percent in government ($\chi^2 = 4.955$, 3 *df*; $p = .175$). Similarly, for women, the provincial data show that 55 percent work in law firms, 15 percent as solo practitioners, 14 percent in corporations, and 16 percent in government, and the sample data are, respectively, 48 percent, 17 percent, 13 percent, and 16 percent ($\chi^2 = 1.229$, 3 *df*; $p = .746$).

3. It is certainly the case that two lawyers may have different frequencies of collegial interactions. Therefore, one lawyer may talk often with colleagues and most of the time s/he receives support/help. Another lawyer may engage in conversations less frequently with colleagues, and most of the time s/he receives support/help. The frequency of interactions and occasions of support lending vary between these two lawyers. Therefore the measure of perceived support reflects the *share* of interactions where discussions of stresses took place that involved positive support. For both lawyers there is a perception of considerable support received.

Independent Variables. The characteristics of the lawyers' firms are based on the respondents' self-reports and examined in terms of three variables: women's proportional representation in the firm, female partners' proportional representation in the firm, and size of the firm. Following Kanter (1977a), the proportional representation of women and female partners in the firm was determined by the percentage of female lawyers employed in the respondents' firm and/or in a partnership role. Specifically, women (partners) are *tokens* if they represent less than 15 percent of the lawyers (partners) in the firm; women (partners) represent a *minority* if they comprise 16 to 45 percent of the lawyers (partners); the gender ratios are *balanced* when women (partners) represent 46 to 55 percent of the lawyers; women (partners) are a *majority* if they represent 56 to 85 percent of the lawyers (partners); and women (partners) are *dominant* in firms if they represent 86 to 100 percent of the lawyers. In the regression analyses, the categories of balanced, majority, and dominant are collapsed into one category due to the extremely small number of cases (refer to Appendix A for a more detailed breakdown of each category).

Recently, within the legal services industry, large corporate law firms are shifting from single location, hierarchical professional partnerships to multisite service businesses with expanded geographical scope and more diversified service offerings (Greenwood and Empson 2003). We therefore include three measures reflecting this shift that have been associated with collegial processes becoming more time consuming and difficult to manage (Greenwood and Empson 2003). *Firm size* is the number of lawyers working in the respondent's firm. *More than one location* is whether (coded 1) or not (coded 0) that respondent's firm has more than one office or location. *Majority of time with corporate clients* is whether (coded 1) or not (coded 0) the respondent spends 51 percent or more of their time working with corporate clients.

Work involvement is examined in terms of four variables. Lawyers' *weekly work hours at the office* were measured by the average number of hours they work at the office in a typical week, including evenings and weekends. *Extra professional activities* refer to lawyers' involvement in job-related social activities outside of regular business hours. Respondents indicated how many times a month, on average, they attend activities that are professionally related (e.g., related to business or client development, continuing education). In order to normalize the distribution for this variable, responses were summed and coded as follows: 1 if respondents participated in extra-professional activities less than three times per month; 2 if they participated in activities between three and seven times per month; and 3 for participation in eight or more activities per month. *Work salience* was measured by three Likert items that tap the extent to which respondents feel absorbed in their work, their work is very important to them, and they are deeply committed to their work ($\alpha = .73$). The responses range from strongly disagree (coded 1) to strongly agree (coded 5). The three items were summed and divided by the number of items such that a higher mean score reflects greater work salience. *Position in firm* (*partner = 1*) is coded 1 for partners and 0 for associates.

Family involvement is examined in terms of five variables. *Time spent on housework* is the respondent's estimate of how many hours a day they spend on home chores, such as cooking, cleaning, repairs, shopping, yard work, and banking, on days that they work. *Time spent on child care* is the respondent's estimate of how many hours a day they spend with their children taking care of them, playing with them, feeding them, and other child-related responsibilities on days when they work. Those without children were assigned a score of 0. *Scaled back* is the sum of three items that asks respondents to indicate whether they have done any of the following because of responsibilities to members of their family: refused to take on additional work, refused to work late or extra hours, or cut back on their work time. If they answered yes, they received a score of 1 and if they answered no, they received a score of 0. The three items were then summed to compute a range of scores from 0 (no scaling back) to 3 (scaled back on all three items). *Taken a leave* is based on the item asking: "Since you started practicing law, have you ever taken a leave from the practice of law?" where yes is coded 1 and no is coded 0. The presence of *preschool-aged children* is coded 1 for respondents who had a child under the age of 6 living with them at the time of the survey and 0 if they did not. *Gender* is a dichotomous variable (female = 1).

Analysis

Three types of statistical analyses were used in this article: mean differences, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, and tests for moderating relationships. Mean difference tests were conducted using *t*-tests of significance to determine whether firms where women are tokens differ from firms where women are not tokens (see Table 1) and to examine gender differences across firm characteristics, work involvement, and family involvement (See Table 2). OLS regression was used to test the main effects of gender (H₁), women's proportional representation (H₂), female partners' proportional representation (H₃), lawyers' work involvement (H₄) and family involvement (H₅) on lawyers' emotional and informational support (see Table 3). Lastly, we computed a series of interaction terms to explore whether the effects of firm characteristic and work involvement or family involvement differed for women and men in terms of the amount of emotional and informational support lawyers receive from their colleagues. Cross-product gender-interaction terms were computed by multiplying the gender of the respondent with each independent variable (e.g., gender*firm women are a minority, gender*firm size, gender*work salience). Of the 16 gender interaction terms estimated for each type of support (32 gender interactions in total), only 2 significant interactions were found for emotional support and 6 were found for informational support. Given the relatively small number of statistically significant gender interactions, the regression results for women and men were pooled in Table 3. The significant gender interactions are identified and discussed where relevant in the results section below. Lastly, it should be noted that examination of the zero-order correlations and variance-inflation factors (VIFs) that were estimated for all of the variables included in the analysis (available from authors), suggests that multicollinearity is not evident for any of the variables.

