

JANET BICKEL RECOMMENDS*

Table of Contents (as of 6/02)

Thriving in 24/7: six strategies for taming the new world of work by Sally Helgesen, Free press, 2001..... 2

Survival is not enough: zooming, evolution and the future of your company by Seth Godin, Free press, 2002..... 3

Sex and Power by Susan Estrich, Penguin, 2000..... 4

In The Company of Women: Turning Workplace Conflict into Powerful Attitudes by Pat Heim et al., Penquin Books, 2001..... 6

Tempered Radicals: How People Use Difference to Inspire Change at Work by Debra Meyerson, Harvard Bus Schl Press, 2001..... 7

Play Like a Man, Win Like a Woman by Gail Evans, Broadway Books, 2000. 9

The Secret Handshake: Mastering the Politics of the Business Inner Circle by Kathleen Reardon, Doubleday, 2001..... 9

Eve’s Seed: Biology, the Sexes and the Course of History by Robert McElvaine, McGraw-Hill, 2001. 9

The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy by Allan Johnson, Phila: Temple U Press, 1997..... 10

Research on Mentoring 11

*This regularly updated feature consists of summaries of recent literature that AAMC’s Director of WIM Program recommends as particularly relevant to increasing women’s leadership

1) *Thriving in 24/7: six strategies for taming the new world of work by Sally Helgesen, Free press, 2001.*

We live in an era of VUCA: volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity.

Starbucks Syndrome of Contemporary Life: 100 choices replaces 1. We have so many options that there are no typical patterns anymore. We invent lives as we go along, improvising to take advantage of the bewildering array of choices. A richer environment but a far more daunting one that requires expending a great deal of energy making what were until recently routine decisions. Convergence of intensity at home and at work requires us to be clear about what we need and what we don't, what serves our true purpose and what's superfluous.

Strategies suggested:

- Start at the core. If instead we accept reflexive, inherited or semi-thought-out definitions of who we are and what we have to contribute, then we risk being overwhelmed by all the possibilities we face. Therefore:
 - 1) Confront your personal history.
 - 2) Locate your inner voice (especially useful in a frontier period when new ways of working evolving rapidly; to download deepest thoughts, on awakening every morning write uncensored thoughts in a journal.
 - 3) Get comfy in the neutral zone. The universe is not a machine run by logic; it's pulses of energy continually evolving as various elements interact. Like the brain: any synapse can set off a chain of reactions in the whole system and alter reality in seconds. Therefore we need a greater tolerance for the discomfort of being in limbo and for the fact that intuition can be more useful than slow logic.
 - 4) Take inventory on regular basis (take a day off first of every year to review past year's calendar and list: things I like and want to spend more time on; and things I don't like & want to spend less time on. Is what you give your time to what you value? Many successful people feel beaten down by work and only focus on what have NOT gotten done, giving them unrealistically negative picture. So at the end of day, write down 3 things you did accomplish.
- Learn to Zigzag:
 - Learn from youngest generation
 - Think in terms of projects, gigs
 - Plan to keep learning all your life
 - Define what YOU mean by loyalty. Ask yourself: Whom do you feel most loyal to? What ideas do you want to promote? What tool do you prize using above all? In what areas is in your intuition sharpest? What medium best enables you to express yourself? (images, words, flowers, marketing plans, people?)
 - Internalize optimism: Optimism and confidence are key, so get past "scarcity" approach. If hardwired to notice only negatives, confront internalized negative messages, e.g. you're lucky to have a job, life is tough, why do you think you can have it all? Are you trying to prove your loyalty to your family by carrying around outdated messages? (You may need therapy or coach to unlearn). Begin with smiling (simply behaving in a particular way sets in motion physiological changes; SH 121)
- Create your own work: Remaining in unsatisfying work is a losing game and soul-destroying. Trying to adjust to what organization wants from us might have been an asset in the old industrial economy. But today's knowledge economy rewards individuals, originality, and innovation. Used to be you looked for a job/slot where you could "park"; those days are over (even though parking slots still

highly coveted). It's becoming easier to affect the kind of work our organizations do and devise more satisfactory ways of working (instead of just quitting). Decision-making in most organizations is now more decentralized such that power is no longer necessarily linked to position.

