View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by KU ScholarWorks

THE FACE OF THE STATE:
THE ROLE OF SOCIAL STATUS AND OFFICIAL POSITION IN THE MOBILIZATION OF AUTHORITY

BY

Copyright 2008

Shannon Portillo

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Public Administration and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Committee:

Charles Epp, Chairperson

H. George Frederickson

Steven Maynard-Moody

Leisha DeHart-Davis

Glenn Adams

Date defended:___4/16/08___

The Dissertation Committee for Shannon Portillo
certifies that this is the approved version of the following
dissertation:

THE FACE OF THE STATE:
THE ROLE OF SOCIAL STATUS AND OFFICIAL
POSITION IN THE MOBILIZATION OF AUTHORITY

Committee:

Charles Epp, Chairperson

H. George Frederickson

Steven Maynard-Moody

Leisha DeHart-Davis

Glenn Adams

Date approved:______4/24/08_____

THE FACE OF THE STATE:
THE ROLE OF SOCIAL STATUS AND OFFICIAL POSITION
IN THE MOBILIZATION OF AUTHORITY[1]
BY
Shannon Portillo

Abstract:

Social status as a cultural institution has a remarkable degree of continuing power, even in bureaucratic settings that are formally committed to office, merit and professional norms. Social status originates outside of organizations and has effects society-wide, but it continues to permeate public bureaucracies in subtle and explicit ways. This project extends research on the mobilization of law by examining how social identity and status influence the conceptualization and mobilization of authority in policing and city administration. As more women and racial and ethnic minorities enter government employment, a growing number of public officials confront what may be called a power paradox, a condition in which a person has high official status but lacks traditional social status and in which the mobilization of authority may be especially problematic. For instance, when a Latina police officer stops an older white male for a traffic violation she clearly enjoys official status and legal authority, but the older white male driver may claim higher social status. Results from narratives collected from officials in policing and city administration regarding challenges they faced to their authority indicate that public officials conceptualize and mobilize their authority in fundamentally different ways depending on their social status. Public officials with traditionally high social status describe their authority as coming from their social status and typically respond to challenges to their authority in assertive ways. Public officials with low social status describe experiencing more challenges to their authority than their middle-aged and older white male counterparts. In order to mobilize their authority, or even prove that they have authority, public officials with low social status must highlight their official status and disassociate themselves from their social status. But, doing so, in itself, makes public officials with traditionally low social status seem “rule bound,” “bitchy,” “inflexible,” and the like. These instances represent the *paradox of* rules - rules and laws serve as powerfully resources for public officials, but resources that come with costs. Public officials with traditionally low social status actively avoid explicit discussions of their power paradox or the paradox of rules, even with each other, since acknowledging them would draw additional attention to the problem and make the mobilization of their authority increasingly difficult. The implications for normative theoretical arguments in Public Administration public organizations may be significant. The use of rules by public officials with traditionally low social status shines new light on arguments in favor of streamlining rules or cutting “red tape.” Additionally, social status may affect the

[1] This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. SES 0715298. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

retention and promotion of racial and ethnic minorities and women in public organizations.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction…………………………………………………………...5

Chapter 2: Methods and Study Design……………………………………………….38

Chapter 3: Proving Authority: Sources of Authority and Social Status……………...55

Chapter 4: Challenges to Authority…………………………………………………..90

Chapter 5: Strategies for Mobilizing Authority and Responding to Challenges to Authority………………………………………………………………………118

Chapter 6: Conclusion………………………………………………………………152

Tables
- Table 2.1: Respondents Social and Official Status…………………………170
- Table 3.1: Proving Authority by Social Status…………………………….. 173
- Table 3.2: Sources of Authority……………………………………………174
- Table 4.1: Challenges to Authority……………………………………….... 176
- Table 4.2: Type of Challenge Identified in Interviews by Social Status …...178
- Table 5.1: Strategies for Mobilizing Authority……………………………..179
- Table 5.2: Strategies Mobilized by Social Status…………………………...181
- Table 5.3: Strategies Mobilized by Challenge and Social Status…………...182

Works Cited ……………………………………………………………………….. 183

Chapter 1: Introduction

Sharon[2] is a well educated and experienced assistant city manager of a midsized, affluent suburban city. She has spent 17 years with her current city moving up in management positions. In her current role, Sharon is responsible for overseeing the police department of her city. As part of her professional role Sharon managed the search for a new chief of police. The top applicant for the position was invited in for a few days of interviews. After meeting with several citizen and staff committees and passing a battery of psychological tests, the interviewee was asked to lunch with Sharon, the city manager and one other member of the management team. Sharon noted that at the lunch the interviewee was more than a bit nervous and barely touched his food. He requested a box for his lunch. When the box arrived the interviewee looked at his food, looked at Sharon and said that his wife usually boxed his leftovers for him. Sharon and the other members of the city management team were flabbergasted; the interviewee's behavior was highly unprofessional and something they had never experienced as part of the hiring process. Sharon responded lightheartedly to the interviewee by saying that right now she was the assistant city manager and his potential boss, not a wife, and if he needed help boxing his leftovers she was happy to ask the waiter for him, but that was not part of her job description.

[2] Name is changed to protect the confidentiality of the interview participant.

The applicant was not hired; Sharon said that after the lunch she decided he would not be a "good fit" for the organization. Sharon commented that she left the lunch feeling humiliated. The rest of the management team, all white males, laughed about the situation and teased her for days. Sharon said that at that moment she clearly was not being respected as she should be, as an experienced, well trained professional. The interviewee did not see her as a professional equal, or even potential superior. He saw the resemblance to his wife and asked her to perform a duty associated with a cultural role of female "helper." Sharon recognized this as a challenge to her official authority and her identity as a professional. In order to combat this challenge Sharon referred to roles that were clearly laid out in the city charter and her organizational hierarchy: if this man joined the organization he would officially be her subordinate.

Sharon experienced a clash between her social status and her official status. In essence, her official authority faced a challenge based on her social status as a woman. Authority refers to the legitimate power to gain compliance and deference. Authority is differentiated from power because it is legitimate, that is, accepted – more or less – by those subject to it on the basis of norms. Authority can be based on social status – culturally coded assumptions about status – or official status – the position an official holds in an organization.

In this study I address several questions regarding public officials' authority. First, how do public officials characterize their sources of authority? To what extent do these characterizations vary in relation to the social status of the official? Second,

what types of challenges to authority do public officials encounter? Who is the instigator of these challenges and with what frequency do they occur? To what extent do challenges to authority vary in relation to the social status of the official? Finally, what strategies do public officials use to mobilize their authority to head off challenges to their authority and respond to challenges to their authority? To what extent do efforts to mobilize authority vary in relation to the official's social status?

These questions are significant as women and racial and ethnic minorities increasingly enter positions of official authority. While the percentages of women and racial and ethnic minorities in both policing and city administration, remain small, there is growing representation of both groups in the professions. The increase in women and racial and ethnic minorities in the fields of policing and city administration leads women and racial and ethnic minorities to stand out, or receive disproportionate attention in their respective fields, and may lead racial and ethnic minorities and women to feel isolated. Only 13 percent of top local government officials are female (Fox and Schuhmman 1999). An even smaller percentage of racial and ethnic minorities hold the top administrative position in cities. And the numbers are only slightly better in policing with 7-14 percent of local law enforcement officers identifying as female and approximately one fifth identifying as racial or ethnic minorities (Milgram 2002; Department of Justice Bureau of Statistics 1999).

The standard answers to the above questions focus on changes in the "style" of leadership as women and minorities gain official positions (see, e.g., Walker 2005;

Szymborski 1996). Some scholars find that women and racial minorities try to fit the traditional style of their field; others claim that women, especially, present a new, more feminine style that may not garner as much respect in their profession.

My thesis differs considerably from the focus on styles. My thesis is that authority is framed by social status and is fundamentally different for officials with traditionally low social status than officials with traditionally high social status. Public officials with traditionally low social status face a power paradox – they have high official status and traditionally low social status. Exercising authority is problematic for officials with traditionally low social status because of their power paradox; they are constantly negotiating the tension between their high official status and low social status. Because of the tension between their official status and social status they experience and exercise authority in ways that are fundamentally different than public officials with traditionally high social status, who face no such tension.

Conceptions of authority vary by social status. I find that public officials with traditionally high social status describe their authority as coming mainly from their social status, but describe their official status as giving their authority an extra "edge." By contrast, public officials with traditionally low social status describe their official status as their main source of authority. Additionally, public officials with traditionally low social status describe a need to prove their authority – or shift the focus from their social status to their official status in order to access their authority. All public officials in this study describe experiencing challenges to their authority, but public officials with traditionally low social status describe experiencing more

challenges. Public officials with traditionally low social status describe a diverse range of strategies to mobilize their authority in order to avoid challenges to their authority and to respond to challenges to their authority. Public officials with traditionally low social status will often use strategies based on their official status, and mobilize rules in order to mobilize their authority. Exercising authority based on official status often means invoking rules and laws as a source of authority. Invoking rules and laws, however, can come at a cost. Rules are a powerful resource for authority, but public officials who explicitly reference rules and laws are often seen as "petty," "rule-bound" or even "bitchy." I term this the paradox of rules. In order to avoid the paradox of rules public officials with traditionally low social status will often "soft pedal" their use of rules, simply referencing rules while trying to defuse situations and challenges, rather than explicitly invoking rules. By contrast, public officials with traditionally high social status describe a limited number of strategies that they employ to mobilize their authority, the majority of which are based on their social status.

The central concept in this study is "social status." Social status is one's place in an informal, implicit social hierarchy that is constituted by age, economic class and ascribed social identities, particularly race, sex, and ethnicity (Turner 1988). Social status is based on culturally coded assumptions; at the most simple level, for instance, white males by social convention have high social status in relation to women and members of racial minorities. While an intersection of social identities may lead to status confusion, for example for white women or minority males, it is clear that

belonging to one high social status group typically does not overcome membership in a lower social status group (Turner 1988). Similarly, in the US context, persons having one racial or ethnic minority parent and one white parent are still commonly seen as belonging to the racial or ethnic minority group of the minority parent. Therefore, for the purposes of this study I have divided participants into two groups - traditionally low social status and traditionally high social status. Participants in the traditionally low social status group may belong to only one or multiple groups with traditionally low social status. Participants in the traditionally high social status group are middle aged and older white men and belong only to groups with traditionally high social status.

I use the concept of social status as a broad term, rather than the individual categories that comprise social status. Using the broad term comes at a cost, but the merits outweigh the cost. On the one hand, social status is a broad concept that encompasses things other than race, sex and age. Being a young white male is quite different from being a young black female, even though they are both individuals with low social status. Using the broad concept does not allow for a rich discussion of the nuances of particular identity categories. In both of the professional contexts of my study, however, there are not large enough populations of any of the individual low social status categories to theorize about them competently. In addition to methodological convenience and conceptual clarity, using the broad term of social status is a valuable concept here because it represents a continuum and is not categorical. The concept of social status as a continuum helps to characterize the

cross-cutting and reinforcing interaction between race, gender and age. The broad concept reinforces the idea that identity categories do not stand alone; hence, in this study, the broad concept of social status is more useful than individual identity categories.

Although economic class undoubtedly forms an element of the broader concept of social status in the context of officials' authority, particularly in situations where officials' class level differs sharply from that of members of the public with whom they are interacting, I have focused particularly on the dimension of social status having to do with the ascribed social identities of sex and race. In part my focus on gender and race is driven by the value of maintaining analytic clarity. Additionally, within organizations, public officials are all members of two professions, with similar current socio-economic status. But I want to also emphasize that my focus on ascribed social identities of sex and race emerged from my interviews with public officials. In the interviews, officials commonly referred either explicitly or obliquely to the social-status factors of race and gender, but they virtually never mentioned the issue of economic class. Had they done so, class would necessarily have formed a significant part of my analysis.

Official status is theoretically distinct from social status. The term typically refers to positions of legal authority within modern public bureaucracies (Kluegel 1978; Speath 1985). The chief administrative officer of a city (city manager), for instance, has high official status since virtually all employees of the organization are subordinate to the position. In policing there is a strict chain of command and official

status increases with each step up in rank. Official status is based on laws and the rules and structures of public organizations. It is recognized by peers and citizens inside and outside of the organization. In the story above, Sharon has high official status because of her position as assistant city manager in charge of the police department. Sharon has authority based on her role as assistant city manager and mobilizes her authority in response to the challenge she faced from the job candidate.

Theoretically, authority is based on power derived from high official and/or social status, but the sources are fundamentally different. Weber, for instance, argued that bureaucratic authority derives from official position, rules and structure (1946: 224). Patriarchal power, on the other hand, in Weber's framework is rooted in traditional social norms (245). Weber suggested that bureaucratic authority and patriarchal authority are antagonistic: the former strives to eradicate the influence of social status within the organization, while the latter is thoroughly rooted in cultural norms and tradition. Wrong (1980) also provided a typology of power and authority. He identified three different types of authority that are relevant to this study – competent authority, legitimate authority and personal authority. The first, competent authority, is authority based on specialized knowledge. Legitimate authority is based on an acknowledged right to command. These are similar to Weber's (1946) bureaucratic authority and the definition of official status used in this study. Wrong's (1980) personal authority is based on personal qualities and characteristics. Wrong's personal authority is similar to Weber's (1946) patriarchal authority and maps onto the concept of social status.

In Sharon's story above, she "mobilizes" her authority by light-heartedly joking and making reference to her official position. The "mobilization of authority" refers to public officials' use of strategies to gain respect, compliance and deference. The idea is theoretically informed by scholarship on the mobilization of law, which explores how law can be used as a resource but also acts as a constraint for those seeking social change (see for example McCann 1994). With the mobilization of authority, public officials are invoking authority based on either their officials status, their position in their organization and the rules of the organization, or their social status cultural norms and traditions.

Public officials with traditionally low social status face what I term here a "power paradox." Here I am using the term power paradox to describe the condition of officials who have high official status but low social status. A power paradox is an extension of the concept developed by Haraway (2002) and Sitkin and Bies (1994), who use the term power paradox to characterize interactions in organizations in which subordinate employees may use written rules as leverage over their bosses. Here I am interested not in situations where employees make up for lower official position, but rather how public administrators with traditionally low social status but significant official status negotiate the tension between the two. My use of the idea of a power paradox was influenced by Black (1976) who specifically considered how much law individuals had at their disposal to use. He argued that as people attained higher official positions they had more law that they could use or mobilize (17). He also argued that when people do not fit "cultural conventions," such as a female firefighter

or female manager, they had less law that they could mobilize. These two arguments create an implied power paradox for public administrators with traditionally low social status – their official position offers to them significant *legal* resources, while their social status imposes significant cultural *constraints* – and at the same time their social status may undercut access to the legal resources that technically are available to their official position. My research thus extends the concept of a power paradox to contexts in which public officials' social status weakens the authority associated with their official status, and examines how public administrators with traditionally low social status use laws and organizational rules to compensate for their lack of social status.

Past Research on Race and Gender in Positions of Official Authority

Increasingly public officials in both policing and city administration are facing a power paradox because of the growing diversity of both professions. As the professions become more diverse, scholars have begun to examine how increasing diversity affects both of these traditionally white male dominated fields. Martin (1980) argued that, with more police women in uniform, the symbol of legal order may be changing, becoming less masculine and assertive. Martin and Jurik (1996), nonetheless, found that police departments are still highly gendered organizations where women have to choose which of their incompatible identities to assert, being a woman or being a police officer. Female and minority police officers, they observe, typically try to fit in to the traditional image of policing as best they can, rather than creating a more inclusive image of legal authority. Gerber (2001), in a study of

authority relations in policing teams, demonstrated that gender, specifically the superior status of males in policing, strongly shaped officers' expressions of personality and authority, with men taking on characteristics associated with leadership and women taking on characteristics associated with subordination. Herbert (2001) similarly observed that policing is dominated by a masculine ideology. He observed, however, that in policing a masculine ideology is distinct from patriarchy. Where patriarchy, by subordinating women, directly benefits men in positions of power, masculinity reinforces macho behavior. The masculine ideology of policing, he argues, paints as illegitimate anybody seeking reform of the stereotype of police officers as "masculine." He observed that since policing is dominated by a masculine ideology women entering the police force are automatically perceived as out of step by their peers since they may take away from the masculine image of policing. Doran and Chan (2003) conducted a longitudinal study of new recruits as they went through training and started as police officers. They found that female recruits come into policing arguing women should not be treated differently than men, and that women, in fact, are not treated differently. As time passes, however, the women in their study came to believe that being female is a negative trait within the policing environment, that they are indeed treated differently, and that some disparity in treatment is necessary to allow women to work in policing. Doran and Chan (2003) find women try to overcome the lack of credibility associated with their gender in the policing environment by downplaying their gender and emphasizing other positive traits such as experience, seniority and trustworthiness (298).

Although the literature on race in policing remains limited, there is little doubt that race remains a significant dividing line in the profession. Bolton and Feagin (2004) point out that, "In many discussions of policing, all the law enforcement officers are, implicitly or explicitly, taken to be white" (2). They argue that most of the literature that has to do with policing and race looks to race within the community, rather than within departments. Historically police departments, in the South especially, developed as a tool of white citizens to control black populations. As people of color are entering law enforcement they are entering a historically hostile institution (Bolton and Feagin 2004). There is also a debate as to whether black officers garner more respect from black citizens and defuse community tensions with the police (Skolnick 1966) or if black officers have negative images in the black community because of the general negative images of police officers or black officers being seen as co-opted or traitorous (Bolton and Feagin 2004). Bolton and Feagin (2004) conducted an ethnographic study of black police officers in South and found that officers experienced subtle but persistent racism. Bolton and Feagin argued that this discrimination led to a contradiction – African American police officers did not have the same authority as white police officers, even though there is significant occupational authority that comes with being a police officer.

Many of the studies on increasing diversity in city administration have found that there is significant evidence that women have less organizational power than men, measured in lower pay, fewer career opportunities, and underrepresentation at the highest leadership levels (see Guy 1995 for an overview), and focus on why this is

so. Theoretical explanations for this power disparity focus on social forces that originate outside of the organization and include the artificial separation of public and private lives, which disadvantages women with disproportionate domestic responsibilities (Stivers 2002) and the association of leadership and organizations as masculine domains (King 1995). There is an old literature, dating back nearly six decades, that asserts that women lack organizational power and, because of their lack of power, rely on rules and rule abidance as an alternative form of power or authority (Green and Melnick 1950; Thompson 1969). These early studies, however, rely mainly on anecdotal evidence and limited case study research conducted in the absence of theory-guided testing. It is also unclear whether these dated studies would apply to more diverse, contemporary public organizational contexts.

Several studies in public management examine current differences in management styles, finding that women employ more "feminine" management techniques than men (see e.g., Borelli and Martin 1997; Guy 1992). Most such studies examine attitudes toward formal hierarchy and find female managers tend to put less emphasis on formal hierarchies than their male counterparts, and female managers tend to flatten the organizations they manage (Duerst-Lahti and Kelly 1995). Fox and Schuhmann (1999), focusing on management style differences between male and female city managers, found that female managers tend to be more community oriented, live in the cities they manage for longer periods of time, and value citizen input more. The community-oriented style of female managers may be a feminine strategy to mobilize their authority.

Other studies, focusing on bureaucracy as a representative institution, have explored how increasing diversity in the bureaucracy affects bureaucratic outputs for citizens. Although my study does not consider outcomes for citizens, but rather, the experiences of officials themselves, I find, like these "representative bureaucracy" studies, that an increase in the diversity of bureaucrats changes the bureaucracy in fundamental ways. The theory of representative bureaucracy is based on the premise that social groups with particular identities, most often racial and ethnic minorities and women, have unique life experiences that enable them to bring important new outlooks to the bureaucracy (Dolan and Rosenbloom 2003: 5). The mere presence of minorities and women in bureaucratic settings is considered passive representation. While passive representation does not assume that minority and female bureaucrats are making decisions with their particular identity groups in mind, the image of an inclusive governing body is important in a democratic society (Mosher 1982). Representative bureaucracy is also thought to provide more political responsiveness within the bureaucracy: "if the attitudes of administrators are similar to the attitudes held by the general public, the decisions administrators make will in general be responsive to the desires of the public" (Meier and Nigro 1976: 2003: 84). Specifically, when bureaucrats from historically underrepresented groups are making decisions on behalf of those groups, they may work towards correcting historical wrongs the groups have encountered, and thus passive representation may be transformed into active representation. Most current literature focusing on representative bureaucracy considers empirically how racial and gender

representation in bureaucratic settings affects bureaucratic outcomes for corresponding race and gender populations (Selden 1997; Keiser et al 2002; Wilkins and Keiser 2006). While scholarship focused on representative bureaucracy has added significantly to our understanding of the effects of increased racial and sexual diversity on outputs and outcomes for bureaucracies, this study focuses instead on how increasing diversity in the bureaucracy affects the authority and experiences of the bureaucrats themselves.

Conceptualizing Social Status and Official Position as Bases for Authority

My contribution to the growing scholarship on the increasing diversity in policing and city administration focuses on social status and official position as distinct bases for authority. Authority is the legitimate power to gain compliance and deference from organizational subordinates and citizens. Authority, as I have defined it here, can be based on two different sets of structures, schemas, institutions and norms – official status and social status. The structures, schemas, institutions and norms can be based on formal laws and rules within the organization – as is the case with official status – but, they can also be based on taken-for-granted informal rules, legal ideas and orienting schema – as is the case with social status (Stryker 2003). Orienting schemas need not be consciously recognized by the individuals who are participating in them or mobilizing them. Orienting schemas are the general assumptions that frame expectations about behavior and organizational norms. Orienting schemas work to produce structures which frame the organization and the behavior of individuals within the organization. Structures “are sets of mutually

sustaining schemas and resources that empower and constrain social action and that tend to be reproduced by that social action" (Sewell 1992: 19). Structures imply a certain stable framing to organizational life, but they also may generate tension and change. "Structures are multiple and intersecting, because schemas are transposable, and because resources are polysemic [have multiple meanings] and accumulate unpredictably" (Sewell 1992:19). Particularly as diversity increases in modern organizations, structures associated with formal bureaucracy and social status come into tension too.

Official status and social status operate as formal and informal structures which serve as resources of power for public officials. Historically, informal structures based on social status reinforced formal organizational life. But, as more public officials with traditionally low social status lacking social structures as sources of power attain official positions of authority, they bring with them alternative cultural schema and put the historic framing of structures of organizational power at risk.

Neo-institutionalist scholarship has shown that rules, structures and schema constitute professional organizations and the meaning of law in them. Neo-institutional scholars have added significantly to the discussion of organizational change and the legalization of organizations (Edelman 1990, 1992; Dobbin and Sutton 1998; Edelman et al. 2001; Pedriana and Stryker 2004).

> In the new institutionalism of law and organizations, 'legalization' of schools, workplaces and families is a consequence of a combination of social mechanisms, including professionalization, business

> organizations' search for legitimacy and the coercive powers of the state, coming together to promote processes of institutional isomorphism and diffusion across organizational fields (Stryker 2003:347).

Legalization of organizations has resulted in an increasing formalization of rules operating within organizations, and these rules increasingly take on common forms (Powell and DiMaggio 1991). As discussed in the quotation above, forces of change for organizations can come from social as well as official mechanisms.

The increasing legalization of organizations represents a broad institutional shift over the last two to three decades. This shift offered new resources to public officials with traditionally low social status. In addition to the explicit resources offered in the way of Affirmative Action legislation and the institutionalized acceptance of laws promoting equality, there has been an acceptance of increased formalization in organizations. Formalization of all aspects of organizations has taken place, not just formalization with regard to affirmative action and equality measures. Significantly this formalization has allowed for rules to be mobilized as a more explicit resource by members of the organization.

With increasing legalization, it is increasingly possible for officials to draw on rules and laws as resources of power. Research in the law and society tradition has significantly influenced how we think about law. The invocation of law or rules during a dispute is known as "the mobilization of law." Most studies of the mobilization of law focus on the mobilization of law by people in non-official capacities (e.g., Ewick and Silbey 1998), particularly by persons of relatively low

social status or in positions of social disadvantage (see for example, Bumiller 1987; Albiston 2005). That research has observed two patterns. First, although rights and law offer potentially powerful resources on behalf of the socially disadvantaged, they also constrain the range of options and strategies available to the socially disadvantaged (McCann 1994). Second, although a wide range of people mobilize rights and law, those with lower social status may be especially hesitant to do so, or may do so in ways different from those with higher status (Bumiller 1987). In this study I examine the mobilization of authority more broadly particularly how officials mobilize any and all aspects of their authority, including rules and social status in order to prevent or respond to challenges to their authority.

Expectations Based on Status

In the power paradox context, where public officials have high social status but traditionally low social status, the expectations derived from official status and social status are in tension. Officials with traditionally low social status may mobilize rules and resources consistent with their official status, but these sources of authority may conflict with the norms associated with their social status. Ultimately, as I will show, officials' social status frames how they mobilize the resources of their official status. Status expectation theorists argue that often groups place expectations for ability and behavior on members based on such status characteristics as sex and race (Ridgeway and Berger 1986; Meeker and Weitzel-O'Neill 1977). Expectations based on social status characteristics often frame individuals' behavior and their reactions to others' behavior.

All status positions, both social and official, are located in larger societal structures, or referential beliefs (Ridgeway and Berger 1986). Ridgeway and Berger's theorizing assumes that all members of the task group believe in similar status hierarchies regardless of their own status background. While researchers would argue that this is not always the case (Kochman 1981), Ridgeway and Berger plausibly assert that it is a valid assumption that all members of the group understand and operate within an overarching, society wide, set of assumptions about status. While specific groups may have differences in opinions about subgroup or within group status, there is an overarching status narrative that all groups play by in heterogeneous group settings.

When organizational or group members have status characteristics that invoke two conflicting narratives, such as the female doctor, or female police officer, other group members may display conflicting expectations of them. Their identity encompasses two roles and these roles are in tension. Ridgeway and Berger (1986) also suggest that although other group members are confused by the conflicting status expectations around these individuals, the individuals themselves are part of the overarching society that creates and reinforces expectations and so they, to, may have conflicting expectations of their own behavior.

