

*"They Are Testing You
All the Time":
Negotiating Dual Femininities
among Chicana Attorneys*

*Gladys García-López and
Denise A. Segura*

"I think they always want to *see* if you really are a lawyer
... they are testing you all the time."

—Yvette García

A SMALL BUT GROWING NUMBER of Chicanas are entering highly prestigious and male-dominated legal professions. This relatively recent development raises a number of questions regarding their incorporation and mobility within this field. For example, how are Chicanas received by other lawyers, judges, and clients? How do Chicanas negotiate space in this masculine terrain? The experiences of Chicana attorneys are critical to examine in light of the growing need for lawyers proficient in the cultural and classed "ways of being" of Chicanos/Latinos,¹ immigrants, and other people of color who comprise a majority of those arrested and incarcerated in the United States. Meeting this demand, however, challenges law schools, law firms, and courtrooms to develop inclusive strategies within "institutions historically developed by men, currently dominated by men, and symbolically interpreted from the standpoint of men."²

In this article we present findings from a recent qualitative study of 15 "successful" Chicana attorneys.³ These Chicana attorneys define success as "making a difference in my community," "empowering people and in

Feminist Studies 34, nos. 1/2 (Spring/Summer 2008). © 2008 by Gladys García-López
and Denise A. Segura

turn, myself," and "having a balance between my career and my family." Our analysis of the ways that co-workers, supervisors, and clients "are testing" successful Chicanas' qualifications and legitimacy "all the time" reveals key mechanisms in workplace structure and interaction that reinforce racially gendered boundaries that contradict larger goals of social diversity. We also find that Chicanas who enter the legal profession aspiring to serve their community navigate across racially gendered worksites by developing a number of strategies including negotiating a distinctive Chicana practice and presentation of self, or what we term "dual femininities," as part of the process of becoming "legitimate" lawyers.

Dual femininities are enactments of a culturally gendered ideology and practice produced through a series of negotiations across class, culture, and gender systems. In their professional lives, Chicana attorneys are held accountable to white, middle-class femininities that are becoming more visible within increasing numbers of legal settings. Unlike white women, however, Chicanas are expected to adhere to distinct values and perform culturally gendered behaviors by their Chicano/Latino clients. Dual femininities are thus ideological and dynamic gender practices that are produced contextually as Chicanas negotiate the "shoulds" of culture with the "musts" of the profession.⁴ These racial-ethnic-gender practices represent one way to resist hegemonic masculinity in the legal profession.

How Chicana attorneys navigate across these accountability systems to develop strategies for acceptance and legitimacy in both their political communities and worksites is our major question. We begin with an overview of the location of Chicanas in law that identifies key workplace features that women must negotiate to survive and succeed in this highly competitive profession. We situate the concept of dual femininities within perspectives on gender as an active accomplishment produced in social interaction alongside of structural approaches that view gender as intimately tied to workplace organization and hierarchy.⁵ We then provide a brief profile of the informants followed by an exploration of the ways Chicanas negotiate their presentations of self in the key settings of the courtroom, the firm, and the larger Chicano/Latino community.

LAWYERS, OCCUPATIONAL INEQUALITY, AND
DUAL FEMININITIES

Studying and practicing law historically has been the province of white, middle-class men. Equal employment legislation and affirmative action are eroding some of the barriers women and people of color have experienced accessing this profession.⁶ Today, 67 percent of all lawyers are white males, and 25 percent are white females. Fewer than half of one percent ($N=3690$) of U.S. attorneys are women of Mexican descent, and nearly one percent are Mexican-origin men. The pool of Chicana lawyers is growing, albeit very slowly. In 2002, 667 law degrees (J.D.) were awarded to "Mexican-Americans" compared to 468 in 1990. In the same years, 34,215 (1990) and 30,787 (2002) J.D. degrees were awarded to non-minorities.⁷

Law is a gendered institution where "gender is present in the processes, practices, images and ideologies, and distributions of power."⁸ The characteristics associated with women, that is, being kind, gentle, and morally superior, have been viewed as antithetical to the "qualities" of successful (male) lawyers. Simply put, the legal arena is no place for a woman. Although women's integration into the legal profession has grown considerably, women and their femininities continue to be suspect. Women's inclusion has been somewhat strategic, that is, channeled largely into specialties socially constructed as "appropriate" or "feminine," including trust and estates, family law, and as public defenders. This occupational segregation has consequences for the production of gender inequality at the operational and interactional levels.

In private firms, women attorneys work in specialties where they earn, on the average, 73 percent of men's median weekly salaries. In 2002, the lowest median salaries (\$34,000) within the legal sector were in public interest specialties where women lawyers predominate.⁹ In general, women take longer, or are less likely, to become partners than male attorneys. Women comprise 16.8 percent of all law firm partners whereas 43 percent are lower-paid associates.¹⁰ Latina and African American women account for less than 1 percent of law firm partners. Women of color who enter private sector jobs have lower retention rates, which intensifies occupational inequality. In the private sector, 12.1 percent of women of color leave their firms within the first year of practice and over 75 percent

leave within the first five years.¹¹ Low integration of women and men of color into the legal profession reflects processes of selective inclusion that reinforce the power and privilege of white, middle-class males.

Working in white male-dominated professions offers unique occasions to "do gender." Candace West and Don Zimmerman argue that gender is a dynamic, interactional accomplishment, produced in the course of daily affairs. Denise Segura notes that in the workplace women and men "present, reaffirm, and reproduce themselves as belonging to and competently representative of, gender and racial-ethnic categories." Sarah Fenstermaker and West propose that "class-, race-, and gender-based inequalities result from the ongoing interactional accomplishments of class, race, and gender" that appear to be "infinitely adaptable to specific social circumstances." Individuals are held accountable in different ways and degrees to particular "classed," "raced," and "gendered" expectations," which "are informed by the past outcomes of interactions." West and Fenstermaker formalize this dynamic as "doing difference."¹²

Chicanas in law are submerged in an institution where white heterosexual masculinities define success. Successful attorneys must immerse themselves within the profession on a full-time basis, leaving little time for other social obligations, such as parenting, which has been defined as "women's work." The current legal professional structure does not support women's reproductive abilities, choices, and desires. For women, family often impedes their upward mobility. According to Mona Harrington, women do not obtain positions of power within their firms because they feel like they must commit to either becoming a successful attorney or a mother and believe that there is no viable opportunity to make the two roles function without strain.¹³

Women are expected to "do" a relatively narrow form of "white heterosexual femininity" that has gained some acceptance within this profession. As working-class women of color, however, Chicanas "do difference." This difference often makes it difficult if not impossible for them to be accepted as competent attorneys. Furthermore, within their respective racial-ethnic communities, Chicana attorneys are expected to perform "heterosexual Chicana femininity." These femininities are accom-

pished through culturally gendered practices in their respective workplaces.