- Articulate your value (What do you bring to the table? Forcefully enumerate how the organization can benefit from making better use of your skills);
 - Integrate your passions (We need to find ways to manifest our passions in our work, then we create something unique to us);
 - Identify your market (Respond in highly personal way to those you serve; strengthen bonds, give some work away, share space with others rather than considering them competitors);
 - Integrate all parts of your life into your persona; create rather than fill your space;
 - Run your own "shop", i.e., the nexus of commerce you preside over; your way of operating in the world, an extension of you, reflecting your values.
 - Target multiple centers of gravity because in current environment, it is dangerous to count on any one thing working out, so spread the risk, spin off multiple variations of projects, anticipate making adjustments.
- Weave your web:
 - Careers increasingly resemble "networks of multiple and simultaneous commitments with a constant churn between new skills and outmoded roles." (SH168). Weave strong webs of inclusion: organically operating across boundaries, thus becoming a force for breaking them down. When you weave a web (rather than a "network"), everyone gets included, with your circle extending to the personal. Webs require continual maintenance, keeping in touch, reaching out. Flourishes when you connect elements within it, generating relationships as well: join professional organizations; go deep fast (must move past chitchat to connect on profound level: e.g., what's your big issue right now? What led you to present path? What do you need?)
 - Use strength of weak ties; move in and through a variety of circles, reach out to others first, keep ties over long periods.
 - Grab spotlight, becoming visible in ways comfortable for you (work hard to get to know who you need to know).
 - Look people up; do web work every day.

2) ***Survival is not enough: zooming, evolution and the future of your company by Seth Godin, Free press, 2002.***

This cutting-edge book takes its start from "*memes*"—that is: the idea equivalent of genes, the basic building block of an organizational construct, the functional unit of idea transference, e.g. a cookie recipe. Sometimes a meme is tied up in a person and can't be easily transferred. Memes perpetuate themselves if they succeed in the environment. Memes mutate and retransmit millions of times faster than genes can.

Thus, Godin propounds that:

*Organizational culture is overrated. Underrated is day-to-day interactions between employers, employees and clients. Every time you interact with someone at work, you're swapping memes.

*Have "sex" (bring in "new blood") or get stale. Expose yourself to people carrying memes you'd like to incorporate; get comments from outside early in projects to catch unwanted errors (i.e., mutations) and eliminate them from the rest of the project.

*If the memes you're swapping with your boss aren't dramatically enhancing your personal mDNA, it's time to find a better one. You have to protect your personal mDNA and find a job in which you can improve it. You are the ultimate caretaker for your memes. Be loyal to the people to help you grow, not necessarily to the organization.

*Companies that cause change attract employees who want to cause change. Companies that are afraid of change attract employees who are afraid of change.

*Removing a person from an organization deletes a person's mDNA. This form of corporate sex is powerful; there's no faster way to alter a company's mDNA than to fire the right people.

*Every time you take money from a client, you're swapping mDNA and if their mDNA is slowing you down, you're trading your future success for today's revenue.

*During times of chaos, today's "role model" is tomorrow's disaster.

*The difference between a penguin and your company is that, while you both evolved to the point where you could succeed, the penguin continues to evolve and your company tries desperately not to.

*Why aren't we as afraid of stagnating and dying slowly as we are of sudden death? The chaos we're facing now came on gradually, so it's easy to believe that we gradually adapt in dealing with it. But we don't. The way we used to do business—dependent on profitable physical goods and manageable cycles of change—is over.

*Companies have too many committees that work to maintain the status quo under the guise of increasing communication.

*"Hotwash" is an example of a feedback loop that forces the organization to distinguish between feedback and criticism and ensures that the loops don't break. Hotwash sessions should occur immediately after the event as a fast feedback loop providing a breeding ground for new memes; they bypass the social prohibition against criticism by turning it into feedback. After every Powerpoint presentation, allot 5 minutes for the group to give feedback on the process and execution of the presentation itself. By sanctioning the process of directing feedback, evolution is far more likely to happen.

