ACADEMY OF Management Journal

Overcoming Conflict between Symmetric Occupations: How "Creatives" and "Suits" Use Gender Ordering in Advertising

Journal:	*Academy of Management Journal*
Manuscript ID	AMJ-2020-0806.R2
Manuscript Type:	Revision
Keywords:	Ethnography < Qualitative Orientation < Research Methods, Organizational culture < Organization and Management Theory < Topic Areas, Organization and management theory (General) < Organization and Management Theory < Topic Areas
Abstract:	In knowledge-based organizations, conflict among interdependent occupations can be exacerbated by the absence of a clear hierarchical ordering of these occupations within the organization. Moreover, given women's inroads into some traditionally male-dominated occupations but not others, these workplaces are increasingly horizontally gender segregated. In this paper, we study how members of these symmetric and segregated occupations manage conflict in U.S. advertising agencies through the case of relationships between 'creatives' (copywriters, designers, and creative directors) and 'suits' or account practitioners (account executives, strategists, and managers). Creatives and suits are at the same organizational level in their agencies. While creatives are primarily men, suits, traditionally also men, are now primarily women. Drawing on participant observation in five different U.S. advertising agencies and over 100 interviews, we show how creatives and account practitioners use gender ordering to overcome jurisdictional conflict. These practices are grounded in enacting essentialist gender differences that transform symmetric occupational relationships into hierarchical ones by embedding the gender hierarchy. We find that while gender ordering helps women and men in cross-occupational pairs get work done, it also reinforces women's disadvantage because for women it involves low-status and emotionally-taxing scut work that it does not involve for men.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Overcoming Conflict between Symmetric Occupations: How "Creatives" and "Suits" Use Gender Ordering in Advertising

Sharon Koppman*
University of California, Irvine
4291 Pereira Drive
Irvine, CA 92697
skoppman@uci.edu

Beth A. Bechky
New York University
44 West 4th Street,
New York, NY 10012
bbechky@stern.nyu.edu

Andrew C. Cohen
Yale University
493 College Street
New Haven, CT 06520-8933
andrewcohen.phd@gmail.com

*Corresponding author

Acknowledgements
We thank Erin Cech, Laura Doering, Erin Leahey, Ming Leung, Melissa Mazmanian, Ashley Mears, Gerardo Okhuysen, Damon Phillips, Louise Roth, and Carroll Seron for thoughtful comments. We also received helpful feedback from participants in the Organization Studies seminar at the MIT Sloan School of Management, the Organizational Behavior seminar at Harvard Business School, the Creative Industries Conference, the Davis Qualitative Research Conference, the Economic Sociology Conference, the Junior Organizational Theory Conference, and the UCI Center for Organizational Research Workshop. We are also grateful for the guidance of Jennifer Howard-Grenville and the three anonymous reviewers. Finally, we thank the advertising agencies and practitioners who let us into their world and took the time to speak with us. This research was supported by National Science Foundation Dissertation Improvement Grant #SES-1131157.

OVERCOMING CONFLICT BETWEEN SYMMETRIC OCCUPATIONS: HOW "CREATIVES" AND "SUITS" USE GENDER ORDERING IN ADVERTISING

ABSTRACT

In knowledge-based organizations, conflict among interdependent occupations can be exacerbated by the absence of a clear hierarchical ordering of these occupations within the organization. Moreover, given women's inroads into some traditionally male-dominated occupations but not others, these workplaces are increasingly horizontally gender segregated. In this paper, we study how members of these symmetric and segregated occupations manage conflict in U.S. advertising agencies through the case of relationships between 'creatives' (copywriters, designers, and creative directors) and 'suits' or account practitioners (account executives, strategists, and managers). Creatives and suits are at the same organizational level in their agencies. While creatives are primarily men, suits, traditionally also men, are now primarily women. Drawing on participant observation in five different U.S. advertising agencies and over 100 interviews, we show how creatives and account practitioners use gender ordering to overcome jurisdictional conflict. These practices are grounded in enacting essentialist gender differences that transform symmetric occupational relationships into hierarchical ones by embedding the gender hierarchy. We find that while gender ordering helps women and men in cross-occupational pairs get work done, it also reinforces women's disadvantage because for women it involves low-status and emotionally taxing scut work that it does not involve for men.

INTRODUCTION

Knowledge-based organizations rely on members of different occupations to get work done and this interdependence often leads to conflict (Abbott, 1988; Bechky, 2003a; Kellogg, Orlikowski, & Yates, 2006). According to theories of professions and occupations, interdependence produces conflict because occupations compete with one another to control task domains (Abbott, 1988; Bechky, 2003a). When members of different occupations are expected to work together inside organizations, they often overcome this conflict through coordination mechanisms like hierarchical roles, plans, and shared spaces (see Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009 for a review).

A shift in workplace demography in recent decades suggests a need to further explore the enactment of occupational conflict within organizations. Women have entered some previously male-dominated occupations in large numbers, increasing the prevalence of horizontal occupational gender segregation, in which occupations at the same organizational level are dominated by opposite genders (Charles & Grusky, 2004; Reskin & Roos, [1990] 2009;

Tomaskovic-Devey et al., 2006). In engineering firms and start-ups, for example, predominantly male engineers increasingly have their work managed and sold by female managers and sales representatives, respectively (Cardador, 2017; Cech, 2013). In television production studios, mostly male directors and writers have their work produced and marketed increasingly by female producers and marketers (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2015), and in advertising agencies, mostly male designers and copywriters have more of their clients and projects managed by female account practitioners (Grow & Deng, 2014).

This shift in gender representation likely affects occupational dynamics in organizations, yet the literature on occupational conflict has yet to explore it. Scholarship has shown that gender influences interaction at work; this literature focuses primarily on how gender differences are enacted in cross-gender relationships between occupational members, employees and customers, or occupations in subordinate-superior relationships, like managers and secretaries (e.g., Hall, 1993; Kanter, 1977; Pierce, 1996). Yet we know little about the role of gender in relationships between occupations unordered by formal hierarchy, when relative rank is ambiguous and occupational competition protracted and intense (Gould, 2003; Karunakaran, 2018). How do members of these horizontally segregated occupations manage occupational conflict?

Given that knowledge-based organizations increasingly rely on interdependent work between such occupations, it is important to understand how conflict is overcome in these relationships. In this article, we examine how conflict stemming from occupational competition is managed in relationships between two interdependent and horizontally gender-segregated occupations in U.S. advertising agencies: female-dominated account practitioners (account executives, strategists, and managers) and male-dominated 'creatives' (copywriters, designers, art directors, and creative directors). Drawing on participant observation of five different U.S.

advertising agencies and interviews with over 100 advertising practitioners, we examine how members of these two occupations navigate interdependent work during the advertising development process.

Our inductive study finds frequent conflict between these two occupations at points in advertising development where ambiguity about occupational control surfaces, particularly about which occupation has the most valued task, the right to direct work, or the most relevant knowledge. Cross-gender pairs manage this conflict by enacting essentialist gender roles and stereotypes, a practice we term "gender ordering." Through gender ordering, women and men import the gender hierarchy into cross-occupational relationships, providing order through this shared alternative hierarchy. For instance, a women account practitioner might "mother" a male creative by bringing him his favorite snacks, which encourages him to comply with her request because he feels cared for and respected. This enables collaboration to accomplish advertising work, yet potentially disadvantages women and their occupations, as it involves women performing low-status, menial or emotionally taxing work to support men's occupations.

Managing Occupational Conflict in Organizations

The literature on managing occupational conflict examines how members of different occupations work together in organizations (Bechky, 2003a; Kellogg et al., 2006). Inspired by Abbott's (1988) model of professional systems, this literature conceptualizes occupations as engaged in an ongoing competition for task domains, or jurisdictions, through public, legal, and workplace claims of ownership. In the perpetual war for occupational control, the workplace is a fraught battleground. It is here, in the messiness of everyday work practices, that abstract jurisdictional claims are made real for occupational members.

In the workplace, problems frequently arise over which no occupation has complete jurisdiction and multiple occupations vie for control through legitimacy, knowledge, and

authority claims (Bechky, 2003a). Members of occupations seek to define their work as highly valued by the organization through legitimacy claims (Anteby, 2008; DiBenigno & Kellogg, 2014; Fayard, Stigliani, & Bechky, 2016; Kellogg et al., 2006). For instance, web designers compete with project managers in interactive marketing by valuing work that reflects their independent "signature" as opposed to latter's valuing of work that is "on time," "on budget," and "to spec" (Kellogg et al., 2006). Members of occupations also try to enlarge their sphere of influence through authority claims (Kellogg, 2018; Ranganathan, 2013). For instance, engineers refuse to implement requests from marketers in a start-up by telling marketers their ideas are not technically feasible (Truelove & Kellogg, 2016). Finally, members of occupations assert the high relevance of their knowledge and skill through knowledge claims (Abbott, 1988; Barley, 1986; Bechky, 2003a; Huising, 2014; Waring & Currie, 2009). For instance, engineers assert that machine construction is an application of their abstract knowledge communicated through blueprints, even though assemblers copy from technician prototypes to build (Bechky, 2003a).

Organizations, needing different occupations to work together, try to manage conflict between members of different occupations. One prominent approach is through formal hierarchy. Classic work in organizational theory examined the role of formal hierarchy in managing conflict between coalitions in organizations (Cyert & March, 1963; Perrow, 1961). One of the main ways formal hierarchies manage conflict is by providing clear expectations about how organizational members relate to one another by specifying lines of dominance and deference (Scott & Dornbusch, 1975). Hierarchies, embedded in organizational design through role structures and plans handed down from superordinate to subordinate occupations, are also used to respond to emergent problems at work (Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). For instance, doctors, nurses, and technicians in emergency medical teams coordinate work through high-ranking members quickly

delegating and retracting active leadership to and from lower-ranking members of the team (Klein, Ziegert, Knight, & Xiao, 2006).

Given the role of hierarchy in maintaining social order, when occupations unordered by formal hierarchy are expected to work together, an increasingly common occurrence in knowledge-based organizations, occupational conflict is more likely. As work increases in complexity, occupations at the same organizational level come to share work. For example, over 100 years ago, architects did their own engineering, but as building became more complex, architects came to share work with engineers (Abbott, 1988:73). As knowledge accumulation and technological advancement increase work complexity (Barley, 1996; Rivera, Soderstrom, & Uzzi, 2010), and firm hierarchies flatten (Rajan & Wulf, 2006), these symmetric relationships between occupations are increasingly common in organizations. For example, interactive marketing relies on designers, programmers, client services, and project managers (Kellogg et al., 2006), nanotechnology on chemists, physicists, engineers, and medical doctors (Kaplan, Milde, & Cowan, 2017), and community health reforms on doctors and lawyers (Kellogg, 2014). Such symmetric relationships are difficult to manage, particularly in the workplace, because occupational boundaries blur (Abbott 1988:74). Under these conditions, occupational members may resist cooperating with members of the other occupation to protect their jurisdiction (Bechky, 2003a; Vallas, 2001) and to assert their group's dominance (Gould, 2003). As a result, symmetric occupations often have protracted jurisdictional conflicts (Karunakaran, 2018).

Further, demographic differences appear to exacerbate occupational conflict. In general, research on demography and intergroup relations suggests that when demographic differences are aligned with group differences, they amplify intergroup conflict. As members of different groups often hold competing views of group differences (Tajfel & Turner, [1985] 2004),

demographic differences along these same lines tend to intensify in-group/out-group dynamics; for example, by activating stereotypes about the out-group, building in-group pressure, and decreasing the frequency of intergroup contact (Blau & Schwartz, 1984; Turner, 1982). Bringing this perspective to occupational conflict, DiBenigno and Kellogg (2014) argue that when demographics are aligned with occupational differences, they intensify jurisdictional conflict. For instance, in a hospital unit characterized by such alignment—nurses were largely young, white, and native-born and patient care technicians were largely older, non-white, and immigrants—when nurses worked with technicians with whom they differed demographically, nurses were not only more likely to describe technicians using stereotypes, avoid them, and say they disliked them, but they were also less likely to help with technician tasks like emptying bedpans and to accept technicians' knowledge as relevant to patient care (DiBenigno & Kellogg, 2014). Similarly, in a study of U.S. client managers and Indian software developers, as the result of the alignment of occupational and organizational differences with differences between Western and emerging countries, U.S. client managers rarely treated Indian developers as peers and frequently dismissed their professional knowledge (Koppman, Mattarelli, & Gupta, 2016).

The shift in knowledge-based organizations that has increased the prevalence of horizontal gender segregation raises new questions about occupational conflict. While we might expect that increased gender segregation across horizontal occupations would, much like other demographic differences, exacerbate conflict, research on how gender influences interaction suggests it might differ in its effects on occupational coordination in organizations. Like other demographic attributes like race, gender is a primary frame through which we categorize others because it is easy to see and apply. Yet gender differs from other visible social groups because it is associated with shared beliefs about group differences that provide expectations for

coordinating behavior (Ridgeway, 2011). Unlike members of different racial or ethnic groups, men and women are bound together in long-term mutual dependence through kinship and sexual reproduction. As a result, instead of men and women each assuming the superiority of their in-group, members of both groups develop shared beliefs that one group (men) is more worthy of status and respect than the other. Such status beliefs produce expectations that actors bring into cross-gender interactions (Ridgeway, 2011; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999). As such, the informal status hierarchy organized around gender may, much like an organizational hierarchy, provide clear expectations about how members of different groups relate to one another that are agreed upon by both groups.