Both in "their" specialties as well as the few high-prestige areas to which they secure access, women engage in gender practices, or "a class of activities that are available—culturally, socially, narratively, discursively, physically, and so forth—for people to enact in an encounter or situation in accord with (or in violation of) the gender institution."¹⁴ Men's continued dominance in high-prestige specialties bolsters ideologies and practices of hegemonic masculinities including aggressive, competitive behaviors and efficient or "winner" goal orientations. These behaviors contrast markedly from those associated with women's femininities. In law firms and courtrooms, women are expected to "act like women," that is, in ways that are caring, nurturing, and responsive to others. They are also expected to "act like lawyers" and conform to the dominant adversarial model.¹⁵

Women have developed a number of strategies to address idealized feminine and masculine accountability systems. Some women emulate aggressive "masculine" behaviors. Others try to integrate more "caring" orientations to the practice of law, including developing relationships of trust and respect with colleagues and clients, showing public displays of emotion in court, and reshaping the traditional adversarial role to one of greater collaboration. "People practice particular kinds of gender, however, not generic forms." Drawing on the work of Patricia Yancey Martin, who encourages "focusing on practicing femininity/femininities and practicing masculinity/masculinities . . . because multiple masculinities and femininities exist, and people practice, and are held accountable to, specific kinds depending on their bodies," we argue that multiple forms of Chicana femininities operate. These dual femininities are physically and ideologically negotiated depending on the context (for example, private versus public-interest firm, courtroom versus community).¹⁶

Michel Foucault posits that the body is a site for the articulation of power relations but Judith Butler argues that it also can be a site for women to resist prevailing relations of dominance and subordination.¹⁷ Thus, it is critical "to examine in what ways gender is constructed through specific corporeal acts, and what possibilities exist for the cultural transfor-

mation of gender through such acts."¹⁸ Research on women lawyers indicates that some are transforming the masculine ethos and nature of the institution in firms, particularly those with a critical mass of women partners or in female specialties, for example, criminal defense public defenders.¹⁹ Such research does not analyze the agency of Chicana attorneys or incorporate their ways of managing multiple culturally gendered accountability systems. We argue that there is significant potential for social change in disrupting gender practices at work among Chicana attorneys as they negotiate spaces in the legal field.

Similar to white women attorneys, Chicanas are evaluated by colleagues and clients within a masculine normative order that typically regards feminine gender displays and ways of being as antithetical to "winning." Jennifer Pierce argues that women lawyers are often caught in a "double bind" between the requirements of "the good woman" and the role of the adversary.²⁰ Chicanas' double bind involves developing gendered practices that incorporate various Chicana/o cultural values, behaviors, and presentations of self within environments that are slowly accepting some aspects of white femininities as the profession diversifies.

Chicana femininities engage distinctive cultural values and belief systems. For Chicana/Latina women, culture is an important factor in research models on occupational access and mobility. What is problematic in many of these models is the assumption that cultural features are static as opposed to dynamic. We favor a holistic approach that recognizes women's agency in enacting cultural forms within the context of institutional processes. Jeannette Rodriguez and others argue that Chicanas "primarily identify themselves in relation to others where achievement and success are [often] measured according to contributions made to the family."²¹ Motherhood is highly valued and women, including Chicana attorneys who are also mothers, are expected to privilege that role.²² The Chicana "cultural template" also includes deference to men and elders as well as *respeto*/respect and compassion for others.²³

Chicana lawyers are expected to continue their role as intermediaries or brokers between the Chicano/Latino community and the legal system. This expectation extends the well-documented practice of Latino immigrants to utilize the bilingual skills of their children as cultural and

linguistic translators.²⁴ These idealized traits associated with Chicano/Latino culture exist in varying levels among Chicanos and Latinos depending on generation in the United States; neighborhood ethnic composition; region; interaction levels with kin, particularly relatives in Mexico or Latin America; educational levels; and social class.²⁵ Chicanas who violate these idealized norms and expectations are often viewed as "*vendidas*" or "cultural sell-outs."

Chicanas are bombarded with contradictory messages regarding their expectations as attorneys. Resembling chameleons, Chicana attorneys reinvent themselves (including language, presentation of self, and values) as they produce gender practices that integrate qualitatively distinct femininities. The actual forms their dual femininities take are contextual. Some Chicana attorneys' femininities conform to the expectations that principal actors, such as attorneys, partners, clients, and judges, have formed for successful white women attorneys. Other Chicana femininities are enacted in interaction with Chicano/Latino clients and communities. As Chicanas secure greater seniority in the profession, they often begin to integrate the dual aspects of these femininities. These forms of dual femininity vary by worksite and express women's agency.

This study is organized into three sections that together illustrate the processes whereby women craft distinctive femininities in key settings such as the courtroom and the firm. The first explores physical and ideological negotiations of dual femininities in the workplace. The second analyzes the ways in which Chicanas' construction of "the community" produce culturally gendered values to which they hold themselves accountable. Finally, we discuss how Chicana femininities are the result of self-conscious and reflexive analysis by women whose workplace experiences are characterized by discrimination, numerous "gender slights"²⁶ including misidentification, and strong traditional cultural expectations by Chicano/Latino communities.

METHOD

The goal of this study is to explore Chicana attorneys' negotiation of appropriate femininities, in particular dual femininities, as a strategy for survival and success in this white- and male-dominated profession. Dual

femininities are produced in interaction with clients and colleagues in different worksites. In order to facilitate exploring the questions posed by this research, a total of fifteen women were selected for one-to-three hour in-depth interviews using a snowball sampling approach. Women were selected based on racial-ethnic background and area of expertise. The legal specialties of the interviewed Chicanas include litigation, corporate, criminal, immigration, family, and civil rights law. Five of the fifteen women are married, including four who have children. The ages of the women ranged from 32 to 54 years. Thirteen of the women identify as heterosexual; two as lesbian. Over half of the women were born in the United States to immigrant parents, and the rest are Mexican-born immigrants. All but one woman are fluent in Spanish. An additional noteworthy characteristic is that all but one woman report working-class origins. The informants have been practicing law between two to over thirty years. Seven of the women own their own private practices, four are associates in private firms, and four are public interest/government attorneys.