3) *Sex and Power* by Susan Estrich, Penguin, 2000.

Estrich (USC Professor of Law and Political Science) was the first woman to run a presidential campaign. In this book, she reflects on her professional life in the media, the university and the corporation; it is part memoir, part progress report and part call to action:

*It is a measure of how far we have come that so many young women today could believe that they don't face discrimination. They don't see a work-place structured for people with no child-care responsibilities as inherently discriminatory.

*It's not a pipeline issue. How could it be, in a world structured by and for the winners of the game of child-rearing chicken?

*Identify policies and practices that exclude half the population from achieving their full potential in the public world. Shouldn't we all be interested in knowing whether these policies and practices are really necessary?... If the old rules aren't really necessary, if you accomplish your business some other way that doesn't exclude women, then you should.

*Motherhood doesn't need a movement anywhere near as desperately as ambition does. Hallmark celebrates women who are mothers; who celebrates women who want power?

*Show me a woman over forty who is successful and isn't considered difficult. Why do we have to be difficult to get paid, to get a working computer, to get ahead?

*We are not taking advantage of the tremendous talents of the absolute majority of the population to the detriment of the students, the faculty, and institutions as a whole....Women's leaving the professional workforce is our collective loss. If it weren't for gender—if it weren't for the fact that it is middle-aged women who are being excluded, which doesn't seem unusual—the loss would be obvious... Too many women leave because they can find a way to use their talents.

*It may be true that mothers work fewer hours than men while their children are young, but they also drink less, abuse drugs less, commit fewer crimes, live longer have fewer heart attacks, get into fewer fights at work, are less driven to make costly business decisions for the sake of ego, are less likely to be sued for sexual harassment, or to quit for a better job. Whether women cost more than men, even under the most traditional analysis, depends on which costs you choose to consider...Looking at children simply as a handicap to a parent's career ignores the fact that many of us get smarter when we become mothers, more mature, more responsible, more adept at handling people.

*How do companies change? Very simply. People with power use that power to demand better; they insist on results, and they get them...The determination both to count and to demand accountability reflects a judgement that success is both possible and important... The critical point is to see the absence of significant numbers of women in positions of power as a problem. Once you do, it can be approached the same way businesses address other problems. You get all the facts, analyze what's causing the problem, and set about to fix it.

*You get a better army with women in it, because you can set standards higher; a larger pool of applicants means greater competition and higher selectivity. That's even more true in a world of high training costs and shortages in key labor markets, where technology sets high standards. If we all weren't so used to seeing women leave the workforce and seeing sex-segregated workplaces, we'd realize how high a price we're paying for their departure.

*The standards that measure success in the public world continue to be standards applied by men to men and women...but who is asking questions about what counts as a qualification—or a disqualification—and why.

*"The ideal woman," one senior man tells me, "is married, but has no children; attractive, without being too sexy; strong, but not too tough; ambitious, but not too aggressive. More buttoned up than Ally McBeal, less sweet than Mary Richards, fewer edges than Murphy Brown; a good athlete, and a good sport; active in professional groups, but not women's groups.

*Women downplay their goals; admit to the limits of their accomplishments. It wasn't that they were less ambitious, or not as smart and capable; they were just less arrogant.

*The essence of “comfort” lies in a woman’s ability to defy expectations, even as the factors that make that so difficult are themselves the product of the differing expectations of men and women. Women make men comfortable by proving that they are not like other women, thereby affirming the very stereotypes of women that become, for the most, self-fulfilling prophecies.

*Men’s assumptions about women’s ambition, determination, and commitment, or resentment of their success, means that women come out short on significant fronts. Some women don’t make it because men find them too masculine or too sexy.

*The fact that conscious discrimination has given way to unconscious discrimination not only leaves women feeling confused, it leaves men feeling guilt-free. They’ll tell you that they ‘d like nothing better than a qualified woman for a top job. But the majority of CEOs have “bigger” things to deal with, where there is real pressure. If no one is demanding results on where they company stands with respect to women, it just doesn’t make the list.