Ridgeway and Berger's theory directly relates to task group members' behavior within groups. They argue that high-status, socially-legitimated group members can participate in more domineering behavior, and that such behavior is, in fact, expected of them. They also argue that low status officials who try to participate

in behavior that is beyond their status expectations (status violating behavior) are looked at poorly by other members of the group; they are seen as inappropriate and 'uppity'. Meeker and Weitzel-O'Neill (1977) discuss this as the 'burden of proof' assumption in status expectation theory. The 'burden of proof' assumption asserts that a lower status person must prove competence to fellow group members in order to gain legitimacy and respect, while a higher status person need not; their legitimacy is externally rooted and automatically internally accepted.

Is it possible to separate identities?

If official identities and official status positions carry higher authority and legitimacy than is conferred by an official's social status, it might seem valuable to separate their professional identity from their personal or social status identity. Such separation of identities, however, is not a realistic option in cases of ascribed social identities. Some identities, such as parenthood, can be largely left out of the professional workplace, with some work on the part of the official. Such ascribed identities, as race, sex and age, however, cannot be separated from the professional identities of public officials. Oberweis and Musheno (2001) argue that even the term we often use to describe our multitude of identities – roles - is misleading. In the case of ascribed identities, there is no way to switch between one role and another for professional and personal reasons as if you are leaving one play and entering a completely separate one on a different stage. Both roles exist in every context. Identities, or subject positions "inter-exist: that is, they define and create each other" (Oberweis and Musheno 2001: 59). A female doctor is always seen as both female

and a doctor, and she cannot choose to exit the role of woman when she enters an examination room. While identities cannot be fully separated, I have found that women, racial and ethnic minorities, and young people develop extensive strategies to emphasize one of their identities over the others. For example, they reference their official status in order to bring that identity to the forefront of an interaction with a citizen or subordinate employee.

Conflict Between Status Expectations and Internal and External Rules and Schema

When a public official has high social status and access to powerful professional schemas and resources, these are different but reinforcing forms of authority and power. The individual mobilizes, operates and reinforces structures based on both identities – traditionally high social status white male and public official. For public officials with traditionally high social status these structures do not come in conflict and they provide access to a wide variety of resources and schema. By contrast, officials with traditionally low social status experience fundamental tensions or conflicts between their identities and the schemas of which they are a part. Officials with traditionally low social status also have a number of resources and schemas which they can access, but unlike their high social status counter-parts their schemas can come into conflict and be incompatible with one another. Although some literature recognizes such tensions (Stryker 2000), little literature directly addresses this conflict and fully explains how it may play out in individual's experiences and behavior within organizations.

As I will show, using such official sources of authority as rules comes with a downside which I will call the *paradox of rules*. Not only is the official using the rules now constrained by those same rules, but the official is also seen as weak or petty by colleagues or citizens. Invoking rules invokes power, official power, but it also makes explicit a lack of social power or weakness. The official is seen as having a lack of social authority, which causes them to need the rules as an official source of power. Invoking rules as a source of authority locates the authority outside of the individual, and with the organization. Additionally, invoking rules is an explicit use of authority that is easily recognizable. Relying on cultural traditions or traditionally high social status as a means of mobilizing authority, however, is implicit and hard to directly connect to something outside of the individual. Relying on social status then makes the individual seem more powerful and like the source of authority, rather than the rules or organization.

Officials with traditionally low social status, and hence a lack of social authority, may consciously or unconsciously recognize the paradox of using rules as power. Officials with traditionally low social status expect that their authority will be challenged more so than their older white male counterparts, and they discuss feeling the need to prove their authority and develop a wide range of strategies to mobilize their authority. Due to these expectations they develop a multitude of strategies to mobilize their authority. These strategies rely on both social and official sources of authority. In contrast, older white male officials, those with traditionally high social status, do not have the same expectations of challenges to their authority as their

female, minority and young colleagues. Without the expectation of challenges to their authority there is no incentive for them to develop strategies to mobilize their authority. The strategies that officials with high social status often rely on when mobilizing their authority are based on their social status. Social status is powerful and accessible to them. Officials with traditionally low social status do not have the same access to social status as their colleagues, so they must use strategies based on their official status.

In order to avoid the paradox of invoking official strategies, officials with traditionally low social status often mix their use of official strategies with defusing strategies, or strategies that are consistent with their social identity. Defusing strategies often focus on traditionally feminine characteristics, such as light-heartedness or humor. By joking about or defusing the use of the rules officials with low social status try to avoid the paradox of the rules. They remind the person or group they are interacting with of the rules without going so far as to invoke the rule in any formal fashion. By not invoking the rule formally the official with traditionally low social status can avoid looking petty, weak, bitchy or uppity (all negative traits associated with officials with low social status who openly use official sources of authority). By defusing their use of official strategies, officials with low social status are simultaneously playing by the rules of both of their identities, as low social status people and high official status officials. They have the power of the rules, but hesitate to invoke it. They also keep situations lighthearted and seem almost deferential while invoking their authority. Officials with low social status who defuse their use of

official strategies for mobilizing authority get to remind the person they are dealing with of the rules, invoking some of the power of the rules, making the rules structuring the encounter more explicit. But, since they are not invoking the rule in any formal sense they are not seen as petty, they don't frame themselves as a rule enforcer. They avoid the paradox of the rules.

Officials with traditionally low social status have developed a number of strategies for mobilizing their authority based on multiple sources of authority. They expect to experience many challenges to their authority, consciously anticipate those challenges, and develop strategies to head them off or respond to them. But, officials with traditionally low social status may not be conscious of the sources of authority they are relying on or the strategies they are using as they respond to challenges. It is one thing to anticipate a challenge and try to avoid it, but another to experience it. Many of the officials discussed their reactions to challenges as just that, reactions, gut responses that they had in moment that were not consciously thought through. The officials with low social status developed and used a multitude of strategies that were consistent with both of their primary identities, but they did not openly acknowledge the effects of their social status on their official position. If anything the officials denounced the idea that their social status affected their official position in any way. But the deep social structures in which they were operating influenced their use their authority, whether it was acknowledged or not.

Social status and official status constitute ongoing identity-based tensions over authority and the mobilization of authority in the professional workplace. The

tensions between social status and official status are constantly under negotiation. Socialization may have been thought to create homogeneous experiences for officials in the public workforce (Lipsky 1980), but there are deep social structures based on social status factors including race, sex and age that are not overcome by socialization or organizational cultural in public organizations. The experiences of public officials with traditionally low social status are fundamentally different than the experiences of their middle-aged and older white male colleagues. They must prove their authority in order to access it, they face more challenges to their authority, and they employ a wide range of strategies to mobilize their authority in order to head off challenges to their authority or respond to challenges to their authority. When public officials with traditionally low social status make tensions between their social status and official status explicit, by invoking their official status as a way to mobilize their authority, it ironically causes women and racial and ethnic minorities to "lose face." Since invoking official status as a means of mobilizing authority carries negative consequences, public officials with traditionally low social status may decline to acknowledge or do not recognize their use of official strategies, which limits widespread recognition of the issue.

Two Conflicting Sets of Norms

After the civil rights movement of the 1960s, organizations were presented with a new set of norms for hiring and operation based on egalitarian principals. Prior to the 1960s, however, a set of norms based on white supremacy influenced organizations, and there is still a tension between the classic white supremacy set of

norms and egalitarian set of norms, post-civil rights. My project is exploring the tension still present between these two conflicting set of norms and how the tension affects public organizations, public officials and public authority.

Overt racism and sexism are now rare and notable occurrences in the public workplace. But there is no denying that racism and sexism have had profound effects on the development of the public workplace. King and Smith (2005) assert that “the nation has been pervasively constituted by systems of racial hierarchy since its inception” (75), and that competing “racial orders,” one white supremacist racial order and the other a racial egalitarian order, have competed for dominance. While they do not argue that racial orders are the only influential institutions shaping American political life, they do argue that much of the institutional scholarship so far has failed to recognize the power of racial orders in American political life. Racial orders, along with other institutions, form the basis of American political life and permeate public employment. They argue that competing racial orders have influenced the development of public employment in the United States. After the civil rights movement and the legalization of organizations, they suggest, racial egalitarianism has gained influence – albeit in the context of the continuing but subtle power of the once dominate white supremacist order.

Feagin and McKinny (2003) do not disagree with the racial orders thesis, but they argue that historically there has not been much progress with the competing racial orders in the work place. According to Feagin and McKinny (2003) historically women and racial and ethnic minorities have had to accept white male norms in order

to participate in public employment, which has been dominated by white male actors. These white male norms include specific credentialing – the best way to prepare for particular jobs – and specific behavior norms – expectations of social behavior inside and outside of the workplace. Institutionalized norms regarding white male authority in organizations do not imply that all white men are racists. There is a recognized difference between individual racism and systemic racism. The racial orders thesis asserted by King and Smith and the discussion of racism in the workplace by Feagin and McKinny argue that American politics in general and the American workplace in particular are influenced by systemic racism. The structures of the workplace favor schemas and resources afforded to white males. While some individuals remain racist or sexist, the vast majority of whites and males in the workplace do not expressly share this orientation. It is not the actions of individuals, but rather institutions and structures that still favor the schemas and resources of white men. The tradition of favoring resources and schema of white men leaves women and members of racial and ethnic minorities in a distinct disadvantage when entering these workplaces. As discussed above, however, structures are not immutable. Members of racial and ethnic minorities and women who are public officials have access not only to the schemas associated with their social status, but also with their official status. These two identities create different schema which are often in conflict.

Alternative Explanation: Organizational Culture?

It might be thought that organizational culture can overcome the influence of social status, but I find that this is not the case. For instance, some may argue that the

policing culture is likely to be much less amenable to the entrance of women than is city administration. McElhinny (2003) in a study of authority mobilization by police officers, observed that the masculine culture of policing powerfully shapes the experience of female officers, with younger female officers, in particular using the linguistic strategies of traditional crime-fighting policing, “acting crazy”, aggressively, and assertively when encountering citizens (272-275). McElhinny (2003) suggests that the young female police officers are trying to associate themselves with the traditional conception of policing as an authoritative and masculine institution. Newman (1994) argues when we study glass ceilings and glass walls we may need to look not only at people entering and advancing in the workplace, but also the types of organizations that people are a part of. She argues that glass ceilings and glass walls may have little to do with employees and social structures, but may actually come from the organizational mission or history. Women have historically been employed by particular types of organizations, the types of organizations that have the least room for advancement and little power beyond their walls. Saidel and Lascocco (2005) found that regardless of the sex of the manager, if they worked for a redistributive agency that could impact women, they would have a female-centered policy agenda and focus. They argue that it is not just the sex of the manager that matters, but also the gendering of the institution they are leading. If so, this line of scholarship suggests that organizational factors may condition or shape the role of social status in the mobilization of authority by public administrators.

Such organizational factors as organizational culture, therefore, may be a viable alternative hypothesis to the argument that social status is a structure that influences how public officials consider and use their authority. It may be that the organizational culture strongly determines the frequency of challenges experienced within the organization and strategies that have been developed to mobilize authority. If organizations are more supportive of women and racial and ethnic minorities, female employees and employees of color may face fewer challenges to their authority. Supportive organizations may also work to develop and train on a range of strategies for all public officials to mobilize their authority in situations where their authority may be challenged, regardless of their social status. I took this idea into consideration while designing the study, and both the qualitative and quantitative pieces of the study consider organizational culture as a possible alternative hypothesis to social status, as a way to frame authority for public officials.

Policy Implications

My thesis has implications for current policy debates over how to best reform government bureaucracies and public policy. Much of the current literature concerning rules in public organizations favors "streamlining" rules or increasing the discretion of bureaucratic experts. New Public Management or Reinventing Government scholarship focuses on "cutting red tape" in order to increase efficiency in public organizations. The argument is simply that bureaucrats can be more efficient if they do not have to focus on following too many rules and regulations. Scholars of New Public Management and Reinventing Government are often cast as critics of the

bureaucracy since they advocate making the bureaucracy more businesslike and flexible, with an ultimate goal of efficiency. Kagan (2003) also argued for increased discretion for bureaucrats, but from a different perspective. He argued that “reducing legalization” and allowing for increased discretion and decreased rules for expert bureaucrats would decrease the current adversarial nature of the US legal system. In contrast to the New Public Management literature, social equity scholarship in public administration has long championed expert bureaucrats and their role in promoting social equity for the citizens they serve (Frederickson 1990, 2005). While this literature does not oppose rules, it suggests that bureaucrats have a moral obligation to use their discretion in policy implementation to promote social equity.

My findings suggest that rules and laws are used as crucial resource for public administrators with traditionally low social status. They mobilize rules in order to promote equity within the organizations they are a part of as well as to head off and confront challenges to their authority from citizens. This observation suggests that “streamlining” or “cutting red tape” would come at a very significant cost to social equity within government bureaucracies: rules may act as a significant “red tape” constraint on officials with high social status, but rules are a crucial resource for officials with low social status.. I also argue that my findings have implications for training and management within modern public organizations. I expand on the implications for management and training and current scholarship in public administration in the conclusion of the project.

Methods and Overview of the Study

The setting of this study is policing and city administration. The two professional settings of policing and city administration are each becoming increasingly diverse in their employment which makes them ideal settings for answering questions about the affects of social status on the mobilization of authority. Each of the professional settings also presents different images of authority. Police officers convey iconic images of authority in America: they carry the trappings of official status and exercise authority on the street in interactions with ordinary citizens. City administrators exercise their authority over complex public bureaucracies; they typically do not have the visual cues of authority enjoyed by police officers, but, within their organizations, their official status is well known to all employees. Public officials in both of these professions have official authority. Police officers have more visual cues to their authority, and they also are more visible to the public when they exercise power beyond their authority. While the authority of city administrators may not always be overtly visible to the public, they are powerful local actors within the government. These two settings for exploring these questions were chosen for their similarities as well as their differences. Both professions wield significant power in their local jurisdictions, and both professions are becoming increasingly diverse. Choosing both of these professions, additionally, provides some insight into the differences that may arise because of the different expectations for each profession and the differences in visual cues of authority in the different professions.

Although the theory of intersectionality argues correctly that identities are not the sum of different categories but instead a unique intersection of categories for each person, I have conceptualized social status as a dichotomous variable, either low or high status. The theory argues that women of color have unique experiences that cannot be fully categorized by their womanhood or their racial category; rather they are the multiplication of these two categories to create a new unique experience (Crenshaw 1994). In this study the unique experiences of each person who occupies multiple, intersecting traditionally low social status categories cannot be captured. Because of the low number of women of color who occupy positions in either of two professions discussed – policing and city administration – I cannot theorize about highly specific identity intersections. Whether a person occupies one or multiple categories that are considered traditionally low social status, for the purposes of this study, and consistent with Turner's (1988) theorizing, I have categorized them as traditionally low social status. Future studies, which will take place when, hopefully, more women of color have attained positions of public authority can explore the implications of intersectionality more in-depth than the current study.

In order to explore public officials' authority I conducted semi-structured interviews with forty-nine public officials in policing and city administration. The interviews focused on stories about authority that I asked the officials to share with me. The collection of stories allowed me to explore the conscious and unconscious uses of authority by the officials. The interview setting allowed for an explicit discussion regarding the mobilization of authority, a discussion that the officials may

not have had a place for previously. I discuss the methods of the project more thoroughly in the next chapter. The remaining five chapters in this project lay out my project and my findings from the interviews. The next chapter focuses on the settings and design for the study. Following that there are three substantive chapters focused specific aspects of authority and how they are framed by social status. Chapter three focuses on sources of authority and proving authority. Chapter four focuses on challenges to authority from citizens and subordinates. The final substantive chapter focuses on strategies for mobilizing authority in order to prevent and handle challenges to authority. The concluding chapter contains a discussion of the normative implications for the increasing diversity of public officials and the affects of social status on public authority.

Chapter 2: Methods and Study Design

In order to better understand challenges faced by public officials and the strategies they use to mobilize their authority I conducted semi-structured interviews with 49 officials involved in policing and city administration, which aimed to elicit stories or narratives of the exercise of authority. The interviews were conducted face to face, on average took about one hour, and focused on understanding the respondents' observations of their own authority, social status, and appropriate responses to challenges to authority. The interviews also included a discussion of the public administrators' perceptions of the organizational culture and its openness to people of various social status backgrounds. At the start of each interview, each public official was asked to provide a narrative of a situation when his or her authority was challenged. A narrative consisted of a challenge, the official's response to the challenge and a resolution to the challenge. I began each interview by asking "Will you please tell me a story of a time when your authority may have been tested or challenged by a citizen outside of your organization or a subordinate within your organization." As the respondent shared their story with me I asked numerous follow-up questions. The follow-up questions were meant to build rapport with the respondent, elicit full narratives and gain additional information. Since the interviews continued in this way, no two sets of interview questions were identical.

As the interview unfolded, many participants provided more than one narrative of challenges to their authority. Once the narratives were collected I asked follow-up questions about the official's views of authority, their individual

backgrounds and experience and their perceptions of the organizational culture they worked in. The main focus on each of the interviews, however, was the narratives collected about challenges to the public official's authority.

In this study, I make no claim that the narratives represent "objective" descriptions of the interactions that form their basis. Instead, the narratives provide arguably the best measure of the participants' understanding and framing of the experience, and of its cultural and social context (Oberweis and Musheno 2001). Similar to Ewick and Silbey's (1995) argument, the narratives provide details and insights that would be overlooked with traditional social science methods. Collection of narratives from the interview participants provided for the collection of rich details about the institutions in which these experiences took place (Maynard-Moody and Musheno 2003). The narratives helped to connect the discussion of particularities and generalities of the social interactions and contexts (Ewick and Silbey 1995).

Participants were not always aware of what they are revealing with their stories. The rich details they supplied in their stories provided insight into the subtle, yet profound, ways that structures and schema implicitly and explicitly shaped their use of authority. By describing reactions that they had to situations, officials often revealed actions they took or thoughts they had when interacting with citizens and subordinates that they did not or have not deliberately thought through. Because the sharing of stories focuses on actions that moved the plot of a narrative forward, the narratives often revealed actions taken by officials that they had not heretofore recognized as significant. For example, many officials talked about jokes that they

told or off-hand humorous comments that they made when confronted with a challenge to their authority. I thought of these types of comments and jokes as humorous strategies to mobilize their authority – especially when they referenced the official's power and official standing in a particular situation. The officials, however, rarely framed these same actions as "strategies". Instead, when asked directly about such jokes, the respondents characterized them as reactions, and the only recourse they could think of in response to a challenge. The official not only had no deliberate cognition of the strategy they were using, but they also were not aware of revealing the strategy as they shared their story. Yet such "strategies" reappear very commonly and, as I shall show, form an unmistakable pattern which demonstrates the subtle, yet profound affect social status has on the mobilization of authority. The narrative methodology provided a unique means to access information about the actions officials took that they may not have been deliberately cognizant of, something that may not be captured with traditional survey methodologies.

I proceed in this chapter with a discussion of narrative methodologies and why I chose to use this method. I will also address why a traditional survey method was an inappropriate tool for the questions and phenomenon I am concerned with. Following the discussions of different methodologies and their appropriateness, I will describe in more detail how I went about collecting and analyzing my data.

The use of narratives and stories as data has become more popular in the social sciences (Maynard-Moody and Musheno 2003). Stories are a type of narrative that focuses on the movement of plot through the telling of actions. Narratives are

especially helpful in revealing the identities of the participants who are sharing them (Patterson and Monroe 1998). Stories demonstrate the ways that identities continually are formed, re-formed and re-enforced. Especially in the cases of officials with conflicting identities, such as public officials with traditionally high official status but traditionally low social status, stories provide insight into how they see their identities forming, reforming and reconciling their disparate identities.

Stories are not, precisely factual descriptions, but rather reveal the teller's interpretation of the world. Stories bring institutions and structures to life. They reveal the mundane and the routine as well as what breaks the mold. As Maynard-Moody and Musheno (2003) argue, "They offer insights into how actors make choices, understand their actions, and experience frustrations and satisfactions. Stories give research a pungency and vitality often absent from mainstream social science because they give such prominence to individual actions and motives and the human condition" (30). The formative power of stories enforces the reasoning and actions of public officials. In stories, public officials often justify their actions and ideas. Public officials convey knowledge about their thoughts and actions, knowledge that they may be deliberately cognizant of or not, knowledge that may not yet have a full language outside of the story.

The narratives collected as part of this project demonstrated how nuanced are officials' conceptions of authority. Throughout the project I use the terms stories and narratives interchangeably since stories are part of the larger category of narratives, and the only type of narrative collected and analyzed as part of this project. I

collected stories of challenges from public officials in police and city administration. Authority is not as simple as enforcing rules without regard to context. The use of authority has multiple, at times conflicting, structures working around it - including the social and official structures I discussed in chapter one. The respondents' narratives often did not focus on social structures as their core concept, but these structures were often revealed in the details and patterns of their narratives.

The value of the narrative method with regard to identity and conceptions of authority is especially clear in contrast to the failure of a more conventional social science method, the survey. Originally as part of the project I developed two surveys to test and confirm the patterns identified in the initial interviews – but the survey simply failed to elicit meaningful information about challenges and conceptions of authority. The surveys were divided into four major sections. The first section dealt with "handling situations." I recognized during the interviews that public officials were hesitant to refer to challenges as "challenges;" rather they preferred a more neutral label such as "situations". The first section therefore used the language of "situations" and presented respondents with the three most common types of challenges they faced – verbal, evasive and defiant (as recognized in the initial interviews) - and asked about the frequency of the type of challenge, information about the latest challenge of that type and how they responded to it (or the strategies they used to mobilize their authority in response). The second section of the survey focused on sources of authority. Participants were asked about each of the sources of authority that were identified in the interview process and how much they identified

with each source of authority. In the third section participants were asked about their organization, particularly focused on organizational culture. The final section asked participants about themselves and their experiences.

Two versions of the survey were developed and administered. One went out electronically to city administrators through the University Of Kansas Masters Of Public Administration Alumni Association[3]. Police officer participation in the survey was solicited from six police departments in the Kansas City metropolitan area, an area containing two very large departments and a range of mid-size and smaller departments[4]. The online survey of city administrators resulted in a response rate of 39% (154 of 400). The paper and pencil survey of police officers also resulted in a response rate of 39% (702 of 1781).

The survey set out to confirm three major sets of hypothesizes. Hypothesizes were developed from the theories used for the overall study as well as the conclusions from the initial interviews. Hypothesizes considered the expectations of and

---

[3] That association contains 400 officials scattered across the country in positions ranging from entry-level to senior management, of both genders and in all racial categories. A key advantage of the KU database is that it is not heavily surveyed and, as a consequence, I expected a high response rate. I considered an alternative data-base, the International City-County Management Association membership list, and while it is larger, it has a reputation for low response rates. The universe of officials in the KU database was solicited for participation in the survey, and the survey was conducted on-line.

[4] The area contains urban as well as suburban departments. Departments ranged in size from 90 sworn officers to over 1700 sworn officers. In small and mid-size departments all sworn officers were solicited for participation, since nearly all officers interact with citizens. In the two largest departments only the patrol units were solicited for participation, for logistical survey administration reasons and since they have the most contact with citizens within their jurisdictions. Within the six participating departments, the survey was administered in paper and pencil form. It was necessary to administer the two surveys in these two different ways for the two different professions. City administrators are located throughout the country and regularly communicate through email and on-line forums. The police officers rarely use email for their line of work and may not have been as willing to participate in the survey on their own time.

frequency of challenges, sources of authority and strategies for handling challenges to official's authority:

H1:

A) Officials with traditionally low social status will be more likely than officials with traditionally high social status to associate their authority with their official status

B) Officials with traditionally high social status will be more likely than officials with traditionally low social status to associate their authority with their social status.

H2: The lower a public official's social status, the more challenges, he or she is likely to face

H3: Officials with traditionally low social status will use laws, rules and organizational hierarchies more frequently as tools for mobilizing their authority than will officials with high social status.

The basic observation of the survey is that public officials appear to be unwilling or unable to talk about sources of authority, challenges to authority and strategies for mobilizing authority. It may be that there is a lack of awareness or language for discussions of authority and the mobilization of authority. In the survey responses, virtually none of the expected associations appeared.

The comparison of the narrative methodology and survey methodology revealed three distinct reasons why the narrative methodology was better suited for

this project. First, the survey method required that the actions of the public officials rose to the level of deliberate cognition. Public officials most have an awareness of the actions they are taking in order to respond to survey questions posed about their actions. Second, narratives were able to reveal underlying structures that guided the actions of the administrations. The structures appeared in the connections public officials made between the narratives they shared and their justifications for particular actions. Assumptions about structures were embedded in the connections that respondents draw between their experiences and their actions. Finally, in the process of sharing the narratives the public officials began to articulate their views. There may not have been a place for conversations centered authority and the exercise of authority before I asked the public officials who participated in this study to share their narratives with me, the interview may have provided a place to begin a discussion on authority and the mobilization of authority.

While officials' narratives revealed a host of assumptions about sources of authority, challenges to authority and strategies for mobilizing authority, the survey method is useful only if such assumptions rise to a level of deliberate cognition. One important question that cannot be answered by the direct survey method is: how is consciousness of public officials concerning sources of authority, challenges to authority and strategies for mobilizing authority framed? With a direct method, such as the surveys, there must already be consciousness about the topics covered. Public officials must already be aware of the topics or at least once the question is posed they must be able to quickly answer how they would actually respond in a particular

situation. If responses to challenges are subconscious defense mechanisms or even actions that are just not fully thought out, then a direct method will not fully capture what public officials are doing. A survey methodology necessarily assumes that participants have the language, capacity and desire to discuss or share their insights into the phenomenon of study.

The narratives, however, revealed that respondents often do not have the capacity or desire to speak openly about the issue of authority. As a minority male police officer (Interview 30) shared, his experiences growing up as a minority influenced the way he thought about his authority, and though he did not deliberately consider it before going out on each call he knew that he had to do things differently than his white male colleagues. But the way that he functioned in his position was "normal" to him; he did not have the perspective to compare it to others and had not reflected on his responses. He said that he could not articulate how he used his authority; it was just "what he did." He had not reflected on his use of authority and would have a hard time answering questions regarding it. But, as his narratives revealed, he had a number of substantive and varied strategies for mobilizing his authority. He prepared strategies to head off challenges that he anticipated due to his past experiences and he responded to challenges to his authority based on his official position.