All interviews were conducted by Gladys García-López during 2004-2005. They were tape-recorded and conducted in English, Spanish, and *Spanglish* (a mixture of the English and Spanish languages). The respondents were guaranteed anonymity; therefore, we use pseudonyms and do not identify the names of any of their firms. The Chicanas were asked about their motivations to become attorneys, their law school experiences, and their everyday experiences at work, in particular their treatment by law professors, colleagues, clients, and judges. The Chicana informants discussed the values they sought to bring to the profession and the pressures they felt to meet the competing exigencies of their careers, their families, and their communities. Women described the process of crafting a Chicana professional presentation of self. Finally, the informants discussed their community involvement and how this was important to their sense of personal and professional well-being.

This research reflects a Chicana feminist perspective. By this we mean a Chicana-centered analysis of women's descriptions of their struggles to achieve legitimacy in this highly competitive profession. A Chicana feminist methodology moves us to explore the intersection of cultural prerogatives with norms of the profession. This method contrasts with analyses

that focus only on structure or culture as causal variables that objectify women by denying their power in decision-making processes. Our method focuses on the intersections of structure and agency depicted in Chicana narratives that reveal the negotiations that produce distinctive femininities associated with their success in the profession. The nonrandom nature of the sample precludes generalizability; however, analysis of the processes whereby Chicanas assert voice and agency through strategic mobilization of gender practices such as dual femininities offers insight into some of the ways that hegemonic masculinities are being resisted within this gendered terrain.

PHYSICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL NEGOTIATIONS OF DUAL FEMININITY IN THE WORKPLACE

In this research the courtroom and the law firm (both private and public-interest) are key workplace sites. The firm provides the context for Chicanas' development of gender practices and deployment of dual femininities through the cases they handle, their interaction with colleagues and clients, and their presentation of self. The courtroom is a racialized site characterized by defendants of color and white attorneys. In both settings, the mere presence of a Chicana attorney disrupts racial and gendered displays and configurations. In the courtroom, male culture within the profession is at its peak, and the adversarial model predominates. Moreover, the structure of the courtroom favors male body displays that serve as a backdrop for the presentation of adversarial lawyering. Within both of these masculine settings, verbal badgering, sexual harassment, tokenism, and misidentification of women lawyers as staff and of Chicana lawyers as translators or defendants occur. In response, Chicana attorneys develop a number of strategies to successfully navigate this often hostile terrain.

Chicanas report that they are often the "token" woman of color attorney in their respective workplaces. Their low visibility magnifies the ascendancy of white male culture and leads them to voice feelings of what several term *rechazo*, or rejection. Laura Esquivél is one of the many women who perceive rejection and a sense of undesirability by male counterparts:

I feel that we [Chicanas] are not accepted as attorneys, litigators, and thinkers, or as contributing to the legal society, but rather we're just kind of like there for their viewing [laughter]. I don't think that's imagined either. There are certain people who think like that.

A workplace organization that puts Chicanas "on display" for "their viewing" is a mechanism that "others" Chicanas.²⁷ In the work setting, Chicanas are watched to see if they perform in accordance with the rules of the profession—rules that reaffirm masculinities and their presentation and for women include expectations to conform to white, middle-class femininities. Chicanas, unlike white women, are often viewed as "foreigners" by the state and within the system that regulates the state—the law. Their "othering" can be described as part of their "perceived difference";²⁸ they do not simulate the prototypical white male attorney or, in most cases, idealized white femininities.

"Othering" is also reinforced by the misidentification process. Misidentification reflects the hierarchal structure of the legal profession along racial-ethnic, gendered, heterosexual, and class lines. One of the challenges of diversity in the legal profession is accommodating different bodies, particularly in the courtroom. Light-skinned Chicana lawyers with classic European features and a taller build that more closely resemble white attorneys report fewer instances of racial discrimination. Darker-skinned and petite-statured Chicanas with indigenous features, however, are habitually misidentified as interpreters, court reporters, other support staff, defendants, and janitorial staff. They attribute this confusion to their race-ethnicity and gender, phenotype, and accents. Some suggest that their relatively youthful appearance often contributes to misidentification. Ana claims she is confused with courtroom support staff as a result of "looking young, and especially because I'm not that tall." Irma describes how her body evokes a negative assessment of her legal qualifications from judges.

You know, a judge will get a paper and it will say, "Irma Juárez, attorney-at-law, Compton, California," and he will probably assume that I went to some correspondence school instead of Harvard Law. There are definitely some mixed notions of who I am and sometimes I feel that they think that I am just this short, young-looking girl.

Irma, Ana, and all the Chicana attorneys, with the exception of the one woman with the lightest skin tone and most Northern European phenotype (blond hair, blue eyes, small upturned nose), assert numerous instances of misidentification by other attorneys and support staff. Misidentification is reinforced by the organization of the courtroom, further undermining Chicanas' visibility and legitimacy:

I think I was pre-judged by the judges; kind of looked down on. Nothing helped. Being small in stature, all of the furniture was made for male bodies so you would get lost. You would get behind a podium, and if you were lucky they could see you. Maybe they can hear you, but the podium was always too tall. You had to step to the side of the podium to be seen.

Melinda Salazar's words vividly convey how courtroom infrastructure is organized to restrict her ability to make herself (and other petite women) seen as well as heard by the court. From the moment she enters the courtroom she is placed at a disadvantage by the furnishings, especially the podium from which she must "step to the side" to address the court, unlike typically taller male lawyers. Melinda's words speak to an ongoing ideological and psychological battle for physical and intellectual visibilities that are critical markers of professional legitimacy.²⁹ Claiming space in the courtroom sometimes involves relatively simple strategies such as stepping to the side of the podium or wearing high-heeled shoes to prevent being overpowered by courtroom furniture customized for white males.