4) ***In The Company of Women: Turning Workplace Conflict into Powerful Attitudes* by Pat Heim et al., Penquin Books, 2001.**

As more women enter the executive ranks in organizations, the challenges of women’s workplace relationships are increasing. This book is a guide through the confusing thicket of woman-to-woman conflict. Most women report examples of other women undermining them at some time in their careers. The authors explain how *Power Dead-Even Rule* works in female relationships: “It’s much more straightforward for men to wield power on the job than for women. When men take command of a situation, they’re perceived as resolute and authoritative. But women are in a more precarious position; for a positive relationship to be possible between two women, the self-esteem and power of one must be, in the perception of each woman, similar in weight to the self-esteem and power of the other. These essential elements must be kept “dead even,” unless one is older and more experienced than the other. Thus, women are more comfortable with a powerful woman who plays down their importance than one who does not.” Heim’s advice: If you are aware that your successes are about to or have already ruffled the feathers of the women around you, set them at ease, e.g., symbolically minimize your position, while gently but firmly asserting your authority. Remember that women have developed a great facility for relatedness, and need these connections in order to maintain a sense of personal well-being. Understanding what sparks a conflict helps defuse the confusion and enables you to analyze what’s going wrong.

Among the authors’ other observations:

The importance of social interactions in the workplace is the most significant difference between the genders. Men more often experience “friendliness” with their co-workers, rather than friendships. They tend to be guarded when it comes to divulging intimate information about themselves.

*Women who have met with success in terms of concrete achievements but not what’s called “affiliative success” often feel empty, lonely, and isolated.

*Our genetic heritage, brain structure, and hormones are linked to our need to establish intimacy with others, and especially other women. We are wired for empathy, intuition, and connectedness. We have facility with language and emotion that allows us to express our deepest feelings. We look to our female friends for comfort in times of crisis and need.

*If you’re feeling low, you may be more reactive to what would normally pass as everyday banter or constructive feedback. You may find yourself taking seemingly small issues personally. To deal with

self-defeating messages, write to your internal critic. A different approach is: behave differently from how you feel, i.e., "fake it till you make it."

*Competitive boys' games are rule bound, which makes them far more complex than girls' games. Due to the existence of so many rules, boys often become involved in procedural or other disputes. Boys seem to enjoy these debates as much as the actual game. The social learning that occurs during competitive games teaches boys valuable lessons about resolving conflicts and encourages the development of organizational skills necessary to coordinate the activities of several people at once.

*Women don't know how to depersonalize attacks, after attempting to destroy each other on the playing field. Whereas boys readily accept the occupants of top-ranking positions, for females. . . only the indirect power style is socially sanctioned; the aggressive style is closed off as an option. Females are inculcated to "be humble."

*Women too often diminish their self-esteem through negative self-talk; they also fail to compensate for it by building themselves up when they experience success. They then fall prey to the *imposter syndrome*: what can happen when your external power exceeds your self-esteem.

*"Okay?" "You know?" "Don't you think?" Isn't that true?" Men often hear these as meaning "I need your assurance," but women hear these expressions as "I don't see myself as the big authority here," "I'd like your input," or "I need your involvement."

*Using "I'm sorry" can help equalize power. "I'm sorry" does not necessarily mean "I apologize." But some men may be oblivious to the subtle distinctions.

*Give the person who is attacking you truthful, positive feedback. It disarms them.

*Power is synonymous with masculinity. It's often the boy who sounds most self-assured, the one whose voice is left unchallenged, who's the leader of the pack. Confidence carries over to the adult male perception of leadership in organizations. Men grow up to value a powerful leader who gives direction and then acts self-assuredly. Girls rarely get to play leadership roles. When a girl is selected as a leader, once she stops being nice, she's labeled "bossy" and is ousted. But in the business world, organizations care very little about your being "nice."

*Women outscore men in most management categories, however, women do fall down significantly in risk-taking. Perfectionism is a nasty habit that can cause us to fear that no one is capable of doing the job as well we can. This anxiety can prompt us to micromanage employees.