Research on how gender composition influences interaction at work provides hints as to how the gender hierarchy may shape cross-occupational interactions between men and women. Compared to gender-integrated groups, perceptions of gender differences tend to be more salient in groups that are gender-segregated and men and women are more likely to enact gender stereotypes and roles when they interact (Ely, 1994; Izraeli, 1983; Kanter, 1977; Nieva & Gutek, 1981). Inside predominantly male occupations men tend to "trap" the token woman in their work group into stereotypical roles as mothers, pets, or mistresses (Kanter, 1977). And when men interact with women in predominantly female occupations, for example, as customers, they often expect these women to act in stereotypical ways (e.g., nurturing or sexy) because their expectations from personal and familial relationships with women "spill over" into these work relationships (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Women generally accept these gender enactments as the "price of admission" in male-dominated occupations and "part of the job" in female-dominated ones (Gutek & Morasch, 1982; Kanter, 1977); they may even strategically enact feminine scripts with the men with whom they work to put them at ease (Baxter, 2012; Izraeli, 1983).

Theories of "gendered" occupations and organizations describe similar enactments of gender differences within gender-segregated occupations and between members of highly unequal, gender-segregated occupations such as paralegals and litigators (e.g., Britton, 2003; Hall, 1993; Leidner, 1991; Pierce, 1996) and direct attention to the role of these enactments in the reproduction of gender inequality. These theories argue that the everyday enactment of essentialist gender differences at work, even when these differences are portrayed positively, may reproduce the gender hierarchy (Acker, 1990; West & Zimmerman, 1987). In line with this reasoning, gender enactments at work often have negative status consequences for women; for example, token women who take on the role of group mother are less likely to advance (Kanter, 1977) and women in female-dominated occupations who take on caretaking roles for men in a higher-ranking ones reinforce their occupation's lower status (Pierce, 1996).

Taken together, the literature points to how the enactment of gender differences, and the hierarchical relationship it imports, undergirds everyday relationships within occupations in organizations. Thus, though some have found other demographic differences aligned with occupational differences exacerbate occupational conflict, we also know that gender differences can be a mutually agreed upon and taken for granted part of everyday workplace relationships. The role of gender enactments is particularly important given the increasing horizontal gender-segregation of such occupations in knowledge-based organizations, as well as their likelihood of occupational conflict. As such, tracing how gender enactments play out in occupational conflict has become critical to understanding how members of different occupations get work done. Using the case of two such occupations in advertising agencies, creatives and account practitioners, we examine how jurisdictional conflict is managed by the most prevalent type of cross-gender pairs in this context: female account practitioners and male creatives. We then

deepen our analysis by comparing the practices we uncover in these dyads to those between the less prevalent type of cross-gender pairs—male account practitioners and female creatives—and same-gender pairs.

METHODS

The Case of 'Creatives' and 'Suits' in Advertising Agencies

We conducted an inductive, qualitative study of the relationships between creatives and account practitioners in U.S. advertising agencies. Advertising production relies on interdependent work performed by these two horizontally gender-segregated occupations. These occupations provide a valuable opportunity to study how gender shapes occupational conflict, as we explain below.

Advertising agencies develop, create, and distribute advertising material that promotes a product or service for clients, usually for-profit companies. At the time data for this study were collected, there were a reported 13,113 advertising establishments in the United States that employed 171,246 advertising practitioners (United States Census Bureau, 2012). Creatives' primary function is to create advertising material—a concept, like a brand identity, or a piece of advertising, such as an advertisement, (broadcast) commercial, web page, or logo. Account practitioners' primary functions are to connect agencies to their sources of revenue, clients, and guide these "accounts" through the production process (Ibarra, 1992). Creatives and account practitioners are the two largest occupational groups in advertising agencies and are segregated by different genders. In the U.S., creatives comprise approximately 17% of agency employment and are 72% male while account practitioners comprise approximately 29% of agency employment and are approximately 30% male (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016; Grow & Deng, 2014). We consider someone a creative if her job title is designer, copywriter, art director, or

creative director. We consider someone an account practitioner if her current job title is account coordinator, executive, director[1], strategist, or planner.[2]

The relationship between creatives and account practitioners is an "intensity case." Unlike extreme cases, intensity cases provide rich data on a phenomenon but are not so unusual as to be idiosyncratic (Patton, 1990). Account and creative occupations provide rich data on the role of gender in occupational conflict. Because these occupations are segregated by different genders, the cross-gender pairings of interest occur frequently and gender identities, activated in mixed-sex contexts (Ridgeway, 2011), are salient. Because these occupations are in a horizontal relationship, the conflict of interest occurs frequently. The skewed rather than uniform gender composition of these occupations (i.e., 70% male rather than 100% male) is also analytically valuable because it allows us to compare cross- and same-gender pairs in the same occupations.

At the same time, this case is not completely unusual, as it results from a broad change in knowledge-based organizations: Women's integration into some relatively highly ranked and formerly male-dominated occupations but not others (Reskin & Roos, [1990] 2009). This is what happened in advertising. Prior to the 1970s, women were minorities in both occupations, more commonly found in low-ranking jobs like secretary (Fox, 1997). Account practitioners' colloquial name "suits" even evokes a characteristic (though now outdated) masculine identity. As women made inroads into some male-dominated occupations in the 1970s (Reskin & Roos, [1990] 2009), they entered account occupations but not creative occupations (Advertising Age, 2003). As a result, the relationships studied here exemplify the horizontal gender segregation in

[1] We interviewed three account directors who also held a senior management position (e.g., agency president or owner) in very small agencies, where such dual roles are common. When interviewing these individuals, we focused on their role as account directors and asked about their experience prior to assuming this senior role.
[2] In large agencies, research/strategy and client management are separated (*Account Planning* and *Account Services)* but in average-sized agencies, these are usually in the same department, if not the same person. In this study, we do not distinguish between these two groups.

many technical and creative organizations. For instance, women have entered formerly male-dominated occupations like marketing and client services, but not software engineering, product development, architecture, and screenwriting (Hunt, 2013; Yua, 2007), leading to horizontal gender segregation in many technology companies, architecture firms, and television studios.

The process of advertising development is relatively standard across agencies. A project is launched through a meeting between an account practitioner and client manager. Based on what the client says she needs at the meeting, one or more account practitioners will conduct research, develop a strategy, and put together a timeline, all of which is combined into a plan for the project, known as the brief. Clients, account practitioners, and creatives agree to the brief and it is handed off to creatives, who develop a "concept" (i.e., guiding idea) for the campaign. Sometimes creatives develop concepts based on the brief, but sometimes the brief is tweaked after the concept is developed to provide support for the concept. The account practitioner or creative director will then present potential concepts to the client for approval. Clients rarely approve concepts on the first round of review. Account practitioners must steer creatives toward a concept the client will approve, which is often difficult because creatives often argue that they know what the client needs better than the client. Once a concept is approved, creatives produce the various advertising components—e.g., scripts, logos, print advertisements, webpages—referred to as "executions" or "creative." Account practitioners, with or without creatives in tow, typically seek client approval for early drafts and mock-ups of executions. Here also, clients frequently request changes—for instance, they do not like the color, or could not get a particular slogan approved by their legal department—and account practitioners must get creatives to produce a new version in which client-requested changes are implemented. Because creatives resent taking directions from others on what they consider their work, these requests are also

fraught. Executions are produced and placed in media outlets after several rounds of revisions and final approval. Depending on a project's complexity and the number of rounds of revision, the timeline can range from a week to over a year.

Research Design

This article draws on qualitative data from 16 months of participant observation at five U.S. agencies and interviews with 116 advertising practitioners from these two occupations. These data were collected as part of two independent projects on U.S. advertising agencies conducted by the first author (Sharon) and the third author (Andrew). Although collected independently, the focus on similar occupational populations within the advertising industry enabled a pooled analysis of the data (Barley, 1996; Bechky & O'Mahony, 2015).

Table 1 summarizes the research sites and data sources from the two projects. Both authors conducted fieldwork through internships at U.S. advertising agencies, where they were participant observers during brainstorming sessions, company meetings, client calls, new employee orientations (or "boot camps"), design work, and social events. They also analyzed proposals, training materials, and advertising materials (e.g., brochures, marketing plans, coupons, etc.) from their field sites. Both authors also interviewed creatives and account practitioners. In Project 1, Sharon recruited interviewees through a survey sent to a random sample of U.S. advertising agencies (see Koppman, 2016 for sampling procedure). She used a semi-structured interview schedule modeled on protocols used to study boundaries between scientific disciplines (Guetzkow, Lamont, & Mallard, 2004) and advertising agency departments (Rubtsova & Dowd, 2004). In Project 2, Andrew recruited interviewees from his field sites. He used an open-ended interview schedule, which asked about day-to-day experiences, work history, and the industry more generally. Both authors recorded interviews and transcribed them verbatim. Interviewees from both projects were demographically very similar and their gender

composition aligned with the gender segregation of these occupations nationally (Grow & Deng, 2014): in Project 1, 32% of the interviewed account practitioners versus 70% of the creatives were men; in Project 2, 24% of the account practitioners and 68% of creatives were men.

~ Insert Table 1 about here ~

Analytic Strategy

As Sharon and Andrew embarked on separate projects on the advertising industry, neither intended to study gender. Project 1 was a mixed methods study focused on hiring creative people and creative work in the U.S. advertising industry; Project 2 was a multi-sited ethnography (Marcus, 1995) focused on meaning-making practices in creative organizations. The authors coded the qualitative data inductively in multiple stages (Corbin & Strauss, 1990), moving from descriptive categories to theoretical categories by iterating between data, descriptive categories, and the literature (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Sharon initially analyzed her interviews and fieldnotes with a broad interest in defining merit in advertising, coding words used to describe which advertising work was excellent and where such excellence came from. This resulted in two other papers, one about differences in the assessment of creative work between creatives and account practitioners (Koppman, 2014) and the other about the evaluation of creative potential in the hiring process (Koppman, 2016). She then noticed that conflict tended to emerge between "creatives" and "suits" and realized that there were differences in how the creatives and account practitioners she interviewed approached conflict with the other occupation and that these differences aligned with informant gender. This led her to engage with the literature on "gendering" occupations and organizations to understand how gender was influencing occupational dynamics. She realized that when informants talked about how they managed occupational conflict with members of the other gender, they frequently referenced essentialist gender roles and stereotypes. She mentioned this to Andrew,

who had initially used his ethnographic data to analyze how advertising professionals justify worth in the face of professional stigma (Cohen & Dromi, 2018) and make sense of the market for clients (Cohen, 2020). He said he had also been surprised by his informants' use of gender tropes during his field work. They decided to combine their datasets to rigorously examine this pattern and invited the second author (Beth) to join them at this stage.

The analysis of combined datasets proceeded in steps. First, we collected all of the examples in our datasets of cross-occupational disagreement seen during participant-observation or referenced in interviews.[3] We labeled these occupational conflict and coded them across four cross-occupational types: (1) cross-gender conflicts between majority group members (male creatives and female account practitioners), (2) male-male conflicts (male creatives and male account practitioners), (3) cross-gender conflicts between minority group members (female creatives and male account practitioners), and (4) female-female conflicts (female creatives and female account practitioners). When the cross-occupational type was not obvious, it was identified using names and gender-specific pronouns; if it could not be identified, we dropped the example. The occupational perspectives represented by our interview examples were evenly distributed between account practitioners and creatives.

We discussed the raw examples as a group and Sharon then coded all of the examples by cross-occupational type, the type of conflict, the way conflict was managed, and the resolution, i.e., which occupation acquiesced. We identified 129 instances of conflict for which we had sufficient data to code on all four criteria but then eliminated the ones where we could not clearly and systematically identify the practices used to manage conflict. Across the remaining 113 instances, we identified three primary areas of conflict and three broad practices for managing

[3] Most of the examples in this article are drawn from interviews; examples drawn from participant observation are explicitly noted as such.

conflict. To code who acquiesced, Sharon identified which member of the pair ceded manifest authority to the other. Manifest authority—the capacity to successfully order another's actions (Wrong, 1979:35)—requires one party to acknowledge, accept, or obey the other in practice (Ewick & Silbey, 2003; Huising, 2015). Thus, for an occupational member to acquiesce, her partner had to successfully elicit her cooperation around a request regarding the conflict situation. Across the 113 examples, in 75 conflicts creatives acquiesced, in 22 account practitioners acquiesced, and in 16 neither acquiesced.

Through a process of coding, memoing and discussing, we realized that cross- and same-gender dyads differed in how they managed conflict and whether creatives acquiesced. For instance, we noticed that practices used in cross-gender conflicts to gain manifest authority enacted taken-for-granted gender roles and stereotypes, such as when female account practitioners acted like "mothers" caretaking or "cheerleaders" supporting their male creative collaborators. These specific practices, which we labeled protecting, nurturing, and counseling, appeared at different points in the advertising development process. However, they similarly resolved the occupational conflict by providing an informal hierarchy for organization members to draw on, a broad practice which we labeled gender ordering.

Although there was, of course, variation within cross- and same-gender dyads, variation across differently gendered dyads appeared central to understanding how occupational conflict was managed. As we describe below, the practice most used by cross-gender pairs, gender ordering, was more frequently associated with creatives acquiescing than the entrenchment practices more commonly used by same-gender pairs, in which occupational members tried to assert occupational dominance or explain occupational reasoning, often with negative consequences for the organization.