The survey only asked about past challenges and asked about challenges as isolated instances. In the interviews, public officials would often reference a past challenge in order to justify a strategy used to head off challenges to their authority.

Starting with the very first interview, respondents said things like "For example….let me tell you about a time." The narrative methodology allowed participants to frame and justify their actions. The survey design required that questions be asked about specific instances, but not be given the chance to fully explain the context. Challenges may be too connected to one another or context-bound for participants to truly respond to questions about only one at a time. Patterns of action were embedded in the connections between narratives that public officials shared. For example, a past challenge would justify reactions shared in another narrative concerning a similar challenge. The interviews also revealed that sources of authority and strategies for mobilizing authority were often not discussed one at a time. Often public officials talked about multiple sources and multiple strategies in a single narrative. The survey, which had individual measures for each source of authority and strategy, may not have seemed realistic enough to elicit responses from the public officials.

With the initial interviews, the stories seemed to capture significantly more information than the public officials thought they were sharing. The narrative methodology also revealed officials' assumptions and cognitive frames, even when they were not "aware" of the frames they were revealing through their stories. Public officials could down-play challenges, and they also were able to put their responses to challenges into context, almost justifying the way in which they mobilized their authority. Interview subjects provided rich detail and context for many of their stories. They may have seen the ability to provide the context of their actions as key for sharing the actions that they took in response to particular challenges.

The inability of the survey method to capture the affects of social and official structures on the mobilization of authority may have been a result of the lack of a developed language to discuss authority. The sharing of narratives during the interviews may have provided a rare chance for public officials to discuss the challenges they face to their authority and their mobilization of authority. In many interviews, officials appeared to be developing a more deliberate conception of authority as they were being interviewed. For instance, in interview 12, the official is very open about not having thought about issues of his own authority, but analyzes his stories as he provides them, finally articulating his views on authority by the end of the interview. The narratives also provided a lot of justification for actions that the official took. The justification often appeared as "if…then" statements. The official would say if something like this would happen then I would respond in this way, which would provide specific context and justification for actions taken.

The interviews provided rich details, and it is the interviews and narratives that I will focus on for the remainder of this project. Initially interviews were conducted with alumni of the University of Kansas Masters of Public Administration program. I initially identified and contacted seven alumni, and then snowballed the participants from these interviews. In the end, most of the participants in the study were not affiliated with the University of Kansas program. The 24 officials involved in city administration came from 10 different cities in the Kansas City Metropolitan area. The 25 policing officials came from 7 different cities in the Kansas City Metropolitan area. I conducted all interviews in person, often in the office of the

interviewee. Occasionally the interview would be moved to a near-by coffee shop if the office of the official did not allow for privacy during the interview.

Each interview began with the question, "Will you please tell me a story of a time when your authority may have been tested or challenged by a citizen outside of your organization or a subordinate within your organization." The question was often met with the response "I have never been challenged, but this one time….." (examples in interviews 2, 15, 16 and 19). The official would then go on to tell a story that clearly focused on a challenge to their authority, and I treated the narrative as a challenge to the official's authority. In the cases where officials denied that they faced any challenges to their authority, but then shared narratives to the contrary, I have credited the narrative, rather than the initial denial, as a more valid indicator of those officials' perceptions and assumptions. Since I asked follow-up and prodding questions to ensure that each narrative included a challenge, a response and the resolution, as well as details and context, no two sets of interview questions turned out to look the same.

Many of the interviews had conversational qualities where narratives were connected to one another and used to emphasize particular points the interviewee wished to make. In interview 26, for instance, a female official provided multiple narratives showing how she developed as an official from each new challenge she faced.

The interviews were often conversational and ranged in time from a half hour to over three hours, with an approximate average of an hour for an interview. Since

the narrative method is very context-specific it is important to qualify my findings. First, I am a member of all of the groups I identified as having traditionally low social status – female, minority and young. My social status could have affected the telling of stories. Officials with backgrounds somewhat similar to mine may have been more willing to open up to me and share stories. Officials with traditionally low social status did share, on average, approximately one more story per an interview than their counter-parts with traditionally high social status. Regardless of social background, these were all stories that were told to an outsider, as I was not a member of either of the professions studied as part of the project. Finally, as with all collections of narratives; narratives may have been biased toward the extreme. It is typically the extreme stories that people remember and tell. But, precisely because they remember and tell such stories, those stories likely play a larger role in officials' conceptions and identities.

When starting my interview process I did not have a theory fully elaborated. The process of developing my theory was iterative and worked reflexively with the narrative data. I began the project by conducting twelve pilot interviews. I transcribed the interviews and read through all of them coding for challenges to authority and strategies used to respond to the challenges. Initial themes emerged in these first twelve interviews and they were confirmed in an additional twenty-eight interviews. The themes and patterns concerning sources of authority, challenges to authority, strategies for mobilizing authority and organizational culture that were identified in these forty interviews were used to develop a survey administered to public officials

in city administration and policing, and discussed above. The lack of consciousness and concrete language to discuss social status and strategies for mobilizing authority began to become evident as I was coding the initial forty interviews. The lack of consciousness and willingness or ability to discuss social status and authority was confirmed by the survey.

I conducted follow-up interviews with nine officials that repeated the initial interview process and then asked specific questions about the officials' level of awareness of the themes emerging from the narratives. For instance, I would repeat back to the interviewee what I identified as the challenge and the strategy they used to respond to the challenge. Once they confirmed my understanding of how they responded to the challenge I asked them if their response was something that they consciously thought of doing and why they took that particular approach. Almost all of the participants said that they did not spend time consciously considering their responses; they just acted in the only way that they saw as reasonable at the time. The following exchange is typical of the exchange regarding strategies:

Immediately following the sharing of a narrative:

> Me: I find it interesting that in this story you talk about your official position and the duties that come with that position with this official. Do you feel like you had an explicit discussion about your role and duties?
>
> Administrator: Oh yeah, sometimes you just have to lay it out there and tell them what you are about and what you are in charge of doing.

> Me: Do you consciously think through when to have these conversations, or in this particular instance did you consciously think that it was time to have this conversation with this person?
>
> Administrator: No, I think that I have a psychological bias, maybe it is my training, it becomes cultural….It wasn't really a strategy, it's just how you react, it's not really a strategy at all. (Interview 45, middle-aged Latino male assistant county manager).

After the three stages of interviews I had a total of 49 interviews. All interviews were conducted with public officials in the Kansas City Metropolitan area in 2006, 2007 and 2008. All interviews were conducted in person by me and took an average of about an hour. I transcribed all of the interviews and coded them using Atlas.ti software. Of my 49 respondents, 25 came from policing and 24 from city administration. Participants had a range of experience, ranging from a few months in field in policing to over 30 years of public service. There are 30 male respondents and 19 female. 10 respondents are members of minority racial or ethnic groups, 29 are white. 44 respondents are middle-aged or older and 5 officials are young[5]. Since inclusion in any one traditionally high social status group does not negate membership in the traditionally low social status group (Turner 1988), I have categorized as belonging to a traditionally low social status all respondents who were young (under 25 for police officers and under 30 for city administrators), members of

---

[5] For administrators involved in city management young is defined as under thirty. For police officers young is defined as under 25. This difference is based on the different required levels of education for entering the professions – for the police officers involved in this study a bachelors degree was required while city managers almost all possessed post-graduate degrees. This difference is also based on the average starting age for these two professions, most likely influenced by the required level of education. Most police officers begin their careers in the early 20s, while many city managers begin their careers in their late 20s.

racial or ethnic minorities or female. My categorization resulted in 20 public officials belonging to the traditionally high social status group and 29 public officials belonging to the traditionally low social status group. Table 2.1 below provides specifics on the participant's professional and demographic identities.

Table 2.1 Here

In the chapters that follow I present the findings of the interviews I conducted with 49 public officials in 2006, 2007 and 2008. When reporting my findings I present quoted material verbatim, with only two exceptions. I have removed "ums", "oh yeahs" and "you knows" in order to enhance clarity of presentation. Additionally, I have removed references to specific individuals, organizations or cities in order to maintain the anonymity of the participants.

It is important to note that the patterns found in the narratives did not vary by profession. With the exception of physical challenges to authority and physical strategies to mobilize authority, which both only occurred in policing, there was little difference between the responses of police officers and city administrators. Instead, the primary differences arose from social status. It is because of the similarities by social status breakdown that I report all findings based on social status differences, not professional differences.

Analysis of the narratives revealed that social status is a deep social structure that permeates almost all aspects of how authority is seen and mobilized by public

officials. While public officials may not be completely aware of how social status affects the mobilization of their authority, or may not yet have the language to succinctly discuss how their social status affects the way they view and mobilize their own authority, the narratives that the participants shared provided insight into how this particular social structure frames authority. Clear patterns emerged in the narratives that were divided on lines of social status. In the following chapters I discuss these patterns and share the results of the narratives and subsequent discussions regarding authority. In chapter three I begin with a discussion of sources of authority and proving authority.

Chapter 3: Proving Authority: Sources of Authority and Social Status

Social status frames both how public officials view their sources of authority and how they gain access to their authority. Police officers and city administrators with traditionally low social status discussed the need to "prove" their authority – or shift the focus away from their social status to their official status in order to access their authority. Public officials with traditionally low social status are not immediately recognized as public authority figures, because their social status is inconsistent with traditional cultural image of a public authority figure. While public officials with traditionally high social status have instant access to their official authority, since it is consistent with their social status, public officials with traditionally low social status must first shift the focus away from their social status, which is incompatible with their official status, in order to access their authority based on their official status.

Returning to the narrative presented at the start of this dissertation, when the interviewee for chief of police challenged Sharon's authority, she responded by saying she was currently not acting as a wife, but instead was the assistant city manager and his potential boss (Interview 16). The interviewee saw Sharon as a female helpmate, a role based on her social status. In order to prove her authority Sharon shifted the focus away from a role based on her social status, and chose to focus on her official status. She discussed her title, and the role that came with her title, rooted in the city charter.

Sharon had to shift the focus from her social status to her official status in order to prove her authority because her social status was initially seen as incompatible with her official status. Middle-aged and older white male officials, those with traditionally high social status, by contrast, describe typically feeling no need to prove their authority within the organizations they worked in and only a minimal need to prove their authority with citizens they interacted with. How and why public officials prove their authority both within and outside of the organizations they work within is the central focus of this chapter.

At the outset, I want to note that the findings from the two contexts of this study, policing and city administration, were remarkably similar. Because differences between these two contexts were minimal, I will present observations from the police and city administration settings together rather than separately. To be sure, police officers faced physical challenges and physically mobilized their authority, while city administrators did not. But physicality was the only major difference between these two professions. And, as police officers will be quick to report, physical confrontations are very rare, even in policing. But physical confrontation was the only major difference between the two settings, and all other sources of authority, challenges to authority, and strategies for responding to challenges to authority appeared in similar patterns between the two settings. Instead, throughout this study, it is not profession but *social status* that marks the major distinction.

Although the proposition that people in practice draw on difference sources or types of authority is not new, few scholars have explored the implications. Wrong

(1980) proposed a typology of types of authority. Three of his types are particularly relevant to the discussion of sources of authority presented by the interview participants – competent, legitimate and personal. Competent authority is based on specialized knowledge and training. Legitimate authority is based on an acknowledged right to command. These two types are similar to my conceptualization here of official status and the authority that comes with it. The third type of authority Wrong discusses is personal authority. In his typology, this is a broad term that encompasses all authority based on personal characteristics and qualities. A key aspect of personal authority is, in my conceptualization, the authority that accompanies social status.

I identified nine different sources of authority through the interviews. These sources appeared in the narratives shared by the participants as well as discussions of authority that followed the narratives. The sources are largely based directly on social status or official status. I discuss each of the main sources of authority below as well as the nine specific sources identified in the interviews.

While Wrong (1980) discusses various types of authority as fundamentally distinct, they interact in practice. Individuals with traditionally high social status can possess all three types of authority he discussed simultaneously; they can layer their sources of authority on top of each other since there is no conflict between the sources. In the discussions presented below, I show that while many public officials with traditionally high social status acknowledge their official status, they rely more heavily on their social status as a source of authority. For public officials with

traditionally low social status, the authority they have based on their official status must overcome the lack of authority from their social status. The two sources of authority are incompatible for them, so instead of layering their sources of authority, as the officials with traditionally high social status do, they shift the focus from their social status to sources of authority based on their official status. While public officials with traditionally high social status discuss their official status as giving them an edge when it comes to authority, public officials with traditionally low social status must rely on their official status as the primary source of their authority.

Before getting into a full discussion of the sources of authority and specific techniques for proving authority, it is important to note how often discussions of proving authority took place during the interviews with the forty-nine public officials. Table 3.1 below shows how many officials discussed the need to prove their authority either within or outside of their organizations.

Table 3.1 Here

All four of the officials with traditionally high social status who discussed the need to prove their authority were police officers discussing proving authority with citizens outside of their organizations. No officials with traditionally high social status discussed feeling the need to prove their authority within their organization. One middle-aged white male city manager noted, “When people think of a manager,

they think of someone like me, tall, white and male and a bit older" (Interview 35). He is here observing that there is no conflict for employees between his personal and professional identities. He need not shift the focus from his social status to his official status because his social status complements his official status and provides him with an additional layer of authority. By contrast, officials with traditionally low social status discussed the need to prove their authority within and outside of the organization. An older minority male city administrator, for instance, discussed the need to prove his authority:

> You will have employees who come and they bring all their baggage, they walk in and see you and they don't like it. It is only through time they are going to drop some of their baggage. When they meet you because of your title they will leave some of it at the door, and then as you prove your knowledge, some more of that baggage will go, as you prove trust then more of that baggage will go (Interview 17 older black male city administrator).

The majority of the sources of authority that this city administrator is discussing are derived from official status – title, knowledge and trust (which he later discusses as being a combination of tenure in the organization and record of actions). Where the officials with traditionally high social status often discussed these official sources of authority as automatically working for them, the public officials with traditionally low social status, like this city administrator, discuss having to *activate* or *prove* these official sources of authority. Proving sources of authority often meant moving past the 'baggage' that came with their social status:

> People are people, and I have trained a lot of people over the years, we are what we are and we bring a lot of baggage, whatever that prior experience is we bring that baggage and it is only through the knowledge, education and exposure and experience that we start unloading that baggage…it is only after people start unloading that baggage that they will see you for who you are and start listening to you as their boss (Interview 17 older black male city administrator).

The characterization of the above public official is not to say that public officials with traditionally low social status are only proving their authority to citizens and colleagues with traditionally high social status. For example, a young black female discusses having to prove her authority to members of her own race:

> Even with your own race you have to prove yourself, because some people think that you are an Uncle Tom, or you are, you know a traitor or something like that. So, yeah, it could bother you but I can't let them break me down, you have to take each day as it comes and each person as they come (Interview 14)

The discussions of proving authority, or shifting the focus away from social status to official status, also often included discussions of society-wide expectations about authority. For example, one middle-aged white female police officer observed that she had to constantly fight against expectations:

> They expect to see men coming through the door. And when you are dealing with my grandma she is expecting to see a policeman or a doctor as a man or a lawyer as a man. So it is not just the men or the younger male adults, it is the older adults too. But you have to overcome that and I think that you have to overcome that by being assertive, not mean, but saying hey I am the police and I am on the job

> and this is what I want, and then they are like oh yeah this isn't 1952, women can have this job (Interview 37).

Not all officials with traditionally low social status used the term proving authority, but a full 21 out of 29 (72%) officials with traditionally low social status provided examples of rhetorical moves that amount, in effect, to efforts to prove authority. While women and minorities are becoming more accepted in public organizations, the majority of officials with low social status interviewed described struggling against preconceived notions of who should lead. For instance, a young white male police officer discusses conflicting expectations about authority based on sex:

> ….just the karma of having a female in uniform. The authority is given to them because they are in uniform and they are wearing a badge, but the neighborhood or the city or wherever they are at, they might not picture a female having the same authority as a male, physical stature whatever the case may be, we have seven, I think it was last time I counted. Two of them are sergeants, with the exception of one, all of them are thin, small stature female officers (Interview 31 young white male police officer).

The young white male police officer quoted above sees no conflict in his own identity. He acknowledges both official sources of authority (the uniform and badge) and social sources of authority (physical size and sex). For him, and many of his fellow police officers, all of these sets of resources go together. They can be large men in uniforms with badges, but the female police officers in their department may

have a tougher time. He frames the cognitive conflict as coming from the citizens they are serving, but notes that other officers in his field and even in his department may not see the official status of female police officers as legitimate because of their lack of corresponding social status.

The seventy-two percent of public officials with traditionally low social status who discussed proving their authority described three main techniques for doing so. The first was through knowledge or credential dropping when interacting with people who seemed to be seeing the official mainly in terms of social status. In credential dropping, public officials with traditionally low social status would "read their resumes" or let citizens or subordinates know their background and credentials in order to secure their authority. The second way public officials with traditionally low social status proved their authority was through the passage of time. Some public officials with traditionally low social status felt that they needed time to allow their record of service in an organization to prove that they were worthy of authority. Finally, some individuals with traditionally low social status relied on their professional networks or relationships to prove their authority. Relying on professional networks or relationships to prove authority often involved discussing the official's peer group, or even name dropping, in order to prove their sources of authority. Almost all public officials with traditionally low social status discussed using one or more of these methods to prove or legitimate their sources of authority within their organizations or with citizens outside of their organization. I will discuss these techniques for proving authority more completely later in this chapter, but first I

will discuss the nine sources of authority identified in the interviews and narratives, many of which are the basis for proving authority.

Most of the sources of authority in the list relate to social status or official status specifically. Throughout my interviews, sources of authority that relate to social status are often discussed as "traditions" or "norms." These have been institutionalized in many organizations over generations or come from larger industry-wide or society-wide expectations. Sources of authority that are related to official status are often based on organizational rules, city charters or statutes. For officials with traditionally high social status these two sets of resources are often not in conflict. Traditionally high social status individuals can draw on all of these sources of authority simultaneously or choose between them as they see fit. For officials with traditionally low social status, their multiple sets of resources and sources of authority are often in conflict. When officials with traditionally low social status access sources of authority based on their official status they must shift the focus away from their social status, downplaying their social status or denying a connection to their social status altogether.

Sources of Authority

Table 3.2 identifies the nine sources of authority found in the interviews and narratives.

Table 3.2 Here

Of the nine sources of authority identified only three of the sources – physical attributes, assertiveness and institutionalized traditions or norms -- are based on social status. These three sources are, nonetheless, in practice quite powerful. Institutionalized traditions and norms, physical attributes and assertiveness are all powerful sources of authority both within public organizations and outside of organizations when interacting with citizens. Five of the sources of authority – ordinances, statutes and/or judicial decisions, job title, uniform or clothing, position in the organization hierarchy and seniority -- are based on official status. The five sources based on official status can all be traced back to laws or organizational rules as their foundational source of power and authority.

Since official sources of authority are more explicit than the sources of authority based on social status, which are based on unwritten but highly recognizable norms, they are not as powerful as sources of authority based on social status. The fact that they can be explicitly identified as official sources of authority means the authority does not appear to be inherent in the individual, but rather is a characteristic merely of the position that they have been hired into. Since sources of authority based on social status are implicit, and difficult to recognize, they are often seen as inherent in the individual who possesses them, making them seem more permanent and powerful. When an official relies on a source of authority based on official status the source of their authority is explicit and can be attributed to something outside of them. When, on the other hand, an official relies on a source of authority based on social status, their authority is implicit. The source of authority cannot be pinpointed

or easily attributed to anything other than the official and their intrinsic authority. I will discuss the mobilization of authority, utilizing sources of authority, in chapter five. But for now I will turn to a full discussion of sources of authority based on social status and official status before returning to the main focus on this chapter – techniques used to prove authority.

Social Status and Authority

Social status frames and influences all aspects of authority. Traditionally high social status comes with its own unique sources of authority, and it also bolsters official sources of authority. Traditionally low social status burdens public officials not only by limiting access to forms of personal authority, but also by making access to official forms of authority more difficult. Although some public officials are aware of how their social status, whether traditionally high or traditionally low, affects their sources of authority, not all officials seem to show this awareness. While few if any sources of authority accompany traditionally low social status, several sources of authority are granted simply due to traditionally high social status factors. I will discuss first the sources of authority that accompany traditionally high social status, and then I will discuss how consciousness of social status conditionally affects sources of authority.

Traditionally High Social Status and Authority

Public officials identified three main sources of authority that are based on traditionally high social status – physical attributes, assertiveness and institutionalized

traditions and norms other than policy-based norms. These are not necessarily exclusive to individuals with traditionally high social status, but tend to be associated with traditionally high social status more often than traditionally low social status.

The most obvious source of authority rooted in social status is physical size and strength. Larger physical stature and expectations about physicality are closely associated with traditionally high social status. Expectations of physicality included obvious expectations and benefits for police officers who were physically large and could intimidate citizens into cooperation, but it also worked in more subtle ways. One of the most basic sources of authority for many traditionally high social status public officials was their close fit to the cultural image of public authority. As the young white male police officer discussed above observed, his small female colleagues did not fit the image of police officers, but as an average-size white male, he did (Interview 31). The physical element of social status is not exclusive to the uniform-wearing profession of policing, as size was also discussed in city administration. For instance, in Interview 22 an older white female assistant city manager talked about how her tall stature helped her fit into the traditional image of a city administrator even though she was female. Nonetheless, physical size is more prevalent in the police officers' narratives.

Although women are becoming more accepted in professional workplace settings, and are no longer limited to roles of receptionist or administrative assistant, there still are preconceived notions of who should lead. As one tall, middle-aged, white male city manager noted, when the "general public pictures the city manager

they typically think of someone like me" (Interview 35). The classic image of a city manager is still consistent with Weber's (1946) ideas of traditional leadership: a tall white male as a leader. While women can and have attained the role of city manager, the idea of "looking" like a leader still is exclusively a source of authority for the public officials with traditionally high social status who operate within these roles, especially when interacting with the "general public."

Culturally-conditioned images of authority are even more prevalent in policing. In policing there is a term of art for a major source of authority, "command presence." All seven of the police departments visited as part of this project reported having some type of training on command presence. Command presence has many definitions, but officials with high social status tended to define it as based on physical size and attitude, whereas training manuals and officials with low social status defined the same concept as knowing the laws and projecting an attitude of authority based on that knowledge. For example, a middle-aged white male mid-ranking police officer stated that he was over six feet tall and over two hundred pounds so he embodied command presence (Interview 11), a definition that rests solely on physical attributes closely aligned with social status. A mid-ranking white female in the same department, by contrast, defined command presence as "looking smart and sharp," a definition based, at least in part, on knowledge of the profession (Interview 33).

Gender-based understandings of "command presence" are not unique to the suburban department these two officers came from. Similar differences were seen in

an urban department where officers with traditionally high social status focused on the physical aspects of the definition while officers with traditionally low social status focused on official authority. In one urban department a middle-aged white male officer defined command presence as appearing assertive and acting as if you will not take any guff from citizens (Interview 6). The primal aspect of some definitions of command presence comes across in another middle-aged white male police officer's description: "People are animals still, they are like dogs and cats and they smell confidence and they smell fear and they react to that" (Interview 7). Such a characterization stresses the physical aspects of confidence and command presence. Another middle aged white male police officer described command presence, similarly, as a mix of physical and psychological, "I think that it has a lot to do with size and the way that you carry yourself. I have a happy medium of both, I have a good size and I carry myself in a manner that I come across as a person who does not want any trouble, but I also come across as a person who does not want to screw you over just to screw you over" (Interview 10).

Although physical attributes and assertiveness are the most obvious sources of authority based in social status, institutionalized cultural traditions and norms may be the most powerful social status-based sources of authority. Such norms may be as simple as who is implicitly seen as a leader or manager and who is not. The city manager who knew that others "saw him as a manager," (Interview 35) is aware of the benefit of institutionalized norms and traditions. His job is easier because he does not have to continually prove that he belongs in it. Public officials who do not fit the

traditions of their profession, however, must work to continually fit the mold of their profession. Public officials with traditionally low social status may be able to mimic some aspects of authority based on social status, such as physical attributes and assertiveness. For example, female police officers described entering situations assertively or responding to challenges from citizens with “over-the-top” physical responses. But, regardless of a public official with traditionally low social status’ ability to mimic aspects of high social status, he or she is still not as immediately recognizable as an authority figure. Public officials with traditionally low social status must work to make their authority explicit while public officials with traditionally high social status enjoy authority that is implicitly granted based on cultural traditions and institutionalized norms.

Awareness of the benefits and difficulties of authority based on social status

Some public officials with traditionally high social status appear to be fully conscious of the privileges that come with their social status. A middle aged white male city manager told a story of a councilman who came to his office one day and complained that all of the assistant city managers of the city were female and therefore did not project a strong leadership image in the community. While the city council has complete discretion over the position of city manager, the city manager has all hiring and firing power over the rest of the organization in most council-manager forms of local government. The councilman wanted the city manager to fire some of the female assistant city managers and hire more male assistant city managers to “improve the leadership image” of the city. While the city manager

responded that he did not bend to the pressure and continued to make personnel decisions without regard to sex in all positions below him within the organization, he noted that it would be quite difficult for a woman to hold the top position in that particular city regardless of her qualifications professionally. He was fully conscious that his social status allowed his credentials to shine when he interviewed for the top position, and his sex allowed him to attain his official status. While he was working to promote equal access and diversity within his organization he noted that it would probably be quite a while before a woman would hold his position:

> What is unique about the city manager, the city manager serves at the pleasure of the governing body, truly at their pleasure, and a city council does not have to give a reason to terminate a manager. And that is the contractual arrangement at the beginning, so I mean they can fire you because you are female and they don't like it, they don't have to ever say it, they don't have to give any reason why they fire you. I mean, I guess what I am saying is it would be easier to discriminate against a city manager than practically any other position that I can think of (Interview 35).