*Women's best management qualities are those involving interactions with others that demonstrate caring. Moreover, bring more women right-brain intuitive thinking, which encompasses creativity, sensitivity, and values when making decisions. Predictably, think women think of businesses as family with a network of connections whereas the men perceived their companies as hierarchies with clear rules and procedures. But when you care too much about your employees, you risk becoming enmeshed in their personal lives.

*The principal components of leadership are *task focus* (how, what, when, and where to get things done) and the *cultivation of relations hips* (the two-way communication between the boss and the employee). These exist on continua.

5) *Tempered Radicals: How People Use Difference to Inspire Change at Work* by Debra Meyerson, Harvard Bus SchI Press, 2001.

"Tempered radicals" feel different from the traditional majority in their organizations—they are

women and men concerned about social justice in profit-motivated corporations or determined to be active parents or citizens in high-tech companies; women who don't want to act like men in male-dominated institutions; and people of color who want to expand the boundaries of inclusion in predominantly white organizations. Tempered radicals want to rock the boat, and they want to stay in it. Meyerson observed tempered radicals for fifteen years; interviewing senior-level employees who had "identities of difference" as well as those who were self-described change agents and "progressives." Few of them would embrace the titles of "radical" or even "leader". This book reveals the spectrum of approaches such people use to walk the fine line between difference and fit, and to use their differences to inspire positive changes in their organizations. Unfortunately, many people never find a way to sustain this balance, so they have fundamentally disempowering experiences of being "different."

While some people feel that the benefits of fitting into the majority are worth the personal compromises, many others conform simply because they see no other choice, so they surrender a part of themselves in order to survive. Others opt to leave the organization, feeling that they have no way to "be" within the status quo in a manner that is sufficiently antagonistic they they confirm what they believed—that they do not belong. These responses can entail a good deal of pain. But a wide middle ground stretches between the extremes of conformity and pure radicalism, and this book lays out this continuum.

Meyerson's advice for TRs:

- Realize that sometimes biases are so deeply embedded in "normal" practice that they are not evident and it seems that you are creating the issue by raising it.
- Adopt an "opportunity" frame: asking more questions and searching more vigorously for alternatives uncover more viable options for acting, e.g., see silence as a choice.
- Consider the complex "self": Many interactions feel threatening because they appear to threaten "who we are." But people have multiple selves and any particular threat is probably aimed at only one aspect of the self, therefore depersonalize encounters.
- "Responsive turns" help change the dynamics taking place in a encounter:
 1. Interrupt an encounter to change its momentum.
 2. Name an encounter to make its nature and consequences more transparent.
 3. Correct an encounter to provide an explanation for what is taking place and to rectify understandings and assumptions.
 4. Divert an encounter to take the interaction in a different direction.
 5. Use humor to release the tension in a situation.
 6. Delay to find a better time or place to address the issue.
- In situations in which you are personally invested in an issue, a third party may need to step in and raise the concerns.
- The following strategic considerations are relevant to a variety of situations: step back, look inward, take stock of the other person's interests, and use third parties.
- While many situations may feel like threats, criticisms, affronts, or attacks, view incidents as negotiations with the potential for give-and-take. Negotiating successfully creates more options for responding, including those that promote broader learning and change. To think in terms of negotiation is to think in terms of competing interests, differing positions, distinct sources of influence, and alternative framing of issues.
- Successful TRs favor action, recognize that they have choices (including the choice not to act), pay attention to details, look for opportunities, create learning by framing local events in terms of their broader significance, and forge connections with other people. They choose their workplaces wisely and pick battles within contexts in which there is some chance of accomplishing something.
- Some people know they would enjoy an accelerated career if they assimilated more completely. But to live by your ideals—your values, identities, beliefs, principles—is to gain a deep satisfaction that you have lived a life of integrity.