Results

In our sample, 27 percent of the lawyers are employed in firms where women lawyers have a token status in their immediate work setting and over half (59 percent) of lawyers work in locations where women are the minority (see Appendix A). Only 5 percent of lawyers report that their immediate work location is relatively balanced in terms of the proportions of women and men lawyers working there, and fewer still report women are the majority (3 percent) or are dominant (2 percent) in their representation within the law firm. Table 1 allows us to compare the characteristics of law firms where women are tokens to those where they are not tokens where

Table 1 • Comparison between Characteristics of Law Firms where Women are Tokens and Women are Not Tokens

	Women are Tokens (0 to 15%)	Women are Not Tokens (16 to 100%)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
% (N) of cases	27 (N = 203)	63 (N = 590)
% partners in firm	65 (25.98)	54 (18.91)***
% female partners	3 (6.02)	18 (21.37)***
Firm size	10.89 (16.08)	40.60 (44.50)***
% more than one location (yes = 1)	20 (40.3)	52 (50.0)***
% majority of time with corporate clients (yes = 1)	29 (45.59)	53 (49.95)***
Emotional support	2.84 (.72)	2.99 (.65)**
Informational support	2.71 (.70)	2.80 (.65)*

p* < .05 *p* < .01 ****p* < .001 (one-tailed tests)

Table 2 • Mean Differences between Male and Female Lawyers

Variable	Women	Men
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Emotional support	3.13 (.63)	2.87 (.67)***
Informational support	2.93 (.65)	2.71 (.66)***
Women's firm representation		
In firm women are:		
Tokens (0–15%)	.09 (.28)	.33 (.47)***
Minority (16–45%)	.65 (.48)	.58 (.49)*
Balanced/majority/dominant (46–100%)	.22 (.41)	.05 (.21)***
In firm female partners are:		
Tokens (0–15%)	.54 (.50)	.72 (.45)***
Minority (16–45%)	.26 (.44)	.19 (.39)*
Balance/majority/dominant (46–100%)	.14 (.35)	.05 (.22)***
Firm characteristics		
Firm size (<i>N</i> of lawyers)	37.31 (43.41)	30.90 (40.18)*
More than one location (yes = 1)	.50 (.50)	.42 (.49)*
Majority of time with corporate clients (yes = 1)	.39 (.49)	.50 (.50)**
Work involvement		
Weekly work hours at office	47.17 (10.21)	50.32 (9.41)***
Extra professional activities	1.85 (.74)	2.22 (.76)***
Work salience	3.83 (.73)	3.80 (.68)
Position in firm (partner = 1)	.33 (.47)	.68 (.47)***
Family involvement		
Time spent on housework	1.93 (1.26)	1.39 (1.12)***
Time spent with children	1.62 (1.97)	1.22 (1.30)***
Scaled back	1.50 (1.25)	1.33 (1.15)*
Taken a leave	.48 (.50)	.18 (.38)***
Preschool-aged children	.27 (.45)	.28 (.45)
<i>N</i>	239	553

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (one-tailed tests)

they represent a minority, gender balanced group, majority, or dominant. A more detailed breakdown of comparisons for all five groups is contained in Appendix A.

According to Table 1, in law firms where women lawyers are tokens they are less likely to have female partners in contrast to firms where women have greater overall representation. In addition, where women are tokens, their firm employs a significantly smaller number of lawyers working in a single office or location and fewer lawyers spend the majority of their time working with corporate clients. The results also suggest that in firms where women are tokens, lawyers report receiving significantly less emotional and informational support from their colleagues than lawyers working in firms where more women are employed.

Table 2 displays the mean difference results for male and female lawyers. The results show that women overall report receiving significantly more emotional (mean = 3.13) and informational (mean = 2.93) support from their coworkers than men (means = 2.87 and 2.71, respectively). Overall, these results also reveal that the majority of female (74 percent) and male (91 percent) lawyers work in firms where women, as a group, represent either tokens or a minority. More pressing is the question of women's representation among leadership positions, as partners, in law firms. Overall, 80 percent of the women and 91 percent of the men report that female partners are tokens or minorities in comparison with male partners in their law firm.

In terms of work involvement, men compared with women work significantly longer hours, are more involved in professional activities outside of regular work hours, and are more likely to be a partner in their firm. Both men and women report similar levels of work salience. In regard to

Table 3 • OLS Regression Analysis of Firm Characteristics, Work Involvement, and Family Involvement Predicting Emotional and Informational Coworker Support

Variable	Emotional		Informational	
	Eq. 1 b(β)	Eq. 2 b(β)	Eq. 1 b(β)	Eq. 2 b(β)
Gender (female = 1)	.21 (.15)***	.19 (.13)***	.20 (.14)***	.13 (.09)*
Women's firm representation				
In firm women are:				
Minority ^a (16–45%)	-.01 (-.01)	-.03 (-.01)	-.02 (-.02)	-.03 (-.03)
Balanced/majority/dominant ^a (46–100%)	.29 (.13)**	.27 (.13)**	.17 (.08)*	.13 (.06) [†]
In firm female partners are:				
Minority ^a (16–45%)	.06 (.03)	.07 (.04)	-.01 (-.01)	.01 (.01)
Balance/majority/dominant ^a (46–100%)	-.04 (-.02)	-.03 (-.01)	-.07 (-.03)	-.04 (-.01) ^c
Firm characteristics				
Firm size (N of lawyers)	.00 (.05)	.00 (.05)	.00 (.04)	.00 (.05) ^c
More than one location (yes = 1)	-.03 (-.02)	-.04 (-.03)	-.04 (-.03)	-.07 (-.05)
Majority of time with corporate clients (yes = 1)	.12 (.09)**	.12 (.09)**	.07 (.06)	.08 (.06) ^{†c}
Work involvement				
Weekly work hours at office		-.01 (-.01)		-.00 (-.01)
Extra professional activities		.01 (.01)		.03 (.03)
Work salience		.10 (.11)**		.09 (.10)**
Position in firm (partner = 1)		-.08 (-.06)* ^b		-.17 (-.13)***
Family involvement				
Time spent on housework		-.01 (-.02)		.01 (.01)
Time spent with children		.01 (.01)		.02 (.07)* ^b
Scaled back		.00 (.01)		-.00 (-.01)
Taken a leave		-.02 (-.01) ^b		.00 (.00) ^b
Preschool-aged children		-.04 (-.03)		-.13 (-.09)* ^b
Constant	2.99***	2.70***	2.88***	2.57***
R ² (F)	.06 (5.80)***	.07 (3.34)***	.03 (3.14)***	.05 (2.52)***

^areference category is token representation (0 to 15 percent).