Misidentification serves as an insidious reminder to Chicanas that they are outsiders. For Chicanas, misidentification results not only from body signification, but what they *sound* like as well. Research indicates that women tend to have softer voices vis-à-vis men, which are a significant drawback in the legal profession and points to an additional layer of complexity for Chicanas with Spanish-accented voices.³⁰ Linda Guardia, a light-skinned Chicana with a white European phenotype, indicates that she has not experienced misidentification in person "because I don't necessarily look Latina, you know. People can be very ignorant, they think that all Latinos are dark, and don't consider that there are some of us who are blond and blue-eyed." When she is heard but not seen, however, Linda experiences misidentification:

I remember this client calling the first time, she asked if she could speak to the attorney, and I said, "I am the attorney." I guess she thought, here's this woman with a Spanish accent, it's unlikely that she's the attorney. I didn't get mad; I didn't get frustrated by it. Unfortunately that is the stereotype.

Seen and unseen, Linda, like all of the Chicana attorneys with Spanish accents, assert that their voices heighten misidentification and lead to inquiries and doubts about their professional competence. Oftentimes, speaking with an accent in the United States is equated to "thinking with an accent." The implication is that people who communicate with an accent cannot think clearly or are unintelligent. Furthermore, speaking the English language with a Spanish accent signifies Chicanas as foreigners to the nation irrespective of their actual place of birth or immigrant status. Identifying Chicanas as foreigners creates a sense of entitlement among white male and female lawyers who would claim the legal arena as *their* rightful territory. Despite the negative feedback they receive from their accents, Chicanas express pride in their ability to speak Spanish and view it as an asset they bring to their job. Spanish fluency is an integral part of the enactment of their femininities that builds relations with their Chicano/Latino clients.

Misidentification does, however, negatively impact Chicana lawyering. Olivia states:

When people confuse me with something else, that tells me that they don't think that I am capable or that I can't do it. All Latinas encounter situations where you walk into a courtroom and they think you are the interpreter or they think you're the defendant. My feelings no longer get hurt when that happens. What happens is that I hope that this person learned a lesson today.

Chicana misidentification is part of the process of questioning the legitimacy of their presence and professional capacity. Research on the first significant wave of white women lawyers illustrates that they were often mistaken (or misidentified) as support staff.³¹ Misidentification of women lawyers has diversified with the profession and is contingent upon gender, race-ethnicity, accent, and phenotype. In an effort to curtail misidentification, Chicanas craft a wide array of practices to shape a presentation of self

that sometimes simulates or extends the type of femininities that are acceptable in this space—white, middle-class femininities.

For most women, a negotiation process that includes either erasure or subduing cultural aspects in their appearance is one strategy to minimize misidentification and convey professional status. In many instances Chicanas strategically mobilize clothing to assert their strength, knowledge, and power, consciously adapting their understanding of white, middle-class femininities in their presentation of self. They describe conservative wardrobes that include pantsuits or skirts in the “power colors” of blue, red, and black. Chicana attorneys wear dark or nude-colored pantyhose and “Mary-Jane” or conservative high heels. This polished look includes natural make-up, pearl or small gold earrings, and a matching necklace. Their hair is usually short or pulled toward the back in a bun.

Chicanas craft an intricate equilibrium between their preferred forms of ethnic femininities and the conservative demeanors enacted by white women lawyers. Many women’s gender displays invoke a racially gendered presentation of self customized to accomplish workplace legitimacy that integrates, in varying degrees, Chicano/Latino cultural identifiers. Depending on their clients and the setting (courtroom, firm) they mold their bodies to eradicate, minimize, or incorporate aspects of the colorful dress, hairstyles, and jewelry (for example, large silver or gold hoops) often associated with Chicano/Mexican cultural displays. Soledad Cruz narrates this elaborate practice:

You have to be sure that you wear appropriate clothing around the office; you want to look professional. And then, when you go to court you should pull your hair back, but absolutely no *trenzas* [braids], unless we’re talking a French braid or something. You wear conservative heels—none of those open-toe ones, or those that are so tall that you may be confused with a hooker or something, you know. Oh yeah, and you should wear discreet earrings, none of those like the ones my *abuelita* [grandmother] would wear that are so big that they distract everyone. Don’t get me wrong, I love those earrings, I wear them all the time, but not at work, and certainly not in court. You want to be taken seriously.

Soledad describes the process of self-monitoring in the presentation of her "Chicana feminine" self. The unwritten rules of the workplace convey that she should erase, conceal, or subdue certain cultural adornments. This self-modification intersects with the process of case assignment in that law partners often respond to visual cues to match lawyers with specific cases. A Chicana's construction of a socially acceptable body incorporates significant reflection critical to improve her chances of securing legitimacy in the field.

Chicanas assert that this presentation of self often helps neutralize body signifiers that contribute to their misidentification, or worse, mistreatment by judges or other colleagues. Irma Juárez professes that if she appears in court "without a suit or briefcase, it will take a little longer to get a question answered." Gloria Santoyo also recounts the importance of not only behaving like a lawyer, but looking like one as well. She states, "You have to make it clear to people; you carry a briefcase, wear a suit [laughter]. . . . You have got to play the role of lawyer." Gloria's narrative bears witness to the narrow style and character of what is considered a "professional attorney." Similar to other women in the study, she feels compelled to try to conform to gendered and professional expectations in order to be accepted as a credible attorney.

The majority of the women do not adopt but rather adapt to specific aspects of white, middle-class femininities. About two-thirds of the women, particularly those with dark-skinned complexions, wavy or long hair, and more indigenous phenotypes find it difficult to comfortably enact white femininities and did "just enough" to ease partner misgivings. Numerous Chicanas negotiate their presentation by combining elements of white, middle-class femininities with Chicano/Latino culture. For example, one respondent adopts the professional female attire expected in a largely white firm located in one of the most affluent business districts in Los Angeles County; however, she also wears a small yellow gold chain around her neck with a pendant of *La Virgen de Guadalupe*, the patron saint of Mexico revered by Catholic Chicanos/Mexicans. Others wear their hair long, abiding by Chicano/Latino norms even if it counters what is considered "professional" in the legal world.³² When the women attend court however, some report pulling their hair back in a more conventional style.

Still others reject conventional gender expectations imposed on both white women and Chicanas. Melinda, a self-identified lesbian and former litigator, often cross-dresses like a man, which she claims allows her to "blend in" to the male-dominated setting. Melinda's choice to cross-dress like a man disrupts traditional gender displays and is a qualitatively distinct form of denunciation of white, middle-class femininities deployed by her heterosexual Chicana colleagues. Moreover, her decision to adopt a masculine presentation of self is accompanied by a distinct set of disapproving sanctions. For example, Melinda stated that her previous supervisors refrained from giving her specific cases, citing clients' discomfort with her sexuality.