6) ***Play Like a Man, Win Like a Woman* by Gail Evans, Broadway Books, 2000.**

An executive Vice President at CNN, Evans here offers some valuable perspectives on “winning” at work. These quotes are illustrative:

*Guys turn business into a game because it’s more fun that way, and that helps them devise new plays, etc. Women have a different sense of the “gameboard” than men and are more comfortable within a circle than a pyramid. But if the game you’re playing is on a backgammon board or a pyramid, play on it! Then find a way to do circular and use your relationship orientation whenever you’re free to.

*Women shouldn’t be so quick to turn their backs on the earned symbols of success, such as a nice office and salary equal to their male peers; these rewards of hard work become self-empowering.

*Today, careers tend to be sequential and simultaneous, but women tend to be monogamy-oriented, seeking unproductively to make jobs last longer than they’re meant to.

*Women prefer overpreparation to bluffing but need to realize there is never any safety net or “experts” at the game of life. You can rely on self-confidence, improvisation, and your ability to draw on past experience. Also learn to compartmentalize tasks so they have parameters and look more doable. Women tend to undertake more than their share and forget they are on a team.

*Don’t assume responsibility without authority.

*There’s no more nor less balance at the pinnacle than half way up a slope.

*Say out loud what you want; say it to the walls and ceiling, then sit back and decide if it’s really you.

*There’s always going to be something missing, usually that something is you.

*American moms should pull in \$508,000, based on the average value of all the services they provide.

7) ***The Secret Handshake: Mastering the Politics of the Business Inner Circle* by Kathleen Reardon, Doubleday, 2001.**

Recognizing that “politics is simply too pervasive in organizations for career advancement to be based solely on competence,” this USC professor of management interviewed hundreds of executives at Fortune 500 companies about how they acquired the “secret handshake.” The resulting book will help individuals not yet in the in group to decipher the politics of the inner circle, so that they can more effectively decide which battles to fight, predict and prepare for others’ reactions, and identify allies. The book offers guidelines on sizing up both your organization’s political arena and your own style and what to do when the two do not match. Among her many pieces of advice: “being wired into key knowledge clusters outside your organization” is increasingly important as is “learning how to unlearn.” Reardon also addresses the “narrow parameters within which women’s actions at work are interpreted,” which she calls the “thin pink line” exacerbated by the fact that “how women dress and talk . . . has a great likelihood of being noticed.” Too many women respond by “keeping on the sidelines rather than taking calculated risks. . .and letting people know what they’re doing.” Another pervasive barrier to achieving organizational diversity is that “people tend to be attracted to others who are like themselves. . .[thus] unless the people in charge recognize their own biases. . .[women and minorities] will have difficulty achieving the secret handshake.”

8) ***Eve’s Seed: Biology, the Sexes and the Course of History* by Robert McElvaine, McGraw-Hill, 2001.**

This book explores how people’s views of sexual difference have shaped history, inviting new readings of Genesis, Darwin, Locke, de Tocqueville and Theodore Roosevelt, and many others. In one sentence McElvaine’s thesis is: “hell hath no fury like a man devalued.” The following excerpts do not begin to capture the scope of this book:

- Protohistory: By the time humans began to record history, the most important history—had already taken place. As a result of the development of agriculture (and it is likely that “Eve” discovered the practical use of seeds), before the conventional starting point of history, humans had already moved into a new reproductive situation in which population expansion was possible and desirable, women had been largely consigned to reproduction, men had seen their traditional roles devalued and claimed procreative power, and women had come to be seen as inferior.
- The Conception Misconception: A master metaphor that has shaped the human experience since before recorded history began as one that proved to be all but irresistible after plow agriculture began. The apparent analogy of seed being planted in furrowed soil to a male’s “planting” of semen in the vulva of a female led to the conclusion that men provide the seed of new life and women constitute the soil in which that seeds grows. The seed metaphor reversed the apparent positions of the sexes in regard to procreative power. What had always appeared to be a principally female power was transformed into an entirely male power. No longer apparent bystanders in reproduction men now claimed to be the reproducers, while women were reduced from the seeming creators to the soil in which men’s creations grow: not to put too fine a point on it, women were equated with dirt. Women were left with all the work of procreation, but men now took all the credit. For all the ill effects that the Conception Misconception produced, certainly the greatest harm flowing from it was that it led, virtually inevitably, to the assumption that The Creative Force—God—must also be male.
- Hypermasculinity: Rather than absolute differences between the sexes, there are “average” differences in many characteristics. Even viewing these distributions as a male/female continuum or spectrum from A to Z greatly oversimplifies reality because one person is likely to occupy a different relative position on each characteristic, say an H for upper-body strength and a K for nurturing. . Unfortunately, in most cultures throughout most of history, men have been “gender-extenders,” constructing a hypermasculine ideal that rejects everything considered feminine and exaggerates those characteristics that are in reality only somewhat more common men than in women obscuring the vast middle ground. This is a way of thinking that is, literally, a bi-polar disorder. It has been such a powerful force throughout history because men who have been most insecure have so often been the ones most driven to seek power.