^bsignificant gender difference at .05.

^csignificant gender difference at .10.

[†] $p < .10$ * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (one-tailed tests)

family involvement, women spend significantly more time on household tasks and caring for their children, are more likely to have scaled back their work for family reasons, and are more likely to have taken a leave from law compared with their male counterparts. About one-quarter of both women and men in our sample report having at least one preschool-aged child at home.

Lastly, in regards to the firm characteristics, women are typically working in firms that employ more lawyers and are more likely to have more than one office or location compared to men. However, more men (50 percent) than women (39 percent) report spending the majority of their time working with corporate clients.

Table 3 presents the regression results predicting emotional and informational support received from colleagues. First, the firm characteristics were entered in Equation 1 for each form of support. Next, the work involvement and family involvement variables were added in Equation 2. Given that the findings are consistent across the two equations, the discussion will focus on the more complete results presented in Equation 2. Third, gender interactions were entered for each exogenous variable included in the model. These interactions are discussed in greater detail below.

First, contrary to H_1 , the results show that women receive significantly more emotional ($\beta = .13$) and informational support ($\beta = .09$) than do men. It was hypothesized that given women's underrepresentation in the legal profession, women would report less social integration and support from their legal colleagues than men.

In regard to women's representation in firms, lawyers working in firms that have more balanced gender ratios or where women represent the majority or dominant gender report significantly more emotional and informational support than lawyers in firms where women are tokens. It is interesting to note that these work environments are similarly supportive for both men and women. The gender interaction terms were not statistically significant for either form of support.

In addition, both male and female lawyers receive similar amounts of emotional and informational support from their colleagues in firms where women are the minority compared to firms where women are tokens. These results do not offer support for H_2 , that in firms where individual women have a greater representation as a group, they will feel greater support from their colleagues. Thus, it appears that balanced gender ratios (and even women as the majority in firms) increases coworkers' support (both emotional and informational). However, the small increase from token to minority representation affords little impact on coworkers' supportiveness. Moreover, women's increase in representation to gender balance and beyond improves emotional and information supports of *both* genders, not exclusively those of women.

Turning next to the representation of women in partnership positions, the results indicate that women's representation among partners is unrelated to the emotional support that women and men lawyers receive. This is contrary to H_3 where it was hypothesized that in firms where women in leadership positions hold token status, individual women will report less supportive relationships than their male colleagues in the firm. We also find that the flow of informational support appears unaffected by the representation of women among the partnership ranks of law firms. Yet, the interaction tests suggest that the representation of female partners does have gender-specific effects. That is, when female partners represent at minimum a balanced ratio to male partners, female lawyers' informational support is unaffected ($b = .07$, $\beta = .04$, $t = .44$), but a balanced gender ratio at the partnership level significantly reduces the amount of informational support male lawyers report ($b = -.20$, $\beta = -.07$, $t = -1.47$) in comparison with those working in firms where female partners are tokens. Thus, when male partners represent token or a minority presence in the firm, male lawyers receive significantly less support than when they represent a more balanced or larger proportion of partners in the firm. It should be noted, however, that a very small number of the male lawyers ($N = 29$) are actually in this situation where male partners represent tokens or a minority in the firm.

Turning next to the firm characteristics, male lawyers appear to benefit from working in larger firms as they report receiving more informational support from their colleagues in these environments ($b = .00$, $\beta = .08$, $t = 1.52$). Female lawyers, however, do not reap the same benefit from working in larger firms ($b = .00$, $\beta = .03$, $t = .12$). Lawyers who spend the majority of their time working with corporate clients perceive more emotional and informational support from their colleagues. Yet this effect is gendered. The significant gender interaction reveals that male lawyers report significantly more informational support if they spend the majority of their time working with corporate clients ($b = .10$, $\beta = .08$, $t = 1.56$), whereas women do not ($b = .04$, $\beta = .04$, $t = .47$). Recall that male lawyers are more likely to have corporate clients. Men also accrue benefits of information sharing from colleagues when their time is devoted primarily to corporate clients. Finally, working in a firm that has multiple offices is unrelated to the amount of support lawyers receive from their colleagues.

The results also show that work involvement is related to the amount of support lawyers receive from their colleagues. As predicted, the more important work is to a lawyer, the more emotional and informational support he or she will receive, consistent with H_4 . Recall, that men and women lawyers did not differ in their work involvement in regards to the salience of their work. Partners appear to receive less emotional and informational support than associates.

However, the amount of emotional support received by associates and partners depends on the lawyer's gender. More specifically, the amount of emotional support women receive is unrelated to their position in the firm ($b = .10$, $\beta = .07$, $t = .96$) whereas for men, partners receive significantly less emotional support than associates ($b = -.13$, $\beta = -.09$, $t = -1.99$). The negative impact of being a partner on how much support is received from one's colleagues may reflect career stage, whereby associates are more likely to seek out support and guidance and also are expected to require considerable direction, while partners, more experienced and in positions of leadership and decision making, have reached a stage where these particular forms of support are less often sought and/or offered. Approximately twice as many men are partners compared with women and this may partly account for why men receive less support than women. Lastly, work hours and participation in extra professional activities, both of which men are more involved in than women, do not appear related to lawyers' supportiveness, either emotional or informational.

In regard to family involvement, several significant gender interactions were revealed. The only family-related variable related to colleagues' emotional supportiveness is whether or not the lawyer has taken a leave from law. More specifically, taking a leave reduces the amount of emotional support women receive ($b = -.13$, $\beta = -.11$, $t = -1.29$), whereas leaves have no impact on how much emotional support men receive ($b = .07$, $\beta = .04$, $t = .97$). It is interesting to note that the men and women in this sample differ in the reasons for their leaves from law practice. The most popular reasons for men taking a leave from law are travel (55 percent), followed by career changes (such as starting up their own business or firm, or being seconded to a position in business or politics outside the practice of law) (18 percent), and education upgrading and training (e.g., graduate degrees in law or business administration) (8 percent). The most popular reason for women is family reasons such as maternity or adoption leaves (71 percent), whereas only 2 percent of the men who had taken a leave from law did so for family reasons.