When women do come into the top position in an organization they are often conscious of the difficulties they face, as illustrated by the following observation from an older white female police chief:

> Coming in as woman I am always going to get tagged with, and certainly have here, that she only wants to hire lesbians because they make better police officers. That is one of the stupidest things I have ever heard. Or, she only wants to promote women. Okay I have had the opportunity now to promote one, she did the best on the test, she did the best interview, that time around but how about the 12 other men that I have promoted. It's that threat that its there. It was the same

> thing that I dealt with coming up, is that even though that on almost all of my promotion assessments I came out number one on the list, except for one, it was always like, 'well she only got promoted because she was a woman' (Interview 28 older white female police chief).

Top public officials in policing and city administration are often aware of the systemic inequalities that face individuals with traditionally low social status in public organizations. In both of the two examples above such an awareness framed the way the officials saw their authority. The middle-aged white male city manager knew that his social status made it possible for him to attain a position that it would be hard for a woman, with similar professional credentials, to attain. The police chief with traditionally low social status was aware that her social status negatively framed each increase in official status she attained, and as well as her decisions to promote subordinates.

Some public officials deny that social status frames their official authority. For instance, a young white female police officer just starting her career said that discrimination was in the past and that people now understood a police officer was a police officer regardless of their sex (Interview 8). A young white female city administrator praised the women who came before her in her profession, claiming that they handled "all that stuff" so she didn't have to worry about it (Interview 19). Since explicit sexism is no longer publicly acceptable, and therefore the councilman from above would most likely never make public the comments he shared with the white male city manager, it is possible that these two young professional women will

go on in their careers without facing any overt actions that change their thinking about their social status and how it frames their authority. But, more likely, as their careers develop they will face challenges like those described in the next chapter and will learn to develop strategies like those described in the chapter which follows that.

Official Status and Authority

In the interviews, I identified five sources of authority based on official status: ordinances, statutes and/or judicial decisions, job title, uniform or clothing, position in the organization hierarchy and seniority. These sources of authority bring with them a sense of legitimacy since they are explicitly based on written organizational rules, city charters, statutes, and the like. These sources of authority are not necessarily universally accepted. Official status, like social status, brings with it sources of authority. While, as the section above discusses, social status may frame these sources of authority, official sources of authority are available to all public officials occupying positions of public authority.

Although sources of authority based on official status are powerful, they often carry a stigma: they are, at times, in competition with powerful cultural schema based on tradition and social status. A middle-aged white male police officer who noted that he came from a long line of male police officers said he had a problem with some sources of authority based on official status (Interview 11). While discussing some of his fellow officers, he noted that "I have got real problems with the fact that we all assume that we are granted authority just by the nature of our position and our badge." For the officer in Interview 11, authority is not something that can be handed

out by an organization, based on rules and laws; he characterizes authority as something implicit to the official holding it, and implies that it should be based on an official's own personal characteristics.

Rather than coming from traditions passed along in a family or other social group, sources of authority based on official status often find their roots in organizational norms, organizational rules, city charters or statutes. "Official" images of authority are based on the profession or the organization, not social status characteristics. As a young, white female police officer put it:

> I think that they see the uniform and they know that the uniform means business, and it means that this person has gone through training, they know what they are doing, and sometimes a combination of being scared, I don't want to say scared of the police like really scared, but some people do have that fear of the police, like they are going to arrest me, that is really scary and also they just know that we are an authoritative figure (Interview 8).

Sources of authority based on official status are often directly connected to ordinances and laws:

> Laws are very powerful and they never get turned down, that card is always in your hand, always (Interview 37 middle-aged white female police officer).

Since sources of authority based on official status are explicit, when they are absent, that fact may be especially obvious to officials with traditionally low social status. Thus, an older white female city manager discussed the ordinances governing

her position, noting the absence of supporting legal terms. Unlike most council-manager cities, this particular city did not have a charter or ordinances laying out the specific organization hierarchy within the city organization. The city manager below noted that the absence of such a formal hierarchy mattered:

> You know, I think it would have been easier for me all of these years if it had been established by ordinance what my authority was, and if the structure had been a line structure where you know, people knew that they couldn't go around me, they knew that we had to sit down. Because I don't mind sitting down with anybody and sitting face to face and arguing with them, and coming to a solution, but if they don't like that, if they resent that in any way, and they know it is very easy for them to go to the mayor, and the mayor will always talk to them, they can go to any of those council members, and then come back on me and say, and sometimes not listen to my side, that is very difficult, and there have been issues with difficult times. So I think authority, whether it is by ordinance or not, it must be very clear, and I think it can be abused and that is probably why it hasn't been used in this city (Interview 34 older white female city manager).

Similarly, many of the public officials with traditionally low social status characterized a charter- or ordinance-based organizational hierarchy as a helpful source of authority. In the interviews, women more than any other group talked about each step they took up in the organizational ladder and described each step as having a new title and new power and new responsibility. They appeared especially attentive to of each step up in authority. For example, in Interview 29 a middle-aged white female city manager talked about the step she took going from assistant to the city manager to assistant city manager. She said that it was profound and she felt that

people were treating her differently and she had more authority. She was taken more seriously, she said after, she got the new title.

By contrast, individuals with traditionally high social status often discussed the general amount of authority that came with being a public official regardless of where they were in the organizational hierarchy. Many middle-aged white male field training officers, who typically ranked as sergeants – a management level rank -- discussed how they had no more authority than they did when they walked onto the job years before with the rank of patrolman. They described all people of their profession having the same level of authority, especially in the eyes of the public. Middle-aged and older white male police officers characterized it by saying that police officers are police officers and that citizens see them and are deferential (Interviews 1, 2, 6, 11).

Organizational hierarchy was also important for public officials with traditionally low social status whose positions were lower in the hierarchy. A middle-aged white female assistant city manager observed several times that she was under the city manager in the organization hierarchy so she could use directives that came from that office as a source of her authority, without having to make the directives herself (Interview 18). A young white male city manager said that when he was coming up in the organization he liked being the assistant department head or assistant manager because it meant that someone else ultimately had the responsibility for things going right, so he could not be used as a fall guy if things did not go well (Interview 25).

How social status frames official sources of authority

Social status frames some forms of official authority. By framing, I mean that an official's social status influences the power and accessibility of official sources of authority. For example, uniform or attire is an official source of authority discussed by many of the public officials. The uniform or professional clothing as a particular source of authority provides a telling example, however, of how an official source of authority can be framed by social status. The uniform that police officers wear or the suits and professional clothing that city administrators wear was identified by both officials with traditionally high social status and officials with traditionally low social status as an official source of authority. There was, however, a stark contrast in how the two groups framed this particular source of authority. Officials with traditionally high social status talked about their attire as giving them an extra edge in interactions, while officials with traditionally low social status talked about their choices in attire as a crucial source of their authority and a key way furthermore to present an authoritative professional image.

An older white male police chief, for instance, observed, "you can do this job and a lot of what comes with it in jeans and something else, but you have the uniform, the uniform, you have to have something visible when you hit the streets and you are walking up on a car, you have that edge right there" (Interview 27). While this police chief describes the uniform as providing an extra "edge" of authority, he claims it is not crucial, and that officers could still be recognized to do their jobs without the uniform. In contrast, an older female police chief characterizes her uniform as

follows: “there is a difference when I meet people and they have first met me in regular clothes versus when they meet me in uniform and often it takes them a moment or two when they see me the opposite of how they first met me to kind of figure out oh who is that, oh yeah that is the chief of police” (Interview 28). She describes her uniform as a crucial aspect of her authority, and without it she is sometimes not even recognized as the authority figure that she is.

The older female police chief goes on to discuss her uniform as a way to mask her social status: “when I need to assert a little more authority in front of the city council I will wear my uniform to meetings. Then they are thinking of me as the police chief and not a woman.” Significantly, the uniform as a source of authority is also present for traditionally low social status city administrators. Thus, a young male city manager observed, “depending on a meeting that I have that day, depending on what role I need to play in that meeting, I definitely will dress it up, and I think that is more because of my age too. I take that into consideration, if there are some pretty important decisions to be made I will dress up” (Interview 25).

Both groups of public officials, those with traditionally high social status and those with traditionally low social status, have access to attire as a source of official authority. Social status, however, frames this official source of authority. Public officials with traditionally high social status can layer the uniform onto the authority that comes with their social status, but many public officials with traditionally low social status discuss the uniform as masking their social status and the lack of authority that comes with it.

Public officials with traditionally low social status in my interviews often described taking steps to mask their social status. Similarly, many public officials with traditionally low social status, as I noted at the outset of this chapter, described proving their authority by shifting the focus from the social status to their official status. I turn now to the mechanisms for "proving" authority.

Proving Authority

Proving authority consists of shifting the focus away from social status to official status in order to access authority. The act of proving authority is not the same as mobilizing authority or exercising authority. Mobilizing authority happened in order to head off or respond to a challenge to authority. Proving authority was something that public officials with traditionally low social status discussed as a prerequisite necessary even to allow them access to the sources of authority that they possessed as part of their official status. While many officials with traditionally high social status described authority as being automatically conferred as a result of their various social and official statuses, public officials with traditionally low social status commonly described struggling to achieve recognition for their "official" authority. Their social status framed their official status in such a way that they had to prove their official status in order to have access to it as a source of authority.

Public officials with traditionally high social status tended to characterize proving in terns of the actions of the public official once they were in office. The story below is typical of how public officials with traditionally high social status discuss proving authority:

> A year from now, I will be able to tell whether or not the departments respect that person [a new public official] by how they use the position or are they working around it. I clearly think we are set up so that the position holds the respect, but the person working it has to hold on to it, has to develop that. They [others in the organization] are going to get things done and if they feel the incapacity of that person to do anything for them in a decision making capacity or that they don't have some type of influence in working things, or there is no value to them then they will work right around them, and that is what happened with the previous assistant city manager, departments continued to use him in the chain of authority for minor things, but anytime something big came up they were waiting to see me (Interview 20 middle-aged white male assistant city manager).

With the above response the middle-aged white male assistant city manager is focused on how the official performs his or her job. There is an assumption that the position and the person hold power and the person simply has to perform. The response does not consider the need to prove authority, or shift the focus from the social status of the official to the official status. Instead, it assumes that the person can come in and start performing. By contrast, public officials with traditionally low social status discussed the need to prove their authority, or shift the focus from their social status to their official status every time they entered a new position regardless of their official status.

Public officials with traditionally low social status discussed three distinct ways for proving their authority. The first was by subtly or explicitly making reference to their credentials or their knowledge. The second was time, by which I mean either gaining the type of experience that comes only with the passage of time

or allowing sufficient time to pass to allow colleagues to recognize that they are qualified to participate. The final way that public officials with traditionally low social status proved their authority was by subtly or explicitly making reference to their professional networks and relationships. Similar to the knowledge or credential dropping of the first strategy this strategy often manifested itself in name dropping as a way to prove that they should have the authority that they are granted as public officials because of their professional peer groups.

Credentials and Knowledge

A key "proving" technique is credential-dropping. When a public official experienced a power paradox – that is, a conflict between their traditionally low social status and their high official status -- they often discussed steps they took to emphasize their qualifications for their high official status. For younger public officials with traditionally low social status credential dropping often meant referring to degrees they held or specialized training. For instance, a middle-aged white female assistant city manager described instances in which she referred to her Master's of Public Administration (MPA) and specialized training received with a regional management organization (Interview 23). A young white female police officer similarly described instances in which she referred to her specialized training in the use of force (Interview 13).

In order to prove their official status and authority public officials with traditionally low social status also referred to their specialized knowledge. For instance, they described subtly bringing up their knowledge, casually in the course of

conversation, as in this example drawn from an interview with an older white female city manager:

> Despite the fact that it is almost 30 years experience I can still remember a few things and I think that credibility does help, either with the folks that I am working with and with public as well. It is not something that you trot out, but it is something that in the course of your conversations with them you can emphasize an understanding of a particular issue that they can relate to, whatever it might be, and they are more appreciative then of your perspective (Interview 39).

Public officials with traditionally low social status also described using very explicit references to their own specialized knowledge. For instance, another older white female city administrator discussed knowing the technical side of everything that goes on below her in the city:

> So I think that is the key to a good public administrator, you need to know enough of the technical to be able to speak intelligently and understand what they are talking about because there are so many technical areas or expertise within our organization. And then be able to assist them administratively, whether it is a personnel issue, a policy issue, have you thought about getting all the input you need from the neighborhoods kind of issue, you know sometimes folks who are on a technical track, they want to get a project done, they want to get a street built, they want to get a waterline laid, and they are not always thinking about some of those peripheral issues that are as important, and can make or break a project (Interview 22).

She went on to say that she would regularly engage technical staff below her in technical conversations in order to demonstrate that she knew her stuff and could

"hold her own" with the more technical sides of local government. Knowledge dropping allowed her, she said, to then exercise administrative authority over these employees; once she proved her knowledge she could have access to the authority that came with her position.

Many of the women, minorities and young people in my interviews discussed knowledge- or credential-dropping as a technique to prove their authority. All of the people who used the credential- or knowledge-dropping strategy said they did it as a way to prove their authority through their credentials every single time they met someone new inside or outside of the organization. Therefore, many women, racial and ethnic minorities and young people would effectively "read parts of their resume" to people when they first met them in order to prove they had real authority based on their official status.

While credential- or knowledge-dropping was not out of the ordinary for public officials with traditionally low social status, not a public official with traditionally high social status – not one - discussed doing it. Public officials with traditionally high social status did not discuss sharing their credentials or proving their knowledge to citizens they encountered outside of their organization, or with subordinates within their organization.

Time

A second technique used by many women, racial and ethnic minorities and young people for proving authority was time. Although public officials with traditionally high social status discuss a certain amount of authority accompanying

them to the job, public officials with traditionally low social status seemed never to feel that they had authority in the earliest days on the job. They needed *time*. When time passes at a job two things that help to prove authority happen. The first is that invaluable experience is gained. There are certain things for which no amount of training can prepare a public official. Time on the job allows for a variety of experiences that help to prove authority, since now an official can say that they have handled a certain type of situation. For example, a middle-aged Latino assistant county manager discussed his experiences working with constituent groups. He said even though he had trained to work with a variety of constituent groups there was no amount of training that could replace the real experience. Additionally, once he successfully facilitated a few projects with large constituent groups he could point to those successes to prove his authority to new constituent groups (Interview 45). Such a use of "time" as a means to prove authority is not entirely unique to public officials with traditionally low social status. Although public officials with traditionally high social status talk about their jobs becoming easier with time, of adjusting to a job over time, the way that public officials with traditionally low social status speak of time is unique. Time is used as a way for public officials with traditionally low social status to establish themselves as having the ability to do the job and work past the stigmas of their social status. The passage of time also allows traditionally low social status officials the chance to build a reputation on the basis of their official status rather than their social status. For the following official, her decade of service allowed her to be seen not as a woman, but as a public official who knows about finance:

> I think I had established my reputation in over tens years in finance. 'Okay, she's female but she might know what she is talking about, or at least she might be pretty decent'. I have never been a big ego person or a big I am a woman hear me roar kind of person. I felt that to be more effective you should not have to deal with that issue unless you absolutely have to (Interview 22 older white female city administrator).

Some public officials with traditionally high social status acknowledge that time may be an issue that affects public officials with traditionally low social status. Some individuals with traditionally high social status implied that officials superior to them in the organizational hierarchy but with traditionally low social status must earn respect in a way that officials with traditionally high social status do not have to.

> My current major, I have worked for her since I really started and she is well respected and nobody questions her rank or her authority, it just doesn't happen, but she's also earned that respect. I think that it is probably tougher for women to earn that respect, but once they earn it, it is the same thing, because they understand that you aren't going to mess around with this lady because she is going to tell you how it is (Interview 40 middle-aged white male police officer).

For some public officials with traditionally low social status, the need for the passage of time as a way to prove their authority limits career opportunities. A number of females, especially those in middle management positions, described foregoing job opportunities because they said it would be hard to walk into a new environment and be forced to start earning respect all over again. They said it would be hard to rebuild their authority in new organizations. For example:

> I have applied other places, and I thought, gosh I would be starting at ground zero, no one would know that I am really trustworthy, or how hard I work, or how dedicated I am. So I think some of it, yes absolutely is that I have been here, 17 years and they have seen projects that I have done, and the dedication that I have shown (Interview 16 middle-aged white female city administrator).

The use of time as a technique is prominent among women, racial and ethnic minorities and young people, but it can have negative consequences for many of these officials' careers because it is tied to a single organizational context and prevents movement between jobs and possible career advancing opportunities.

Professional Networks and Relationships

The final technique for proving authority discussed by many of the women, minorities and young people I spoke with was discussing networks and peer groups. The strategy of discussing network groups and professional peers is similar to knowledge or credential dropping and often is manifested in name dropping. Discussing networks and peer groups, or name dropping, proves officials' authority by who they know. Discussions of professional networks or relationships establish where the public official has been for their education, what groups they belong to professionally and who they are connected to professionally, which may make them seem more deserving of authority or deference to their official status.

In many ways proving authority by referencing peer groups is linked to credentials, as it was for a female department head who said that she often references successful alumni of her master's program in order to show what people with her

credentials go on to accomplish (Interview 29). Another middle-aged white female city administrator said that her status in a prestigious alumni network provided her more legitimacy when she started her job in local government (Interview 23). A young white male city manager said that he would make references to his mentoring relationship with an older white male city manager in order to prove to his subordinates that he had access to the "old guard" of local management in the area. By drawing attention to such connections, he implied that he too deserved some respect for his position as a city manager (Interview 25). Public officials with traditionally low social status used these relationships and networks to legitimate their official status and the authority that came with it. The legitimation process was not mentioned as necessary for traditionally high social status individuals.

Often, however, discussing networks, peer groups, and name dropping focused on showing that others of a particular social status group could handle authority and, therefore, so could the individual doing the name dropping. An older white female police chief, for instance, often discussed the accomplishments of another female police chief in her area (Interview 28). Younger white female city administrators often touted the accomplishments of the pioneering women who came before them in local government (Interview 28). By mentioning success stories, current public officials with traditionally low social status established a record of success that they intended to follow and be a part of. They also established that other people with similar backgrounds to their own could succeed in their chosen field. Such an observation was unnecessary for middle-aged and older white men in order

to establish credibility. None of the middle-aged and older white men discussed the need to talk about their peer groups with others within their organization. It was assumed that people with their background could succeed.

Young White Men and Proving Authority

Young white men use many of the techniques for proving authority used by women and racial and ethnic minorities. In Interview 25 the young, white male city manager provided many examples of having to prove his authority. He said that often with citizens he would have to remind them of his credentials and his ability to hold his position despite his age. He often referenced his training and degrees as well as discussing his peer network and name dropping when he met new citizens or colleagues. Middle-aged and older white men, however, do not report using any of these techniques to prove their authority. The present study is not longitudinal, and speculations about changes overtime in the views of public officials are beyond its scope. It appears, however, that proving authority is a temporary necessity for young white men, something that they only have to do when they are young and new to their profession, and which recedes as they age. Racial and ethnic minorities and women, however, discuss having to prove their authority throughout their career, regardless of their age and the length of their service. Proving authority is a life-long issue for women and racial and ethnic minorities, but this does not appear to be the case for white men.

Conclusion

All public officials have authority that is based on their official position. Social status, however, frames access to the authority of the position. Public officials with traditionally high social status seem to assume that they have instantaneous access to their authority. Public officials with traditionally high social status can even layer sources of authority on top of each other. Social status is seen as their primary source of authority, and their official status provides them with an "edge." Public officials with traditionally low social status did not receive the same edge, because they must first prove their authority in order to access the authority of their position. Public officials with traditionally low social status must prove their authority by shifting the focus of their authority away from their social status to their official status. Rather than layering sources of authority, public officials with traditionally low social status must rely primarily on their official status as their source of authority.

The power of social status in framing authority has repercussions for how public officials experience their professions. Social status frames initial access to authority, and officials with high social status have immediate access, but officials with traditionally low social status have delayed access. Proving authority is something that white males only have to do early in their careers, when they are young and still do not fit the traditional image of a public official. But proving authority is something that officials with traditionally low social status discuss doing throughout their careers, doing so each time they encounter a new citizen or enter a

new organization. Reliance on time as a means to prove authority means that public officials may not want to change organizations as often, potentially foregoing career enhancing opportunities. It also means that public officials with traditionally low social status are constantly reaffirming their official identities, work that is not necessary for public officials with traditionally high social status.

Chapter 4: Challenges to Authority

Public officials inevitably experience challenges to their authority. A challenge to a public official is a direct or indirect disregard or confrontation of the official's authority. A challenge can be as simple as a remark or harsh question, or as explicit and confrontational as a direct confrontation or defiance. In this study, I asked the public officials, "to share a story of a time with their authority was tested or challenged by a citizen outside of their organization or a subordinate within their organization." The framing of the question gave the public officials the ability to define challenges broadly, and my categorization of challenges was based on the responses I received from them.

All public officials, regardless of social status or profession, received challenges to their authority. Challenges to authority were instigated by citizens and subordinate employees with traditionally high and traditionally low social status. Public officials with traditionally high social status faced challenges based exclusively on their official position as authority figures. By contrast, public officials with traditionally low social status faced challenges based on both their personal and professional identities.

I identified nine types of challenges to authority. They are: questioning of a directive, questioning authority to give a directive, denying authority based on a social status factor, denying authority without reference to a social status factor, passive evasion of a directive, evasion of a person or position in the chain of command, outright defiance of a directive and physical challenge against an official.

See Table 4.1 for a full description of each type of challenge. I also did not consider physical challenges since they applied only to police officers. The remaining challenge types cluster into three broad categories – verbal, evasion and defiance - and the rest of my analysis focuses on these general categories:

- *Verbal challenges* include questioning of a specific directive handed down by the public official, questioning the official's authority to give the directive, verbally denying the official has authority based on a social status factor, or verbally denying the official has authority without mentioning a social status factor. One example of a verbal challenge comes from a narrative provided by a white female city manager - a city employee questioned her authority to make hiring decisions (Interview 38).
- *Evasion challenges* refer to when a subordinate or citizen passively evades a directive of the official or goes around them in the chain of command without acknowledgement from the official. For example, an older female city manager told of a time when a department head did not want to cut his budget as she had requested. Rather than presenting the budget to her without the changes, he presented it directly to the city council (Interview 39).
- *Defiant challenges* consist of direct refusals to comply with a directive from the official. Defiance is more than just questioning the directive, since it includes non-compliance, a specific action or lack of action on the part of the subordinate or citizen. For example, a female police officer pulled over a man

for a traffic violation, she asked for his license which he refused to provide to her. He insisted on waiting for a male backup officer (Interview 33).

Table 4.1 Here

Two observations are theoretically significant. First, respondents with traditionally low social status reported more challenges than respondents with traditionally high social status. I was a told a total of 162 challenge narratives from the 49 public officials who were a part of this project. One hundred-six of the challenge narratives came from the 29 public officials with traditionally low social status. The 20 public officials with traditionally high social status shared 56 challenge narratives. On average public officials with traditionally low social status told me 3.7 narratives each while public officials with traditionally high social status told me 2.8 narratives each.

There are a number of reasons that could explain the differences in the number of narratives. Consistent with my theory, and based on the observations from the stories told by public officials, I believe that the first reason for the differences in the number of narratives is most compelling, but a mixture of any or all of the factors below may have influenced the results. First, and most compelling, it could be that public officials with traditionally low social status experience more challenges to their authority than their counterparts with traditionally high social status. Second,

public officials with traditionally low social status may be more “sensitive” to recognizing and reporting challenges to their authority. Third, public officials with traditionally low social status may be more willing to tell stories of challenges to their authority, or public officials with traditionally high social status may be less willing to share stories of challenges to their authority. Finally, public officials with traditionally low social status may have been more willing to share stories of challenges to their authority with me, since I could identify with them as woman, ethnic minority and/or young person.

The second theoretically important finding is that the distributions of challenges across the three challenge categories were similar for traditionally low and traditionally high social status respondents. See Table 4.2 below. The vast majority of all of the challenges reported, regardless of social status, were verbal. Public officials with traditionally low social status reported 70 verbal challenges in 106 narratives. Public officials with traditionally high social status reported 41 verbal challenges in 56 narratives. The two more serious types of challenges represented far fewer of the narratives for both groups. There was, however, a slight difference by social status. Public officials with traditionally low social status reported 28 evasive challenges and 8 defiant challenges, representing 26% and 8% of the narratives they shared respectively. Public officials with traditionally high social status reported 5 evasive challenges and 10 defiant challenges, representing 9% and 18% of the challenge narratives they reported respectively. I cannot draw any definitive conclusions, but it may be that public officials with traditionally low social status are experiencing more

evasive challenges to their authority, but it may also be that they are more likely to recognize evasive challenges to their authority and discuss them than their middle-aged and older white male colleagues.

The pattern of types of challenges, however, is still strikingly similar between the two groups, with verbal challenges representing the bulk of the challenge narratives shared by both groups. While the pattern of types of challenges is similar, the framing of the challenges discussed varied considerably by social status. The remainder of the chapter will focus on the framing of challenges and the particular types of challenges public officials described.

Table 4.2 Here

Expectations of Challenges

Public officials with traditionally low social status not only reported experiencing more challenges to their authority as their counterparts with high social status, but their narratives indicate that they commonly *expect* to be frequently challenged. Officials with traditionally high social status appear not to expect challenges, often saying things like “Well that just doesn’t happen in this organization” (Interview 24, middle-aged, white, male deputy county manager). By contrast, the public officials with traditionally low social status commonly reported feeling under constant pressure from colleagues and citizens and feeling as though they would be challenged by individuals from both of these groups. The interviews

provided insight into why public administrators with traditionally low social status felt they received more challenges. Four themes emerged as especially significant. Women and people of color both discussed the significance of being the first or one of a few of their social background in an organization. Being the first was talked about as the worst situation. Public administrators who were the first racial or ethnic minority or woman felt as though they were "under constant surveillance" (Interview 28, older, white, female Police Chief) and "represented their entire cultural group" (Interview 17, older, black, male Department Director).