In a system based largely on hypermasculinity—those women who are most likely to succeed are those who think and act most like men. Women have a tough enough time “making it” in areas that were until recently male preserves; they have a much tougher time if they adhere to feminine values. . . . Historian Gerda Lerner: “Women must understand that getting ‘equal’ parts will not make them equal, as long as the script, the props, the stage setting, and the direction are firmly held by men.”

9) *The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy* by Allan Johnson, Phila: Temple U Press, 1997.

This sociologist has worked for decades in corporations and schools helping people understand what living in a patriarchal world means. Following are quotes from this remarkable and jargon-free book:

*The basic features that define patriarchy have barely budged, and the women’s movement has stalled in much the same way that the civil rights movement stalled after the hard-won gains of the 1960s....Like all social systems, patriarchy is slow and difficult to change because it is complex and its roots run deep....our profound connections to it shape our sense of who we are and what kinds of alternatives we can choose from. As a system, patriarchy provides paths of least resistance that encourage men to accept gender privilege and perpetuate women’s oppression, if only through silence.

*As part of men's patriarchal training, they are *affirmed* through what they accomplish. This contrasts with women, whose training *affirms* them less for what they accomplish than for their ability to empathize and *mirror others*.

*Another consequence of patriarchal mirroring is that heterosexual men are encouraged to relate to women with the expectation of seeing only themselves. When men's reflection is obscured by the reality and demands of women's own lives, men are vulnerable to feeling left out and neglected. Like cold-blooded animals that generate little heat of their own, this dynamic makes it hard for men to feel warm unless the light is shining on them at the moment.

*If patriarchy is rooted in men's paradoxical fixation on control, fear, competition, and solidarity with other men, then the way is open to changing not men per se, but the patriarchal system and its paths of least resistance, which we can see as only one of many possible forms that the natural human potential for control can take.

*No matter how much energy women expend to get men to "get it," it won't amount to much unless men *want* it to, which, most of the time, to judge from their behavior, they don't...Like water to a fish, the social environment is about the last thing we're likely to notice as something to be studied and understood.

*Reality is socially constructed in every society such that the group with the most control over the resources finds its own interests most accurately reflected in the institutions it creates. This means that those with the biggest stake in changing the world—lower classes, women, and people of color—have the *fewest* resources and the most difficult time getting their experience accepted as "real," much less as a legitimate basis for social criticism and change.

*To take responsibility for patriarchy we have to *feel* responsible for it, which means we have to look at how we're connected to it...we share responsibility for any system we participate in, whether or not we had a hand in creating it.

*A goal like ending gender oppression takes more time than our short lives can encompass. If we're going to see ourselves as part of that kind of change, we can't use the human life span as a significant standard against which to measure progress.

*An awareness of oppression compels people to speak out, breaking the silence on which continued oppression depends. This is why most oppressive cultures mask the reality of oppression by denying its existence, trivializing it, calling it something else, blaming it on those most victimized by it, or drawing attention away from it to other things....Racism continues because white people tell themselves that racism doesn't exist, or that it isn't that bad, or that *everyone* has it tough. White people find ways to numb themselves and bury the reality of racism in their consciousness and go on with their lives, silent on the subject of race except, perhaps, to complain when racial minorities bring it up. This is how oppression feeds on the complicity of decent people who participate in evil systems without doing anything overtly evil themselves.... Seeing things clearly is tricky business and hard work.