In addition, three family-related variables have gender specific effects in regard to informational support. For men, spending more time with their children on workdays ($b = .06$, $\beta = .11$, $t = 2.13$) or taking a leave from law ($b = .10$, $\beta = .06$, $t = 1.34$) results in greater informational support from their colleagues. In contrast, time with children during workdays and leaves offer no enhanced communication or support for women ($b = .00$, $\beta = .01$, $t = .09$; $b = -.01$, $\beta = -.01$, $t = -.11$, respectively). For both women and men, having preschool-aged children reduces the amount of informational support they receive from their colleagues, but the effect is more than twice as large for women ($b = -.24$, $\beta = -.17$, $t = -1.84$) than men ($b = -.11$, $\beta = -.08$, $t = -1.47$).

Discussion and Conclusions

This article set out to explore tokenism and the implications for women's growing representation in traditionally male-dominated professions such as law. Several findings are intriguing. First, contrary to the predictions of Kanter's structural theory and our first hypothesis, women reported receiving significantly more emotional and informational support from their colleagues than did men. This pattern is, however, consistent with the broader social support literature that shows that women are more likely to seek out and receive more social support than men (Thoits 1995). In the situation of women working in law, this finding may be the result of women's lower hierarchical position in law firms—the majority of women work as junior lawyers or associates, rather than as partners or co-owners of law firms. As more junior members of organizations, women may be more likely to seek and be offered greater support by their senior colleagues who guide and mentor them in the early stages of their careers (Kay and Wallace 2010).

Part of this dynamic may also lie with expectation states theory. Perhaps female lawyers receive more support because they are perceived as less competent and therefore expected to need greater supervision and direction in conducting their work assignments, regardless of hierarchical rank. Men and women's self-presentation styles may also provide indirect cues as to performance level and needed support. Thus, a man who is self-promoting about his abilities and a

woman who is modest about hers may both reinforce their expected status order based on gender beliefs (Foschi and Valenzuela 2008:1023). Future research should explore factors motivating offers of support, the content of those interactions, and the consequent evaluative interpretations of support received in the course of executing work tasks.

However, given women's representation in firms, clustered predominantly in the junior ranks, it is likely that much of this support that is offered is *lateral*, with women receiving more support from other women in junior positions, and in part, because women also lend more support. Women may engage in niche seeking and niche building among coworkers, through advice giving and friendship, and these interactions offer bounded solidarity among other women in structurally equivalent positions within male-dominated law firms (Lazega 2001). Thus, women may receive more support because they have more reciprocally supportive relationships with women coworkers in their firms.

Further, some work suggests that jobs are segregated, with women performing more of the "emotional labor" (Guy and Newman 2004). Women lawyers may find themselves in firms bearing the staple responsibility for organizational citizenship functions, the emotional labor of tending to others, and the maintenance of "precarious values" of the firm (Lazega 2001:15). Again, gender beliefs and expectations about women's roles may shape women's responsibilities for communication and support lending within the firm.

Another possibility is that women hold a lower sense of entitlement and lower expectations in the workplace than do men (Babcock and Laschever 2003; Graham and Welbourne 1999) and therefore women perceive the workplace to be more supportive than men, all else being equal (Taylor 2010). Therefore, it may be that women's assessments of the coworker support they receive is generous—women may simply expect little and be grateful for any information that is shared and any gestures of understanding and emotional support offered. Future research will benefit by unpacking distinctions between workers' own perceptions of the support they receive (freely given or provided in response to requests for help), supervisors' and coworkers' perceptions of support given to others, as well as the frequency of specific supportive behaviors over the course of a workweek.

Women's Representation in Firms

We also predicted that if women as a group hold a token status in the firm, then individual women in the firm would report less supportive relationships than men in the firm. Our results reveal that lawyers generally benefit with enhanced emotional and informational support from colleagues in firms that have balanced gender ratios or where women represent the majority or dominant gender. These gains in emotional and informational support occur when women exceed the 50 percent mark in firms. These gains are not gender specific, contrary to our hypothesis, as *both* women and men benefit from the collegial support that follows. However, little impact on support responses transpires when the shift takes place at the low levels of token to minority representation of women in firms.

As indicated above, our results show that women in general receive more support from their colleagues than men. The pattern of "support diffusion" is consistent with the gender socialization explanation of the support gap, such that women typically offer, provide, and receive more support than men (Greenglass 2002; Schieman 2006). Research demonstrates that across home and work life, women do, and are expected to do, more "emotion work" to support others (Minnotte et al. 2010). Our finding that lawyers generally receive more emotional support when firms move toward balanced gender ratios is not only about the decline of tokenism effects in firms where women reach a "tipping point." This shift may also be related to changes in the work environment due to status expectations of workers (i.e., women) who have reached that tipping point. Matt Huffman and colleagues (2010) report a similar tipping point pattern where segregation levels in nonmanagerial positions are lower in establishments that have a greater representation of women in managerial positions, up to 50 percent, above which the level of segregations increases

or levels out. We argue that status expectations interact with numerical representation to change organizational cultures in important ways.

Women's increased managerial representation, however, may be a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the integration of women in male-dominated workplaces and professions (Huffman et al. 2010; Zimmer 1988). While we found that women's overall representation in firms increased the emotional and informational support received by both genders, the effects of women's increased managerial representation was inconsequential for women's informational support and detrimental to the informational support received by men. This is contrary to our third hypothesis where we predicted that women would report less supportive relationships than men when women were underrepresented at the decision-making level of partners of the firm. This finding, however, confirms the notion raised above that merely increasing numbers is not enough, even when these increases take place at the upper echelons of organizations. Our research also suggests that we need to more closely examine women's representation in the top organizational tiers to better understand why it is that women's increased managerial representation does not significantly affect the supportiveness of coworker ties or correct professionals' perceptions and beliefs about women leaders (Huffman et al. 2010). Female partners do not appear to be change agents, practicing homosocial reproduction that would increase hiring of women and enhance mobility prospects of women in their firms (Maume 2011). Nonetheless, the actual representation of women in partnership positions was relatively small in our sample and it may be that with greater representation among organizational leaders, women may reach that tipping point where they have "potential allies amongst each other, can form coalitions, and can affect the culture of the group" (Kanter 1977a:209).