Although some Chicanas enact their interpretations of white, middle-class standards of femininities or reject them altogether, most create an amalgamation. Women negotiate their presentation of self around the multiple (often oppositional) messages of femininities that they receive from their racial-ethnic communities and their profession. Aware of the ways gender and race intersect in structure and interaction, Chicanas engage in a process of negotiating dual femininities to subvert their ideological and physical invisibility in the workplace.

Chicanas' dual femininities typically reflect ideological commitments to Chicano/Latino culture and politics. About a third of the women had been activists during the Chicana/o civil rights movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. All of the others had been active in Chicano/Latino politics during their college years. Their activist backgrounds strongly motivate them to figure out ways to assert Chicana femininities to resist hegemonic masculinities and affirm their Chicano/Latino cultural connections and politics. The Chicana attorneys often seek high-status cases as a pathway to establish professional legitimacy that facilitates their abilities to take other cases more relevant to their communities. Thus, the way they practice law, their case selection, and their femininity forms are mutually reinforcing dynamics whose purpose is to establish their legitimacy as "Chicana" lawyers.

Key dynamics through which Chicanas assert cultural identity in practice and presentation include their legal cases and the clientele they choose to serve. In private practice, successful attorneys are expected to

engage in high levels of rainmaking (bringing in high-profile and profitable clients). Although some Chicana informants are assigned affluent white clients in the firm, they also choose less lucrative and pro bono cases involving members of their community. For example, Mirna Hernández, who is employed in one of the most prestigious private law firms in the nation, has enacted strong culturally gendered practices and displays to meet the demands of her firm as a specialist in employment, discrimination, sexual harassment, wrongful termination, and retaliation cases—all specialties dear to her heart and valued in this particular firm. She uses an array of cultural characteristics and mannerisms that denote Mexican forms of *respeto* with her clients, including communicating in their native language (Spanish) and making every attempt to make them “feel comfortable.” In a quid pro quo common among the most successful attorneys in private practice, Chicanas perform for the firm and for themselves. Integral to their success is articulating dual femininities that simultaneously authenticate their identities as Chicanas “helping” their communities and as lawyers “winning” cases for the firm.

In general, Chicanas report greater incorporation and job satisfaction within firms that have gender and ethnically diverse partners with supportive colleagues. In firms controlled by white partners, Chicanas with fairer skins and a presentation of self that closely resemble accomplished white women in the firm are also successful. Establishing comfort in the heterosexual environment of the firm is difficult, however, for Chicana lesbians. Vanessa López, a lesbian, changed firms until she found one with a “number of Latinas . . . actually there is an older Latina lesbian too.” Vanessa values an environment that includes a Latina lesbian senior colleague who can mentor her to be successful as a Chicana lesbian lawyer.

When Chicanas are unable to find amenable work environments, they venture out and become entrepreneurs, opening up their own legal firms. Nearly half of the fifteen women interviewed own their own firms; six of these women had once been employed in the private and public sectors. Melinda articulates a rationale for starting her own firm that resonates with the other self-employed women.

I would say my life as a lawyer was really tough. Others were not as supportive of my talent. Eventually, I think that I did so well that I finally had to be out on my own. I just couldn't manage things. I didn't understand my own power at that point either. I got too big for my firm, and I had to leave. That was a bad thing. Another painful experience, but definitely what I needed to do.

For Melinda, having her own firm is empowering. She is in control of her environment, can take on any and all cases she desires, and can affirm both her Chicana identity and professional competence.

By opening their own practices, Chicanas exercise agency reclaiming work environments where differences of race-ethnicity, class origins, gender, and sexual orientation are embraced. Most women establish their own practices in their communities of origin to facilitate working with this population. They practice legal specialties that are highly relevant for members of their racial-ethnic community including, but not limited to, immigration, civil rights, employment, criminal, and family law. Across private and self-owned firms, Chicanas negotiate oppositional messages of dual femininities and craft their own distinctive style that integrates workplace and Chicano/Latino community expectations.

THE COMMUNITY

Chicanas' enactments of dual femininities negotiate across the accountability systems of the profession and their interpretations of the culturally gendered expectations of the Chicano/Latino community. Chicana lawyers in this study assert they are held accountable to being a "Chicana" lawyer and enact appropriate forms of Chicana (heterosexual) femininity. Chicana lawyers are expected to be proficient in Chicano/Latino cultural capital (for example, knowing how to act, speak, and present oneself in ways that demonstrate affinity with other Chicanos/Latinos). They are expected to use their education to improve the overall conditions of their respective communities. Women are expected to prioritize marriage, motherhood, and their extended families. Chicana lawyers are expected to be family spokespersons and to resolve any public discord that family members may be undergoing. These expectations have been directed at other highly educated Chicanas as well.³³

Chicanas in this study report they were drawn to the legal profession not only as a form of acquiring upward mobility, but also as a way of producing positive social change for their communities. "I feel a unique responsibility to be accessible to the Latino community," states Ana Cantú. Laura Esquivél prizes her ability to "look at a code and know how to interpret it and lead my clients in the right direction" as "empowering." She states that these actions fulfill her purpose and need to combat "oppression against Latinos."

Chicanas' strong sense of accountability to their communities and their sense of how this should be done differs from that of the prototypical white attorney. That is, Chicanas are far less interested in asserting positional aspects of their profession or "doing dominance" with their clients. As Marissa Muñoz states, "I make sure my clients know that I don't think I'm better than somebody else." Rather, Chicana attorneys in this study emphasize relationship building that utilizes femininities constructed in dialogue with Chicano/Latino culture and the culture of the profession to connect individuals to larger community agendas, for example, housing, immigration, and underemployment. Mirna Hernández, for example, draws on her own working-class Mexican background to connect with clients.

I think there is a sense . . . they think I understand. I usually connect with them and share with them my own background so they can feel comfortable and they feel like they trust me. I think it is important at least for me. . . . I think it is really useful to have the background [where] you can connect [with them]. . . . My coming from that background of living pay check to pay check, I can understand their problems and know where they are coming from. I understand that and I find it very important to understand it; and I think other lawyers understand that too, but having lived it impacts you in a different way.