In settings where there were more than one minority or female official, respondents described these pressures as somewhat diminished, but they nonetheless still described anxieties and the expectation of facing challenges. It is also important to note that to ameliorate this "being the first" problem, other people of their social status did not have to be in their particular organization, but only known to the members of the community and the organization. For instance, a middle-aged assistant city manager provided a narrative focused on the process of hiring a police chief (Interview 16). The police department reported directly to the assistant city manager, and she had sole responsibility for the hire. She discussed a number of rumors in the organizations and direct confrontations from citizens who said that she would hire a female police chief just because she was female. She did hire a female police chief, but used the presence of a female police chief in a neighboring city to justify her decision to skeptical citizens and colleagues. When reflecting on the hire

she said, “I think that it would have been difficult if we hadn’t already broken the glass ceiling in [neighboring city].”

Being a follower rather than a pioneer took some of the spotlight off women and persons of color and relieved some of the pressure. Thus, an older white female assistant city manager who joined an organization with other women in management positions observed, “I was never a crusader, I knew what I was talking about, I did my work well and I didn’t have to then deal with it” (Interview 34). She emphasized throughout her interview that “not being a crusader for women” allowed her to focus on her work as a manager, rather than representing “what a female manager is like.” A female police sergeant discussed her choice to move to a larger city with other female officers, leaving her job in a small town where she was the first female sworn officer. She said having female colleagues was a major part of her decision to move and that it was a relief that she was no longer the only one on the force being “hazed” (Interview 37).

Female officials described that the “challenge of being first” led them to feel the need to prove their authority (see Chapter 3 for more on proving authority). Indeed *only* female officials described a pressure to prove that they could do the “real” job of the organization based on a continued expectation of challenges to their authority. Narratives centered on challenges to do the “real” job clustered in traditionally male job settings, such as public utility departments and policing. Challenges concerning the “real job” were most apparent in policing, and happened regardless of rank. Younger female officers, occupying lower ranks in the

organization said they were constantly challenged by citizens over their physical abilities and by their colleagues about whether they would be willing to jump into a fight and provide back-up. A female police chief, for instance, observed that such challenges never stopped regardless of her rank or record. She had risen through the ranks in a different organization and came into a department as police chief. She noted that the chief of police is largely a manager and deals with administrative matters, rather than in-the-streets policing. Regardless of the administrative nature of her job, however, she observed that many of her male subordinates would challenge her with questions about whether she would jump into a fight or be willing to risk herself physically for the department (Interview 28).

The pattern appeared as well in other traditionally masculine city departments, particularly the department of public utilities. For instance, two respondents – one a current department head, and the other a former department head who is now assistant city manager of another organization, discussed how male subordinates commonly made statements and asked questions about their ability to do the "real" job of the department by going out on trash trucks or reading meters for the city (Interview 22, older, white female and Interview 19, young white female).

Similarly, young officials, regardless of sex, discussed challenges unique to their age (Interviews 8, 12 and 25). Such age-related challenges consisted mainly of people questioning whether they were qualified for the position that they held. People who rose through the ranks of an organization and started in the organization when they were young faced a different set of age-related challenges, namely that

regardless of their current position other employees type-casted them in terms of their first position, treating them as neophytes. For example, a young, white male city manager currently serves in the same organization where he began his career as a part time management intern. He noted that many of the department heads who had been around for his entire career had a hard time taking directives from him and would constantly mention how they used to give him directives when he was a management intern (Interview 25). Female public administrators noted that when they "grew up" in the organization there were also increased references to their personal life. A female assistant city manager said that she would sometimes have a hard time being taken seriously when disciplining subordinate employees because they would refer to her by her first name, talk about her children and nostalgically discuss major events in her life like her wedding day and having children (Interview 16).

Narratives from public officials with traditionally low social status that refer to "growing up" in an organization are especially significant in light of conversations with public officials concerning proving authority (discussed in the last chapter). Public officials with traditionally low social status identify time as one technique that they use to prove their authority to colleagues within their organizations and community members outside of their organization. Public officials with traditionally low social status argue that the passage of time allows for colleagues and community members to recognize that they are capable and can do well at the job they have. Paradoxically, however, this way of proving authority also means that public officials

are "growing up" in the organization and their colleagues may never fully recognize them as "grown up" peers.

Although it seems clear that public administrators with traditionally low social status face more frequent challenges than those with traditionally high social status, most public officials with traditionally low social status tried to downplay the extent to which they face challenges to authority. There were two distinct forms of downplaying challenges. First, many said that they had learned to live with challenges their whole life, and such challenges in their job were no different. These officials claimed to be nonchalant about challenges to their authority. A minority male police officer, for instance, said that he was a minority first before he became a police officer, so he had never expected to receive the kind of deference to authority that white male officers receive (Interview 30). He told a story of responding to a domestic battery call with his partner, a white male subordinate officer. He said "growing up as a minority you just learn to accept certain things, accept people the way they are, so you know, I would ask a question and he [the alleged perpetrator] would answer to the white officer, okay that is fine with me." Several others said they just learned to accept challenges to their authority and were reluctant to identify with any characteristic that may portray them as a victim in their current position.

Second, others denied that they faced any such challenges at all, reframing challenges as part of their work as public administrators. A female city manager was explicit in trying to reframe challenges to her authority. Strikingly, after providing several narratives of challenges to her authority, among them instances when

subordinates refused to comply with her direct orders, I asked whether employees often challenge her authority, and she replied by reframing the issue: “We are a staff of professionals and that doesn’t happen very often at all. Challenges to my authority are rare, but employees do ask a lot of questions, which is different” (Interview 29, middle-aged, white, female city manager). Her stories, however, described very different experiences.

While all public officials with traditionally low social status anticipated numerous challenges, almost all public officials, regardless of social status, anticipated some challenges. Police officers, for instance, openly and regularly discussed expecting to face challenges. Generally police officers with traditionally high social status did not expect a lot of challenges to their authority within their department, but they did anticipate challenges to their authority from citizens. When talking about anticipating challenges to authority, for instance, an older white male police officer said challenges have nothing to do with social status:

> It has nothing to do, it doesn’t make a difference who shows up, what color, what race you are, what gender, they are going to yell at you because you have a badge on, they are just taking personal shots at you because they are trying to feed, and get you into the argument and defeat you, to feed the fire. Like I said that comes with experience, you don’t play into that stuff anymore. You let them get the best of you if you get angry (Interview 10).

The above officer attributes challenges against him and other officers because they “have a badge on,” and not because of any social status factors. He characterizes

the challenges not as affronts to personal characteristics or social status markers, but as challenges to his official position. Female, minority and young police officers, too, describe their authority being challenged just because they "have a badge on." But there the similarity ends. In contrast to public officials with traditionally high social status, female, minority and young police officers describe many challenges as intensely personal, or directly related to their social status as female, minority or young. When discussing anticipating challenges to her authority one female police officer put it this way, "One, I am a police officer, but two I am a female. I think that sometimes people think that they can intimidate you just because you are a female" (Interview 7, middle-aged, white, female police officer).

In sum, officials' expectations of challenges, essentially, their assumptions about the nature of their official world - varied by social status. Women often mentioned that others thought they could be intimidated. Racial and ethnic minorities were disrespected, or completely ignored. Young people were consistently questioned about their qualifications and experiences. These challenges may come from citizens as well as others within their own department. Police officers with traditionally low social status have two identities that they can be challenged about by citizens, their official role and their traditionally low social status. They also face challenges within their own departments since their social status does not match the social status of many of the other officers they work with. The types of challenges faced are not unique to these officers, but the volume of possible challenges is much larger than for their counterparts with traditionally high social status.

Verbal Challenges

Verbal challenge represented the bulk of challenges in narratives told by public officials with both traditionally low and traditionally high social status, amounting to over 60% of the challenges reported by each group. Verbal challenges include questioning a particular directive given by a public official, questioning the administrator's authority to give the directive, verbally denying that the administrator has authority, either because of social status or some other reason.

For public officials with traditionally high social status, verbal challenges typically are associated with questioning their authority to hand down a directive. Often the authority questioned is not their personal authority, but the authority of the official position they hold. For example, many officers described citizens who are pulled over as saying "you can't pull me over" or "you shouldn't have pulled me over," claiming that they were not violating the law or that they were not violating the law sufficiently badly to warrant being stopped. Such verbal challenges to authority challenge not the official as a person but rather the act of enforcing the law. Almost all public officials with traditionally high social status expected verbal challenges, but discussed them in their narratives as insignificant. Such verbal challenges were described as non-threatening. Police officers and city administrations characterized such challenges as arising from a "need to vent," which ultimately threatened neither physical harm nor completion of the task at hand.

Many of the police officers, regardless of social status, told stories of drivers complaining that they had been stopped on the basis of race. Such complaints were

made, officers said, mainly by black drivers. The police officers were quick to state that they had stopped such drivers only for legitimate violations of traffic laws. White officers often felt that black drivers were only making the argument because they - the officers - were white:

> I do know that white officers hear all the time that if they stop a minority they are being stopped because of their race, they hear that almost every time they stop somebody so, yeah I mean it is pretty common to stop a minority, especially today with all of the racial profiling topics that are out, you know it is pretty much common knowledge and that kind of thing and there is a lot of misinformation about it, but it's very, yeah, if you look at some of the news reports you will see it there. But it is not uncommon for an officer to be running radar on [a major highway in the metropolitan area], and someone is going 80 miles an hour, stop them, and the first thing they say is you stopped me because I am black. (Interview 36, middle-aged, white, male police officer)

> So driving the car was a black woman in her twenties and she jumps into my face, and says the only reason you are doing this is because I am black. My response was the only reason you are saying that to me is because I am white. (Interview 37, middle-aged, white, female police officer)

Challenges of racism or racial profiling are not exclusive to the experiences of white police officers. One middle-aged black female officer reported that when she stopped black drivers they would often refer to her as an "Uncle Tom" or "sell out" (Interview 14). In addition to being accused of perpetuating racist policing tactics, racial and ethnic minority officers also faced the opposite challenge. A young

minority male police officer working in an affluent, mostly white, suburb stated that he would often get quizzical looks and sometimes outright questions about this employment when pulling over citizens in his jurisdiction (Interview 30).

While public officials with traditionally high social status primarily shared stories focusing on verbal challenges to authority, public officials with traditionally low social status provided many more narratives of such challenges, and often the challenge experiences related directly to their social status. Some of these unique challenges to authority as described by the officials were blatant cases of discrimination based on race, sex and age. Public officials with traditionally low social status shared narratives which described citizens pulled over refusing to speak to officers based on their race, sex or age, and waiting until a middle-aged white male back-up officer arrived (Interviews 42, 33 and 12). Other challenges to authority made subtle reference to systemic racism or sexism. Often in these cases the officials were left wondering if they were bring challenged because of their race, sex or age, or if all public officials experienced the type of challenges they faced. An older white female city manager, for instance, said she would often go home and ask her husband if he thought someone would challenge him in a particular way (Interview 39). While not overt, these latter challenges suggest that public officials with traditionally low social status have yet to be fully accepted as legitimate public authority figures.

Although within professional organization settings few public officials report outright racist, sexist or ageist verbal challenges from their colleagues, out on the street, with citizens, however, they described experiencing such overt discrimination.

Both police officers and city administrators with traditionally low social status, and colleagues with traditionally high social status, who work with them, report that blatant disregard for their authority based on social status factors is a frequent occurrence. For example:

> Oh, it happens all the time, just right now one of my recruits was arresting a guy the other day and the first thing he starts off, you can't arrest me, you are a woman, why don't you have one of these men arrest me, one of these men are going to arrest me, you aren't going to. (Interview 10, middle-aged, white, male talking about his young white female police trainee)

> I had challenges from people; [who said] send me a real police officer. (Interview 28, older female police chief)

> I was with the city engineer, he is a couple of years older than I am. We were in a situation where we were trying to resolve a contractor issue on a project and the contractor of course hadn't met me or had forgotten that he met me. I went along to try and solve the issue as the city administrator being [the engineer's] supervisor, and of course the contractor is a little older and they get kind of, they are an interesting group to work with, they are a lot about authority and they like to get in your face and see how far they can push you before you push back. It was interesting because he said something, he didn't like what [the engineer] had to say and he was kind of bad mouthing the city and bad mouthing [the engineer] and said who do I talk to, I need to talk to your supervisor and he said he's right here, this is the city administrator, and his face dropped. Not only was he saying negative things about the city, but he was very shocked to find out that I was the city administrator and had that authority and anyway it was kind of fun to come from that angle and surprise him [because of his youthful appearance]. (Interview 25, young white city manager)

Many of the stories of explicit verbal challenges from within the organization were framed as taking place long ago, or at the beginning of the careers of many of the officials interviewed. In the traditionally masculine profession of policing these stories of early inappropriate behavior by male colleagues are not new or surprising. An older female police officer said that when she first entered policing many years ago, if she would express an opinion or question a male colleague, male colleagues would announce to their fellow officers that she must be "on the rag because she was bitchy, bitchy, bitchy" (Interview 28). Similarly, a middle-aged female city administrator talked about working with unions on contract negotiations early in her career. She framed unions as "good old boys clubs." She said they initially hazed her about her sex; they even went as far as to send out inappropriate letters to their members about the nature of her position within the organization (Interview 26).

By contrast, many of the more-recent verbal challenges within organizations reported by public officials were much more subtle. A young female city administrator, for instance, told of a story that she heard in her organization and when working with citizens closely involved in city governance: "It is kind of funny, I hear this story about after [current female city manager] was first appointed and then she appointed me [to the position of assistant city manager]: they [the city council and active citizens] called us a 'she-ocracy'" (Interview 23). While the story does not necessarily directly threaten the standing or even the directives given by this woman or her current female boss, there is a suggestion that the city council and active

citizens are not taking her and her boss as seriously as they took the former older white male city manager. A similar story gives a fuller explanation of a similar issue:

> I just talked to a guy who was calling about a little tax increase, people respond differently, they just do, and by the time he hung up he said 'oh honey thanks that explains it, thanks.' Now I am sure he wouldn't have called my previous boss honey, but the conversation may have ended just as well, just differently, but on a positive note. (Interview 38, middle-aged white female city manager)

Challenges based on social status are a phenomenon experienced not only by female public officials but by racial and ethnic minority officials too. A minority male police officer working as one of only a few minorities in a suburban department, for example, noted:

> I get ribbed in the roll call room you know, and I don't take it personally. And I know there are some departments in the metro area where it is definitely not appropriate, they have very strict rules against horse play and that kind of thing, and it is kind of…[shrugs] but I will give it right back to them, a white officer or whatnot (Interview 30, minority male police officer)

In sum, although almost all public officials experience verbal challenges, the frequency and nature of these challenges varies by social status. For officials with traditionally high social status, challenges often target their official position and the actions they are taking as part of that position, and more often than not, come from outside of the organization. Public officials with traditionally low social status face verbal challenges as well, but they also face both explicit and subtle challenges based

on their social status. Some such status-based challenges are still expressed as verbal challenges and may be connected to a particular directive given by the public official or the public official's authority generally. While such verbal challenges are the most often experienced, they are also the least threatening types of challenges faced by public officials.

Evasive Challenges

Evasive challenges, by contrast, are a more serious threat to an official's authority. Evasive challenges consist of working outside of the chain of command or organizational chart, for example "working around" and without the knowledge of the public official who is being challenged. Such evasive challenges can be as simple as being "left out of the loop" on an important decision, or as complicated as employees ignoring directives and working behind their superiors' backs.

Although such challenges are reported to be much less frequent than verbal challenges, almost all public officials report such challenges. Public officials with traditionally low social status, however, provided narratives of evasive challenges than their counterparts with traditionally high social status. Even so, evasive challenges represent about a quarter of the challenges reported by public officials with traditionally low social status and almost 10% of the challenges described by public officials with traditionally high social status.

Public officials talk about evasive challenges as "games" that they assume are always happening. For example:

> I have an employee that has a certain desire to see things happen in the city, you know without getting too specific, that person will, even though they know where I am, what I desire, this is one of my direct reports, this person knows what my position is, but rather than, and we have had a discussion about a particular topic, but rather than honor my final decision this person will quietly go behind my back and plant seeds with elected officials, with elected officials that this person has enough of a relationship with that the elected official will keep it in confidence, so but I know what is going on. That kind of thing goes on in every municipal organization I think, it is not uncommon. But, there is rarely direct confrontation to one's authority on almost everything people are more subtle than that, the games go on indirectly behind the scenes. (Interview 35, white male middle-aged city manager)

> It's really easy for an elected official to get into a department and start to do something and then make you feel like they want to direct the activity of what is going on there, and when a new person is elected in office you always feel that maybe there is a time that you are challenged that they will start to direct and time to sit down and that is a role that [the city manager] always takes on himself and I clarify or tweak somewhat after the fact, but it is always a role that he takes on with the new commissioners, so they understand how to work with departments (Interview 18, white middle-aged female city administrator)

Some instances of evasive challenges, however, rise above the level of expected "games" or "adjustment periods." For example here there was blatant disregard for directives:

> We have a lot of employees who are assigned to take vehicles home, which has a lot to do with reporting back, or emergency service, or efficiency, effectiveness kinds of reasons. But we have had some change in our departmental leadership and we have had some change

> in our city leadership and there has been a direction to minimize the number of city vehicles going home, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is public perception about the efficiency of that. So we may believe that it provides for more efficient citizen service, but the guy that lives next door doesn't necessarily and he is the one who pays the tax bill. So we have been moving toward minimizing or reducing the number of city vehicles going home, and our city manager says no more new employees, so we will do it by attrition at least to start. And we have a variety of divisions within public works, we do street maintenance, which truly legitimately gets called out all the time, we have solid waste which uses their take home vehicles much more for efficiency, responsiveness. And a new supervisor in our street division, who we interviewed and said that there won't be a vehicle going home with this position except for the weeks that you are on call, is that okay, he said yeah. The guy starts to work, they move on, the division manager allows him to go ahead and take the vehicle home, clearly in contradiction to everything that has been said. That was kind of challenging, because that is not an employee, that is one of your topic level managers and its pretty blatantly disregarding. He did it and ignored it, to see if anybody caught him. Eventually somebody said, so and so takes that vehicle home everyday, and he said yeah I made that decision, I know you told me not to, but I made that decision. (Interview 19, middle-aged, white female city administrator)

Since many evasive challenges are passive, whether they are related to social status is often difficult to discern. Still, officials with traditionally low social status appear often to *believe* that evasions are related to their social status. One, for instance, observed, "Many times they [her employees] would defer to the city attorney, when I thought they should defer to me, to see how I would handle a situation. Uh, and of course, he was a man" (Interview 39). While she does not directly say that they ignored her because she was a woman, she certainly implies that

a male ranking below her would be approached about major decisions that she felt were hers to make.

But some evasive challenges are clearly related to social status, as illustrated by the story below told by a male official:

> I remember when I was an explorer, which was, in high school you can go do ride alongs, when I was an explorer for the [city] Police department and I rode along, one time in particular I rode along with a female police officer, and I was in uniform, it was a different color than the police officers, it was a light blue shirt and theirs are a little bit darker. Well I rode with a female officer, and we left the station on a call and I remember the, and it was obvious I was a teenager, I was not a cop, I didn't have a gun on, I had a badge and a different uniform, but the guy we left the station to talk to, walked right by the female and started talking to me and telling me what was going on. And it was up to her because she was the officer there. (Interview 31, middle-aged white male police officer)

In sum, narratives describing evasive challenges are not nearly as frequent as those describing verbal challenges, but they remain significant. Evasive challenges can lead to public officials being "left out of the loop" on important decisions and can undermine their authority with elected officials, citizens and colleagues in their organizations. Although evasive challenges are expected and experienced by all types of public officials, they are also associated with social status factors, especially gender. Mild forms of evasive challenges are expected by public officials in both professions, and may not have long-lasting or serious repercussions. When directives are completely ignored and the authority of particular official is called into question,

however, evasive challenges can be quite serious and can result in a loss of face or loss of respect for the public official involved.

Defiant Challenges

Defiant challenges represent a third type of challenge to authority. Defiant challenges are the active unwillingness to follow a directive of a public official or active disrespect for their authority. For police officers defiant challenges may be represented by non-compliance with a directive, resisting arrest or putting an officer or civilian in a position where physical harm may occur. For city administrators defiant challenges do not threaten physical harm, but may result in the disruption of work. While defiant challenges are rare, representing only 8% of the challenges reported by public officials with traditionally low social status and 18% of the challenges reported by public officials with traditionally high social status, they represents the most serious type of challenges.

Police officers are given extensive training for how to handle defiant challenges when experienced in the street with citizens. Although such situations do not often occur, police officers report that they expect to experience occasional defiance and are not surprised when it occurs. Below are three similar stories. In each case a citizen was defiant when presented with a directive from an officer:

> Way back, probably about four years ago, we went to a house on call, somebody called and said there somebody knocking at her front door, trying to kick in her front door that she didn't know. When we got there, there was somebody on the front steps, you know we told him, show us your hands, get down on the ground, show us your hands. And he just stood there and didn't do anything. So we had to escalate

> and go hands on with him to get him into custody. (Interview 11, middle-aged white male police officer)

> We had a very, what I would consider disorderly, belligerent, female. Responded to a call, a citizen had called us and said that there a person being dragged into this house by the collar of her shirt, so we responded to the call. The owner of the house, which was the female in the doorway wouldn't let us come in. And we obviously have the right to check the welfare of somebody, we don't know if they have been shot, whether they have been hurt, whether they have been assaulted, whether they need medical attention, blah blah blah. So we have got a right to go in the house. She was very belligerent, very disorderly, I do not know why she did not want us to come in the house, but she screamed and yelled at us. (Interview 12, young white male police officer)

> It was a disturbance call. A homeless guy didn't want to leave the store that he was in front of, and he was lying on the ground, he was kind of asleep. He didn't want to get up for us, so we had to make him get up. (Interview 8, young white female police officer)

As city administrators rarely give orders directly to citizens, most of the defiant challenges described by city administrators were made by fellow employees or officials within the organization. Several city administrators with traditionally high social status said that defiant challenges were extremely rare, and most were unable to remember experiencing such a challenge. By contrast, several public administrators with traditionally low social status recalled experiencing such defiance. Two high ranking female administrators, one in city management and one in policing, shared

very similar stories of defiant challenges arising when they initially entered their high ranking positions:

> Probably early on, when I was quite a bit younger and people were not used to seeing a young female in a position of authority in the finance department I had all of the meter readers quit on me one day because I had decided that we were going to, well I had found out through my research that they were not reading meters, it is a long story, but they were estimating, making things up and then they would go to the pool for the afternoon or they would go shopping in [large adjacent city]. So, I got my ducks in a row and told them that we were going to have a new system where they had to be more accountable for their work. They didn't really read the meters, this was a pretty simple example. I don't think they thought, well they had always had a male before and they thought they could get away with it with me, then they thought they could get away with just quitting and I would beg them back and work with them. I let them quit and we hired all new people and that is when I was out reading meters for a while. So, that was a challenge to a female, a young female, and it was pretty scary for me, I thought what have I done, but I had huge amounts of support from the city manager's office and others on that management team, it worked out fine. (Interview 22, older white female city administrator)

> I know that there were some retirements of some senior staff before I came, that's fine, its certainly preferable that people choose to weed themselves out than have to go through the pain of doing that. For some people, my style is certainly different. Some of it has to do with growing up in law enforcement out on the west coast versus in the middle of the country, socially I am much more liberal than what you often find in law enforcement. (Interview 28, older white female police chief)

In sum, although defiant challenges did not occur often for any of the public officials, regardless of social status, the few stories of defiant challenges suggest that

these types of challenges had serious consequences. As a result of defiant challenges, public officials can lose respect within their organizations. The work of the organization and the public official may also be disrupted as a result of defiant challenges to their authority. In some extreme cases, in policing, public safety may also be an issue. As with other types of challenges, public officials with traditionally low social status described experiencing defiant challenges based on their official position or their social status. Regardless of the reason for the challenge, defiant challenges could result in serious repercussions for the exercise of authority, as it did for the two women above where the makeup of their organizations fundamentally changed and the work of their organizations was temporarily interrupted.

Conclusion

A challenge to a public official is a direct or indirect disregard or confrontation of the official's authority. Most of the challenges described by the public officials who were a part of this study were verbal in nature. Verbal challenges were occurred often and were handled quickly. Evasive challenges were not described as frequently, but could have long-term, serious repercussions for the public official experiencing them. Defiant challenges were described rarely by public officials, but carried serious consequences. All public officials who were a part of this study described challenges to their authority, but descriptions of frequency varied by social status. Challenges to authority could result in long-term loss of face or respect for public officials, as well as disruption of the work of the organization and the official.

Public officials with traditionally low social status reported more challenge narratives than their traditionally high social status counterparts. All public officials described the vast majority of their challenges as verbal challenges to their authority. Evasive and defiant challenges were described far less commonly by both groups.

Nonetheless, public officials with traditionally high and traditionally low social status framed challenges differently. Public officials with traditionally low social status reported challenges based on their social status as well as their official position, whereas their counterparts with traditionally high social status only reported challenges based on their official status. The differences in what challenges are based on means that public officials with traditionally low social status not only expect to be challenged because of their official positions, but also because of their personal background. In other words, many such challenges appear to be based, at least in part, on broad society-wide perceptions of the appropriate "place" of women and racial and ethnic minorities. If so, even though more women and racial and ethnic minorities are entering public employment, they may be widely seen as having less authority than officials with high social status and may continue to be challenged at higher rates than their high status counterparts.

Public officials with traditionally low social status clearly expect that they are like to be challenged more often than their middle-aged and older white male colleagues. Public officials with traditionally low social status expect always to face a struggle at work, and appear to be challenged more often than their colleagues. The additional number of challenges may make their work more stressful and a choice to

opt out of their position more compelling. While we see the face of state changing and more women and racial and ethnic minorities entering positions of authority, continuing to serve as public officials and ascending into higher positions of power may be more difficult for them than for public officials with traditionally high social status because of the large amount of stress generated by the challenges they face.