In traditionally masculine professions, a greater presence of women may influence workplace culture in several ways. Growing diversity within law firms may prompt more frequent and direct communication patterns, particularly in the forms of emotional and informational support. Research on the "feminization of medicine" finds female physicians share different communication and interpersonal styles than male physicians and women are particularly effective team players and encourage others to work as a team in the delivery of care to patients (Levinson and Lurie 2004). EST suggests that women are expected to bring these qualities of communal team work, empathy, and nurturing interpersonal style, regardless of whether as individuals they actually possess these communication styles. But it is also possible that growing diversity in the demographics of law firms has prompted policy discussions regarding parental leaves, part-time work arrangements, and issues of discrimination. As a presence within firms, women may have played a role in stimulating policy changes and consequent cultural shifts within law firms. A question for further research is to what extent this cultural shift of increased support exchanges among colleagues may benefit not only individual careers but also the success of firms. Possible gains to the firm may include more satisfied employees, higher productivity, and retention of legal talent.

Family Involvement

Family involvements continue to pose a considerable challenge for women in law. As hypothesized, taking a leave, most often a maternity leave, results in women receiving less emotional support from colleagues, whereas men who take leaves, often for travel, career changes, or education, suffer no comparable loss of support. In fact, taking a leave is related to *greater informational* support for men, as is spending time with their children on workdays. Recall that our measures focus on coworker support received in response to job-related issues, not work-family related or personal concerns. Therefore, the losses (and gains) here may be especially relevant to one's reintegration to work responsibilities.

Men who take leaves or spend more time with their children during the work week receive more support from colleagues in the form of receiving advice or suggestions in dealing with their work-related problems, while women in similar circumstances are not extended the same information or advice. In taking leaves, men may be viewed as engaging in gender

appropriate behavior because they are seen as investing in their careers by broadening their contacts and experiences through travel, politics, and corporate work, initiating new career opportunities, or upgrading their training. Colleagues may be more receptive to providing informational support to those whom they see as advancing careers and contacts professionally. By contrast, women who depart the firm for a period of weeks or months on maternity leave may be viewed as making a choice to invest in family, an engagement seen as without value to the firm. Such leaves also reinforce gender beliefs about women's primary obligations as mothers and undermine women's status as an "ideal" professional who is willing to put the personal on hold for the employer and without interruptions from home (Blair-Loy 2003; Wallace 2004).

When men and women attend to their children's needs or events during the work week, the interpretation may play out in a different fashion. Men may be viewed as exceptional (outside of expectation states) and their actions perceived as a gesture of dedicated parenting rather than a distraction from work. Therefore, men may receive additional support in the forms of valuable information on cases and clients to keep them "up to speed" to deal with the stresses of their job. By contrast, when women devote time on weekdays to their children's activities, these behaviors are likely to reinforce widely held cultural beliefs about a mother's primary dedication to her children over her professional career, and therefore underline the perceived lower professional commitment of women (Wallace 2004). As a result, colleagues may view women as undeserving of enhanced informational support that might assist them in keeping pace at work following time spent with their children.

A growing body of evidence suggests that employers reward men for being fathers and penalize women for being mothers (Benard and Correll 2010; Budig and Hodges 2010; Correll et al. 2007; Crittenden 2001; Roth 2006). The same dynamic may play out as colleagues respond toward men and women with preschool-aged children. Young children may be interpreted by fellow lawyers as "status cues," indicating a lack of career commitment on the part of women (but not of men). Thus, women incur a heavier penalty in terms of informational support during the life stage of having young children. Furthermore, while both women and men lose some *informational* support from colleagues when they have preschool-aged children, the effect is twice as large for women. This loss of support may be a result of expectation states and beliefs about gender roles, where the responsibilities of young children are perceived as competing with women's professional commitments, and therefore women receive less information and guidance from their colleagues in attempting to cope with work-related stresses and challenges. This penalty may be moderated by sexual orientation. Some research suggests that lesbians suffer fewer penalties than heterosexual women when they have parenting commitments (Peplau and Fingerhut 2004). These patterns of findings deserve further attention in terms of exploring lawyers' support-seeking behaviors, as well as their colleagues' assumptions and beliefs about the relevance of providing support to those attempting to balance work and family demands.

In closing, several limitations of this should be noted. One limitation is the cross-sectional design, which does not allow us to determine the causal ordering of linkages among the variables in the model. Second, the data are based on subjective self-reports based on the perceptions of individual lawyers. Third, this article focused on a single, high-status, professional occupation, namely law firm lawyers. Some of the findings presented in this article may be limited to this particular occupation or high status professionals more broadly. In settings other than law firms, where the path to top organizational leadership is less clearly delineated, information flows and support offering may transpire primarily laterally among coworkers within and across departments or from immediate supervisors. Future research should explore the extent to which information sharing and the lending of support occurs more often as vertical (downward) flows in hierarchical organizations versus lateral exchanges in flatter organizational structures. Also, how do women as tokens and minorities fair with regard to perceptions of informational and emotional support in flatter, less hierarchical organizations? Are these organizations more welcoming to women professionals?

Despite these caveats, the results of this study make several important contributions to our understanding of women's underrepresentation in professional occupations and women's career

advancement within traditionally male-majority professions. Women's growing representation within law firms appears to bring enhanced communication and stronger coworker ties through informational and emotional support, benefiting both men and women lawyers. This finding underscores the importance of evaluating both composition and structural positions of groups in assessing the support outcomes of diversity in the workplace (Dickerson et al. 2010:64). Yet, women's increased representation, from tokens to greater gender balance, has done little to dislodge the expectation states associated with women as lawyers and to reduce the professional disadvantage women face as lawyers with family responsibilities. It appears that women's growing overall representation in law firms is related to workplace cultures characterized by productive, supportive relationships amongst colleagues and organizational climates that are more family friendly. Yet, interestingly, women's inroads to the upper echelons of law firms have not produced the catalyst for more profound organizational change in the form of support for women professionals managing careers and family responsibilities. Women's advances to firm partnerships have been modest to date and organizational cultures may be a key underpinning here (Wallace and Leicht 2004). That is to suggest, an unwelcoming organizational culture may be responsible for both the lack of work support offered to women, particularly those with family responsibilities, and this support deficit may also reflect a dimension of the glass ceiling that limits women's promotion prospects within firms (Benard and Correll 2010). Conversely, law firms with supportive organizational cultures are more likely to attract, retain, and promote women to partnerships. One thing is for certain: The organizational climate remains resistant on this front—women professionals have yet to receive levels of support comparable to what their male colleagues receive when they take leaves, spend time on child-related responsibilities, and while raising young children generally.