The combination of having lived from "pay check to pay check" and being able to share this with clients in nuanced Spanish that reflects respect (for example, the appropriate use of the formal *Ud.* versus the informal *tú* in conversations) informs Mirna's enactment of an appropriate Chicana femininity. Non-Chicano/Latino lawyers may also speak Spanish, but they cannot speak to clients from the standpoint of a Chicana from a working-

class urban *barrio*. According to Linda Guardia, the fact that she is “Latina,” and the majority of her clients are of this same background, “makes it an easy connection, an easy relationship.” Olivia’s narrative offers yet another example of a unique Chicana relationship-building model based on race-ethnicity, class, language, and culture.

I think it definitely helps that they see me walking into their home and I feel comfortable in their home. I don’t find it weird that there are three beds in the living room, and I’m not going to refuse a glass of water that they give me. There’s something more of a comfort level when you see someone like you because you have no idea what’s in store [as far as the legal system]. I was born here but you have a very good idea of the sacrifices that these people make. The way you have a good idea is that you are connected to these people every day. . . . I’m not saying that if you are not a part of the culture you are not going to have an understanding of it, it’s just that you’re connected to them in a way that they [white, middle-class attorneys] aren’t.

Chicana femininities enact an aura of feeling comfortable in Chicano/Latino and Mexican immigrant homes. Their comfort sitting down on a bed that stands in for a couch in a living room and accepting a glass of water even if they aren’t thirsty makes their Mexican clients comfortable. Olivia notes that non-Chicano/Latino lawyers also can be effective; however, the way they engage in building relations is qualitatively distinct.

Chicanas sometimes felt conflicted about emphasizing relationship building with their Chicano/Latino clients. For example, Olivia states:

Your attorney is not your friend, they are there to try and help you navigate the situation. When you are trying to run off and get closer, and hav[e] a holistic approach to taking care of clients (which is great) but it can be exhausting. I feel really tired sometimes.

Similar to Olivia’s frustration with the high levels of emotional labor expected of them as Chicanas, Marissa also asserts that she “feel[s] for [her] clients, yet [is] rational about it.” When her clients are sentenced for long periods of time, she “feel[s] bad and compassionate” toward them; however, she has learned to “distinguish between my work and my feelings.” According to Marissa, she “doesn’t let it carry over; otherwise, it would be too hard.”

It is difficult for Marissa and the other attorneys to set boundaries when clients expect them to "be available" both physically and emotionally. If they resist the expectations of their community to "be available," they run the risk of appearing "uppity" and "*presumida*" [pretentious]. Irma Juárez states:

Sometimes they are, like, "*yo quiero hablar con mi abogada*." [I want to talk to my lawyer.] And if I can, I do. Sometimes I do it in twenty minutes. Other times I have to be in court, I have meetings, I have clients. *Se imponen a lo bueno* [they get used to a good thing]. You get their call, you call them back, you follow up with them, and they are like, "I called you yesterday." And I was, like, "I was in court, I did my best today, I'm sorry."

Although Irma would like to modify the community's expectation to be available on call, she still would call them back and apologize. The apology is an important enactment of Chicana feminine deference to her Chicano/Latino client's expectations. The sense of entitlement to a Chicana attorneys' time is exacerbated by youth as well as gender. Chicanas noted that Chicano/Latino and Mexican immigrant clients did not articulate the same behavioral expectations and deference from white or Chicano male attorneys.

Chicanas also express frustration over numerous expectations by Chicano/Latino clients for lower legal fees or free advice. They report high degrees of interrogation by Chicano/Latino clients regarding their experience and expertise despite the impressive reputations that had brought these clients to their offices. Chicana attorneys report both frustration and worry that some Mexican immigrant clients seek out male public notaries to verify their legal advice and opinions. The Mexican immigrant community frequently confuses the authority of a public notary or "*notario*" in the United States, because "in Mexico and other places a notary is basically an attorney" (Irma Juárez). The women tend to attribute the consultation with notaries by such clients to the power of Mexican patriarchy. Many women express resentment that their Chicano/Latino male counterparts do not undergo the same degree of inquiry or perform the same amount of emotional labor.

The complexity of culture and gender dynamics among Chicano/Latino clients is also demonstrated in the ways that Chicana attorneys are

addressed, for example, "*mija*," which literally means "my daughter," but can be used to address any younger woman. *Mija* is a culturally gendered term of endearment that can be used both inside and outside the kin network to "cement kinship that may or may not be genetic."³⁴ By using the term *mija*, Chicano/Latino community members are holding the Chicana attorneys accountable to cultural norms of daughterly respect and deference that bridges the social distance between them. This term often creates ambivalence among the attorneys. On the one hand, they honor older community members' expectations to be respected by all segments of the community irrespective of educational levels. Women attuned to this nuance express pleasure in establishing the type of connection with the client that *mija* implies. However, client deployment of this term can also signal unwillingness to recognize (and pay premium price for) the professional credentials of the Chicana attorney. Doing *mija* also can destabilize the classic deference clients display for their legal counsel and disrupt the professional training of the Chicana attorneys.

Despite the complexity of the *mija* dynamic, Gloria Santoyo indicates that being accepted as a "daughter" is positive and connotes success in building strong relations with Chicano/Latino clients:

To someone who's not Latino, they don't exactly know how much that means to have somebody that speaks Spanish that they can feel comfortable with. Someone that reminds them of their daughter and really makes them feel at home and not embarrassed or ashamed. That's something, especially when you deal with issues of the undocumented and clients really feeling embarrassed or really feeling like, "Oh my God what's going to happen to me?" [They are] afraid and just . . . they imagine the worst. For me, it was even more exciting to be a part of that process of really being able to work firsthand and addressing those issues and putting people at ease because you know a lot of my family . . . felt the same way. I almost felt like I was giving back . . . to my own family, when I was helping other families that were going through that. . . . You *do* have a stronger connection.

Gloria, like most Chicanas in the study, attributes her ethnicity, language, and working-class background as mechanisms that facilitate the client-lawyer relationship. Gloria argues that her bilingual and bicultural abilities enacted within Chicano/Latino norms of daughterly deference ease tension

and reduce the shame many Chicano/Latino clients feel when they seek help from women outside the family circle. For Gloria, enacting a Chicana femininity that embraces *mija* as a principle in relationship-building is desirable, despite its challenge to her professional identity as an attorney.