10) Research on Mentoring

- Many studies have found that women gain less benefit from the mentor relationship. One internal medicine department found that mentors more actively promoted their men than their women proteges' participation in professional activities outside the institution and that women were three times more likely than men to report problems with their mentor taking credit for their mentor utilized their work.¹ Among cardiologists, women found their mentors to be less helpful with career planning than men did and more commonly noted that their mentor was actually a negative role

model (19% of women vs. 8% of men). They were also less likely than men to negotiate for salary, benefits, travel, space, support staff, and administrative duties—reflecting a combination of naivete and under-use of their professional network.² The American Orthopaedic Society asked women academics to rate obstacles to academic advancement; the 3 most frequently identified were: lack of protected time for research, inadequate mentoring and need to see more patients to support the department.³ Women's informal networks are less extensive and less likely to include superordinates or colleagues from previous institutions.⁴ Because women tend to be more modest than men about their achievements and less apt to see themselves as qualified for top positions even when their credentials are equivalent or superior,⁵ women actually have a greater need for mentoring than men do.⁶ Worse, the lack of effective mentoring is a disadvantage that accumulates in power over time.⁷

- A study of the career progress of minorities at US corporations reveals similar results: that is, minorities face extra challenges obtaining mentoring. Insights from this research apply directly to women.⁸ Here are the major conclusions: 1) Of the minority professionals who became executives (vs those who plateaued), even though they were not on an obvious fast track during stage 1 of their career, influential mentors were investing in them as if they were. These relationships opened the door to challenging assignments and protected the protégé from unfair criticism. 2) Managers who plateaued received mentoring that was basically instructional, whereas those who became executives enjoyed fuller developmental relationships with mentors, particularly early in the career when confidence-building is crucial. These mentors gave both coaching (i.e. technical advice) and counseling (i.e. experiential cues and emotional support). 3) Cross-race and cross-gender relationships may encounter numerous extra difficulties forming and maturing: a) A mentor who holds negative racial or gender stereotypes is unlikely to give proteges the benefit of the doubt (whereas fast-track whites are likely to be evaluated based on their *perceived potential*), with the consequence that the minority is less likely to take risks. b) When the mentor has trouble identifying with the protégé, seeing beyond the protégé's weaknesses is harder. c) A protégé adopting the behavior of the mentor might produce different results (e.g., an aggressive style successful for white men may get women and minorities labeled "angry"). d) Because cross-race relationships are rare, people focus on them, adding to their fragility and discouraging people from participating in them. 4) A key task of the mentor is helping the protégé build a network which needs to be heterogeneous along three dimensions: functionally (from sponsors to peers); position and location; and demographically. 5) The work of mentoring minorities does not end with one-on-one relationships but requires broader initiatives such as executive development workshops addressing these issues, helping colleagues manage their discomfort with race, and offering a range of career paths so that people can move at their own speed.

¹ Fried LP, Francomano CA, MacDonald SM, et al. Career development for women in academic medicine: multiple interventions in a department of medicine, JAMA 1996;276:898-905.

² Limacher M, et al. The ACC professional life survey: career decisions of women and men in cardiology. J Am Coll Cardiology. 1998;32:827-35.

³ Tosi LL, Mankin JH. Ensuring the success of women in academic orthopaedics. Orthopaedics 1998;356:255-63.

⁴ Hitchcock M, Bland CJ, Hekelman FP, Blumenthal MG. Professional networks: the influence of colleagues on the academic success of faculty. Acad Med 1995;70:1108-16.

⁵ Ragins B, et al. Gender and willingness to mentor in organizations. Journal of Management 1993;19:97-111.

⁶ Bickel, J. *Women in medicine: getting in, growing, and advancing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Pub., 2000.

⁷ Austin L. *What's holding you back? 8 critical choices for women's success*. Basics Books, 2000.

⁸ Thomas, D A. The truth about mentoring minorities: race matters. *Harvard Business Review*, April 2001, pp: 99-107.