Appendix A • Characteristics of Respondents' Employment Settings

	Women are Tokens (0–15%)	Women are Minority (16–45%)	Gender Balance (46–55%)	Women are Majority (56–85%)	Women are Dominant (86–100%)
% partners in firm	65	55	54	53	57
% female partners	3	14	35	40	87
Average firm size	11	43	20	14	3
% more than 1 location	20	54	33	29	33
% spend majority of time with corporate clients	29	55	45	25	17
Emotional support (M,SD)	2.84 (.72)	2.94 (.65)	3.22 (.61)	3.43 (.51)	3.18 (.66)
Informational support (SD)	2.71 (.70)	2.77 (.65)	2.83 (.69)	3.31 (.55)	2.99 (.63)
<i>N</i> = 740					
% (<i>N</i>) of cases	27 (<i>N</i> = 203)	59 (<i>N</i> = 468)	5 (<i>N</i> = 39)	3 (<i>N</i> = 20)	2 (<i>N</i> = 10)

References

- Allmendinger, Jutta and Richard J. Hackman. 1995. "The More the Better? A Four-Nation Study of the Inclusion of Women in Symphony Orchestras." *Social Forces* 74(2):423–60.
- American Bar Association. 2011. *Enrollment and Degrees Awarded 1963-2008 Academic Years*. Retrieved July 7, 2011 (www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/legaled/statistics/charts/stats_1.pdf-2011-03-14).
- American Bar Association, Commission on Women in the Profession. 2011. *A Current Glance at Women in Law 2011*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association.
- Anseel, Frederick, Filip Lievens, Eveline Schollaert, and Beata Choragwicka. 2010. "Response Rates in Organizational Science, 1995-2008: A Meta-Analytic Review and Guidelines for Survey Researchers." *Journal of Business Psychology* 25:335–49.

- Babcock, Linda and Sarah Laschever. 2003. *Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the Gender Divide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Becker-Blease, John R., Susan Elkinawy, and Mark Stater. 2010. "The Impact of Gender on Voluntary and Involuntary Executive Departure." *Economic Inquiry* 48(4):1102–18.
- Beckman, Christine. M. and Damon J. Phillips. 2005. "Interorganizational Determinants of Promotion: Client Leadership and the Attainment of Women Attorneys." *American Sociological Review* 70(4):678–701.
- Benard, Stephen and Shelley J. Correll. 2010. "Normative Discrimination and the Motherhood Penalty." *Gender & Society* 24(5):616–46.
- Beutal, Ann M. and Margaret Mooney Marini. 1995. "Gender and Values." *American Sociological Review* 60(3):536–48.
- Bielby, Denise D. and William T. Bielby. 1988. "She Works Hard for the Money: Household Responsibilities and the Allocation of Work Effort." *American Journal of Sociology* 93(5):1031–59.
- Blair-Loy, Mary. 2003. *Competing Devotions: Career and Family among Women Executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Bolton, Sharon C. and Daniel Muzio. 2007. "Can't Live with 'Em; Can't Live without 'Em: Gendered Segmentation in the Legal Profession." *Sociology* 41(1):47–64.
- . 2008. "The Paradoxical Processes of Feminization in the Professions: The Case of Established, Aspiring and Semi-Professions." *Work, Employment and Society* 22(2):281–99.
- Budig, Michelle and M. Hodges. 2010. "Differences in Disadvantage: Variation in the Motherhood Penalty across White Women's Earnings Distribution." *American Sociological Review* 75:705–28.
- Budig, Michelle J. and Paula England. 2001. "The Wage Penalty for Motherhood." *American Sociological Review* 66:204–225.
- Burke, Peter J., Jan E. Stets, and Christine Cerven. 2007. "Gender, Legitimation, and Identity Verification in Groups." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70(1):27–42.
- Burleson, Brant R., Lisa K. Hanasono, Graham D. Bodie, Amanda J. Holmstrom, Jennifer D. McCullough, Jessica J. Rack, and Jennifer Gill Rosier. 2011. "Are Gender Differences in Responses to Supportive Communication a Matter of Ability, Motivation, or Both? Reading Patterns of Situation Effects through the Lens of Dual-Process Theory." *Communication Quarterly* 59(1):37–60.
- Carbado, Devon W. and Mitu Gulati. 2004. "Race to the Top of the Corporate Ladder: What Minorities do When They Get There." *Washington and Lee Law Review* 61(4):1645–93.
- Castilla, Emilio J. 2008. "Gender, Race, and Meritocracy in Organizational Careers." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(6):1479–1526.
- Chambliss, Elizabeth and Christopher Uggen. 2000. "Men and Women of Elite Law Firms: Reevaluating Kanter's Legacy." *Law & Social Inquiry* 25(1):41–68.
- Correll, Shelley, Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2007. "Getting a Job? Is There a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology* 112:1297–338.
- Crittenden, Ann. 2001. *The Price of Motherhood: Why the Most Important Job in the World is Still the Least Valued*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Crompton, Rosemary and Clare Lyonette. 2011. "Women's Career Success and Work-Life Adaptations in the Accountancy and Medical Professions in Britain." *Gender, Work & Organization* 18(2):231–54.
- Cuddy, Amy J. C., Susan T. Fiske, and Peter Glick. 2004. "When Professionals Become Mothers, Warmth Doesn't Cut the Ice." *Journal of Social Issues* 60(4):701–18.
- Davies, Celia. 1996. "The Sociology of Professions and the Profession of Gender." *Sociology* 30(4):661–78.
- Dencker, John C. 2008. "Corporate Restructuring and Sex Differences in Managerial Promotion." *American Sociological Review* 73(3):455–76.
- Dickerson, Niki, Lisa Schur, Douglas Kruse, and Joseph Blasi. 2010. "Worksite Segregation and Performance-Related Attitudes." *Work and Occupations* 37(1):45–72.
- Ely, Robin J. 1995. "The Power of Demography: Women's Social Construction of Gender Identity at Work." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(3):589–634.
- Federation of Law Societies of Canada. 2010. *2009 Statistical Report*. Ottawa, ON: Federation of Law Societies of Canada.
- Fiske, Susan T., Amy J. C. Cuddy, Peter Glick, and Jun Xu. 2002. "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 82(4):878–902.
- Floge, Liliane and Deborah M. Merrill. 1986. "Tokenism Reconsidered: Male Nurses and Female Physicians in a Hospital Setting." *Social Forces* 64(4):925–47.