Jessica Fernández also discusses the ways that primarily older clients call her *mija*. For example, some clients have asked, "*Mija, ¿me puedes traducir esta carta?* [My daughter, can you please translate this letter for me?]" However, the use of this term often confuses Jessica: "I am, like, should I get offended, or take it as a term of endearment?" After a pause, Jessica pondered, "I'd love to hear from a bunch of Latino [male] attorneys if they've ever been called '*mijo*' [my son] or '*mijito*' [endearing form for 'little son']". Jessica analyzed this situation a little further and concluded that Chicano/Latino male attorneys "would rather not hear that, I'm sure they've heard '*mi rey*,' ['my king,' a form of endearment for males] maybe just from their *mamás* [mothers]." With these words, Jessica somewhat sarcastically suggests that Chicano male attorneys probably distance themselves more from their clients and do not tolerate discourse such as *mijo* that may reduce their authority or power. She also argues that Chicano men may be more agreeable to terms that heighten their authority, such as *mi rey*.

Jessica rationalizes her acceptance of the term, *mija*.

I feel like I have probably been conditioned to just let that slide and appreciate it as a term of endearment. . . . I think I have just been conditioned to just get it or take it and receive it from my elders.

Jessica also articulates significant discomfort with being called *mija*.

It is hard though because they are my client and they should do what I say, but in a cultural sense they are my elders and I must show you that respect. . . . So I guess if you want to call me *mija*, I guess you can.

For Jessica and all of the other Chicanas in this study, cultural norms of respect toward elders coupled with the importance of making Chicano/Latino clients feel comfortable takes precedence over their professional training to assert hierarchy in client-attorney relationships. The dynamic and principle of *mija* is a cornerstone of Chicana femininities enacted by this group of attorneys. They may not always like the contradiction to

their professional training *mija* represents, but their desire to work effectively in their community outweighs their misgivings.

Chicana attorneys are also held accountable to Spanish language fluency. All of the interviewed Chicanas aver that understanding and speaking Spanish is expected of them by their community, not only to communicate with Chicano/Latino clients, but to make her/him feel more comfortable throughout the process. Vanessa López, the only non-Spanish speaker of the sample indicates that there is "absolutely an expectation that I know Spanish—especially from *raza* [a word for the Chicano/ Latino community]." She notes that Chicanos/Latinos who she comes across look down on her and make her feel "guilty for not speaking Spanish."

Olivia Ramírez discusses how communicating in Spanish helps build trust with immigrant clients, particularly victims of fraud by public notaries who knowingly accept money for dead-end immigration cases. Establishing trust is not only a matter of being bilingual, but bicultural as well. As Olivia Ramírez states: "I know the language . . . the lingo, and the culture, and it's so much better for me. I don't need someone else in the room to talk to them, and we understand each other." Chicanas attract more clients as a result of conveying a feminine way of being anchored in nuanced Spanish language fluency (for example, *mija*), a deep understanding of Chicano/Latino and Mexican culture, deference to key cultural norms, and their lived experiences growing up in working-class and often immigrant communities.

In their private lives, Chicanas are expected to prioritize marriage and motherhood above their careers. Five of the women in the sample are married, and two of these women have children under the age of 18. The husbands of three of the five married women are fellow attorneys; moreover, two own private firms with their spouses. This partnership affords them considerable flexibility in sharing parenting responsibilities. For example, if one spouse works late one day, the other will leave early to care for their children. All the women emphasize the importance of their families. Linda Guardia articulates this view saying, "My child and my husband are the most important thing." The high value of "family" and family solidarity or familism is well documented among Chicano/Latino families.³⁵ This normative feature of Chicano/Mexican culture

adds an additional layer of accountability to Chicanas as they build their careers.

Single Chicanas are reminded constantly by their extended families that they should marry and start a family. Olivia Ramírez, who is divorced, explains that although her parents are "proud of my accomplishments, there is still the expectation that I will get married and have kids." Jessica Fernández, who has been partnered with a man for over seven years, is constantly harassed by her family to have a Catholic wedding as soon as possible. Although they are highly successful career women, their success is not quite complete in the eyes of their families and communities for whom marriage and motherhood are primary.

Chicano/Latino heteronormativity is another value to which Chicanas are held accountable. Chicanas are not supposed to engage in just *any* type of relationship, especially homosexual relationships that are not "supposed" to yield children. Melinda states:

We're a very conservative culture. It doesn't suit me and I don't care for it. They [Chicano/Latino clients] are sometimes curious and I feel like they pass judgment on me. It's awkward; what happens if I had a child and no husband? Well I have a child, but he's not my [biological] child, but he is my child . . . and I don't have a husband and I never will . . . so I mean it just doesn't work.

Melinda's assertion of lesbian sexuality and motherhood is the ultimate form of defiance to Chicano/Latino families and communities. She often feels uncomfortable working with Chicano/Latino clients compared to other clients who do not make her feel accountable to heterosexual Chicana femininity. Numerous Chicana lesbians employed in professional fields have spoken and written of the pain of rejection by their families and communities.³⁶ Some distance themselves from the community, but others seek to educate and develop greater acceptance of their sexuality and lesbian motherhood.

As educated women in a profession highly useful to the Chicano/Latino community, Chicanas are held accountable for family advocacy. Given that "family" among Chicanos/Latinos tends to incorporate large numbers of fictive kin, this can snowball into quite a job. Not only are

Chicanas supposed to perform this work, as women they are supposed to "know" when it is needed without being asked. Thus, Chicana femininities are supposed to express intuitive knowledge of their family's legal as well as emotional needs. This culturally gendered practice flows from childhoods where they served as "cultural brokers," translating and interpreting for immigrant parents in numerous institutional settings (for example, schools, clinics, the department of motor vehicles). As Olivia Ramírez states, "All of us who have immigrant parents are expected to do different things." Claudia Solís describes some of these "different things."

I just always had to translate for my parents, and I was basically the person doing all this outside advocating. Whatever, you know [the] interaction with everybody. I thought that I liked it, and I like helping my parents even though at the time I was shy. As I got older I started to like it. I felt important and I felt useful.

Cultural brokering is typically assumed by Chicanas unless there is a significantly older son. Their responsibilities as the "voice" of the family imparted a sense of power to the informants. From this process, women learned femininities that anticipate familial needs and to negotiate on behalf of families.

Chicanas' accountability to advocate on behalf of their families and kin networks extends with age and education. Women shared that their families believe that they are knowledgeable in all facets of the law irrespective of their actual area of expertise. Hence, the Chicanas are expected to answer any and all legal questions. Olivia, for example, a consumer fraud and civil rights lawyer, is expected to advise her brother through his divorce. Similar to Olivia, all the interviewed women describe themselves as "the first person everybody [the extended family] calls whenever something happens." Yvette explains that being an attorney is similar to "having a doctor in the house—they always call even if it's just for tickets."