MANAGING CONFLICT BETWEEN SYMMETRIC OCCUPATIONS

Conflict between "creatives" and "suits" has been present in advertising since the occupations emerged (Fox, 1997). Though industry lore often attributes this conflict to creatives' personalities, it is actually an unresolved jurisdictional conflict (Koppman, 2014). Protracted jurisdictional conflict such as this is expected between symmetric occupations, in which ambiguity about social rank abounds (Gould, 2003; Karunakaran, 2018).

Creatives and account practitioners are symmetric occupations. According to Gould (2003; pg. 70), asymmetric relationships are those in which one side has the right to decide what happens when disagreements occur, a right conferred by formal hierarchies in complex organizations. Creative Services and Account Services sit at the same level in agencies' functional structures and neither has the right to formally reward or sanction the other. They are also symmetric according to the heuristic Gould proposed, in which a relationship is asymmetric if one side can end a disagreement by saying, "We will do it this way because I said so" and symmetric if neither side can. Many of our informants explicitly described this relationship as the latter. As Nina, a designer, explained, "Our relationship [with accounts] is good…Account people recommend stuff, but it's never, 'Do this because I said.'" Jenna, an account planner, similarly described her relationship with her creative director: "It's not a hierarchy where she is just passing things down and she's the end-all-be-all." Table 2 provides additional evidence that when compared by power and pay, clear and consistent cues of asymmetry are absent (Gould 2003). Both occupations perform core work on which agencies depend: creatives produce the products agencies sell and account practitioners connect agencies to their only source of revenue, clients (Broschak, 2015; Ibarra, 1992). The two occupations are mutually dependent and both have the power to grant or deny the other something that the other wants (Emerson, 1962). Account practitioners depend on creatives to produce specific kinds of work, which creatives can

refuse to do. Creatives depend on account practitioners to get projects from clients, so if account practitioners think their clients are not being well served, they can have a creative removed from a project. Finally, both occupations also have similar valuation by society at large. Median salaries at the junior-level are comparable, though those of senior-level account practitioners are higher than those of senior-level creatives.

~ Insert Table 2 about here ~

To understand how jurisdictional conflict between symmetric occupations is resolved, it is important to first identify how jurisdictional conflict was enacted in this setting. When symmetric occupations come into contact, conflicts emerge because these interactions are opportunities to protect one's jurisdiction (Bechky, 2003a; Vallas, 2001) and assert one's dominance (Gould, 2003). In our observations and interviews, conflict arose mainly in three areas of the advertising development process that, in practice, neither occupation fully controlled: agency-client interactions, revisions, and concept development. These areas incited conflict because they inspired occupational competition around whose work was more valuable to "good advertising" (i.e., legitimacy claims), who had the right to direct work (i.e., authority claims), and whose knowledge was most relevant (i.e., knowledge claims).[4] According to official job descriptions, account practitioners manage the development process, including maintaining agency-client relationships, ensuring creatives implement revisions, and guiding concept development by writing the brief. And yet because account practitioners do not have the formal hierarchical authority to direct creatives, creatives often felt they had the right to intervene in agency-client relationships, ignore account practitioners' revision directions, and stray so far from the brief—the formal document outlining the assignment—that it needed to be changed.

[4] These distinctions are not as clean as these categories in practice and should be understood as ideal types.

Agency-client interactions—presentations, meetings, even a simple email exchange—could inspire conflict between account practitioners and creatives because the two occupations disagreed about what is legitimately "good" advertising. Most account practitioners, tasked with maintaining agency-client relationships, felt that "better" advertising came from paying attention to client's needs. As Mary, an account director, said: "[Advertising] has to satisfy the client. Whatever my clients need, I jump in there and do…I try to listen, I try to ask some pertinent questions, and then make [the clients] talk. Because the more they talk, the better the end project turns out." In contrast, many creatives described good advertising as form of art that resonated deeply with audiences. As Brian, a copywriter at Alexander & Sons, put it, "Good advertising, it's truthful and it's either entertaining or adds value to someone's life, like it teaches you something, either it makes you laugh or it motivates you…it's like art." These differing perspectives on which occupational values legitimately created "better" advertising, client needs or creative art, led to conflicts during agency-client interactions.

Conflict also tended to emerge when account practitioners asked creatives to revise concepts or executions. Account practitioners felt they had the authority to direct creatives to implement feedback quickly and literally, but creatives disagreed. A good example of this comes from our observations of Greg, an account executive, and Billy, a designer, at Pioneer, when they received an email from their client with a detailed plan for the website Billy was designing. In the email, the client had written: "We've laid it all out for you so you don't have to think." Billy quickly skimmed what the client had written and said implementing it would create problems for user experience. Greg and Billy discussed whether to implement the client's plan as written or go back to the client with Billy's concerns. Greg said that they should implement the client's plan because of the impending deadline. Billy reluctantly agreed but later complained to Wayne,

another creative, about his frustration with Greg accepting the plan despite its obvious flaws. Yet from Greg's perspective, Billy did not know when to give up. As he later told us, they had "fought the good fight" to try to preserve Greg's work but it was important to know when to "give [the client] what he wants." Account practitioners thought it was within their authority to direct the creatives to execute plans, but creatives felt this impinged on their creative authority, and this could lead to conflicts.

Finally, when account practitioners handed off the brief to creatives to develop a concept (i.e., the main idea that drives a campaign), conflict frequently arose because the two occupations disagreed about which occupation's knowledge was the right source of inspiration. The brief is a formal plan for the advertising project that account practitioners compose and creatives are, at least in theory, expected to follow. Account practitioners generally said that the research contained in the brief was the primary valid source of knowledge of what would sell to the targeted demographic. As Joe, an account director and agency president explained, the brief was "the basis for everything" and the demographic research in the brief was the best source of knowledge for concepts: "You get better creative [work] if you do your research and come up with some insights, some emotions that will relate to the people that you're talking to—then you don't have to guess." In contrast, many creatives said that a heavily researched brief did not inspire good concepts; instead, their intuitive knowledge and understanding of the human condition was the source of ideas that would be universally appreciated. As Ford, an art director, explained, "If you don't understand people at all, you're not going to be a good advertiser and the ad's not going to be good." He likened creatives' intuitive knowledge to that of comedians or scriptwriters: "I just know that there are these fundamental things about people, maybe not every single person, but there are these truths about what people think is funny in a sort of

unquantifiable way." Conflict about concept development arose from tension about which knowledge was more relevant: account practitioners' research-based knowledge or creatives' intuitive knowledge of people.

Conflict between account practitioners and creatives in advertising agencies therefore stemmed from disagreements about which occupation performed work most valuable to "good" advertising, had the authority to direct work, and possessed more relevant knowledge. Without a clear way to settle these disagreements, both sides kept pushing their jurisdictional claims.

ELICITING MANIFEST AUTHORITY IN SYMMETRIC OCCUPATIONS

Although official descriptions of account practitioners' jobs suggest that they should manage clients, get feedback implemented, and have their briefs followed, because they were in a symmetric position and did not have hierarchical authority over creatives, there were frequent conflicts at these junctures. Ultimately, in almost two-thirds of the examples of conflict we coded, creatives acquiesced by letting the account practitioner manage the client, implementing account practitioner feedback, or following an account practitioner's brief. When a conflict ended in this manner, account practitioners were able to do their jobs. In a smaller number of cases, conflict ended with an account practitioner acquiescing by letting a creative intervene in the agency-client relationship, supporting a creative's "vision," or modifying the brief to match a creative's idea. For example, an account practitioner described how she gave in and presented a creative team's idea to a client even though she knew it would not be accepted. Occasionally, conflicts ended without a resolution, and neither occupation acquiesced. This often left projects to drag on and go over-budget. As evident from these examples, creatives acquiescing was the organizationally expected and desired outcome—when creatives did not acquiesce, there were often negative consequences for the organization; specifically, more revisions were often

required, which meant that the agency spent more time on the project, leaving them either with less profit or an unhappy client with a larger than anticipated bill.

When comparing conflicts between cross-gender and same-gender pairs, the former described creatives acquiescing more frequently and in different ways than the latter, as shown in Table 3. Cross-gender pairs primarily managed conflict through gender ordering, enacting essentialist gender roles and stereotypes that transformed competition between symmetric occupations into a hierarchical relation in which women (and their occupation) ceded status to men (and their occupation) in exchange for cooperation. Same-gender pairs primarily used occupational entrenchment practices, in which they attempted to assert occupational dominance or explain occupational reasoning, which usually left conflict unabated or account practitioners acquiescing. We describe these practices in detail below.

~ Insert Table 3 about here ~

Gender Ordering

Cross-gender pairs composed of majority gender groups (female account practitioners and male creatives) and minority gender groups (male accounts and female creatives) primarily used gender ordering to manage occupational conflict. When these pairs used gender ordering, they mitigated competing occupational claims through an informal status hierarchy accepted by both parties. By enacting essentialist roles and stereotypes, cross-occupational pairs transform the competitive relationship between occupations into a hierarchical relationship between genders in which women cede status to men in exchange for cooperation.

Cross-gender pairs of the numeric majority (female account practitioners and male creatives) were the most common pairs observed and the pairs generating the vast majority of gender ordering practices observed. When these pairs used gender ordering, female account practitioners mitigated competing occupational claims by enacting feminine roles and

stereotypes that inspired and justified performing scut work for male creatives. The term "scut work" is used to describe low-status, menial work that does not require occupational knowledge and is physically, socially or morally challenging (Hughes, 1958; Huising, 2015; Kellogg, 2011; Ranganathan & Shivaram, 2020). Unlike occupational claims, scut work does not typically help occupational members preserve or expand their jurisdiction. However, it can help them perform their jobs, for example, by eliciting cooperation from clients (Huising, 2015) or motivating subordinates (Ranganathan & Shivaram, 2020). For female account practitioners, the gender ordering that elicited cooperation from male creatives cloaked undesirable scut work—menial and emotionally taxing tasks that did not draw on their occupational knowledge, such as absorbing a creative's frustration or bringing him food—in socially accepted essentialist feminine roles and stereotypes.

Turning competing legitimacy into cooperation during client interaction. Agency-client interactions inspired conflict between account practitioners, seeking to satisfy clients, and creatives, seeking to produce art. Account practitioners felt that creatives valued "clever" advertising over satisfying the client. Mary, an account practitioner, joked that "I've worked with copywriters who thought that they were demigods! And the comedy of it is, if the line or the copy doesn't work, whether it's genius, whether it's clever, if it doesn't satisfy the client, you've failed…You're all cogs in a wheel." As a result, she noted, account managers "have every right to go inside and say, 'This isn't working for me and none of you are gonna have a job if we don't have clients.'" In contrast, from the creatives' perspective, satisfying clients should be secondary to their artistry. As Brian, a copywriter at Alexander & Sons, put it:

> Who creates ads really? The creative department. So we know what is good and what is bad. And account people, there are two kinds of account people: one who works for the agency and one who works for the client. We try to hire people who work for the agency - your job is to sell the client on our ideas. Our ideas! Not to make the client happy. If they're pissed at you, good! … Account people

> that bend over backwards for the clients to make them happy are just going to make bad work… And then we are sacrificing our creative integrity for the sake of a bad idea which is not healthy.

This disagreement about the value of each occupation's work to good advertising led to conflict around agency-client relationships.

In female account-male creative pairings, account practitioners often tried to keep creatives' artistic goals from hindering client satisfaction by protecting creatives through mediating and buffering between them and clients. Instead of competing with male creatives to define "good" advertising, these women performed scut work protecting men's artistic view of advertising work couched in roles associated with femininity like mother, babysitter, wife, and girlfriend. In exchange, they received cooperation from these men, who said they trusted the women to handle agency-client relationships.

Protection through mediating. Female account practitioners often protected male creatives' view of advertising as deeply meaningful art from clients who primarily did not share this view, a role many of these women likened to a mother or babysitter caring for squabbling children. Julia, an account executive, described how she elicited cooperation from Tim, a creative director, during a meeting in which he presented his concept directly to the client. The client responded: "Oh, I really hate this." Tim seethed and started to defend his vision. Julia stepped in to defuse the tension. She asked the client to explain herself, saying, "Well, what don't you like? Is it too direct? Do we need to soften it?" She then coaxed Tim back into the discussion by emphasizing that the client did like a lot of what he had done. Though Julia could have responded to Tim's outburst using account practitioners' view of good advertising, reminding him that he was providing a professional service for clients, she protected his artistic view by acting as a mediator, softening the blow of the client's assessment and gently drawing

him back into the conversation. "Accounts has to step in and defuse a situation or put a spin on it to where you're pulling out the good parts," she explained.

Julia described this mediating as resembling mothering. "Women make better [account] managers, especially in the agency world, because people can get their feelings hurt a lot and women are more aware of how to deal with personality," she said. "It's a bit motherly. With a more caring attitude, they [women] just make better managers. Especially with creative." Women were better at protecting creatives during client interaction, Julia reasoned, because like mothers, they were more caring. Instead of competing with Tim about what mattered to good advertising, her "caring" inspired empathy for his perspective and efforts to absorb his frustration, transforming competition into a hierarchical relationship in which she tried to protect his feelings and artistic view of his work during interactions with clients.