- Foschi, Martha. 2009. "Gender, Performance Level, and Competence Standards in Task Groups." *Social Science Research* 33:447–57.
- Foschi, Martha and Jerilee Valenzuela. 2008. "Selecting Job Applicants: Effects from Gender, Self-Presentation, and Decision Type." *Social Science Research* 37:1022–38.
- Glass, Jennifer L. 1990. "The Impact of Occupational Segregation on Working Conditions." *Social Forces* 68(3):779–96.
- Gorman, Elizabeth H. 2005. "Gender Stereotypes, Same-Gender Preferences, and Organizational Variation in the Hiring of Women: Evidence from Law Firms." *American Sociological Review* 70:702–28.
- . 2006. "Work Uncertainty and the Promotion of Professional Women: The Case of Law Firm Partnership." *Social Forces* 85:864–90.
- Gorman, Elizabeth H. and Julie A. Kmec 2009. "Hierarchical Rank and Women's Organizational Mobility: Glass Ceilings in Corporate Law Firms." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(5):1428–74.
- Graham, Mary E. and Theresa M. Welbourne. 1999. "Gainsharing and Women's and Men's Relative Pay Satisfaction." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 20:1027–42.
- Greenglass, Esther. 2002. "Work Stress, Coping, and Social Support: Implications for Women's Occupational Well-Being." Pp. 85–96 in *Gender, Work Stress, and Health*, edited by Debra L. Nelson and Ronald J. Burke. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Greenwood, Royston and Laura Empson. 2003. "The Professional Partnership: Relic or Exemplary Form of Governance?" *Organization Studies* 24:909–34.
- Guy, Mary E. and Meredith A. Newman. 2004. "Women's Jobs, Men's Jobs: Sex Segregation and Emotional Labor." *Public Administration Review* 64(3):289–98.
- Hays, Sharon. 1996. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Heilman, Madeline E. 2001. "Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent up the Organizational Ladder." *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4):657–74.
- Heilman, Madeline E., Aaron S. Wallen, Daniella Fuchs, and Melinda M. Tamkins. 2004. "Penalties for Success: Reactions to Women who Succeed at Male Gender-Typed Tasks." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89:416–27.
- Hewstone, Miles, Richard J. Crisp, Alberta Constarello, Alberto Voci, Laura Conway, Giorgia Marletta, and Hazel Willis. 2006. "Tokens in the Tower: Perceptual Processes and Interaction Dynamics in Academic Settings with 'Skewed,' 'Tilted,' and 'Balanced' Sex Ratios." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 9(4):509–32.
- House, James S. 1981. *Work Stress and Social Support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Huffman, Matt L., Philip N. Cohen, and Jessica Pearlman. 2010. "Engendering Change: Organizational Dynamics and Workplace Gender Desegregation, 1975–2005." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55:255–77.
- Irvine, Leslie and Jenny R. Vermilya. 2010. "Gender Work in a Feminized Profession: The Case of Veterinary Medicine." *Gender & Society* 24(1):56–82.
- Kalkhoff, Will and Shane R. Thye. 2006. "Expectation States Theory and Research: New Observations from Meta-Analysis." *Sociological Methods Research* 35:219–48.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1976. "The Impact of Hierarchical Structures on the Work Behavior of Women and Men." *Social Problems* 23(4):415–30.
- . 1977a. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1977b. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(5):965–90.
- Kay, Fiona M. and Elizabeth H. Gorman. 2012. "Developmental Practices, Organizational Culture, and Minority Representation in Organizational Leadership: The Case of Partners in Large U.S. Law Firms." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 639:91–113.
- Kay, Fiona M. and John Hagan. 1998. "Raising the Bar: The Gender Stratification of Law Firm Capitalization." *American Sociological Review* 63:728–43.
- Kay, Fiona M. and Jean E. Wallace. 2009. "Mentors as Social Capital: Gender, Mentor Capitalization, and Career Rewards in Law Practice." *Sociological Inquiry* 79:418–52.
- . 2010. "Is More Truly Merrier?: Mentoring and the Practice of Law." *Canadian Review of Sociology* 47:1–26.
- Kmec, Julie A. 2011. "Are Motherhood Penalties and Fatherhood Bonuses Warranted? Comparing Pro-Work Behaviors and Conditions of Mothers, Fathers, and Non-Parents." *Social Science Research* 40:444–59.
- Lazega, Emmanuel. 2001. *The Collegial Phenomenon: The Social Mechanisms of Cooperation among Peers in a Corporate Law Partnership*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Levinson, Wendy and Nicole Lurie. 2004. "When Most Doctors are Women: What Lies Ahead?" *Annals of Internal Medicine* 141(6):471–74.
- Longo, Patrizia and Clifford J. Strahley. 2008. "Whack! I've Hit the Glass Ceiling! Women's Efforts to Gain Status in Surgery." *Gender Medicine* 5(1):88–100.
- López, María P. 2008. "The Future of Women in the Legal Profession: Recognizing the Challenges Ahead by Reviewing Current Trends." *Hastings Women's Law Journal* 19:53–104.
- Lyness, Karen S. and Christine A. Schrader. 2006. "Moving Ahead or Just Moving? An Examination of Gender Differences in Senior Corporate Management Appointments." *Group and Organization Management* 31(6):651–76.
- Madjar, Nora. 2008. "Emotional and Informational Support from Different Sources and Employee Creativity." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 81:83–100.
- Major, Debra. A., Thomas D. Fletcher, Donald D. Davis, and Lisa M. Germano. 2008. "The Influence of Work-Family Culture and Workplace Relationships on Work Interference with Family: A Multilevel Model." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 29(7):881–97.
- Maume, David J. 2011. "Meet the New Boss . . . Same as the Old Boss? Female Supervisors and Subordinate Career Prospects." *Social Science Research* 40:287–98.
- McBrier, Debra. 2003. "Gender and Career Dynamics within a Segmented Professional Labor Market: The Case of Law Academia." *Social Forces* 81(4):1201–66.
- McDonald, Theodore W., Loren L. Toussaint, and Jennifer A. Schweiger A. 2004. "The Influence of Social Status on Token Women Leaders' Expectations about Leading Male-Dominated Groups." *Sex Roles* 50(5):401–9.
- McKenzie Leiper, Jean. 2006. *Bar Codes: Women in the Legal Profession*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.
- McMurray, Julia E., Graham Angus, May Cohen, Paul Gavel, John Harding, John Horvath, Elisabeth Paice, Julie Schmittiel, and Kevin Grumbach. 2002. "Women in Medicine: A Four-Nation Comparison." *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association* 57(4):185–90.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:415–44.
- McTague, Tricia, Kevin Stainback, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2009. "An Organizational Approach to Understanding Sex and Race Segregation in U.S. Workplaces." *Social Forces* 87(3):1499–527.
- Minnotte, Krista Lynn, Daphne Pedersen, and Susan E. Mannon. 2010. "The Emotional Terrain of Parenting and Marriage: Emotion Work and Marital Satisfaction." *The Social Science Journal* 47:747–61.
- Pazy, Asya and Israela Oron. 2001. "Sex Proportion and Performance Evaluation among High-Ranking Military Officers." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22:689–702.
- Peplau, Leticia Anne and Adam Fingerhut. 2004. "The Paradox of the Lesbian Worker." *Journal of Social Issues* 60(4):719–35.
- Percheski, Christine. 2008. "Opting Out? Cohort Differences in Professional Women's Employment Rates from 1960 to 2005." *American Sociological Review* 73(3):497–517.
- Pierce, Jennifer L. 1995. *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2001a. "The Emergence of Status Beliefs: From Structural Inequality to Legitimizing Ideology." Pp. 257–77 in *The Psychology of Legitimacy*, edited by John T. Jost and Brenda Major. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2001b. "Gender, Status, and Leadership." *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4):637–55.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations." *Gender & Society* 18(4):510–31.
- . 2006. "Consensus and the Creation of Status Beliefs." *Social Forces* 85(1):431–53.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L., Cathryn Johnson, and David Diekema. 1994. "External Status, Legitimacy, and Compliance in Male and Female Groups." *Social Forces* 72:1051–77.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1999. "The Gender System and Interaction." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:191–216.
- Roth, Louise M. 2004. "The Social Psychology of Tokenism: Status and Homophily Processes on Wall Street." *Sociological Perspectives* 47(2):189–214.
- . 2006. *Selling Women Short: Gender Inequality on Wall Street*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schwartz, Felice N. 1989. "Management Women and the New Facts of Life." *Harvard Business Review* 67(1):65–76.
- Schieman, Scott. 2006. "Gender, Dimensions of Work, and Supportive Coworker Relations." *Sociological Quarterly* 47(2):195–214.