Chapter 5: Strategies for Mobilizing Authority and Responding to Challenges to Authority

If social status seems to shape how public officials frame challenges to their authority, social status even more powerfully frames how public officials describe *responding* to those challenges. It is no exaggeration to say that public officials with traditionally low social status respond to challenges to their authority fundamentally differently than do public officials with traditionally high social status. Public officials with traditionally low social status face a power paradox when they mobilize their authority in response to a challenge to their authority. Mobilizing their official authority, the only authority available to them, is powerful and often is described as immediately resolving a challenge. But, since mobilizing official authority often involves rule enforcement, doing so draws attention to the challenge and frames the official as weak and "bitchy" or "petty." Mobilizing authority for public officials with traditionally high social status, by contrast, is non-problematic. They can often rely on their social status as a source of authority and mobilizing their social status is described as less overt. When public officials with traditionally high social status describe mobilizing official status it is described as being consistent with their social status and more acceptable than in the case of public officials with traditionally low social status.

This chapter shows that strategies for mobilizing authority vary drastically by social status. Official authority is framed by social status. Public officials with traditionally low social status are virtually forced to rely on strategies based on their official position, because of their lack of traditionally high social status. Public

officials with traditionally high social status, on the other hand, can rely on strategies based on their official status or their social status, and tend to rely on strategies based on their social status. Relying on strategies based on official status puts public officials with traditionally low social status at a disadvantage, because they are seen as "petty" or "bitchy." In order to avoid appearing "petty" or "bitchy" public officials with traditionally low social status "soft-pedal" the mobilization of their authority, or combine strategies based on their official status with defusing strategies – or strategies that are meant to smooth out situations with somewhat deferential behavior.

Throughout the project, I call how public officials describe responding to challenges to their authority as "strategies for mobilizing." But I should note that many officials denied that they used "strategies," simply saying, "That's just what I did" (Interview 10, middle-aged white male police officer) or "That's was the only thing I could do in the situation" (Interview 41, middle-aged black male city manager). Strategies were not thought-out before they were employed. Situations were immediate and required that officials "just respond…there isn't time for thinking about it, you just react" (Interview 45, middle-aged Latino assistant county manager). On the other hand, although strategies were rarely framed as such by public officials, public officials with traditionally low social status commonly discussed having thought through strategies and developing a wide range of strategies in anticipation of challenges to their authority. The middle-aged Latino assistant county manager who said, "you just react," for instance, nonetheless went on to say, "But you are prepared to react because you have thought-out scenarios before hand

and learned how certain types of situations should be handled." Public officials with traditionally high social status, by contrast, did not discuss the process of developing strategies or having a wide range of strategies that they could employ. Nonetheless, there were a multitude of strategies discussed by all of the public officials who participated in the project.

I identified 16 different types of strategies for mobilizing authority in the 162 narratives presented in the 49 interviews. These sixteen strategies include: taking no action, using discretion to avoid the challenge, using humor to defuse the situation, helping with work or challenges to defuse challenges, defusing in some other way, doing more work than necessary to avoid or defuse a challenge, using a support system for ideas or help, denying social status, acting assertively, using "command presence" (a policing term for assertive behavior), providing a stern "talking to" to an employee or citizen, escalating a situation from the initial challenge, invoking official position in a self-deprecating way (for example, "I am only the…."), invoking official position in an assertive way (for example, "I am the city manager so what I say goes"), invoking rules or laws, and using physical force. Since using physical force only applied to police officers I excluded it from the following discussion. Table 5.1, below, provides descriptions of each type of strategy. The strategies are arranged from the most subtle to most official and overt.

Table 5.1 Here

I have collapsed the 16 different types of strategies into four broad categories as follows, and discuss the remainder of the results in terms of these categories:

- *None* simply refers to no need for a strategy or taking no action. For example a white male city manager was confronted by an elected official who disagreed with him hiring a female assistant city manager. The male city manager said there was no need to respond and did not respond to the confrontation (Interview 35).
- *Defusing* describes a group of strategies that are meant to avoid challenges or lessen the impact of challenges once they have been presented. I included using humor to defuse the situation, helping with work or challenges to defuse challenges, defusing in some other way, doing more work than necessary to avoid or defuse a challenge, using a support system for ideas or help and denying social status in this category. For example, a female city manager said she would go have coffee with subordinate employees in departments that were rumored to have problems, as she felt that this helped her avoid challenges before they got to her office (Interview 29).
- *Assertiveness* includes using command presence (a policing term referring to assertive behavior and confident demeanor) or having a confident and assertive front to avoid challenges, providing a stern and assertive talking to when there is a challenge, or escalating a challenge by providing an "over the top" response. For example, a female police officer said that she tried to make

herself seem as big as possible and approached people with an assertive attitude when she stopped cars for traffic violations (Interview 33).

- *Official strategies* consist of the invocation of official position and its specific legal powers in order to demonstrate either that the official has no authority to do something demanded or has the authority to make a demand. For example, female city manager described a dispute with subordinate in which she reminded him that she was city manager and therefore had final authority in the decision (Interview 39).

Responses to challenges to authority were described as being profoundly shaped by social status, and the patterns presented in Table 5.2 begin to confirm this. The most significant findings are that public officials with traditionally high social status rely heavily on no strategy or assertive strategies, describing using each strategy in 27% of the challenge narratives. Public officials with traditionally low social status, by contrast, rely heavily on defusing and official strategies, describing using each strategy respectively in 44% and 71% of their challenge narratives. Additionally, public officials with traditionally low social status *combine* official strategies with attempts to defuse the situation, or less commonly, with assertive strategies. In 40% of the challenge narratives shared by public officials with traditionally low social status official strategies were described alongside a defusing or assertive strategy. Public officials with traditionally high social status *do not*

combine strategies for mobilizing their authority. Public officials with traditionally high social status only described using one strategy for each challenge narrative.

Table 5.2 Here

Additionally, the types of strategies employed have a consistent pattern that is based on social status, regardless of challenge type. Table 5.3 below lays out the strategies discussed by participants for particular types of challenges, based on social status, and the patterns are consistent with patterns described above regardless of challenge type. With the most common type of challenge, verbal challenges, public officials with traditionally high social status describe using each type of strategy relatively equally. Public officials with traditionally low social status, however, discussed relying primarily on defusing strategies and official strategies. Often they would describe employing both of these strategies simultaneously, defusing the use of official rules or discussion of organizational position. Patterns emerge more clearly with the more serious challenge narratives. Public officials with traditionally high social status discussed relying primarily on assertive strategies or no strategies at all. By contrast, public officials with traditionally low social status continued to rely primarily on defusing and official strategies, again often describing employing these two types of strategies simultaneously.

Table 5.3 Here

Too much should not be made of the above statistical patterns, standing on their own. Narrative interviews are more appropriately used for identifying patterns of ideas and conceptualizations than patterns of "behavior." Nonetheless, the patterns identified in Table 5.2 are consistent with the structure and arrangement of public officials' *ideas* about authority. The rest of this chapter is devoted to analysis of those ideas.

A note should be made about age as a social status factor. Age is the only social status factor that if someone survives is guaranteed to change with time. Aging was something that young and older white men discussed when discussing strategies. Older white men often described need to use strategies when they were young and not needing to do so now that they were older. Young white men were highly aware that they would no longer need as many strategies once they were older. Women and racial and ethnic minorities, by contrast, do not have the luxury of growing out of the need for strategies. In fact, many of the older women and people of color noted that their strategies only became more varied and efficacious as they got older.

Additionally a note should be made about the gendered notions of defusing and assertive strategies. Although defusing and assertive strategies are gendered, with defusing strategies being associated with feminine ways of doing things and assertive strategies being associated with masculine ways of doing things, the use of these strategies are not based on the sex of the professional. The patterns of use for defusing and assertive strategies to mobilize authority are still based on the public official's social status more generally. Young white men and men of color, as well as

women use defusing strategies more than middle age and older white men. While defusing and assertive strategies may be associated with gendered notions, the frequency they are mobilized is based on broader social status factors.

Anticipating and Heading off Challenges:

Regardless of their social status, few public officials want to experience challenges to their authority. How to avoid challenges is something that police officers discuss in their training and work on throughout their careers. City administrators who are older white and male do not discuss an expectation of having their authority challenged, and do not discuss strategies for avoiding challenges to their authority. Their female, young and racial and ethnic minority colleagues, however, have thought about challenges to their authority and have developed strategies to avoid them. These strategies often focus on establishing expectations and coming off as assertive and professional to colleagues and citizens.

Few public officials enjoyed having their authority challenged regardless of where the challenge originated. Among police officers of all social status categories and city administrators with traditionally low social status, however, there was an expectation that their authority would be challenged. Both of these groups had strategies that they mobilized to avoid challenges. Often these strategies focused on establishing expectations with subordinate employees and citizens, as illustrated by the following quotations.

> I think number one is just your command presence, is how you present yourself, if you go into a situation meek and mild you are not going to get anywhere. I think you know, I sometimes use the term smart and

sharp, you have to look professional, look sharp if you do everything will fall into place. (Interview 33, middle-aged white female police officer)

You know it is kind of a psychological, you have to show that you are confident and you are in command, so when you give an order people are going to listen to you and people understand that you are the authority figure. If you don't do that if you don't take command of a situation it can go downhill pretty quick. And a big part of that is the uniform, but you have to act professionally, you have to articulate what you want the person to do, why you are there, that kind of thing, so that's leadership, and it is command presence. (Interview 32, middle-aged white male police officer)

I think that if you show confidence people are less likely to question you, if you are look like you are confused and don't know what you are doing they are going to question you and they're going to, they jump on it, and you can read people really well, (Interview 12, young white male police officer)

Women are generally seen as passive, if I bully you I can get my way. That is why you have to be assertive, and you have strong and you have to have training in that. There are all kinds of situations where you know people don't want to be told what to do or how to do it, when to do it and you kind of have to be assertive, and I think once they realize that you are going to be assertive and take whatever actions you are going to take then they kind of back down. But if your personality is kind of oh I can't do this then they are going to run all over you, and that has been kind of my experience and trying to help guide newer officers, you have to be assertive, put your foot down and know what you are going to do, (Interview 37, middle-aged white female police officer)

> When I go into a new organization I meet with all of the staff. I say I am so and so, this is my background, this is why I am excited to be here. Then I so them the organizational chart and I make sure that they all know where to find the city code. I want them to know exactly how things are supposed to flow in the organization, and if they need to interact with the city commission that they need to go through me, since I am the city manager and represent the entire staff to the commission. (Interview 45, middle-aged Latino city manager)

Social status seems to frame some strategies for avoiding challenges as illustrated by the following quotations:

> You constantly have to think 5-6 steps ahead, consider how people are going to perceive you. There are things that men in my position don't think about. An example, when I go to police chief or administrative conferences I always eat in groups and I am in my room alone by 9:00. I don't want to give anyone the idea to speculate and start the rumor mill. But the rumor mill is always going. (Interview 28, older white female police chief)

> When I took over our finance department there were a few people I had to give the "yes, but" speech to. These were old time finance guys who had a reputation for not respecting women in the organization. I was nice about it, but I had to say, yes I'm a woman, but I know what I'm doing, I'm qualified to oversee the finances of the city. (Interview 18, middle-aged female deputy city manager).

For police officers especially, anticipating and heading off challenges tends to be one of the areas where they discuss strategies developing over time. Public officials discuss learning how to avoid provoking challenges and try to go out of their way to tone down situations as they gain more experience and age:

> Probably mannerisms and body language has probably changed. Before I probably tensed up, puffed out my chest, you are talking to the police, you can't talk to me that way. And now okay, have a good day, and walking out. (Interview 11, middle-aged white male police officer)

None of the city administrators with traditionally high social status discussed anticipating challenges based on their social status, and as a result did not develop strategies in anticipation of challenges. Public officials with traditionally low social status and police officers, regardless of social status, however, did discuss anticipating challenges to their authority. They developed strategies that they thought would deter citizens or subordinate employees from challenging them. These strategies were often developed over time and influenced by past experiences of the official.

Absence of Strategies

Using no strategies means two very different things for public officials with traditionally low and traditionally high social status. "No strategies" describes the pattern of behavior that public officials describe, regardless of social status, but the meaning of "no strategies" differs fundamentally by social status. Public officials with traditionally high social status often said that they felt that they did not need a strategy, or that a strategy would not be helpful to the particular situation. The characterization of public officials with traditionally high social status was markedly different than when women, racial or ethnic minorities or young people would discuss

using no strategy. In such situations, public officials with traditionally low social status reported either that they did not have a strategy to use or that someone else had stepped in to handle a situation on their behalf. An example from each group illustrates this difference.

In the quote below a middle-aged white male police officer with traditionally high social status as he discusses no need for a strategy to mobilize his authority when he is challenged by citizens he works with:

> The environment I work in is predominantly a black neighborhood, and a lot of times it gets flipped around that way that you are a racist, that you are just targeting. And you learn through experience and time that it is not worth getting upset. That person, it does no good, they believe what they want to believe and they already have that set in their mind and you are not going to convince anybody of anything. (Interview 10, middle-aged white male police officer)

A middle-aged white female assistant city manager provides a very different example of why she did not use a strategy to mobilize her authority. She worked in a city where a no smoking in the workplace city ordinance had just been passed. As part of the passage of this new ordinance all smoking in city vehicles would have to stop. The assistant city manager went to the public works division, police department and fire department with the new ordinance. Employees from all three departments challenged her and the ordinance, saying that they were not going to comply. She stepped back from the situation and considered how to proceed. Ultimately she did

not have to respond directly because one of the department heads solved the problem before she handled the challenge herself:

> The beauty of it is, and I don't know exactly how it happened, but I didn't have to bring that up at all. The fire chief said, 'you know I re-read the ordinance and I checked it with the city attorney and it is already in there and even corporate vehicles, like corporate trucks you can't smoke in them either'. (Interview 16, middle-aged white female city administrator)

In the narratives presented above, officials described using no distinct strategy in response to the challenges. The absence of strategy, however, varied considerably in each story. The middle-aged white male police officer did not have or use a strategy and had no intention of developing one for what he saw as an unnecessary racial challenge. The middle-aged white female city administrator had not yet developed a strategy in response to challenges to her authority to implement a new city ordinance when one of her colleagues stepped in and took care of the challenge. In both cases there was no direct response to the challenger, but for the police officer with traditionally high social status this was because he chose that path. For the public official with traditionally low social status it was because she described few alternatives available for her to directly respond to the individuals who were challenging her. These examples are representative of the differences based on social status found in the "no strategy" or "none" category. It is also important to reiterate that officials with traditionally high social status provided narratives employing "no strategy" in response to 27% of challenges. By contrast, public officials with

traditionally low social status described mobilizing this type of strategy in response to only 12% of challenges.

Defusing Strategies

Defusing strategies included using humor to downplay a challenge, talking out a challenge, asking for guidance or support from a support system or peer group, and trying to help with a problem or doing extra work to avoid a challenge. Defusing strategies may be seen as culturally feminine since they focus less on aggressive behaviors and rely on ideas of cooperation and relationship building. The goal of defusing strategies is often to smooth over challenges to authority or handle before they become overwhelming or too large to manage. Defusing strategies are often employed to ensure that challenges do not escalate. They can refocus a challenge away from the challenge back to the work of the public official. In the narratives, public officials with traditionally low social status described employing defusing strategies more often than their traditionally high social status counter parts. In the narratives, public officials with traditionally low social status described using defusing strategies in response to 44% of the challenges they faced. While, public officials with traditionally high social status described using defusing strategies in response to only 21% of the challenges they faced.

Among defusing strategies, the use of humor was prominent. The use of humorous strategies often occurred with citizens. Using humor was a way to address a challenge but keep the mood light and maintain a connection with the citizen. For instance, an older female city manager reported a story of a call from an older female

resident in her community. In the story, the woman had called and asked to speak with the city manager, and when the city manager answered the phone the woman said that she was holding for the city manager. The city manager responded that she had her, and the women said, "well couldn't they get a man to do the job?" The city manager laughed and said, "No, I think this job is too hard for a man." The city manager reported that the rest of the call went well and she answered the resident's questions (Interview 39). Humor was also used to address expectation issues in policing. An older white female police chief said that she would often get the following question from citizens she encountered, "Oh are you a real police officer [more surprise than anger]?" She said that she would respond, "No, I just dress like this for fun" and laugh the whole situation off (Interview 28).

Similar strategies are employed by young people in city management and policing. A young male city manager discussed an encounter with a contractor in which the contractor asserted that the young man was too young to be city manager and he wanted to speak with the "real" city manager. The city manager responded, "well if you think I look young now, you should have seen me five years ago when I started." He said that the contractor then understood his level of experience and went on with the discussion (Interview 25). A middle-aged female city administrator was addressing a third grade class and had a similar challenge from some of the parents in the audience who questioned her ability to hold her position at her age, since she appeared to be quite young. She responded to the question by joking about her experience and her responsibilities:

> I said I have been with [the city] for 17 years and I could see some people look confused and I mumbled to the parents, I started when I was 12. They all laughed, but I do have to work at that. I often have to kind of go, I have been here 17 years, I am the assistant city manager, I am in charge of police and fire, I have real responsibilities. (Interview 16, middle-aged white female city administrator)

A young male police officer also had a challenge about his age from a construction contractor he encountered on a call. The contractor wanted the police officer to remove a subcontractor from the property. The contractor referred to the police officer with a number of demeaning comments and said that he was too young to understand the situation he wanted him to deal with. The police officer responded that the city thought he was old enough to wear the uniform and get through training so he could probably figure it out (Interview 40). In most of the situations that public administrators described relying on humor as a defusing strategy they said that they tried to keep the situation light and laugh off comments about their social status.

What comes across in comments regarding age specifically is the public administrator's reference to their experience or credentials. The administrator uses their official status to compensate for what their challenger identifies as a lack of social status. But even while asserting their credentials or other official status source of authority they try to joke and smooth over the challenge.

Not all defusing strategies rely on humor. Many public administrators, especially racial and ethnic minorities, women and young people, relayed stories of just "talking situations out". For instance:

> I try to kill people with kindness basically, be as nice as I can, and do my best to explain why I am there. I personally try to defuse it, I try to get them to calm down. I am not a big guy, I don't really like to fight, I don't like to put my hands on people if I don't have to. (Interview 12, young white male police officer)

> What is wrong with giving the reason why and trying to sell that person on the why of it, or get them to understand how I came to the why of it, rather than just I said so. Sometimes it's a lot like being a parent. Just because we said so, we didn't like getting that answer either from mom and dad. (Interview 28, older white female chief of police)

> I am going to approach that as much of a blue kind of person [referring to a personality test result], I am not going to come in guns a blazing. It is much more let's talk about this issue and why you don't agree on this decision that I made, authority kind of based. I can usually talk people through it, and common sense prevails. (Interview 16, middle-aged white female city administrator)

> I definitely try to bring people to the table. Let's say there is an issue of space, people are fighting over space. Okay, enough name calling, let's come to the table and talk about it. (Interview 19, young white female city administrator)

While public officials with traditionally low social status described relying on defusing strategies more than their older white male counterparts, when public officials with traditionally high social status did describe using defusing strategies they often described relying on talking situations out. For instance:

> Some people, if you talk to them in a calm and reasonable voice, and sometimes if you just quiet your voice as you talk they have to quiet down to listen to what you are saying to them. Then they adjust, and

> that can defuse the situation. (Interview 10, middle-aged white male police officer)

Some public officials with traditionally low social status even described developing official policies around the defusing strategy of talking challenges out before they became overwhelming or too large to handle.

> I had a monthly coffee talk where randomly selected city employees would come, and it was just open for anything. Or I would if there were specific issues that I thought employees had questions on I would go visit specific departments or go to shift changes and talk, you know, talk with them, and rarely did people not take the opportunity to challenge something. But I don't think that it was challenging my authority. Questioning isn't challenging I guess, is the point I am trying to make. (Interview 29, middle-aged white female city administrator)

> We have an open door policy, so employees can come anytime, and we encourage them to go through their chain of command, but anytime that they are not comfortable doing that, they can come to me or to our HR director. (Interview 38, middle-aged white female city administrator)

> More than training, I think that it is just the day to day way we do it. When people come in, encouraging the open door policy. When someone has something going on they feel like they can come up here and approach you. Whether, and I will say that I am in meetings a lot, but they still feel the ability, if they have to get in to get to [city manager] or I they will get the information to us. Sit down, and listen, and it is not a issue. (Interview 25, young white male city manager)

In addition to verbal strategies based on humor and talking situations out, some public officials with traditionally low social status described just trying to put in additional work when they faced challenges to their authority. For instance, the following city administrator had to work with a group of uncooperative citizens:

> But what I did, I researched things, and I really gave them all the things that they needed to succeed, I didn't go in and say, I am the leader of this group. Really what I did was, what do you need to make your best decisions, and I am going to get that for you. So you do that, and I gained confidence, credibility and got some people on my side that weren't on the city's side (Interview 16, middle-aged white female city administrator)

Doing extra work also was a strategy public officials with traditionally low social status described employing when colleagues challenged their authority, as was the case with this female police officer:

> There seems like there is a double standard, there shouldn't be but that is the way it is. You have to be better than they do. You have to show that you can handle yourself better then than them, you can take better reports, you don't have to be questioned when it comes to taking short cuts, because they know that you are going to do the right thing at the right time. So, whether it is right or wrong, that is just the way it is, there is a double standard and you have to be better than they are in order to get ahead (Interview 37, middle-aged white female police officer)

Assertive Strategies

Assertive strategies often focus on intimidation, either physically or verbally. They are associated with culturally masculine ways of asserting authority. Assertive strategies are often used by middle-aged and older white men, who report using them in 60% of their defiant challenge narratives, 40% of their evasive challenge narratives

and 17% of the verbal challenge narratives. By contrast, women, people of color and young people, those with traditionally low social status reported using assertive strategies only 10% of the time in their verbal challenge narratives, 7% of the time in their evasive challenge narratives, and 50% of the time in their defiant challenge narratives. Additionally, assertive strategies were rarely reported as being the only strategy mobilized by officials with traditionally low social status, but, when assertive strategies were reported by officials with traditionally high social status it was always the sole strategy described. Assertive strategies include using command presence (a policing term referring to assertive behavior and confident demeanor) or having a confident and assertive front, providing a stern and assertive "talking to" when there is a challenge, or escalating a challenge by providing an "over the top" response.

Public officials with traditionally high social status discussed using these strategies in ways that might be expected in light of their dominant social position. For instance:

> If you put yourself in a position of dominance where you make yourself appear bigger and larger and they start to cower down, then you know you are going to win with verbal skills and everything like that. (Interview 10, middle-aged white male police officer)

> If I can't get them to calm down I will get a little bit more stern in my voice and in my mannerisms. A lot of non-verbal, the eye-brow, and if that doesn't work then you have to put your hands on them. (Interview 6, middle-aged white male police officer)

In both of the above quotes there were clear references to physical intimidation. In policing, assertive strategies are more obvious than in city administration, but city administrators with traditionally high social status also discussed being intimidating to subordinate employees in order to ensure that their directives were followed. For instance, a middle-aged white male city manager described how he would stand up and make himself appear as large as possible when handing out directives he knew would be controversial or when his employees had expressed a lack of willingness to comply (Interview 21).

Public administrators with traditionally low social status also used traditionally masculine assertive strategies. One female assistant city manager discussed her height. She said that she is not often challenged, but she is really tall, over six feet tall, so most of her employees are intimidated by her (Interview 22). It is interesting that she pointed to a traditionally masculine trait, being tall, as a way to fend off and respond to challenges to her authority. Many female police officers described acting consistently with McElhinny's (2003) findings about "acting crazy," or going over the top assertively in order to prove they could handle themselves with uncooperative citizens in order to assert their authority as police officers. Similarly in my study a middle-aged male police officer, even said that he was upset having a female partner since she always escalated the level of physical force and took alleged perpetrators down, never allowing him to get into fist fights with alleged perpetrators who were not listening to commands (Interview 32).

Unfortunately, some women observed that being hyper-assertive backfired for them at times, actually leading to less respect within the organization. A female deputy city manager, for instance, discussed her use of assertiveness within the organization. She said that she knew that many people in the organization thought of her as cold and even a "bitch," but it was the only way she was able to get work done on time (Interview 18). A middle-aged male police major discussed women who escalate their use of force and said, "well they can do that because if they ever get reviewed on it, no one would say that they could defend themselves any other way, whereas if I did something like that, well since I am well [pointing to himself and referencing his large size] they would expect me to try and defuse the situation without escalation" (Interview 40).

Official Strategies

I had expected that the mobilization of official strategies would be inversely related to social status, and this was confirmed. Public officials with traditionally high social status did not discuss using official status in any of their narratives of evasive challenges and only discussed using official strategies in 20% and 29% of their defiant and verbal narratives respectively. By contrast, public officials with traditionally low social status discussed using official strategies in response to at least two-thirds of the challenges they described, regardless of type. Additionally, many of the stories of "official" strategies by traditionally low status officials are substantively richer than those of their traditionally high status counterparts. Thus, one female police chief discussed putting out a memo regarding her "management rights" when

she entered the organization (Interview 28). The memo listed everything she could do as the department head with regard to “policies, orders, procedures, directives, mandates, practices or protocols”. Another example is a middle-aged Latino male city manager who discussed bringing each newly elected city official in for a meeting with him after their election. He said that he would provide the official with a copy of the city ordinances and discuss the differences between policy-making, their job, and policy implementation, his job. He said that he did this because he had a number of elected officials in the past who would come into office and immediately challenge his authority within the city organization (Interview 44).

There were also less obvious invocations of title as a way to mobilize official authority. Female and minority police officers told of stressing their rank and organization when contacting citizens who challenged them about being “real” police officers. Female city administrators said that they often had to remind their subordinates that they were managers and could not always be their friends, since they were also their boss. Some female city administrators even described having to have discussions about their official roles with citizens, as in the story shared below:

> Actually this was with a volunteer, a senior volunteer, who just gave me lists and lists of things that he wanted me to do, and then he was disappointed when I didn’t get them done. And I finally had to say, you know [volunteer’s name], I am the assistant city manager, I can’t go hunting after the 1890s flag, that is just not what you hired me for, I have the fire department and the police department to worry about. And I hated doing it, I hurt his feelings (Interview 16, middle-aged white female city administrator)

Like the assistant city manager quoted above, many of the public officials with traditionally low social status described ill feelings about having to push their title or official position in the face of subordinates and citizens, but they felt that it was the last resort in the face of many challenges.