From male creatives' perspectives, when account practitioners provided such quasi-motherly mediation, they described themselves as less likely to argue with the client. For example, at a large New York agency, Todd, a copywriter, worked primarily with Samantha, a female account executive we also interviewed and whose description of their relationship was familial (e.g., "I try to understand his needs, we're sort of like a family"). Todd said that when he worked with Samantha, he was more willing to "handle [himself] with the client" by keeping his emotions in check. This, he said, was because of the motherly protection she and the other women she worked with provided. "I have so much respect for the account services folks," he said. "They're really juggling the client and they're juggling us. A lot of times, we're the cry-baby creatives lobbing grenades from behind a brick wall. It's not easy, you know? Most times, the account folks do a good job of keeping both parties relatively happy." He based his

willingness to cooperate with Samantha on the way she and other account practitioners mediated the agency-client relationship for creatives, whom he likened to highly emotional children.

Protection through buffering. Account practitioners also tried to prevent male creatives from hindering client satisfaction by acting as a buffer, keeping them from directly interacting with clients. For instance, Penny, an account director and agency president, described how she never let either her current or former creative director, Brad or Walt, meet with clients after Walt had a heated exchange with a large client from the oil industry. "My clients last year wanted to meet with Brad," she said, "and I said, 'Nobody meets with him, I'll talk to you.'" She said that this was necessary because these creative men would not manage their feelings and reactions in client meetings: "They can be very temperamental," she said. "They can be very outspoken without thinking…They just speak out of turn without thinking of what the consequences are." Instead of expecting these men to manage their feelings, she met with clients and performed this emotional labor on their behalf. She would then protect these men's artistic view of their work further by giving them as much freedom as possible to comply with client requests. "I give him [Brad] a great deal of latitude," she went on. "'Fix it the way you think it looks best. Here are the words, here are the photos we want to use.' And he rarely argues with me anymore." Though Penny could have responded to this outburst by reminding Walt and later Brad that the agency needed advertising to satisfy clients to survive, she elicited cooperation from these men by protecting their artistic view of advertising work, which involved the emotionally taxing work of meeting with clients for them and going out of her way to accommodate their artistic vision.

Female account practitioners often likened this buffering to taking on a wifely role. "Accounts people are women because we have to get along with the world," Penny said. "When you read as I do about couples back in the 1700s-1800s, when you read historical novels as I do,

women were getting along and men were being assholes about stuff. I think that women have a subtler gift of understanding the other person that they're interfacing with and being able to get along." She applied this explicitly to the role women frequently played in their relationships with male creatives. "They [women] want to get along," she went on. "The men on the other hand, 'I'm better than you and if I say that this baseball goes right here on this page, that's what I mean!'" Rather than arguing with creatives about advertising's purpose, she "got along" with clients for creatives, transforming a competitive relationship into a hierarchical gendered one in which she went out of her way to protect creative men's artistic view of advertising work from exposure to client's view of advertising.

Many male creatives said that when female account practitioners met with clients on their behalf, they were more willing to let these women handle the agency-client relationship. For instance, David, a creative production manager at Alexander & Sons, appreciated when the female account practitioners with whom he worked protected him from direct agency-client interaction. "I don't talk to the clients, ever," he said. "It's great." As he explained, "They [clients] could fire us at any time. And it's up to the account service team to make sure that they don't…That's out of my control. And I'm fine with that." He viewed his positive relationship with account practitioners as based on this protection, which he said appealed to women more than men due to traditional gender roles:

> We are a family and we all like to do kickass work and try to convince our clients and do kickass work…I don't compromise, I don't settle for bad work...I am not the one talking to the clients every day, making sure that relationship is solid…I am not the person you send to the presentation…I'm candid, smart-ass, condescending, and you can't be like that to clients, you have your happy face on. I am not like that. Like it's a whole different personality. I don't like playing that role...[I: How do you think the other accounts handle it?] They [accounts services people] like it! And that's how they are, they love it probably. It's part of it, and they are all girls. [Historically] it used to be all guys in Account Services but I don't know maybe it's an estrogen or testosterone thing or like girls are just more able to handle that kind of stuff than guys can you know. Guys are more black and white just, 'get to the point,' girls and more 'beat-around-the-bush' type of stuff and 'attention moves.' And everybody in the account service here is girls…they just have more patience, they're more tolerant.

David hated meeting with clients because it required deference and an interpersonal form of work he associated with women, such as "beat-around-the-bush type of stuff" and "attention moves." He said he trusted female account practitioners to handle agency-client relationships because women's natural ability to fill this role let him preserve his work's artistic integrity.

Notably, in these examples, occupational disagreements about which work was most valuable to "good" advertising were resolved when account woman performed scut work that protected men's artistic view of advertising. For example, when Julia, the account executive, mothered Tim, the angry creative director, softened the blow of client's criticism, she performed emotionally taxing work that showed Tim she respected his work as art. Similarly, when Penny tried to make the client happy with her creative director's ideas during meetings and then tried to make the creative director happy with the result, she also performed emotionally taxing work that protected creatives from conversing with clients who generally did not respect the artistic value of their work. Indeed David, a creative producer, described exactly this work as the reason he did not want to work in the account department: he hated holding back his true feelings and put on a "happy face." When account women performed scut work for male creatives, they gave these men the respect they sought, which allowed these women to secure cooperation that benefited the organization. Yet it did not advance their occupational claims and potentially detract from their professional status.

In contrast to two occupations competing to define their occupational work as most valuable to "good" advertising, female account practitioners who enacted feminine roles like mother and wife to manage jurisdictional conflict did not advance their occupational claims. Instead, they tried to protect creatives' artistic view of advertising work during agency-client interaction. In turn, male creatives who received this protection said they were more willing to

hold their tongue during client interactions and let account practitioners handle agency-client relationships. In this way, cross-gender pairs managed conflict around the value of advertising by importing a gender hierarchy, in which female account practitioners, ostensibly tasked with managing agency-client relationships, performed scut work to protect male creatives.

Turning competing authority into cooperation during revisions. Revising concepts or executions tended to produce conflict around authority because account practitioners and creatives disagreed about whether accounts had the right to direct creatives. Account practitioners felt their authority stemmed from their role as the intermediary with the client, but creatives believed that they had the sole right to direct creative work. The disdain creatives felt for account practitioners' directions was best illustrated through the oft-cited example of account practitioners insisting creatives use or not use a specific color. As Ford, an art director, explained during a group interview of mid-level creatives at Alexander & Sons, "If someone over there [in accounts] begins questioning very subjective creative decisions, like the temperature of a blue, or a font choice, you don't respect me as a creative decision maker…The color blue isn't wrong. There's no such thing as wrong there. There's just what we feel is best, in our department of expertise, so I feel like, 'You will defer to us on these decisions.'"

From creatives' perspective, conflict arose in these situations because account practitioners had "forgotten" their place and needed a reminder. The following excerpt from the same interview illustrates this point:

> George [copywriter]: "Nobody's paying them [accounts] to do timelines if there's nothing produced. We are the engine that makes—and by we, I mean creatives at every agency—we make this run. Without what we produce, this isn't a thing…There has to be an end deliverable in what we do, and WE do it. Sometimes some people forget that."
> Third author: What happens when they [accounts] forget that?
> George: They move on to a different agency.
> Ford: We starve them out!
> Lisa [art director]: They disappear!

> Ford: We culturally starve them out until they're so uncomfortable and unhappy working here that they leave on their own. What happens on their end, is sometimes there's this lack of respect for what we do, and they'll start impinging on creative decisions, like critiquing in a way that's ill-thought-out. They'll guard the gate, thinking their idea - like, as if they don't respect that we put enough thought into it to come up with the right solution. They'll sort of critique without really understanding or knowing what they're critiquing, and become very demanding or difficult to work with.
> George: Yeah. At the end of that rabbit hole is, they're an account person that puts 'creative direction' as one of their skills on LinkedIn. [group giggles and groans at this reference to the profile of Carla, a disliked former female account practitioner at Alexander & Sons.]

According to George, the entire agency depended on creatives to produce work. As Ford elaborated, when account practitioners tried to direct creative work, creatives interpreted it as an affront to their professional judgment. As such, the correct response was to put them in their place by refusing to take their directions.

In female account-male creative pairings, the former often tried to quell the latter's resistance to their directions through conceptual and physical nurturing. Instead of competing with male creatives to direct revisions, women elicited cooperation from them by performing scut work nurturing men's influence and achievements that was cloaked in feminine roles like mother, girlfriend, and cheerleader. The men reciprocated by implementing their directions.

Conceptual nurturer. Female account practitioners often minimized resistance to their directions by positioning directions as nurturance for creatives' thinking, a practice they likened to traditionally feminine roles like mother and cheerleader. Heather recalled her early years at Alexander & Sons, when the lead creative director would not take directions from the lead account director during revisions. "They [creatives] would be like, 'That's not how we are going to do that,' and 'That client is wrong,' and 'That client is stupid,' and all that sort of stuff," she summarized. When she became lead account director, Heather addressed this conflict by framing her directions as for creatives' own good, a practice she now advocated among her subordinates. "The way that I approach my day, and I encourage account people to approach their days, is whoever the lead creative is [on the account], that's their partner, that's the most important

relationship you have, so you nurture it." As an example of what this meant, she explained, "I tell account people when they have to tell someone [in the creative department] something they don't want to hear, you just have to say it from a place of caring and you are telling them this because you care about them and about them getting better or evolving or whatever." She likened this approach to mothering:

> Honestly, where I might have gotten into the business because it was about the creativity and the idea, I still love that part of it, but I find myself now loving more nurturing talent and helping others be better. I'm just getting out of their [creatives] way and I get excited when somebody thinks that they can't do something or they are confused. And then they go and they do it and they come back and they are like 'Hey, so here is what I did and this worked.' I feel like I've made a difference, I haven't done it myself but I've made a difference through somebody else, which is just fun. I don't know if that's because now I am a mom. But they used to call me 'the mom,' you know, before I was even a mom.

Heather said that her primary interest was not to contribute individually but to help creatives develop their potential, much like a mother might with her children. Rather than emphasizing her right to direct creatives, she elicited cooperation from them by framing her directions as nurturing creatives' talent and growth, transforming occupational competition into a hierarchy in which her directions supported these men's achievements. When account women she supervised did not nurture these relationships, she said they often would come to her complaining about uncooperative creatives, which she felt reflected poorly on these women because "they are actually the pivotal people that are supposed to make things happen."

Male creatives nurtured by account practitioners often said it made them more willing to consider their directions. For instance, the aforementioned group of mid-level creatives from Alexander & Sons worked with Heather, and they all said they were willing to consider directions from her and the other female account practitioners with whom they currently worked. "If someone [in accounts] brings something up that we missed [from client feedback], and we believe that they believe in us, but they still brought it up, then maybe we should look at it,"

Ford, an art director, said. George, a copywriter, nodded in agreement. These men attributed this willingness to the respect these women gave their occupation. "We have very smart girls over there [in accounts], or ladies, whatever," Ford continued, "and they seem to also have the right things at heart, and, for all of our missions, they also have that same thing. They trust our creative expertise and we, in turn, trust and rely on all the things that they're considering that we're not." "They're not just doing this as a power trip," he continued. "They genuinely respect what we do." Male creatives like Ford and George said they were more willing to take directions around revisions when they believed account practitioners were not trying to exert power over them but instead respected and "believed in" creatives and wanted them to succeed.

Physical nurturer. Female account practitioners tried to minimize male creatives' resistance to their directions through even more literal nurturing, such as bringing creatives food that they liked and otherwise making them feel physically comfortable. For instance, Katie, a senior account executive at CultureShock-Mountain, described her positive relationships with the male creative directors at her agency. "If you build that relationship with a creative," she said, "you can walk into their office and just say, 'Hey dude, I know this is last minute, I know we have already had this approved, the client now wants x, y, z changed'…If you aren't in their good graces and if you don't have that good relationship and haven't proven yourself, they basically are like, 'Fuck you, get out of my office, just find somebody else to do it.'" As she explained, account practitioners were responsible for directing advertising development but the relational side of direction was frequently overlooked. She built these personal relationships through practices akin to nurturing. "It's things that a lot of people think are beneath them," she said. "Like Ted [male executive creative director] loves chocolate, loves chocolate milk, has chocolate milk every afternoon. If you bring him his chocolate, if you bring him something that

has chocolate in it, you are golden." Katie nurtured Ted by bringing him his favorite snack, and as a result, when she needed him to revise something quickly, he would do it. As she summarized, "You will get so far if you are able to mold yourself to the creatives. Because if a creative likes you, he will not only request you onto his account, he will go out of his way [for you]." Instead of fighting about whether she had the right to direct creative men, she and other female account practitioners developed relationships with creatives through nurturing. This transformed competition between similarly ranked occupations into a hierarchy, in which account practitioners helped creatives succeed by making them feel comfortable, and in return, had their directions heeded.