- Smith, Ryan A. and James R. Elliott. 2002. "Does Ethnic Concentration Influence Employees' Access to Authority? An Examination of Contemporary Urban Labor Markets." *Social Forces* 81(1):255–79.
- Sommerlad, Hilary. 2007. "Researching and Theorizing the Processes of Professional Identity Formation." *Journal of Law & Society* 34(2):190–217.
- Sørensen, Jesper B. 2004. "The Organizational Demography of Racial Employment Segregation." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(3):626–71.
- Stitchman, Amy J., Kimberly D. Hassell, and Carol A. Archbold. 2010. "Strength in Numbers? A Test of Kanter's Theory of Tokenism." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38:633–39.
- Stone, Pamela. 2007. *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stone, Pamela and C. Meares. 2008. "Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics* 19(4):443–45.
- Taylor, Catherine J. 2010. "Occupational Sex Composition and the Gendered Availability of Workplace Support." *Gender & Society* 24(2):189–212.
- Thoits, Peggy A. 1995. "Stress, Coping, and Social Support Processes: Where Are We? What Next?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 36:53–79.
- Wallace, Jean E. 2004. "Motherhood and Career Commitment to the Legal Profession." Pp. 219–46 in *Research in the Sociology of Work, Volume 14: Workforce Diversity*, edited by Nancy DiTomaso and Corrine Post. New York: JAI Press/Elsevier Science.
- . 2008. "Parenthood and Commitment in the Legal Profession: Are Mothers Less Committed Than Fathers?" *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 29(3):478–95.
- Wallace, Michael and Kevin T. Leicht. 2004. "Culture Wars in the Workplace? Cultural Antecedents of Workers' Job Entitlement." *Work and Occupations* 31(1):3–37.
- Westphal, James D. and Laurie P. Milton. 2000. "How Experience and Network Ties Affect the Influence of Demographic Minorities on Corporate Boards." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 45(2):366–98.
- Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2009. "Racializing the Glass Escalator: Reconsidering Men's Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender & Society*, 23(1):5–26.
- Williams, Joan. 2001. *Unbending Gender: Why Work and Family Conflict and What to Do About It*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wu, Tsung-Yu and Changya Hu. 2009. "Abusive Supervision and Employee Emotional Exhaustion: Dispositional Antecedents and Boundaries." *Group & Organization Management* 34(2):143–69.
- Yoder, Janice D. 1991. "Rethinking Tokenism: Looking Beyond Numbers." *Gender & Society* 5:178–92.
- Young, Marisa C. and Jean E. Wallace. 2009. "Family Responsibilities, Productivity, and Earnings: A Study of Gender Differences among Canadian Lawyers." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 30:305–19.
- Zimmer, Lynn. 1988. "Tokenism and Women in the Workplace: The Limits of Gender-Neutral Theory." *Social Problems* 35:64–77.