Not all public administrators used their official position in the way I expected, however. Minimizing their position was one of the main ways that public officials with traditionally high social status in policing and city administration described mobilizing their official authority. Many of the city management officials, in particular, noted that when they were promoted their subordinates tried to pawn off problems onto them and overburden them with decisions and projects that were not theirs to handle. In these situations the administrator described reminding the subordinate what their role did not entail and would instruct them to handle the issue on their own. Some administrators in city management and policing would also minimize their position when it came to unpopular policy decisions. For instance, a middle-aged white female deputy city manager said that when there was an unpopular policy she would say "we're not responsible for making the policy, only enforcing it" to those below her in the organization in order to get them to comply with the policy (Interview 18). I refer to this type of official mobilization as minimizing their official position.

Often public officials with traditionally high social status would work against stereotypes about middle-aged and older white male authority figures by invoking their authority in ways that minimized their position. Below there are two common

ways that public officials with traditionally high social status mobilized their official authority, one in policing and one in city management:

> I always go back and talk to them, talk about the simple fact that we are empowered with the consent of the state to enforce the laws of the city, state and laws of the united states, these governments are justly elected, (Interview 2, older white male police officer)

> One of the things that I make very clear is that the city council set the rules. I enforce the rules, and laws, but the city council can change the law. When a citizen wants to complain about, they got a ticket for driving through a neighborhood that had been marked no through traffic. Well a citizen said I always drive through there, I paid for the street, I don't understand why you can do that. I explain the legal authority of that, explain the concerns of the neighborhood, but I say, if you want to you can come down and ask the city council, and we will remove those barriers, but the city council is also going to hear from the neighbors, they don't want that additional traffic on the residential street, so they are going to have to balance your interest in saving a few minutes on getting to the grocery store versus their interest in trying not to have their residential street become a de facto arterial street during this construction. So if you want to come down I can help arrange you being on the city council agenda, if you are interested in that. Then I ultimately say, well the city council makes the laws. My responsibilities are to make sure that the policies and the laws that they adopt are carried out efficiently and effectively, but if they want to challenge that, we can go to the city council. (Interview 21, middle-aged white male city manager)

Assistant city managers with traditionally low social status would also minimize their position, but not always for unpopular policies, sometimes just to complete projects that they were championing. For example, an assistant city manager described discussing with a department head a project that she favored, but he opposed. She said, "Well, I have already cleared this with the city manager, so I

guess it is the direction we have to go" (Interview 16). A female deputy manager even mentioned that she would not like to become the city manager because she could no longer use the "well this came down from the city manager, I guess we have do it" excuse in response to subordinate's challenges. She said that having a supportive city manager enabled her to better handle challenges from subordinates (Interview 18).

Escalating Strategies

At times an official described escalating her response beyond her initial strategy. Both public officials with traditionally high and traditionally low social status described such escalations. In most such stories the progression of strategies was described as going from defusing to assertive and then to official. If a defusing strategy did not work, the public official would then try an assertive strategy, and if that did not work then an official strategy became necessary. Few stories went through the entire progression, but when they did the described progression would often go rather quickly, as is the case with the story below. In the story a police officer, the narrator, has been called to handle a situation where a patron at a bar had consumed too much alcohol and had been asked to leave:

> They call the police of course. I get there and this guy is just running his mouth saying how he has been unreasonably thrown out of the bar. So I am telling him, 'listen the bar wants you to leave, this is private property, you have get off, you know you have to get off the property.' He refuses, he is giving me the run around. We try to make him leave, say, 'listen, if you don't go I am going to have to make you leave.' Finally I do go hands on, he resists. Then you have to take him, you to actually make an arrest and charge him with disorderly conduct. (Interview 30, young minority male police officer)

In the above case the police officer described initially trying reason with the citizen and defuse the situation. When the first strategy did not work he escalated by being more assertive with his demands. Finally, the officer had to use his official authority and make an arrest.

Escalation as described in the story above is not always possible, because, as noted earlier, some public officials with traditionally low social status would start “over the top” with their responses to challenges, and therefore, they had no way to escalate their strategies. Some respondents said that they started with an official strategy because of their past experiences which led them to be apprehensive of giving the challenger the opportunity to react negatively to their initial strategy. For example, a middle-aged black city manager said that whenever his authority was challenged by an elected official he always used his official position to make sure that all interactions were put on the recorded: everything was done in writing and was handled as “by the book as much as possible.” He justified his reasoning by saying that he wanted to show elected officials he meant business and did not want to handle anything informally (Interview 41). Of course, if the elected official persisted in their challenge the city manager could not escalate his behavior further, because he was already going as “by the book as much as possible.”

How Social Status Frames Strategies

Strategies to mobilize authority are framed by social status. Social status influences which strategies are used and how they are used in response to challenges to authority. Additionally, expectations for how a public official will mobilize their

authority are also framed by social status. I will show here that public officials with traditionally high social status, middle-aged and older white men, are expected to mobilize their authority by acting assertively. Public officials with traditionally low social status commented that since they are not expected to act like a typically masculine public officials it is hard for them to fit the traditional image of public authority. When they mobilized their authority in ways that were seen as consistent with their official status, others responded awkwardly, apparently because the actions seemed out of step with the official's social status. For instance, a middle-aged female police officer who used physical force when interacting with uncooperative citizens was seen as unusual. She said that her colleagues commented, saying that having more women in policing was supposed to lessen the amount of violence in the profession. None of her colleagues questioned the legality of her actions, and many said that they would have done the same thing, but her use of physical force, nonetheless, seemed to be inconsistent with her male colleagues' expectations (Interview 4). Her status as a woman framed her official status as a police officer and framed the expectations of her colleagues.

Public officials with traditionally low social status because of their race or sex do not fit the typical image of their professions. And, when they try to fit into this image they are seen by their colleagues as "acting unusual" or bitchy. There is, thus, a paradox when public officials mobilize their official status. Mobilizing official status is incredibly powerful in the moment: when a rule or title is brought up it is recognized and most often respected. When public officials mobilize their official

status, however, they are seen as less powerful by their colleagues and citizens precisely because they had to rely on such an explicit source of authority. Mobilizing official authority invokes power, but it also acknowledges a lack of social respect. Mobilizing explicit authority makes the official appear weaker, whereas mobilizing implicit authority, such as authority based on social status, does not have the same negative consequences. For instance, a middle-aged Latino assistant county manager described a time early in high career when he was city manager of a small town (Interview 45). He described running a search for a new chief of police and was challenged by citizens as well as elected officials who were backing particular candidates for the position. He said that he felt as though he was "backed into a corner" by the various constituent groups. When he was directly confronted by a councilman he finally had to remind the councilman of the city charter, which said that he was in charge of the hiring and firing decisions for the city. He described the councilman's response as one of "reluctant acceptance" and said that the councilman went on to question almost every policy recommendation he put in front of the council until he lost re-election later that year.

By contrast, a middle-aged white deputy county manager told a story in which he denied the need to rely on an explicit ordinance in order to justify his authority (Interview 24). Instead his response to a subordinate employee who challenged his authority was based on social status. In the story the position of deputy county manager had recently been created and employees throughout the organization were unclear as to what exactly the roles, responsibilities and power of the office were. An

employee came in with paperwork that the county manager typically signed. When the deputy manager said he could handle it, the employee challenged the authority of the deputy manager to do so. The deputy manager described responding, “If I say I can do it then I can. You don’t need to have an ordinance lay it out for you, I can handle this.” The deputy county manager not only pointed to himself as the authority, he explicitly said that he did not need to point to an ordinance for authority. Precisely the opposite was described in the previous story of the Latino assistant county manager who explicitly pointed to an ordinance to mobilize his authority in response to a similar challenge.

Strategies can be used simultaneously and, often, public officials with traditionally low social status describe mobilizing several strategies in order to get around the stigma of mobilizing their official status as a way of mobilizing their authority. By joking about or defusing the use of official authority, public officials with traditionally low social status try to avoid the paradox of official status. They remind the person or group they are interacting with of their official status without going so far as to invoke their official status in any formal fashion. By not invoking the rule formally the official with traditionally low social status can avoid looking bitchy, uppity, petty or weak. Doing so allows the official to remind the person or the group they are interacting with of their official status, invoking some of its power and making it explicit. But, since they are not invoking their official status in any formal sense they are not seen as petty, and they don’t frame themselves as a rule enforcer. They thus avoid the paradox of their official status. In such situations, public officials

with traditionally low social status are playing by the rules of their traditionally masculine public setting and not explicitly invoking their official status, but they are also playing by the rules of their social status and by not being too serious or authoritative and by defusing challenges to their authority in traditionally feminine ways. Structures based on official status thus partly shape the challenge encounter, but in ways framed by social status.

Many of the stories shared above concerning defusing strategies demonstrate the use of multiple strategies, with social status framing the invocation of official status. For example, when the middle-aged female police officer was questioned about being a "real" police officer and joked about only wearing the uniform for fun, she was referring to her official status as a uniformed public official, but joked about it in order to keep the situation and the challenge to her authority lighthearted (Interview 37). Similarly when the young female city administrator was questioned about her age and her ability to hold her title, she joked about how long she had been with the city and referenced her responsibilities and credentials (Interview 16). In both of these narratives, which are representative of many more, the official tries to joke and play off the challenge to their authority by making lighthearted references to their official status.

Conclusion

All public officials have official status, but strategies for mobilizing authority nonetheless remain deeply framed by social status. Common strategies for mobilizing authority appear to be based on traditionally feminine norms, as is the case with

attempts to defuse conflict; traditionally masculine norms, as is the case with aggressiveness and bold assertion; and on official sources of authority, as is the case with references to position and rules. As expected, public officials with traditionally low social status described relying on defusing strategies as well as official strategies much more often than their counterparts with traditionally high social status. Also as expected, middle-aged and older white male public officials, those with traditionally high social status, described relying most heavily on assertive strategies for mobilizing their authority. Public officials with traditionally low social status relied heavily on official strategies to mobilize their authority. Their use of official strategies, however, was not described as I initially expected. Public officials with traditionally low social status described using official strategies in conjunction with other types of strategies in order to avoid the negative consequences of invoking official authority. Public officials with traditionally low social status also described minimizing their official position as a way to invoke authority. While public officials with traditionally low social status did not always rely on their official status to mobilize their authority, they did so in the vast majority of the challenge narratives and often described well developed ways of doing it. Additionally, expectations and uses of authority appear to be heavily framed by social status in that public officials described feeling as though they were expected to use their authority in ways that were consistent with their social status. In the following chapter I provide my conclusions for how social status is a deep structure that frames all aspects of authority, even in public bureaucracies where all officials have high official status.

It could be, however, that public officials with traditionally low social status were more willing to discuss strategies for mobilizing their authority in response to challenges to their authority with me than their high social status counterparts were. It could also be that public officials with traditionally low social status have thought through their responses more fully and can better articulate the ways that they respond to challenges to their authority. Therefore, the narratives shared by public officials with traditionally low social status provided richer insight into the use of multiple strategies, and various types of strategies for mobilizing authority. I claim, however, that the patterns described in the narratives give insight into the actions of public officials in response to challenges to their authority, actions that are framed by social status.

The use of authority is fundamentally different for public officials with high and low social status. Since social status is a deep structure and its power to structure interactions is implicit it is not as easily recognized or criticized when it is invoked. It is difficult to separate the individual invoking the authority of the social structure form the authority itself. Whereas, descriptions of invoking official status as the primary source of authority were described as easily recognizable and were often described as carrying negative consequences. The authority of the official, based on rules and organizational power, was seen as easily separate from the authority of the individual invoking it. When rules and organizational power were invoked public officials with traditionally low social status were described as "rule enforcers" or

"bitchy." When social status was relied on public officials with traditionally high social status were described as authority figures and leaders.

Public officials with traditionally low social status have developed and thought through more ways to mobilize their authority. They often mobilize their authority in order to head off challenges, not just respond to them. Mobilizing authority to head off challenges means that public officials with traditionally low social status are working harder than public officials with traditionally high social status in order to use what is, theoretically, the same amount of official authority. The increased work load of developing and using authority may cause problems for the retention and promotion of public officials with traditionally low social status in positions of public power. When the invocation of official status as a response to challenges to authority carries with it negative consequences, then public officials who must rely on official status as their only response to challenges may have serious problems being recognized and treated as public authority figures in their communities. Public officials with traditionally low social status are developing more strategies to mobilize their authority, invoking more strategies in response to the higher number of challenges they receive to their authority and are still facing negative consequences for mobilizing their official authority. Such differences in the ways that authority is mobilized in response to challenges must be recognized and discussed before real changes can be made to ensure the retention, ascension and legitimacy of people of color, women and young people as public authority officials.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

In this project, I found three substantively significant themes with regard to social status. First, social status as a cultural institution has a remarkable degree of continuing power, even in bureaucratic settings that are formally committed to office, merit and professional norms. Social status, as a cultural institution, originates outside of organizations and has effects society-wide, but it continues to permeate public bureaucracies in subtle and explicit ways. Second, public officials with traditionally low social status, unlike public officials with traditionally high social status, face a power paradox – they have high official status but low traditional social status. In order to mobilize their authority, or even prove that they have authority, they must highlight their official status and disassociate themselves from their social status. But, doing so, in itself, makes public officials with traditionally low social status seem "rule bound," "bitchy," "inflexible," and the like. This is the *paradox of rules,* rules and laws offer crucial resources, but their invocation comes at a cost. Finally, public officials with traditionally low social status actively avoid explicit discussions of their power paradox or the paradox of rules, even with each other, since acknowledging it would draw additional attention to them and make the mobilization of their authority increasingly difficult. As a way to avoid drawing attention either to their power paradox, or the paradox of rules, public officials with traditionally low social status will often soft-pedal rule invocation, or not invoke rules fully, but merely mention them while defusing challenge situations.

The above themes emerged as public officials shared their stories with me. As public officials shared their stories with me they began to think through their authority, and many began to think deliberately about their exercise of authority. This project may have provided the space for the beginning of discussions about social status and authority. Prior to sharing stories public officials may not have had the language or space to discuss proving and mobilizing their authority in response to challenges to their authority. In this concluding chapter, I will discuss the three themes introduced above and their implications for public organizations and society at large.

Social status is a deep social structure that still affects the way that public power is experienced and mobilized by public officials. While, according to Weber (1947), in modern bureaucracies social status tends to be replaced by official position as the primary source of authority, I have found that social status as a source of authority remains influential in modern bureaucracies. Modern bureaucracy scholars have argued that personal factors such as race, sex and age, as sources of authority should be replaced by professional factors such as expertise, education and knowledge as sources of authority. But personal factors, including sex, race and age, are still influential. Reliance on social status is the norm for middle-aged and older white males, but this is not the case for public officials with traditionally low social status who do rely on their official status. Public officials with traditionally low social status are challenged more often than their counterparts with traditionally high social status. Public officials with traditionally low social status also expect that their

authority will be challenged often, and develop a wide range of strategies to mobilize their authority. A large majority of public officials with traditionally low social status also discuss the need to prove their authority – or shift the focus away from their social status to their official status in order to access the authority of their official position.

The most important finding of this study is that professional identities can never be fully separated from social identities, regardless of the identity category. Social structures including social status form expectations about authority and how authority is mobilized by public officials in modern bureaucracies even when official status is clear and based on rules, laws and organizational structures. Social status frames authority and even official status. Public officials with traditionally high social status, middle-aged and older white men, have ready access to the authority of their public position. Their authority based on their social status is compatible with their authority based on their official status. By contrast, public officials with traditionally low social status, women, racial and ethnic minorities and young people, have to explicitly shift the focus away from their social status and to their official status in order to prove their authority before they can access it. Some public officials with traditionally low social status, for example, deny their social status and assert their professional identity. They say for instance, "I am not a woman, I am a cop" (Interview 37), "I may be a woman, but I am still good at finance" (Interview 22), or "right now I'm not a woman, I'm your boss" (Interview 16).

Public officials with traditionally low social status prove their authority based on their official positions. They also mobilize their authority based on their official positions much more often than their middle-aged and older white male counterparts. Proving authority or relying on official position and rules as sources of authority can come with negative implications in modern bureaucracies. There is a power paradox when invoking rules as a source of power. The power of the rule is immediately recognized and typically complied with, but the public official is seen as weak for having to explicitly rely on the rules and the official power of their position rather than "their own personal authority" (Interview 35). The power of the rules is immediate and substantial, but the implications of mobilizing rules or official status as a source of authority can have long-term negative consequences with regard to professional reputation. In addition to being seen as weak when relying on rules or official structures, when mobilizing official sources of authority public officials can be seen as uppity, bitchy or overly rigid. For example, an older female police chief came into a new organization and put out a memo of her management rights. She describes the response from some of the older while male police officers as negative, she said that after that she was seen as overly rigid and "bitchy" by some of her colleagues, but she felt the need to put the memo out in order to assert her rights as a manager (Interview 28).

In order to avoid the paradox of the rule, or get around the negative consequences of mobilizing official position as a source of authority, some public officials with traditionally low social status will often defuse their use of their official

position. When defusing their use of official position public officials with low social status will often use humor or make passing reference to a rule or official structure, rather than explicitly invoking it. For example, a middle-aged Latino city manager joked with an elected official who was trying to micro-manage the city that "according to the city charter, I'm the only one who gives specific directives within the organization, but if you think that's a bad idea you can always vote on it, you're the boss, I just follow the city codes" (Interview 44).

Defusing techniques are often consistent with cultural concepts of femininity; they tend to be light-hearted or submissive. By using defusing strategies with official strategies, the public officials still get some of the power of the rule by referencing it, but do not suffer the full consequences of being seen as a rule enforcer since they have couched the reference in a culturally acceptable technique. The official position of the public official is still the primary source of their authority, but the means they are using to mobilize it is more consistent with their social identity. For example, when a female police officer is questioned about whether she is a "real" police officer or not, and she jokes "No, I just wear this uniform for fun." By doing so, she is keeping the situation, and challenge to her authority, lighthearted. But, she is also referencing her uniform, an obvious symbol of her official authority (Interview 37).

Social status is such a deep social structure that it often goes unrecognized and is rarely explicitly discussed by public officials. Rather than relying on traditional survey methodologies I collected narratives from public officials in policing and city administration to assess how social status factored in the use of authority. Traditional

survey methods require at least some deliberate cognition of the phenomenon that is being researched on the part of the research participants, or at the very least research participants must not actively try to deny that the phenomenon exists. In the case of public officials, however, I have found that although many deny that social status factors had any effect on their experiences, they would proceed to discuss multiple stories where social status factors clearly played a role in either a challenge to their authority or their response to the challenge. For instance, the officials with traditionally low social status' interviews for this study commonly denied the importance of their social status, as in the case of a city manager, who claimed, "Being a woman in this field has never really been problematic for me" (Interview 34). But such a claim very commonly preceded a story that powerfully illustrated the continuing influence of social status, as in the case of the female city manager, who then went on to tell a story about the fire chief, described as "a good old boy", who challenged this white female city manager's authority when she first started in her position by saying that he didn't think he could work for a woman.

Public officials also did not seem to be completely deliberate in their development and use of strategies to mobilize their authority. Rather than seeing responses to challenges as techniques or strategies, public officials, regardless of social status often saw their responses as a "gut reaction" (Interview 43) or the "only option they had" (Interview 25). Public officials with traditionally low social status knew that they had developed a large variety of these "gut reactions" over time and that their development had been influenced by previous experiences. The effects of

social status are so profound that they permeate almost all of the stories that public officials shared with me. They appear as obvious patterns, but often the ways that particular social status factors operated in these stories were not explicitly communicated and would be difficult to capture in a survey format. The experiences of women and racial and ethnic minorities have long demonstrated that social status affects the ways that their authority is seen by others and mobilized by them. But it is through the collection and analysis of stories that the subtle and explicit ways that this plays out day-to-day for public officials could be captured. The stories shared by public officials in both professions were strikingly similar and divided by social status lines.

Narratives were often followed by claims that the official had now learned better how to handle challenges to their authority. For example, a middle-aged white female assistant city manager said that she learned to preempt challenges to her authority based on her age and youthful appearance after many such challenges early in her career. She explained that she would often have citizens question her ability to make decisions on behalf of the city, or ask if she was even old enough to hold a "real" job in the city. She described a technique she developed based on her official status. Each time she met someone new, she would introduce herself and say "and I have been with the city __ number of years and I am currently in charge of overseeing four of our twelve departments" (Interview 16). In this way she demonstrated her age, her professional credentials and responsibilities before citizens or subordinate

employees had a chance to challenge her, something she described learning to do because of the numerous challenges she faced early in her career.

The stories I collected revealed the subtle and explicit ways that social status affects the professional lives of public officials. Public officials with traditionally high social status, middle-aged and older white men, often do not recognize how their social status benefits them. The benefits of their social status are institutionalized and seen as traditions and norms. As one middle-aged white male city manager (interview 35) said, “When the public thinks of a city manager they think of someone like me.” Middle-aged and older white males’ personal identity is seen as consistent with their professional identity and they can easily layer these two identities on each other. There is no doubt that they can access the authority of their professional position. Often the power of their social status is not recognized because it blends seamlessly with their professional position. As a middle-aged white male city manager observed, “It’s just me they listen to” (interview 27). The professional identity is not separate from the personal. There is no need and no benefit to separating personal and professional identities.

There is, however, not only a benefit, but a need for public officials with traditionally low social status to separate their professional and personal identities. In order to assert their powerful identity, they often need to deny their social identity: I am not a woman; I am a police officer (Interviews 4, 8, 13, 33, 37); I am not your wife, but your potential boss (Interview 16). They prove their authority by shifting the focus from their traditionally low social status to their high official status. Often, they

must prove their authority even before they can gain access to the authority of their official status.

The implications for public organizations may be significant. For one thing, social status may affect the retention and ascension of racial and ethnic minorities and women in public organizations. Public officials with traditionally low social status describe always struggling at work, since they are working harder to assert their professional identity. For public officials with traditionally low social status, then, choices to opt out may be more easily made than for their middle-aged and older white male colleagues because of the extra effort they are exerting just to be a public official. If so, tensions rising from social status directly affect the life of the individual and the diversity of organization. In the long run, increased opting out of public officials with traditionally low social status might even affect the legitimacy of public organizations. The organization may not be seen as representative or fair to racial and ethnic minorities and women if there is a consistent pattern of public officials with traditionally low social status opting out because of the increased work and strain they face in order to prove and mobilize their authority.

While there are possible negative consequences for public organizations because of the effects of social status on public authority, it is important to keep in mind that social status is a society-wide institution and based on norms and traditions that go beyond individual organizations or the idea of modern bureaucracies. As is the case with many other traditional norms based on race and sex, the effect of social status on public officials is more subtle than it was in the past. Discrimination based

on sex or race or ethnicity, of course, was once commonplace and accepted. Discrimination was explicit and easy to identify. For example, segregated workforces and public accommodations were easy to recognize as racism. After the rights revolution, discrimination has become less accepted. But the racism that still exists has become more subtle and harder to explicitly identify. For example, a middle-aged white female assistant city manager said that when, after a reorganization she assumed authority over the finance department, the finance director began regularly challenging her authority. She observed, “Now I can’t say that this was because of gender, but he never did it to the male assistant city manager and we have similar qualifications and management styles, but you can just never know with those kinds of things” (Interview 23).

But, precisely because their social identity is a “handicap,” public officials with traditionally low social status, as I have noted, do not like to discuss the way that their social identities affect their professional ones. Often they will say, “I’ve never had problems, but this one time” (Interview 18), but will then share a story that is explicitly a challenge based on their social identity. In the case of Interview 18 the middle-aged white assistant city manager shared a story of a time when a male citizen directly confronted her ability to make budget and tax decisions for the municipality, because she was “just a woman.”

Why they hesitate or even refuse to discuss the role of social status is a significant question that has implications for how public organizations might try to address the problem. It may be that women and racial and ethnic minorities have been

socialized to believe that personal factors are no longer an issue for public officials. Many of the participants discussed how early on in their careers they were surprised by how much their social status affected their official status (Interviews 4, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 23, 29, 37, 39, 42, 45, 49). It may also be that racial and ethnic minority and female public officials are trying to consciously ignore the effects of social status on their day-to-day lives in order not to perpetuate it. “Shannon, I don’t like to talk about the problems I have had as a woman in this profession. It just provides an excuse not to excel” (Interview 29, middle-aged white female city manager). “If we want to be treated the same we can’t draw attention to our differences” (Interview 34). In the latter quote the older white female city manager is discussing how she is against having women’s luncheons and breakout sessions focused on gender in the workplace at the annual International City/County Manager’s Association. She argues that drawing attention to how women need to work harder to get ahead will only make the problem worse in the long run. Her strategy is to ignore the effects of social status and hope they get better.

While officials may have very good reasons for refusing to acknowledge the influence of social status, there also may be benefits to beginning a profession-wide discussion of how social status frames official authority. First, by recognizing and discussing how social status frames public authority would bring into the open a tension that is probably unknown to public officials with traditionally high social status, even while it powerfully influences the work lives of public officials with traditionally low social status. Such discussions might be quite uncomfortable, since

many public officials with traditionally high social status are not aware of the benefits they are receiving or the challenges their colleagues are facing. Such discussions also might focus on how to handle the problems that public officials with traditionally low social status encounter as a result of their social identity. Many of the female, racial and ethnic minority and young public officials I spoke with had a multitude of strategies that they developed to either head off challenges to their authority or confront them once they were faced with them. These strategies were often developed from experiences on the individual level. Having explicit discussions about social status and authority can bring those individual strategies into public officials' collective knowledge.

Secondly, such open discussions could lead to training programs or educational opportunities prior to or early in public officials' careers. Some of the public officials that I spoke with and felt as though their education had not prepared them to face the tensions around social status in their professions. A white female department director (interview 49), for instance, said that she never expected challenges to her authority based on her sex to be so blatant. She said that she wished there would have been discussions about it when she was studying for her Master's in Public Administration. Her class was made up of a little more than 50% women and she said that when they saw each other at conferences or got together for class reunions many of the women would spend time complaining and sharing stories and strategies of challenges to their authority based on being a woman and how they handled them. The interviewee commented that she would have liked to have had

those discussions before she entered her current organization, because it would have saved her a lot of stress in her first few years.