When male creatives' mentioned receiving such nurturance from account practitioners, they tended to say they were less resistant to implementing the requested revisions. For instance, Brian, a copywriter who worked at CSI-Mountain with Katie, said he was willing to "suck it up and do" the work that needed to be done. He attributed his willingness to the ways the female account practitioners with whom he worked went out their way to make him physically comfortable. As an example, he described being allowed to dress informally. "Even when we have clients here, they [accounts] don't make us dress [up]," he said. "'Oh guys, look presentable, you know, [CPG brand] is here today, [major financial brand] is here.' No man, we [creatives] do whatever we want because they [accounts] believe in our [creative] staff… I'm working, my feet [are] up, I'm wearing sandals." Being brought food was a second example. "Look at this bunch," he said, "a Crab Feast today! So amazing, I know. They take great care of you here, you feel valued and it's really important because there is a creative problem—[creatives are] very sensitive people, whenever our ideas die it hurts." To him, being brought food made him feel cared for, which was important for managing the pain associated with having

his work rejected or modified during the revision process. Brian and other male creatives said they were less resistant to directions from account practitioners who they knew "cared for" them and their success.

As illustrated by these examples, disagreements between creatives and account practitioners about who had the right to direct revisions were primarily resolved when female account practitioners performed scut work that empowered male creatives and helped them succeed. When Heather, the head account director, nurtured creatives' intellectual development, she performed support work that encouraged and respected men's achievements. When Katie, the senior account executive, nurtured Ted, the creative director, by bringing him chocolate milk, she performed menial work that made him feel valued. Indeed, Ford and Brian noted that these same forms of scut work made they feel as though account women respected and believed in them, which made them more likely to comply with their requests. Yet again, because this scut work facilitated creatives' achievements, it did not advance account practitioners' occupational claims or help them maintain the status of their profession.

As opposed to two occupations competing for the right to direct revisions, female account practitioners who used gendered roles like mother or cheerleader to manage jurisdictional conflict did not advance their occupational claims directly. These women enacted their directions as nurturance for creatives' talent and physical comfort, making these men feel respected and supported. In exchange, the many male creatives who were nurtured said they were more willing to listen to and implement account practitioners' directions because account practitioners "believed in" them. Cross-gender pairs managed disagreements about which occupation had the right to direct work by enacting gender differences, in which women performed scut work to support men's occupational influence and achievements in exchange for cooperation.

Turning competing knowledge into cooperation during concept development. Cross-occupational pairs not only enacted gender roles to defuse conflict around agency-client relationships and revisions but they also used gender stereotypes to manage conflict during concept development. Concept development primarily produced conflict around who had relevant knowledge, which emerged as disagreements about whether concepts applied briefs or briefs justified concepts. Joe, an account director, said that when he handed the brief to creatives, he expected they would use it to guide brainstorming. He said creatives caused conflict when they relied instead on their own intuition. "It's not about you," he said, as if speaking to a creative. "You've got 25-year-old guys trying to sell something to moms with 2.2 kids and a Honda Odyssey minivan and a golden retriever. How would they understand what that person is all about?" Account practitioners, he said, were responsible for bringing creatives back to the brief. "When creatives come back with ideas, someone [in accounts] has to say, 'How does that execute on the brief? If you don't, you're throwing stuff against the wall and hoping it sticks.'"

Instead of appealing to a specific demographic, creatives wanted to create a universally meaningful aesthetic experience that came from their intuitive taste and sense of humor. Many creatives said conflict emerged because account practitioners made creatives hew too closely to research. "Numbers are something you can spin working in strategic planning," Ford, an art director, said. "It's just frustrating when someone's making their decisions that way. It becomes kind of 'paint-by-numbers,' 'research says the headline needs to be this big,' and you're never going to come up with something new if you listen to all your focus groups." For Ford, his intuition about the human condition was more relevant for concept development than account practitioners' research-based knowledge about consumers. As a result, he and other creatives expected account practitioners to re-engineer the brief to fit their concepts. "If you don't do what

they [clients] ask and you do what [you think] they need, that's something you can argue to them," he explained. From this perspective, account practitioners caused conflict around concept development by inappropriately dismissing concepts that did not match the brief.

To manage this conflict during concept development, cross-gender pairs often tapped into gender stereotypes—essentialist beliefs about abilities associated with men and women, such as stereotypes about humor—which feature assumptions that men have strengths that offset women's weaknesses. This differed from other gender ordering practices in that these stereotypes were primarily used by male creatives to reinforce occupational claims. Female account practitioners did not necessarily accept these stereotypes but some did elicit cooperation from male creatives using a practice that aligned with them, couching their intellectual contributions as preparation for presenting concepts to less funny and more conservative audiences, like clients and consumers.

"Women are not funny" stereotype. When male creatives used stereotypes about female humor and taste, they reinforced the relevance of their occupational knowledge. In four of the five agencies, we observed male creatives use stereotypes about humor and taste, sometimes in front of women, to dismiss women's suggestions and opinions about men's creative ideas. At Pioneer, for instance, we observed two creatives, Karl and Davis, trying to decide between emotional and funny versions of a commercial. Karl mentioned that he had shown the versions to two women, who had both preferred the emotional version. Davis said that was because "women aren't funny." Jess, the art director, pointed out that she was in fact sitting in the room. Davis responded that she was hardly a woman because she burped the loudest of the three and shot nerf guns in their faces. Davis defined humor based on what he personally found funny, a common pattern in our observations. But in doing so, he also used a gender stereotype to reinforce the

boundary around who could contribute to concept development. This was also reflected in some of our interviews, in which some male creatives used this stereotype to reinforce occupational knowledge claims. For instance, Max, an associate creative director, justified an occupational division of knowledge favorable to creatives based on the purportedly different abilities of men and women. According to him, accounts required the "relationship-building hustle" whereas the creative department required "good instincts for knowing what's good and knowing what's bad." Women, he said, were predisposed toward the former; as an example, he described Carla, a female account practitioner with whom he had a good relationship because she gave him "flexible" briefs." Men, he said, were predisposed toward the latter. As he elaborated:

> [In a concept] you're telling the story of this brand, you're giving people an idea of what to expect, right? And I just tend to think that men end up being better at this…There's a different sense of humor…Boys and girls like different things even in a vacuum. For example, *Fifty Shades of Gray*, the most successful romance novel of all time, much beloved by women everywhere, is, from an objective writing perspective, horrible. Guys like other stuff, your *Star Wars*, your *Star Trek*. There is a very clear dividing line between what our men and women react to. And I just think that from like a literary perspective, from a story perspective, men are funnier and I think they have better taste.

By pointing to the purported alignment between occupational differences and gender differences, Max reinforced the relevance of good humor and taste to concept development. By saying that creatives were mostly men because men were funnier than women, he tapped into a stereotype that justified gender segregation and also reinforced his occupation's claim that creatives' instinct was the basis for concept development.

When female account practitioners were treated as if, in line with gender stereotypes, they did not have a sense of humor, they primarily responded by couching their ideas and suggestions as counsel for creatives who needed their concepts to reach more conservative audiences. For instance, Melissa, an account director at Alexander & Sons, described how male creatives often dismissed her ideas and reactions to concepts because they assumed she did not understand their humor. "If you question anything, [creatives act as if] it's just because you are

an idiot and you don't know what is going on," she said. As an example, she described an experience with Xavier, a former creative director, who had developed a concept around a joke that she thought was unclear and inconsistent with the brand strategy:

> I was like, 'I don't get it,' and I was just really honest with him. And he actually asked me, he was like, 'Are you saying *you* don't get it or you don't think our consumers are going to get it?' That was one of the things that reminded me to always make sure I was focused on what we were trying to do or who were talking to. I bring up issues not because *I* think we need to change it [but] I think the client is going to bring that up so we need to be prepared to talk it through…You are almost not saying, 'This is my opinion,' [but] 'I am just preparing.' 'I always want to help you be prepared for the questions we are going to get.' 'I am trying to help you,' kind of thing.

When Xavier dismissed Melissa's reaction, she did not respond in kind; for instance, by asking him how his idea was "on brief." She told us that she believed her occupational knowledge was valuable for coming up with ideas ("Creatives are not the only ones who come up with ideas; on the account side we come up with ideas too and we share ideas with the clients."). Yet she let creatives believe that she accepted that creative intuition was the true basis for concept development and avoided conflict around competing knowledge by framing her occupational-knowledge-based contributions as counsel for creatives. Through this, she said she was able to elicit cooperation from Ford, the art director mentioned above. Though Ford had mentioned the "women are not funny" stereotype to us ("Moms aren't that fun or funny. Appealing to a 21-year-old is always going to be funnier and more entertaining than appealing to a 45-year-old woman, mother of three"), Melissa said that she had "intelligent discussions" with him about his concepts using this approach in which he considered her ideas. When creatives did not consider their knowledge relevant, she and other female account practitioners guided creatives back to the brief by framing their suggestions as speaking on behalf of conservative clients or customers.

In this example, conflict about which occupation came up with creative ideas was resolved when account women performed scut work that allowed creative men to maintain their view of concept development as an application of their occupational knowledge, specifically,

their "good" taste and sense of humor. When Melissa reframed contributions based on her occupational knowledge as "helping" these men get concepts past clients, she made her suggestions seem less threatening to creatives and showed them that she respected their knowledge base, which secured their cooperation. Yet by disguising her application of occupational knowledge, she ceded the professional status, typically gained from applying one's occupational knowledge, to creatives.

Unlike occupational knowledge claims, in which two occupations compete for the right to apply their knowledge, gender stereotypes embed the gender hierarchy into cross-occupational relationships. Male creatives used the "women are not funny" stereotype to reinforce the relevance of their intuitive taste. Instead of responding in kind, female account practitioners framed their knowledge as counsel for creatives' intuition. When cross-occupational pairs resolved conflict around which occupation had relevant knowledge by enacting gender, the woman granted relevance to the man's knowledge in exchange for cooperation.

In conclusion, for all three forms of gender ordering, enacting essentialist roles and stereotypes allowed female account practitioners to successfully elicit cooperation from male creatives. Tapping into seemingly innocuous gender roles and stereotypes imported the gender hierarchy and its status expectations into cross-occupational relationships, providing a way to resolve occupational disagreements that was broadly acceptable to both sides. When female account practitioners used gender ordering, it elicited cooperation from male creatives by shrouding low-status scut work in socially accepted essentialist feminine roles and stereotypes.

When female account practitioners described female peers who did not use this manner of gender ordering, they often said these women had trouble eliciting cooperation from male creatives. For example, Katie, the account executive who brought chocolate milk to Ted,

contrasted her "molding yourself to creatives" approach with that of another female account practitioner who did not use it:

> Sometimes people don't have time for that, they don't want to do that, they don't think that that's part of their job. But I feel like its relationship building…I was on [Soda Brand]; I was one of two account supervisors and the other supervisor would go in [to creatives] and say, 'The client said this, so I need you to update the creative for their feedback.' And the creatives were like, 'Okay,' and then she would leave the room and they would never do it. And she would not build that relationship with them. And then I would build the relationship with them and say like, 'Hey guys, I need x, y and z changed, so this is how I think we should change it, can I roll with this?' And they were like, 'Love it, you came in with a solution' and I would sit and chit-chat with them for like 10 minutes.

In this example, Katie described a female account practitioner who did not build a relationship with male creatives through the scut work Katie performed. As a result, at least according to Katie, this woman was not able to elicit cooperation from male creatives. Such examples strengthen our argument that female account practitioners elicited cooperation from male creatives through gender ordering.

Transforming competing legitimacy, authority and knowledge into cooperation in cross-gender minority pairs. The strongest examples of gender ordering in these data came from cross-gender pairs composed of majority gender groups (female account practitioners and male creatives). But examples from cross-gender pairs composed of minority groups (male accounts and female creatives) also supported this larger argument. Given gender segregation of these occupations, we had fewer examples from these pairs. Yet when the occupational pairs' gender was reversed, male account practitioners also used gender ordering to manage conflict with female creatives, although gender ordering appeared to work differently: these account men used it to elicit cooperation from female creatives without performing scut work.

Helping through shielding. Male account practitioners and female creatives working together mentioned conflict around agency-client relationships and client feedback infrequently.

Yet when they did, these men primarily positioned themselves as helping these women by shielding them from business situations for which they were unprepared by alluding to roles such as salesman and leader traditionally associated with masculinity. For example, Ron, an account director, described how he frequently met with clients for Tara and Sandy, creatives who were able to "express themselves creatively" and were "facile with technology" but were "mousy" and "faded into the background." These women, he said, needed his protection and "help" with clients. Yet unlike female account practitioners, his protection did not involve scut work preserving the integrity of creatives' art. Instead, it involved "handling their creative solutions, really their strategic solutions," which he likened to the role of "salesman." As he explained, "You have to be a little more outgoing [to deal with clients]. You have to be a little more able to communicate clearly. You have to be receptive to political influences and yet not let them slow you down." He and others elicited cooperation from female creatives by portraying creative work as a "strategic solution" for a client problem that he "handled" for creatives using a salesman's confidence and political savvy. When account men took on the role of salesman, they did not typically engage in scut work or display respect for creatives' view of good advertising. Rather, they reinforced their occupational claim that good advertising satisfied the client.

When female creatives said they worked well with male account practitioners who handled clients for them, they also referenced the roles of salesman and leader, which they explicitly linked to masculinity. For example, Karen, a creative director, described how over her 25-year career in advertising, she had watched many female creatives shy away from client presentations, leaving them to their male account executives and partners. Indeed, she said that when she started working as a copywriter, she let her male colleague present her work, though he later taught her how to do it herself. To Karen, this occurred because women were generally

reluctant to play the role of salesman. "Women don't own their power in advertising," she explained. "A lot of portfolio school will teach you how to think and how to art-direct and how to copy-write, but they don't really teach you how to sell your work…The same campaign could be presented to the same client by two different creatives and one could have the outcome she wants and one could not and the difference is salesmanship." Though she and other female creatives acknowledged that part of the reason women were less likely to play this role was their historic exclusion from it ("The things that stick out for me again and again are the pitches where women were not invited"), when female creatives like Karen extolled the importance of the role of salesman to agency-client relationships, they primarily accepted account men's "help." As a result, they ceded manifest authority but unlike their male peers, they also yielded to male account practitioners' view of "good" advertising.

"Men are good at math" stereotype. More frequently, male account practitioners and female creatives working together mentioned conflict around concept development. Male account practitioners tried to resolve this conflict by positioning themselves as helping these women reach consumers by using their quantitative skills, which, in line with gender stereotypes, they described these women as lacking. For instance, Don, a strategy director, described how he ensured Carla, a writer at his agency, developed good concepts grounded in, or at least justifiable with, research. Though she had "little background to do anything quantitative," he said they generally worked well together because she allowed him to "control how her [artistic] assumptions come in" and was "willing to compromise to make better work." To Don and some other account men, good concepts required integrating creativity and basic math understanding, which women like Carla were unable to do themselves because they did not have quantitative training. "Most people enter advertising with very few abilities to do anything quantitative," Don

went on. "It attracts a math-phobic type." This was important, he said, because "Creativity is not necessarily what creates the impact. You really need to bridge both the math and the creativity." Don and others justified accounts' influence over concept development by portraying both creativity and research as necessary skills for advertising, in the process leveraging gender stereotypes about mathematical skill. Unlike Melissa, the account practitioner described above, Don openly challenged creatives' view that concept development as an application of their intuition and did not disguise the fact that his contributions to concept development drew on his occupational knowledge. As such, he claimed rather than ceded the status associated with applying one's occupational knowledge to work problems.

Female creatives tended to explicitly reference gender stereotypes about math when describing integrating male account practitioners' research from the brief into concepts. For instance, Anna, a copywriter, described her relationship with Ned, the account practitioner with whom she primarily worked, who ensured her copy was aligned with research from the brief, i.e., "the numbers side." "When a creative is going off on a crazy tangent, they've got to pull us back and be like, 'Well, this isn't the target audience based on research.'" To some female creatives, including Anna, this was helpful because concept development required quantitative reasoning, which they did not consider women's strengths generally. "Math and science weren't necessarily my strong suit," Anna continued. "Men have a larger aptitude for mathematics and more of a finance career versus a more creative career. I think the creative elements that you can find in advertising speak to women." When working with male account practitioners, some female creatives viewed these men as contributing to concept development by providing guidance grounded in quantitative research. By echoing the "men are good at math" stereotype—i.e., that men were generally better at math and thus better suited for aligning concepts with quantitative

research[5]—women in female creative-male account practitioner pairs ceded manifest authority and acknowledged the relevance of male account practitioners' knowledge.

Much like female account practitioners and male creatives, male account practitioners successfully elicited cooperation from female creatives through gender ordering that resolved occupational disagreements in a way that was broadly acceptable to both sides. Yet instead of female account practitioners' motherly protection of creatives' art, when male account practitioners helped female creatives using the "salesmen" role, they subsumed women's art under their definition of "good" advertising that satisfied clients. Similarly, unlike female account practitioners' framing of their occupational knowledge as counsel for creatives, male account practitioners used the "men are good at math" stereotype to reinforce their occupational claim that creatives' work was an application of their quantitative knowledge and skill. In short, when these men used gender ordering, it did not involve scut work. Instead, the work associated with a "salesman" role validated account practitioners' occupational values and the work associated with the "men are good at math" stereotype applied their occupational knowledge.

By comparing majority (female account practitioners and male creatives) and minority (male accounts and female creatives) cross-gender pairs, as shown in Table 4, we see that while gender ordering is similarly effective at eliciting cooperation for these two types of dyads, it works differently. When female account practitioners successfully elicited cooperation from male creatives through gender ordering, they cloaked low-status scut work in socially accepted essentialist gender roles and stereotypes. But when male account practitioners successfully

[5] Male account practitioners almost never described helping male creatives through their strengths in math and male creatives rarely described male account practitioners' help with math, even though male and female creatives described themselves as bad at math at similar rates. Given the nature of our data, we cannot establish whether men's use of stereotypes in this manner is explicit, unconscious, statistical, or institutional discrimination.

elicited cooperation from female creatives through gender ordering, they cloaked occupational work and claims of jurisdiction in socially accepted essentialist gender roles and stereotypes. In short, when women use gender ordering to elicit cooperation, they typically perform scut work that men in the same occupation do not.

~ Insert Table 4 about here ~

Other Approaches: Entrenchment through Occupational Dominance and Occupational Reasoning

Though gender ordering was the most frequently used practice, cross-occupational pairs also tried to resolve competing claims through occupational entrenchment practices, which either involved asserting occupational dominance or trying to explain occupational differences. Yet unlike gender ordering practices, occupational entrenchment often left conflict simmering or ended with account practitioners acquiescing to creatives' demands.

When male-male pairings used occupational entrenchment, they generally asserted dominance by threatening, insulting, and passing blame to members of the other occupation. A representative example comes from Joe, an account director and agency president. Joe described the conflict between account practitioners, seeking to satisfy clients, and creatives, seeking to produce art, as opposite sides in war. He steered the male creatives with whom he worked toward his perspective by putting them in front of clients, so they would not blame him if things went wrong. As he explained, "If accounts comes back and says 'The client likes this one,' which is not the one creatives wanted, creatives say, 'You didn't present it right.' I don't have any credibility with creatives. I'm a suit. Which, to me, is why you have creatives present their stuff." Joe cast this approach as necessary because these men tended to overestimate the value of creative work to advertising. "Creative people, since they want to do things that are creative,

regardless of whether they work or not, whether they're on the strategy or not, they're usually at odds with the account service people," he explained. "That's the big battle going on. Traditionally, creative people in advertising agencies think they're above everybody else. There's still a lot of 25-year-old guys that think that." In contrast to the mediating used by his female peers, Joe tried to elicit cooperation from male creatives who viewed advertising as art by attacking this value and forcing creatives to see the "real" value of advertising—client satisfaction—by facing clients themselves.

When account practitioners' tried to elicit cooperation from creatives by attacking creativity as ineffectual, male creatives tended to respond in kind. As an example, Max, an associate creative director, described when Ted, his account director, tried to steer his work toward client approval by putting him in front of the client, a multinational investment bank. Given the opportunity, Max took his fight directly to the client, which swiftly rejected his ideas without even a reason: "They were just like, 'Not this.'" Incensed, he told them they were making a mistake, which did not go over well. "The client asked that I be removed [from the account]," he said. "I still ended up doing all the work but this other guy became the client contact, representing it as his own." Ted's efforts to elicit cooperation from Max by putting pressure on him backfired—Max did not hew to Ted's desire for client satisfaction. More broadly, when male creatives described male account practitioners managing the agency-client relationships by asserting dominance, male creatives primarily responded by pushing back.

By contrast, when female-female pairings used occupational entrenchment, they tried to resolve disagreement with reasoning, by explaining one's occupational perspective and asking questions to understand the other side. A representative example of the use of this practice came from our observations at CultureShock-Pacific. Following the initial meeting with a financial

transaction client, Sara, a creative director, and several account practitioners discussed the project in the conference room. Sounding frustrated, Sara asked if the agency could give the client "something big and awesome" he did not request instead of the "toolkit" (i.e., a set of logos, templates and banners) he wanted. Lisa, the account planner, avoided a direct answer. She explained that before they did anything, the client needed to identify the audience. Sara disagreed ("The audience could be everyone!") and repeated the question. Again, Lisa explained that the client wanted consumers to understand the brand. Lisa tried to deflect Sara's efforts to produce more artistic work through reasoning: explaining that the client's "take" on his customers and interest in customer comprehension were important. But Sara kept pushing. Not only did she repeat this question twice more before the meeting concluded, but she continued six days later, at a meeting where Lisa presented the campaign strategy. Eventually, Lisa conceded that they needed to rethink some elements of the strategy. Sensing an opening, Sara asked, again, "Why can't we do an emotional, beautiful campaign?" After Sara and the other creatives left the room, a new account practitioner, Francesca, asked Lisa if the tension with Sara came from difficulty understanding the brand. Lisa replied, "No, it's toolkits being exhausting to the creatives." As her comment illustrated, Lisa recognized that her conflict with Sara was rooted in competing occupational values: Sara wanted to do advertising that was meaningful and artistic, Lisa wanted the work to reflect the client's preferences. Yet Lisa's repeated efforts to explain account practitioners' values did not convince Sara.

These examples show how account practitioners tried managing jurisdictional conflict with creatives using approaches other than gender ordering. Yet the more commonly used practice, occupational entrenchment, did not appear to defuse conflict or elicit cooperation from

creatives. Without the introduction of an informal status hierarchy to resolve occupational disagreements, both sides kept pushing their occupational claims.

DISCUSSION

This study shows how members of interdependent occupations unordered by hierarchy and segregated by gender manage jurisdictional conflict though gender ordering, in which cross-gender pairs enact gender essentialist roles and stereotypes that embed a status hierarchy both sides accept. As summarized in Table 5, when female account practitioners use gender ordering to manage conflict with male creatives, they enact feminine roles that involve performing scut work for men. By using roles like mother, wife and babysitter, female account practitioners protect creatives' legitimacy and handle the client. Using roles like mother and cheerleader, female account practitioners nurture creatives' individual achievements, providing support for these men in order to get them to revise their work. Additionally, owing to their experience with the "women are not funny" stereotype, female account practitioners couch their intellectual contributions as counsel for male creatives to reach more conservative clients and consumers. Notably, these women performed this scut work for creatives even though their occupation was tasked with managing the advertising development process. By contrast, when male creatives and account practitioners tap into male roles and stereotypes, they reinforce the value of their occupation to the organization and the relevance of their knowledge without scut work by pointing to the purported alignment between occupational differences and gender differences.

~ Insert Table 5 about here ~

Using the Gender Status Hierarchy to Manage Occupational Conflict

Studying creatives and account practitioners in advertising enabled us to uncover an important way that members of symmetric occupations engaged in interdependent work manage

occupational conflict: enacting gender differences, which embeds a hierarchy both parties accept. As Gould (2003) argues, absent any hierarchical ranking, two conflicting parties will keep pushing in the hopes that the other will give in. We find that the informal hierarchies associated with gender can help symmetric occupational groups stop pushing in the workplace. Instead of competing for jurisdictional control of interdependent work, the gender status hierarchy provides an alternative way to resolve disagreements about which work is more valuable, who has the right to direct, and which knowledge is more relevant.

Our findings expand our knowledge of occupational conflict beyond asymmetric occupations to include the conflict management practices used by symmetric occupations performing interdependent work. For asymmetric occupations, a prominent way jurisdictional conflict is managed is through formal coordination mechanisms, such as formal role structures and plans (Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). For example, disagreements between engineers, technicians, and assemblers in manufacturing about the value of engineers' visions, who had the right to contribute to design, and whether abstract principles or practical knowledge were more relevant could be resolved through formal plans, namely, engineering drawings, because engineers had formal authority over the process (Bechky 2003). But when occupations are not embedded in a formal hierarchy, role structures and plans that traditionally coordinate cross-occupational work carry less weight. For example, in an interactive marketing firm, despite access to formal roles and plans, disagreements persisted between project managers, client servicers, programmers, and designers about the value of designers' independent "signature," the right to make aesthetic decisions, and which information was relevant (Kellogg et. al. 2006). Similarly, in the advertising agencies we studied, disagreements persisted between creatives and account practitioners about the legitimacy, authority, and knowledge of each occupation's work.

Gender ordering provides workable alternatives for symmetric occupations. Gender roles in which women's task is understood as deferential support for men help resolve conflicts around legitimacy and authority, and gender stereotypes that frame men's strengths as offsetting women's weaknesses help resolve conflicts about relevant knowledge.

Moreover, we demonstrate that non-occupational work or scut work, a form of emergent coordination frequently used by asymmetric occupations, can contribute to the resolution of conflict between symmetric occupations when it fits into enactments of gender essentialism. Scholars have noted that when formal coordination mechanisms are insufficient, scut work helps members of lower-status and peripheral occupations elicit cooperation from higher-status and core occupations. For example, a technician may develop "impure" practical knowledge that produces a scientist's dependence on him (Barley & Bechky, 1994); a safety officer may bring over supplies to build goodwill with a researcher (Huising, 2015); and a psychotherapist may read a book about a mission to display her commitment to a commander's values (DiBenigno, 2019). Though professionals are usually reluctant to perform scut work, as they fear others will question their status as experts if they are seen performing low-skilled, dirty work (Huising, 2015), members of occupations lower in the established hierarchy are willing to do so.

In symmetric occupations, however, the balance of status is fragile and could be upset by performing scut work. Indeed, in symmetric occupations previously studied, neither group performed scut work for the other (e.g., Kaplan et al., 2017; Karunakaran, 2018; Kellogg, 2014). In advertising, creatives and account practitioners frequently suggested that scut work was status threatening, yet for female account practitioners to successfully manage conflict, scut work was required. Gender ordering resolved this contradiction, as it cloaks female account practitioners' ceding of status (in the form of scut work) in gender roles and stereotypes. Women and men

accept the status hierarchy embedded in gender roles and stereotypes as a means to resolve conflict.