The lack of awareness discussed above is not universal. As the minority police officer (Interview 30) whose story was shared in Chapter Four said he was expecting challenges to his authority based on his race. The police officer described answering a domestic disturbance call with a subordinate white male officer. He described the white male suspect they were interacting with as “blatantly racist.” As the police officer described it, he would ask the suspect a question and the suspect would turn and provide the answer to his white male colleague. The minority male police officer characterized this as “no big deal” since this kind of thing had been happening “his whole life.” He had challenges throughout his life based on his race and the challenges continued in his role of police officer. The interviewee, however, said that he would like to see more explicit discussions of race in some of the training he received. He said that racial and ethnic minority officers are well aware of the tensions surrounding status, but that none of his white colleagues really know anything about these tensions until they see it directly when they are out on calls with minority colleagues.

Third, having explicit discussions of how social status frames and forms public authority puts much of the current Public Administration literature in a new light. New Public Management scholars and many critics of the bureaucracy argue that strict official structures and rules have negative consequences for modern organizations. They assert that rules and strict official structures lead organizations to

be inflexible and inefficient. Critics of the bureaucracy often view rules almost exclusively as creating inefficiencies. By contrast, some public administration scholars argue that rules should be streamlined and red tape should be cut in order to allow for the increased reliance on bureaucratic expertise for equality. Social equity scholars and legal scholars argue that rules and laws should be stream lined so that bureaucrats can use their expertise to better administer programs and implement policies. They argue that increased discretion is a positive, and rules mostly inhibit the expert administration of policies and programs.

By contrast, I have found that rules and legal structures can be powerful resources that can be mobilized in order to use authority and get work accomplished. While these scholars advocate for an increased reliance on the expertise of bureaucrats to make decisions on their own, and on the entrepreneurial leadership of bureaucrats, there is little to no discussion of the benefit of rules and official structures in organizations. One of the most obvious benefits of rules and official structures in organizations is the ability of public officials to mobilize these resources when their authority is challenged by citizens outside of the organization or subordinates within the organization. Doing away with rules and official structures of power necessarily encourages members of the organization to rely on broader, culturally institutionalized norms and traditions as sources of authority. These sources of authority and institutionalized norms are often based on traditional social status. Institutionalized cultural norms put racial and ethnic minorities, women, and young people at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to exercising authority as public

officials. As social groups, they have not held high ranking public positions of authority for as long as middle-aged and older white men. Middle-aged and older white men have long held high ranking public positions and can rely on their social schema and broader cultural positions of power as sources of authority in lieu of rules and official structures of authority.

The finding that rules and legal structures can be powerful resources for the socially disadvantaged is consistent with the findings of Law and Society, Critical Legal Studies and race and social capital scholars who find that law can be a resource when mobilized on behalf of the socially disadvantaged. Scholars have explored the ways in which social status and identity shape understandings of rights and the mobilization of law, but most studies focus on mobilization by people in non-official capacities (e.g., Ewick and Silbey 1998), particularly by persons of relatively low social status or in positions of social disadvantage (see for examples Bumiller 1987 and Albiston 2005). Scholars have also found that racial and ethnic minorities benefit more from law and rules than social capital (Hero 2007). This project extends this line of inquiry into the public organization context and finds that social status is still relevant even when high positions of official authority have been attained.

Social status frames the way that authority is experienced and mobilized by public officials. But social status is not the only factor that shapes the experience and mobilization of authority. As I suggested earlier in the project, organizational culture may play a role in how authority is experienced and mobilized by public officials. I found that organizational culture, on its own, was not enough to explain challenges to

authority or the need to prove authority to citizens that public officials interacted with. The need to prove authority and many of the challenges that public officials with traditionally low social status faced, based on their personal identity factors, were rooted in society-wide traditional norms and assumptions about social status. Organization culture was, however, an important factor in the degree to which there were explicit discussions of strategies for mobilizing authority. Organizations that public officials felt were more "open to diversity" or "welcoming", had typically held specific training on how to mobilize authority, or had initiated formal mentoring programs.

In organizational cultures that are open and welcoming to racial and ethnic minorities and women, seemed to foster more open discussions of strategies for how to mobilize authority to head off challenges to authority or to face challenges once they arose. These discussions allowed for the exchange and development of strategies as well as the exchange of stories regarding challenges to authority. The exchange of stories demonstrated to newly hired women and racial and ethnic minorities that challenges based on social identities did occur and there are ways to handle them. Such stories helped to teach strategies for responding to challenges.

The exchange of stories also demonstrates to public officials with traditionally high social status, the middle-aged and older white male colleagues, that their colleagues with traditionally low social status are being challenged. The sharing of stories and strategies made the continuing problems of social status in the professional world more explicit. Without open organizational cultures middle-aged

and older white male public officials may not recognize the subtle and explicit ways that social status frames their own experience and use of authority, or the way it frames and forms their female and racial and ethnic minority colleagues.

Social status is a deep social structure that continues to frame and form the experience and use of authority for public officials. Welcoming and diverse organizational cultures while valuable are not enough to change the ways that social status frames authority, as social status is a social structure that is based on traditions and norms that go beyond the organization itself. Social status is formed and reformed in our society at large; it permeates every public organization and professional identity. Open and welcoming organizational cultures, nonetheless, can prepare public officials with traditionally low social status to face the challenges that they will receive because of their social status.

While it may be too early to say precisely what concrete steps may change the way that social status frames public authority, this study offers some preliminary suggestions. Public officials with traditionally low social status implicitly discussed the many strategies that they had developed to head off and face challenges to their authority in the stories they shared. These strategies were often not deliberate, but were developed, nonetheless. Having training or mentorship programs that convey lessons gleaned from experiences and stories of public officials to students or newer public officials could help them adjust to the environment they will be entering sooner.

But, training and discussions about how social status frames authority, should not be aimed only at public officials with traditionally low social status. All public officials need a greater awareness of how authority is framed by social status. Public officials with traditionally high social status are often still the majority in high ranking public positions where they may be influential in decisions about constructing rules and legal structures of organizations. They should have a better understanding of how the rules are mobilized as resources of authority by their colleagues with traditionally low social status. Discussions and trainings may also help to lessen the stigma of rule enforcement or rule mobilization in public organizations. The most important step moving forward is to make discussions of how social status frames public authority a priority in public organizations and scholarship.

Table 2.1: Respondents Social and Official Status

Respondents	***Position***	***Sex***	***Race***	***Age***	***Social Status***
1	Police Captain	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
2	Police Field Training Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
3	Police Patrol Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
4	Police Patrol Officer	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
5	Police Patrol Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
6	Police Field Training Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
7	Police Patrol Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
8	Police Patrol Officer	Female	White	Young	Low
9	City Manager	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
10	Police Field Training Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
11	Police Field Training Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
12	Police Patrol Officer	Male	White	Young	Low
13	Police Patrol Officer	Female	White	Young	Low
14	Police Patrol Officer	Female	Black	Middle-Aged	Low
15	Police Patrol Officer	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
16	Assistant City Manager	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
17	Department Director	Male	Black	Older	Low
18	Assistant City Manager	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
19	Department Director	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
20	Assistant County Manager	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
21	City Manager	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High

22	Assistant City Manager	Female	White	Older	Low
23	Assistant City Manager	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
24	Assistant County Manager	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
25	City Manager	Male	White	Young	Low
26	Assistant City Manager	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
27	Police Chief	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
28	Police Chief	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
29	City Manager	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
30	Police Sergeant	Male	Asian	Middle-Aged	Low
31	Police Sergeant	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
32	Police Captain	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
33	Police Sergeant	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
34	City Manager	Female	White	Older	Low
35	City Manager	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
36	Police Major	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
37	Police Detective	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
38	City Manager	Female	White	Middle-Aged	Low
39	City Manager	Female	White	Older	Low
40	Police Major	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
41	City Manager	Male	Black	Middle-Aged	Low
42	Police Major	Male	Black	Middle-Aged	Low
43	Police Captain	Male	White	Middle-Aged	High
44	City Manager	Male	Latino	Middle-Aged	Low

45	Assistant County Manager	Male	Latino	Middle-Aged	Low
46	Department Director	Male	Black	Older	Low
47	Department Director	Male	Latino	Middle-Aged	Low
48	Department Director	Female	Latina	Middle-Aged	Low
49	Department Director	Female	White	Young	Low

Table 3.1: Proving Authority by Social Status

	Percent of Officials who Describe Proving Authority
Officials with Low Social Status	**21/29 (72%)**
Officials with High Social Status	**4/20 (20%)**
Total	**25/49 (51%)**
T= 4.12 (one tailed t-test) $p < 0.01$	

Table 3.2: Sources of Authority

Source	Definition	Basis	Example
Ordinances, Statutes and/or Judicial decisions	Authority directly rooted in written law	Official Position	Female police officer emphasizes the importance of knowing the law so that you know exactly what you can and cannot do
Job Title	Person's official job title	Official Position	Female city mgr discusses import of change in title from "Assistant to the City Manager" to "Assistant City Manager"
Uniform or Clothing	Police uniform/ badge, city mgr's business uniform	Official Position	Male officer says his authority is obvious because he wears a uniform and drives a marked police vehicle
Position in the Organization Hierarchy	Official position	Official Position	Minority male police officer says that he makes call assignments because of his rank
Seniority	Relative duration of service	Official Position	Older female city manager discusses the importance of her many years in her position and her seniority to all of her employees
Physical Attributes	An official's size or strength	Social Status	During interview, female officer asks male officer (who came into break room) whether he thinks about his "command presence;" he says he is over 6 ft tall and more than 200 lbs & doesn't have to think about it
Assertiveness	Forceful projection of authority	Social Status	Female police officer discusses training and techniques to be more aggressive when challenged

Past Actions Within the Organization	Past decisions enhancing authority	Neither	Female city manger repeatedly describes how she handled a situation early in her career and how it enhanced her credibility
Institutionalized traditions or norms	Norms of the organization or society	Social Status	Male city administrator says citizens respect him because he looks like a manager should

Table 4.1 Challenges to Authority

Challenge	Definition	Example
Questioning of directive	Citizen/employee directly questions order or decision.	Interview 9: White male city manager describes employee who regularly questions his decisions
Questioning of authority	Citizen/employee questions authority beyond a single directive	Interview 38: White male employee questioned a female city manager's authority concerning hiring
Denying authority based on social status factor	Citizen/employee denies that the official has authority based on a social status factor	Interview 28: Female police chief said subordinate officer denied her authority, saying he didn't have to listen to her because the only reason she was there was because they needed an opportunity hire
Denying authority not based on a social status factor	Citizen/employee verbally challenges authority beyond a single directive	Interview 2: White male police officer describes a motorist denying his authority to arrest "real" criminals
Passive evasion of directive	Citizen/employee goes behind an official's back to evade an order.	Interview 30: Minority male officer describes questioning a white male suspect, responds only to subordinate white male officer
Evasion of a Person in the Hierarchy	Citizen/employee goes behind a superior's back frequently to evade their authority	Interview 16: Female assistant city manager is perceived as "sticking to the rules" and not letting employees get what they want, so they go directly to the city manager with requests
Defiance of directive	Citizen/employee openly defies a direct command or request	Interview 33: Female police officer stops male driver, and he refuses to interact with her, waits for male officer and complies with his commands
Formal Legal Challenge	Citizen/employee files formal legal or internal challenge	Interview 29: Female city manager recounts a formal personnel grievance filed against her

Physical challenge	Citizen initiates a physical confrontation	Interview 32: White male police officer describes male resisting arrest and trying to fight the officer

Table 4.2: Type of Challenge Identified in Interviews by Social Status

	Type of Challenge			**Total**
	Verbal	*Evasive*	*Defiant*	
Narratives from Officials with High Social Status	41/56 (73%)	5/56 (9%)	10/56 (18%)	56/56 (100%)
Narratives from Officials with Low Social Status	70/106 (66%)	28/106 (26%)	8/106 (8%)	106/106 (100%)
T-Test Results[6]	T= .81 P= .42	T= -2.9 P< .01	T=2.0 P = .05	

[6] T-test results are reported in order to reinforce the pattern presented in the qualitative results. A caveat for the results of the T-tests is, however, in order. The unit of analysis for the tests is the narrative provided by the public official. Almost all public officials who participated in the study provided more than one narrative. Public officials with traditionally low social status provided more narratives, on average, than their counterparts with traditionally high social status, which may create a bias in the T-test results.

Table 5.1: Strategies for Mobilizing Authority

Strategy	Definition	Example
Taking No Action	Either feeling no need to address the situation or avoiding addressing the situation	Interview 10: White officer says he is accused of being a racist by a citizen resisting arrest, says there is nothing he can do to change the citizen's mind, so he ignores the accusation
Using Discretion	Using discretion of the position to avoid dealing with a situation	Interview 6: White male officer says if a citizen is yelling and screaming about an arrest and an area isn't crowed he just lets them go on, but if there are women and children around he makes them stop
Using Humor to Defuse	Using a joke to down play a challenge	Interview 25: Young city manager gets question about his ability to hold the position at his young age, responds by saying "if you think I look young now you should have seen me five years ago when I started"
Doing Extra Work to Defuse	Putting in extra time or work to avoid or defuse challenges	Interview 29: Female city manager stresses the importance of her open door policy to defuse before they get out of hand
Defusing in Some Other Way	Talking situations down, or in some other way defusing them	Interview 12: Police officer talks about "candy coating" situations to increase compliance from resistant citizens
Using a Support System	Engaging others in similar or superior positions	Interview 30: Police officer calls for back up, when they start arriving the resisting citizens become compliant
Denying Social Status	Verbalizing that your race/ethnicity or gender does not matter to the situation	Interview 37: Female officer describes responding to call for service when a female citizen asked why the police had sent a woman and not a real police officer; the officer responded that she was there because she was a cop, not a woman
Acting Assertively	Projecting greater size & assertiveness	Interview 33: Female police officer says when she stops a car she tries to make herself seem as big as possible and approaches the car with an assertive attitude
Stern	Pulling a citizen or	Interview 34: Female city manager called an

“Talking To”	employee to the side for frank discussion	employee to have frank discussion about how he mishandled a situation with the city council
Escalating the Situation	Increasing the intensity of response to a challenge	Interview 37: Police officer describes how she moves through levels of responses if challenges don’t subside
Invoking Official Position – Deferentially	Appealing to the authority of someone at a higher level	Interview 18: Female assistant city manager was championing a program that her subordinates were resisting, she said that the city manager was behind it so they had to all fall in line with it
Invoking Official Position – Assertively	Appealing to official position	Interview 39: Female city manager describes dispute with subordinate in which she reminded him that she was city manager and therefore had final authority
Invoking Rules or Laws	Invoking rules and policies or following rules to the letter	Interview 14: Black female officer described stopping a driver who questioned her authority. The officer explained that whenever she is questioned she is sure to go exactly by the book
Physical Force	Use of force	Interview 40: Male officer describes using a nightstick to gain compliance from a man resisting arrest

Table 5.2: Strategies Mobilized by Social Status

	Type of Strategy				
Social Status of Official	**None**	**Defusing**	**Assertive**	**Official**	**Combination of Strategies**
Narratives from Public Officials with High Social Status	15/56 (27%)	12/56 (21%)	15/56 (27%)	14/56 (25%)	0/56 (0%)
Narratives from Public Officials with Low Social Status	13/106 (12%)	47/106 (44%)	13/106 (12%)	75/106 (71%)	42/106 (40%)
T-Test Results[7]	T= 2.35 P= .02	T= -3.05 P<.01	T=2.16 P=.03	T=-6.32 P<.01	T=-6.14 P<.01

[7] T-test results are reported in order to reinforce the pattern presented in the qualitative results. A caveat for the results of the T-tests is, however, in order. The unit of analysis for the tests is the narrative provided by the public official. Almost all public officials who participated in the study provided more than one narrative. Public officials with traditionally low social status provided more narratives, on average, than their counterparts with traditionally high social status, which may create a bias in the T-test results.

Table 5.3: Strategies Mobilized by Challenge and Social Status

	Narratives from Public Officials with High Social Status	**Narratives from Public Officials with Low Social Status**
Type of Challenge	***Strategy Mobilized***	
Verbal Challenges	None 12/41 (29%)	None 5/70 (7%)
	Defusing 10/41 (24%)	Defusing 32/70 (46%)
	Assertive 7/41 (17%)	Assertive 7/70 (10%)
	Official 12/41 (29%)	Official 47/70 (67%)
Evasive Challenges	None 2/5 (40%)	None 4/28 (14%)
	Defusing 1/5 (20%)	Defusing 7/28 (25%)
	Assertive 2/5 (40%)	Assertive 2/28 (7%)
	Official 0/5 (0%)	Official 20/28 (71%)
Defiant Challenges	None 1/10 (10%)	None 4/8 (50%)
	Defusing 1/10 (10%)	Defusing 8/8 (100%)
	Assertive 6/10 (60%)	Assertive 4/8 (50%)
	Official 2/10 (20%)	Official 8/8 (100%)

Works Cited

Albiston, C. R. (2005). Bargaining in the Shadow of Social Institutions: Competing Discourse and Social Change in Workplace Mobilization of Civil Rights. *Law and Society Review, 39*(1), 11-49.

Black, D. (1976). *The Behavior of Law*. New York: Academic Press.

Bolton, K. & Feagin, J. (2004). *Black in Blue: African-American Police Officers and Racism.* New York: Routledge.

Borelli, M., & Martin, J. (Eds.). (1997). *The Other Elites* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Bumiller, K. (1987). Victims in the Shadow of the Law: A Critque of the Model of Legal Protection. *Signs, 12*(3), 421-439.

Conley, J. M., & O'Barr, W. M. (1990). *Rules Versus Relationships: The Ethnography of Legal Discourse* Chicago: The Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1994). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. In M. A. Finemane & R. Mykitiuk (Eds.), *The Public Nature of Private Violence* (pp. 93-118). New York: Routledge.

Dobbin, F., & Sutton, F. (1998). The Strength of a Weak State: The Rights Revolution and the Rise of Human Resources Management Divisions. *The American Journal of Sociology, 104*(2), 441-476.

Dolan, J., & Rosenbloom, D. H. (Eds.). (2003). *Representative Bureaucracy: Classic Readings and Continuing Controversies*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Doran, S., & Chan, J. (2003). Doing Gender. In J. Chan (Ed.), *Fair Cop: Learning the Art of Policing* Buffalo: University of Toronto Press. .

Duerst-Lahti, G., & Kelly, R. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Gender Power, Leadership and Governance*. Ann Arbor.

Edelman, L., Fuller, S. R., & Mara-Drita, I. (2001). Diversity Rhetoric and the Managerialization of Law. *American Journal of Sociology, 106*(6), 1589-1641.

Edelman, L. B. (1990). Legal Environments and Organizational Governance: The Expansion of Due Process in the American Workplace. *The American Journal of Sociology, 95*(6), 1401-1440.

Edelman, L. B., & Suchman, M. C. (1997). The Legal Environment of Organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 479-515.

Edelman, L. B., Uggen, C., & Erlanger, H. (1999). The Endogeneity of Legal Regulation: Grievance Procedures as Rational Myth. *The American Journal of Sociology, 105*(2), 406-454.

Engel, D., & Munger, F. W. (2003). *Rights of Inclusion* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. (1998). *The Common Place of Law: Stories from Everyday Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feagin, J. R., & McKinney, K. D. (2003). *The many costs of racism*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fox, R. L., & Schuhmann, R. A. (1999). Gender and Local Government: A

Comparison of Women and Men City Managers. *Public Administration Review, 59*(3), 231-242.

Frederickson, H.G. (2005). The State of Social Equity in American Public Administration. *National Civic Review* (Winter), 31-38.

Frederickson, H.G. (1990). Public Administration and Social Equity. *Public Administration Review, 50*(2), 228-237.

Friedland, R. & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions. In Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. (eds) *New Instiutionalism in Organizational Analysis* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gerber, G. (2001). *Women and Men Police Officers*. Westport, CN: Praeger.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Green, A. W., & Melnick, E. (1950). What Has Happened to the Feminist Movement. In A. Gouldner (Ed.), *Studies in Leadership*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishing.

Greenhouse, C., Yngvesson, B., & Engel, D. (1994). *Law and Community in Three American Towns*. Ithica, NY: Cornell Univeristy Press.

Guy, M. (1995). Women, Public Administration, and the Personnel Function. In Hays, S. W. & Kearney, R. C. *Public Personnel Administration: Problems and Prospects* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Guy, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Women and Men of the States* Armounk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Halaby, C. (2003). Where Job Values Come from: Family and Schooling

Background, Cognitive Ability, and Gender *American Sociological Review, 68*(2), 251-278.

Haraway, W. (2002). Rediscovering Process Values in Employee Grievance Procedures. *Administration & Society, 34*(5), 499-521.

Hero, R. E. (2007). *Racial Diversity and Social Capital: Equality and Community in America.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kagan, R. A. (2003). *Adversarial Legalism: The American Way of Law.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Keiser, L. R., Wilkins, V. M., Meier, K. J., & Holland, C. A. (2002). Lipstick and logarithms: Gender, institutional context, and representative bureaucracy. *American Political Science Review, 96*(3), 553-564.

King, C. S. Sex-Role identity and decision styles: How gender helps explain the paucity of women at the top. In Duerst-Lahti, G. & Kelly, R. M. (Eds.) *Gender, Power, Leadership and Governance.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

King, D., & Smith, R. (2005). Racial Orders in American Political Development. *American Political Science Review 99*(1), 75-92.

Kluegel, J. (1978). The Causes and Cost of Racial Exclusion from Job Authority. *American Sociological Review, 43*, 285-301.

Kochman, T. (1981). *Black and While Styles in Conflict* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent*

Variables Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications

Maynard-Moody, S., & Musheno, M. (2003). *Cops, Teachers, Counselors: Stories from the Front Lines of Public Service*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.

McCann, M. (1986). *Taking Reform Seriously: Perspectives on Public Interest Liberalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

McCann, M. (1994). *Rights at Work: Pay Equity Reform and The Politics of Legal Mobilization*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McElhinny, B. (2003). Fearful, Forceful Agent of the Law: Ideologies about Language and Gender in Police Officers' Narratives about the Use of Physical Force. *Pragmatics, 13*(2), 253-284.

Meeker, B. F. & Weitzel-O'Neill, P. A. (1977). Sex Roles and Interpersonal Behavior in Task-Oriented Groups. *American Sociological Review 42*(1), 91-105.

Meier, K. J. (1993). Latinos and Representative Bureaucracy Testing the Thompson and Henderson Hypotheses. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 3*(4), 393-414.

Meier, K. J., & Nigro, L. G. (1976). Representative Bureaucracy and Policy

Preferences: A Study in the Attitudes of Federal Executives. *Public Administration Review, 36*(4), 458-469.

Merry, S. E. (1990). *Getting Justice and Getting Even* Chicago: The Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal Structure

as myth and ceremony. *The American Journal of Sociology 83*(2), 340-363.

Mosher, F. (1982). *Democracy and the Public Service 2d ed.* . New York: Oxford Universtiy Press.

Naff, K. (1998). Progress Toward Achieving a Representative Federal Bureaucracy: The Impact of Supervisors and Their Beliefs. *Public Personnel Management, 27*(2), 135-151.

Newman, M. A. (1994). Gender and Lowi's Thesis: Implications for Career Advancement. *Public Administration Review, 54*(3), 277-284.

Nielson, L. B. (2004). *License to Harass: Law, Hierarchy and Offensive Speech* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Oberweis, T. & Musheno, M. (2001). *Knowing Rights* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Patterson, M. & Monroe, K. R. (1998). Narrative in Political Science. *Annual Review of Political Science I*, 315-331.

Pedriana, N., & Stryker, R. (2004). The Strength of a Weak Agency: Enforcement of Title VII of hte 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Expansion of State Capacity, 1965-1971. *The American Journal of Sociology, 110*(3), 709-760.

Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reuss-Ianni, E. (1983). *Two Cultures of Policing* New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Ridgeway, C. L. & Berger, J. (1986). Expectations, legitimation, and dominance behavior in task groups. *American Sociological Review 51*(5), 603-617.

Saidel, J., & Loscocco, K. (2005). Agency Leaders, Gendered Institutions, and Representative Bureaucracy *Public Administration Review, 65*(2), 158-170.

Selden, S. C. (1997). *The Promise of Representative Bureaucracy: Diversity and Responsiveness in a Government Agency* Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Sewell, W. H. J. (1992). A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation. *The American Journal of Sociology 98*(1), 1-29.

Sitkin, S. B., & Bies, R. J. (1994). The Legalization of Organizations: A Multi-Theoretical Perspective. In S. B. Sitkin & R. J. Bies (Eds.), *The Legalistic Organization* (pp. 19-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, R. (2002). Race, Gender, and Authority in the Workplace: Theory and Research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*, 509-542.

Stivers, C. (2002). *Gender Images in Public Administration: Legitimacy and the Administrative State*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Spaeth, J. (1985). Job Power and Earnings. *American Sociological Review, 50*, 603-617.

Stryker, R. (2003). Mind the Gap: Law, Institutional Analysis and Socioeconomics. *Socio-Economic Review* (1), 335-367.

Stryker, R. (2000). Legitimacy Processes as Institutional Politics: Implications for Theory and Research in Sociology of Organizations. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations 17*, 179-223.

Stryker, R. (1994). Rules, Resources, and Legitimacy Processes: Some Implications for Social Conflict, Order and Change. *The American Journal of Sociology*

99(4), 847-910.

Sutton, J. R., Dobbin, F., Meyer, J. W., & Scott, R. (1994). The Legalization of the Workplace. *American Journal of Sociology, 99*(4), 944-971.

Szymborski, L. (1996). Why are There So Few Women Managers. *Public Management 78*(12), 11-15.

Thompson, V. A. (1969). *Modern Organization* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Turner, B. S. (1988). *Status*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Walker, S. (2005). *Police in America* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Publishing

Wilkins, V., & Keiser, L. (2006). Linking Passive and Active Representation for Gender: The Case of Child Support Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 16*(1), 87-102.

Wrong, D. (1980). *Power*. New York: Harper Coloph