Though the study of symmetric occupations is not yet well-developed, initial studies show that symmetric occupations can manage occupational conflict through the work of a third group of lower-status workers, such as community health workers buffering between doctors and lawyers (Kellogg, 2014), 911 dispatchers coordinating for policeman and fireman (Karunakaran, 2018), and PhD students as conduits between scientists from different disciplines (Kaplan et al., 2017). Community health workers, for example, buffered between doctors and lawyers by matching legal and medical meanings, performing menial tasks neither profession wanted, and managing the flow of information by only providing lawyers and doctors with the information each profession considered relevant (Kellogg, 2014). But in interdependent work, occupations cannot avoid direct exposure to each other because work requires integrating values, tasks, and knowledge from both occupations. Our study therefore expands our knowledge of how symmetric occupations resolve conflict to demonstrate how gender ordering enables those groups to collaborate to get necessary work accomplished. In advertising, creatives and account practitioners did not rely on a third group to match artistic and client-based understandings of advertising, perform the undesirable task of implementing revisions, or share only occupationally relevant information. Yet through gender ordering, female account practitioners protected male creatives' sense of value, nurtured them into performing work they found uninspiring, and integrated knowledge from both occupations by reframing how their knowledge was presented.

In addition to finding that gender ordering resolved conflict in an interdependent pair of symmetric occupations in advertising, we also noticed many other gender stereotypical behaviors in this context. For instance, some men referred to their female colleagues as "girls," and in the

same-gender conflicts we analyzed, the dominance tactics used by men and the reasoning ones used by women to try to resolve conflicts were consistent with gender stereotypes. It therefore seems important for future research to explore the conflicts of symmetric occupations in other contexts (such as engineering or architecture) to see how gender ordering plays out there. Moreover, ideally future studies will have access to dyadic-level data with interviews from both members of a dyad that would allow for triangulation of descriptions of situations and dynamics.

The Role of Demography in Occupational Conflict

The literature on jurisdictional conflict is largely silent on gender, which our study suggests omits an important basis on which occupational members deploy practices to manage conflict. Many of these studies do not report the gender composition of the occupations under study (e.g., Bechky, 2003b; Huising, 2015; Truelove & Kellogg, 2016). In studies that do report gender composition, the occupations in question are often vertically gender segregated. For example, in relationships between waitresses and chefs (Whyte 1951), human resource professionals and engineers (Sandholtz, Chung, & Waisberg, 2019), psychotherapists and army commanders (DiBenigno, 2017, 2019), and 911 dispatchers and policemen (Karunakaran, 2018), the former are members of lower-status or peripheral female-dominated occupations finding ways to manage conflict with members of higher-status or core male-dominated occupations. In these cases, gender and occupational status are mutually reinforcing, making it difficult to see how gender influences occupational conflict.

Through the case of two horizontally gender-segregated occupations, our study enables us to demonstrate how the role of gender in occupational conflict differs from that of demographic identities previously studied. When occupations are segregated by race, nationality or age, demographic differences exacerbate occupational conflict, but in more integrated occupations with “cross-cutting” demographics, demographic similarities facilitate collaboration

by providing cross-occupational pairs shared, non-occupational identities (DiBenigno & Kellogg, 2014; Koppman et al., 2016). Yet scholars have not found evidence that shared gender was used to manage jurisdictional conflict in either setting (DiBenigno & Kellogg, 2014: 390). And DiBenigno's (2019) subsequent study found that, compared to their cross-gender counterparts, same-gender cross-occupational dyads were *less likely* to successfully manage occupational conflict in gender segregated occupations. Our study shows that when occupations are segregated by gender, gender differences facilitate cross-occupational cooperation because gender is associated with beliefs about relative status held by both genders that provide agreed-upon expectations for behavior (Ridgeway, 2011). As such, when cross-occupational pairs enact gender roles and stereotypes associated with different genders, they also import a means to resolve jurisdictional conflict, the gender hierarchy.

Thus, we find that taken-for-granted gender hierarchies can facilitate resolutions rather than exacerbate occupational conflict in symmetric organizations. There are two boundary conditions for the role of gender in occupational conflict documented here. Scholars have shown that gender roles and stereotypes are present in many work situations (Acker, 1990; Kanter, 1977). We would expect to see gender ordering used less to resolve conflict between those occupations that are not gender segregated because social categories are less salient if there is no variation (Ridgeway, 2011) and gender-based forms of interaction are more prevalent within and between gender-segregated groups than gender-integrated ones (Ely, 1994; Gutek & Morasch, 1982; Kanter, 1977). This could explain why DiBenigno and Kellogg (2014) did not observe its use in the almost exclusively female occupations they studied.[6]

[6] Indeed, the fact that creatives and account practitioners in advertising are uniformly White, college-educated, and U.S. born may explain why we did not observe the demographic-similarity based mechanism DiBenigno and Kellogg (2014) identified.

Moreover, we would expect that interdependent occupations that are symmetric would exhibit more gender ordering. Though any work may be "gendered" and any occupation may use gender to coordinate work, gender ordering involves using gender to overcome jurisdictional conflict. As such, it is less likely when there is no such conflict to overcome (as in a single occupation) or when such conflict is muted by hierarchy (as between highly asymmetric occupations). Cross-occupational relationships that meet these conditions are prevalent in organizations, as women have entered formerly male-dominated functional areas like marketing and sales, but remain outside many technical and creative occupations (Yua, 2007). Indeed, many studies of symmetric occupations that do not mention gender—for example, between marketers and engineers studied by Truelove and Kellogg (2016) or project managers and programmers studied by Kellogg et al. (2006)—may also be unrecognized studies of cross-gender relationships. Another potential site for gender ordering could be asymmetric occupations with status inconsistency—i.e., ranked inconsistently in hierarchies such that one occupation has, for example, more formal authority while the other has more occupational status—because status inconsistency can inspire jurisdictional conflict; for example, when members of lower-status occupations try to direct members of higher-status occupations. Though studies of such occupations have not focused on gender, they have hinted that tactics used to elicit cooperation and defend jurisdiction are not gender neutral (e.g., DiBenigno, 2019; Karunakaran, 2018; Kellogg, 2014; Sandholtz et al., 2019). As such, gender ordering may also appear in these settings, although future research is needed.

Gendered Interaction Across Horizontally Segregated Occupations

Given the changing demographics of the workplace and the prevalence of symmetric occupations with simmering jurisdictional conflict, our study of advertising occupations offers an important and timely extension of the ways gender enactments shape work to new problems and

relationships. We know that gender roles and stereotypes shape relationships between occupational members, supervisors and subordinates, employees and customers, and highly-unequal occupations. But the increasing prevalence of women and men in horizontally gender-segregated occupations presents a workplace problem not faced in those contexts. In these workplaces, members of one occupation frequently need to overcome jurisdictional conflict with members of another occupation because this cannot be resolved through organizational hierarchy. In these previously unstudied relationships, we find occupational members enact gender differences to resolve occupational conflict.

In exploring gender ordering, our analysis draws attention to a previously unrecognized source of women's disadvantage: cross-occupational relationships. Women who use gender ordering can perform their job, yet because doing so embeds the gender hierarchy into the everyday function of the organization, it potentially disadvantages women and their occupations. Notably, we found, consistent with prior work (e.g., Gutek & Morasch, 1982), women in account occupations were largely uncritical of gender ordering and considered it "part of the job." Yet our findings highlight two potential avenues for this disadvantage. First, female-dominated occupations' ability to compete with male-dominated occupations is limited by gender ordering, which does not appear equally useful for women and men advancing occupational interests. Feminine roles and stereotypes helped women manage occupational conflict with men at the expense of scut work. For example, when, in response to the "women are not funny" stereotype, female account practitioners reframed their contributions to concept development as counsel for male creatives' intuitive knowledge, they performed scut work that male account practitioners did not perform. By contrast, masculine roles and stereotypes provide an arsenal for eliciting manifest authority while also defending and expanding occupational interests. Male account

practitioners, for instance, used the "men are good at math" stereotype to elicit cooperation from female creatives and reinforce their occupational claims by reducing concept development to an application of their knowledge.

Broadly speaking, if women find that managing occupational conflict with men requires scut work, as this study suggests, more women entering an occupation and managing conflict this way may, in the aggregate, contribute to the tendency for occupations to lose status when they become dominated by women (e.g., Reskin & Roos, [1990] 2009). Occupations protect their status as experts by "hiving off" exactly such work (Abbott, 1988; Hughes, 1958) and professionals tend to avoid it due to the threat it poses to their professional status and image (Huising, 2015). As such, if women are more likely than men to manage occupational conflict in this way, the deference associated with scut work may become attached to occupations through continual enactments, leading feminizing occupations to lose status over the long term. Along similar lines, if gender enactments and scut work come to be seen as "part of the job" in female-dominated occupation, this may exacerbate gender segregation over the long term because it likely deters men from entering these occupations. Indeed, multiple women in senior account positions told us that although they tried to recruit more men as account practitioners, they had been unsuccessful because men were unlikely to apply.

Additionally, if women are more likely to use scut work, as in the cases we observed, this extra menial work and emotional labor (Hochschild, [1983] 2003) will likely leave them less emotionally satisfied with their jobs and more likely to exit than men in similar roles. In this study, female account practitioners protected male creatives' feelings during client interactions, handled client dissatisfaction for them, and tended to their needs in ways male account practitioners did not. Previous studies of non-occupational work performed by lower-status and

peripheral occupations to elicit cooperation have also noted that it is more often performed by women and speculated that it takes an emotional toll (DiBenigno, 2019; Karunakaran, 2018; Kellogg, 2014). We found additional evidence of this difference when analyzing survey data the first author drew from creatives and account practitioners (N=196) working at a probability sample of U.S. agencies as part of her larger project. Controlling for agency rank, size, and prestige, as well as extent of client interaction and education, male account practitioners are significantly more likely than female ones to report finding their job emotionally fulfilling (results available upon request). This suggests that the emotional strain associated with women's gender ordering contributes to gender differences in job satisfaction. Future research could more specifically test the extent to which the lower satisfaction associated with gender ordering shapes women's career outcomes.

Women have made inroads in some higher-ranking and historically male-dominated occupations, increasing the prevalence of occupational conflict between cross-gender pairs. Our findings suggest that, for these women, enacting gender differences to manage occupational conflict with men is a double-edged sword: Though it promotes cross-occupational cooperation in cross-gender pairs, it does so by importing the gender hierarchy, which gives an edge to men and their occupations. As a result, what appears to be inroads for women does not guarantee equal footing with the men.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A. 1988. ***The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor***. Berkeley, CA: University of Chicago Press.

Acker, J. 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. ***Gender & society***, 4(2): 139-158.

Advertising Age. 2003. Women: Careers in Advertising, ***AdAge Encyclopedia of Advertising***. New York City: Advertising Age.

Anteby, M. 2008. Identity incentives as an engaging form of control: Revisiting leniencies in an aeronautic plant. ***Organization Science***, 19(2): 202-220.

Barley, S. R. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***: 78-108.

Barley, S. R. 1996. Technicians in the workplace: Ethnographic evidence for bringing work into organizational studies. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***(Journal Article): 404-441.

Barley, S. R., & Bechky, B. A. 1994. In the backrooms of science: The work of technicians in science labs. ***Work and occupations***, 21(1): 85-126.

Baxter, J. 2012. Women of the corporation: A sociolinguistic perspective of senior women's leadership language in the U.K. ***Journal of Sociolinguistics***, 16(1): 81-107.

Bechky, B. A. 2003a. Object Lessons: Workplace Artifacts as Representations of Occupational Jurisdiction. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 109(3): 720-752.

Bechky, B. A. 2003b. Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. ***Organization Science***, 14(3): 312-330.

Bechky, B. A., & O'Mahony, S. 2015. Leveraging comparative field data for theory generation. ***Handbook of qualitative organizational research: Innovative pathways and methods***: 168-176.

Blau, P. M., & Schwartz, J. E. 1984. ***Crosscutting social circles: Testing a macrostructural theory of intergroup relations***. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Britton, D. M. 2003. ***At work in the iron cage: The prison as gendered organization***: NYU Press.

Broschak, J. P. 2015. Client relationships in professional service firms. ***The Oxford Handbook of Professional Service Firms***: 304.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2016. Occupational Employment Statistics: NAICS 541800 - Advertising, Public Relations, and Related Services, ***National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates.***: U.S. Department of Labor.

Cardador, M. T. 2017. Promoted Up But Also Out? The Unintended Consequences of Increasing Women's Representation in Managerial Roles in Engineering. ***Organization Science***, 28(4): 597-617.

Cech, E. A. 2013. Ideological Wage Inequalities? The Technical/Social Dualism and the Gender Wage Gap in Engineering. ***Social Forces***, 91(4): 1147-1182.

Charles, M., & Grusky, D. B. 2004. ***Occupational ghettos: The worldwide segregation of women and men***: Stanford University Press Stanford, CA.

Cohen, A. C. 2020. Seeing the market: performative sensemaking and the case of advertising agencies and their clients. ***Consumption Markets & Culture***, 23(5): 481-505.

Cohen, A. C., & Dromi, S. M. 2018. Advertising morality: Maintaining moral worth in a stigmatized profession. ***Theory and Society***, 47(2): 175-206.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. 1990. Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. ***Qualitative Sociology***, 13(1): 3-21.

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. 1963. A behavioral theory of the firm. ***Englewood Cliffs, NJ***, 2(4): 169-187.

DiBenigno, J. 2017. Anchored personalization in managing goal conflict between professional groups: The case of US Army mental health care. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 63(3): 526–569.

DiBenigno, J. 2019. Rapid Relationality: How Peripheral Experts Build a Foundation for Influence with Line Managers. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***: 0001839219827006.

DiBenigno, J., & Kellogg, K. C. 2014. Beyond Occupational Differences The Importance of Cross-cutting Demographics and Dyadic Toolkits for Collaboration in a US Hospital. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 59(3): 375-408.

Ely, R. J. 1994. The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***: 203-238.

Emerson, R. M. 1962. Power-dependence relations. ***American sociological review***: 31-41.

Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. 2003. Narrating social structure: Stories of resistance to legal authority. ***American Journal of Sociology***, 108(6): 1328-1372.

Fayard, A.-L., Stigliani, I., & Bechky, B. A. 2016. How Nascent Occupations Construct a Mandate The Case of Service Designers' Ethos. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 62(2): 270 - 303.

Fox, S. R. 1997. ***The mirror makers: A history of American advertising and its creators***. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Gould, R. V. 2003. ***Collision of wills: How ambiguity about social rank breeds conflict***: University of Chicago Press.

Grow, J. M., & Deng, T. 2014. Sex Segregation in Advertising Creative Departments Across the Globe. ***Advertising & Society Review***, 14(4).

Guetzkow, J., Lamont, M., & Mallard, G. 2004. What is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences? ***American Sociological Review***, 69(2): 190-212.

Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. 1982. Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. ***Journal of Social Issues***, 38(4): 55-74.

Hall, E. J. 1993. Smiling, deferring, and flirting: doing gender by giving "good service". ***Work and occupations***, 20(4): 452-471.

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Baker, S. 2015. Sex, gender and work segregation in the cultural industries. ***The Sociological Review***, 63(S1): 23-36.

Hochschild, A. R. [1983] 2003. ***The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling***: Univ of California Pr.

Hughes, E. C. 1958. ***Men and their work***: Free Press Glencoe, IL.

Huising, R. 2014. The erosion of expert control through censure episodes. ***Organization Science***, 25(6): 1633-1661.

Huising, R. 2015. To hive or to hold? Producing professional authority through scut work. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 60(2): 263-299.

Hunt, D. 2013. WGAW 2013 TV Staffing Brief.

Ibarra, H. 1992. Homophily and differential returns: Sex differences in network structure and access in an advertising firm. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 37(3): 422-447.

Izraeli, D. N. 1983. Sex effects or structural effects? An empirical test of Kanter's theory of proportions. ***Social forces***, 62(1): 153-165.

Kanter, R. M. 1977. ***Men and Women of the Corporation***: Basic Books (AZ).

Kaplan, S., Milde, J., & Cowan, R. S. 2017. Symbiont practices in boundary spanning: Bridging the cognitive and political divides in interdisciplinary research. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 60(4): 1387-1414.

Karunakaran, A. 2018. ***Truce structures: Examining cross-professional coordination in the wake of technological and institutional change***. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Kellogg, K. C. 2011. ***Challenging operations: Medical reform and resistance in surgery***: University of Chicago Press.

Kellogg, K. C. 2014. Brokerage professions and implementing reform in an age of experts. ***American Sociological Review***, 79(5): 912-941.

Kellogg, K. C. 2018. Subordinate activation tactics: Semi-professionals and micro-level institutional change in professional organizations. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***: 0001839218804527.

Kellogg, K. C., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. 2006. Life in the trading zone: Structuring coordination across boundaries in postbureaucratic organizations. ***Organization Science***, 17(1): 22-44.

Klein, K. J., Ziegert, J. C., Knight, A. P., & Xiao, Y. 2006. Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. ***Administrative science quarterly***, 51(4): 590-621.

Koppman, S. 2014. Making art work: Creative assessment as boundary work. ***Poetics***, 46(5): 1-21.

Koppman, S. 2016. Different Like Me: Why Cultural Omnivores Get Creative Jobs. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 61(2): 291-331.

Koppman, S., Mattarelli, E., & Gupta, A. 2016. Third-World "Sloggers" or Elite Global Professionals? Using Organizational Toolkits to Redefine Work Identity in Information Technology Offshore Outsourcing. ***Organization Science***, 27(4): 825-845.

Leidner, R. 1991. Serving hamburgers and selling insurance: Gender, work, and identity in interactive service jobs. ***Gender & Society***, 5(2): 154-177.

Marcus, G. E. 1995. Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. ***Annual review of anthropology***, 24(1): 95-117.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. 1994. ***Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook***: Sage.
Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B. A. 1981. ***Women and work: A psychological perspective***: Praeger Publishers.
Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. 2009. Coordination in Organizations: An Integrative Perspective. ***The Academy of Management Annals***, 3(1): 463-502.
Patton, M. Q. 1990. ***Qualitative evaluation and research methods***: SAGE Publications, inc.
Perrow, C. 1961. The analysis of goals in complex organizations. ***American sociological review***: 854-866.
Pierce, J. L. 1996. ***Gender trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms***: Univ of California Press.
Rajan, R. G., & Wulf, J. 2006. The flattening firm: Evidence from panel data on the changing nature of corporate hierarchies. ***The Review of Economics and Statistics***, 88(4): 759-773.
Ranganathan, A. 2013. Professionalization and market closure: The case of plumbing in India. ***ILR Review***, 66(4): 902-932.
Ranganathan, A., & Shivaram, R. 2020. Getting Their Hands Dirty: How Female Managers Motivate Female Worker Productivity through Subordinate Scut Work. ***Management Science***.
Reskin, B. F., & Roos, P. A. [1990] 2009. ***Job queues, gender queues: Explaining women's inroads into male occupations***: Temple University Press.
Ridgeway, C. L. 2011. ***Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world***: Oxford University Press.
Ridgeway, C. L., & Smith-Lovin, L. 1999. The gender system and interaction. ***Annual review of sociology***, 25(1): 191-216.
Rivera, M. T., Soderstrom, S. B., & Uzzi, B. 2010. Dynamics of dyads in social networks: Assortative, relational, and proximity mechanisms. ***Annual Review of Sociology***, 36: 91-115.
Rubtsova, A., & Dowd, T. J. 2004. Cultural capital as a multi-level concept: The case of an advertising agency. In M. Lounsbury (Ed.), ***Research in the Sociology of Organizations***, Vol. 22: 117–146: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
Sandholtz, K., Chung, D., & Waisberg, I. 2019. The Double-Edged Sword of Jurisdictional Entrenchment: Explaining Human Resources Professionals' Failed Strategic Repositioning. ***Organization Science***, 30(6): 1349–1367.
Scott, W. R., & Dornbusch, S. 1975. ***Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority***: San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. [1985] 2004. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior.
Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Zimmer, C., Stainback, K., Robinson, C., Taylor, T., & McTague, T. 2006. Documenting desegregation: Segregation in American workplaces by race, ethnicity, and sex, 1966–2003. ***American sociological review***, 71(4): 565-588.
Truelove, E., & Kellogg, K. C. 2016. The radical flank effect and cross-occupational collaboration for technology development during a power shift. ***Administrative science quarterly***, 61(4): 662-701.
Turner, J. C. 1982. Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. ***Social identity and intergroup relations***, 1(2): 15-40.
United States Census Bureau. 2012. Industry Snapshot: Advertising Agencies (NAICS 541810).
Vallas, S. P. 2001. Symbolic boundaries and the new division of labor: Engineers, workers and the restructuring of factory life. ***Research in Social Stratification and Mobility***, 18(1): 3-37.
Waring, J., & Currie, G. 2009. Managing expert knowledge: organizational challenges and managerial futures for the UK medical profession. ***Organization Studies***, 30(7): 755-778.
West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. 1987. Doing gender. ***Gender & Society***, 1(2): 125-151.
Wrong, D. H. 1979. Power: Its Forms. ***Bases and Uses New York: Harper and Row***.
Yua, N. 2007. Most Female and Male Occupations Since 1950.

Table 1. Research Sites and Data Collection

	Project 1	Project 2			
Fieldwork					
Number of field sites	1 agency	4 agencies			
Field sites	Quality Solutions Co.	Pioneer	Alexander & Sons	CultureShock-Mountain	CultureShock-Pacific
Location in U.S.	Southwest	Northeast	Midwest	Mountain	West Coast
Agency size	Mid-sized (11-50 employees)	Mid-sized	Mid-sized	Large (> 50)	Mid-sized
Field work duration	4 months, 3 days/week	3 months, 1 day/week	3 months, 5 days/week	3 months, 5 days/week	3 months, 5 days/week
Year	2011	2013	2013	2014	2017
Interviews					
Number of interviews	52	66			
Interview sample	From randomly sampled U.S. agencies: 42 agencies total, 31% small (< 11 employees), 45% mid-sized, and 24% large.	12	23	24	7
White	51/52	63/66			
College-educated	49/52	62/66, remaining four enrolled in college			
Male	29/52	34/66			
Average interview length	30 minutes	70 minutes			
Data collection years	2012-2014	2013-2017			

Table 2. Additional Evidence of Symmetry between Creatives and Account Practitioners

	Creatives		Account Practitioners
Centrality of work to organization	Core work: Create product sold by organization.		Core work: Generate revenue by selling product to clients.
Power	Mutual dependence: Power to refuse to cooperate.		Mutual dependence: Power to remove creative from project.
Pay			
Junior-level (SOC code): associated job titles	Graphic Designers: Designer	Writers and Authors: Copywriter	Advertising Sales Agents: Account Executive, Account Manager, Content Manager
Annual median wage	$54,320	$66,780	$59,080
Annual 90th percentile	$92,050	$128,060	$123,560
Employment	21,650	6,920	52,320
Senior-level SOC[1] code: associated job titles	Art Directors: Creative Director, Director of Creative Services.		Advertising and Promotions Managers: Account Director, Director of Account Services.
Annual median wage	$97,470		$147,100
Annual 90th percentile wage	$205,550		>$208,000
Employment[2]	12,820		12,240

[1] Standard Occupational Classification System.
[2] All within the Advertising, Public Relations, and Related Services Industry Category, May 2019.

Table 3. Frequency of Practice Used to Manage Jurisdictional Conflict by Gender of Pair

	Female account-male creative	Male account-female creative	Both male	Both female	Total	Creatives acquiesced
Gender ordering	50	12	5	2	**69**	62
Occupational entrenchment: dominance	1	2	17	5	**25**	5
Occupational entrenchment: reasoning	3	2	1	13	**19**	6
Total	**54**	**16**	**23**	**20**	**113**	73

Table 4. Cross-Gender Pair by Resolution, Practice and Scut Work

	Total no. examples	Creatives acquiesced	Gender ordering	Scut work
Female account-male creative	61	58	50	56
Male account-female creative	17	16	12	1
Total	78	74	62	57

Table 5. How Gender Ordering Manages Occupational Conflict in Majority Dyads

	Practice	How it Manages Conflict	Who Cedes Manifest Authority
		Legitimacy	
Protecting	***Mediating***: Female account practitioners use feminine roles to protect male creatives' art by defusing conflict between them and clients.	"Mom" calms the creative down by rephrasing the client's demands in a meeting.	Male creatives act more professionally during client interactions.
	Buffering: Female account practitioners use feminine roles to protect male creatives' art by going between them and clients.	"Wife" meets with client for creative and soothes clients' complaints about project for him.	Male creatives let female account practitioners handle agency-client relationship.
		Authority	
Nurturing	***Conceptual nurturing***: Female account practitioners use feminine roles to support male creatives' success and achievements.	"Mom" helps creative be better version of himself.	Male creatives consider female account practitioners' directions during revisions.
	Physical nurturing: Female account practitioners use feminine roles to look after male creatives' wellbeing.	"Mom" brings the creative chocolate milk to make him feel comfortable.	Male creatives consider female account practitioners' directions during revisions.
		Knowledge	
Counseling	***Preparing***: Female account practitioners help male creatives get their concepts ready for conservative audiences due to perceived match with feminine stereotypes ("women aren't funny").	"Serious" woman helps creative think about how to present his funny idea to the conservative client.	Male creatives integrate female account practitioners' suggestions into concepts.

Sharon Koppman (skoppman@uci.edu) is an assistant professor of organization and management at the Paul Merage School of Business and an assistant professor of sociology (by courtesy) at University of California, Irvine. She received her Ph.D. from University of Arizona. She is a sociologist who focuses on employment, work, and career processes in creative and knowledge-based occupations.

Beth A Bechky (bab13@stern.nyu.edu) is the Seymour Milstein Professor of Ethics and Corporate Governance and Strategy at the Stern School of Business and a professor of sociology (by courtesy) at New York University. She received her Ph.D. from Stanford University. She is an organizational ethnographer who focuses on technology and work.

Andrew C Cohen (andrewcohen.phd@gmail.com) is a Culture Industry Fellow at the Yale Center for Cultural Sociology and a senior strategist at Decoded Advertising, a full-funnel marketing, advertising, and design company. He received his PhD from Yale University. His research interests include creative organizations, morality, and magic.