Many Chicanas describe this role as sometimes overwhelming. Olivia professes, "Everybody, everybody always calls me!" Yvette went on to explain that she has "represented some family—I don't like to do it, but I've represented a lot of friends and family members." Although these familial expectations of advocacy can be taxing, true to their cultural feminine

standard, nearly all of the women agree that they are "happy to take on this role" (Olivia Ramírez). The unhappy ones also fulfill this expectation and enact these forms of Chicana femininities. When the women have limited knowledge of the area of specialty required by the case, they do the extra work to "lead them in the right direction" (Olivia Ramírez). Chicanas express satisfaction at the refined cultural brokering that enables them to contribute to the well-being of their extended kin network and utilize their education to empower their families. Olivia Ramirez explains, "I still drop everything and run home to see what the hell is going on, I have to—and I'm okay with that [laughter]."

Chicanas' dual femininities are strengthened further in other forms of legal work they pursue outside the firm. Most of the Chicana respondents volunteer in nonprofit organizations to educate Chicanos/Latinos on a number of legal issues. Numerous women hold leadership positions in associations concerned with the upward mobility of Chicana/Latina lawyers and the empowerment of youth in their communities. These organizations are sites where Chicana femininities are validated and often serve to strengthen the "Chicana" aspects of dual femininities. Chicanas' participation in Chicano/Latino advocacy organizations also helps them to meet the "double-bind," that calls for them to be "successful" attorneys in the private practice setting and "good" Chicanas in their respective communities.

CONCLUSION

Across the firm, courtroom, and the community, the narratives of the fifteen Chicana attorneys in this study demonstrate an ongoing set of negotiations between the "shoulds" of Chicana femininities and the "musts" of the legal profession. Chicanas are held accountable to working-class, culturally gendered ways of being that emphasize respect, daughterly deference, family advocacy, and extended cultural brokering. They bring these funds of knowledge to environments that traditionally have valued adversarial masculinities where relation building is instrumental rather than affirming. In this environment femininities tend to be accepted when they contribute to winning cases. Negotiating across these competing expectations produces what we have termed Chicana "dual femininities."

Chicanas are aware that what is considered "appropriate" femininity in the legal profession is typically that which is performed by white, middle-class female attorneys in the firm. As women, Chicana attorneys are provided with examples of successful white, female attorneys whose presentation of self and lawyering styles are available for review. Workplace organization is critical to the options Chicanas choose. In the courtroom, Chicanas are confronted with furnishings and infrastructure designed to display male bodies and diminish the voice of women, particularly short-statured women, as are many Chicanas. Although they may stand to the side of the podium to be heard, their Spanish-accented voices exacerbate their "othering." Misidentification as support staff and defendants is another form of "othering" that requires Chicana attorneys to craft professional presentations of self. In the firm, Chicanas' misidentification for janitorial and support staff despite their professional attire speaks to their "difference" from the workplace norm. These differences are compounded daily in interaction with partners and clients who "are testing" Chicana attorneys "all the time," but from different standpoints. Some Chicanas, particularly those with fairer skin tones and nonindigenous phenotypes might come close to enacting preferred forms of "white heterosexual femininities," but most either could not or would not abide by such norms.

Rather, Chicanas make decisions about the appropriate gender display and femininities to enact in work and community settings. With twin goals of establishing legitimacy as lawyers and to serve communities historically disenfranchised by legal chicanery, Chicana attorneys map the terrain of the courtroom and the firm to insert new gender practices that affirm their cultural affinities. Chicana dual femininities are strategies women enact to bridge the gap between professional norms and cultural expectations.

Chicanas in this study came to the law with a fervent desire to redress legal injustice historically directed toward their communities. This political commitment alongside cultural values of respect, daughterly deference, and caring, coupled with practices such as cultural brokering, intensify Chicanas' expressed needs to enact femininities to meet these multiple expectations. Acts as simple as wearing a small pendant of *La*

Virgen de Guadalupe or as complicated as providing legal advice as *mija* to older members of the community are expressions of Chicana dual femininities. That is, they are doing two jobs, simultaneously utilizing specific types of femininities. These enactments represent one way to resist hegemonic masculinities in law and broaden definitions of "legitimacy" in the profession.

In many ways these fifteen women are pioneers. As the "first" and token Chicana lawyer in their firms, their experiences may incorporate more strident forms of opposition and exclusion than those experienced by Chicanas and women of color who may follow them. The extent to which their forms of agency lead to more inclusive strategies for acceptance within historically male-dominated professions and broader definitions of legitimacy are critical areas for future research.

NOTES

This research has been supported by funding from the University of California Committee on Latina/o Research at the Center for Chicano Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of *Feminist Studies* for their constructive feedback. Special thanks also to the comments by Sarah Fenstermaker and Patricia Yancey Martin on an earlier draft of this paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 2007, New York. All remaining shortcomings are our own. Authors' names are arranged alphabetically.

1. The term "Chicana" and "Chicano" refer respectively to a woman and to a man of Mexican descent residing in the United States without distinguishing immigrant status. "Chicano" also refers generically to the category of persons (female and male) who claim Mexican heritage (for example, the "Chicano" community). The term Latina/o refers to individuals who can trace their ancestries to Latin America. It contrasts with the term, "Hispanic," which emphasizes Spanish ancestry.
2. Joan Acker, "From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions," *Contemporary Sociology* 21 (September 1992): 567.
3. Gladys García-López, *La Licenciada: The Trials, Tribulations, and Triumphs of Chicana Attorneys* (M.A. Thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2006).
4. We are adapting the duality coined by Sarah Fenstermaker to refer to the ways that "the 'shoulds' of gender ideals are fused with the 'musts' of efficient household production," in *The Gender Factory: The Apportionment of Work in American Households* (New York: Plenum Press, 1985), 204.
5. Joan Acker, "Class, Gender, and Relations of Distribution," *Signs* 13 (Spring

- 1988): 473-97; Candace West and Sarah Fenstermaker, "Power, Inequality, and the Accomplishment of Gender: An Ethnomethodological View," in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference*, ed. Sarah Fenstermaker and Candace West (New York: Routledge, 2002), 41-54; Candace West and Don Zimmerman, "Doing Gender," *Gender & Society* 1, no. 2 (1987): 125-51.
6. In 1996 legislation was passed in California (Proposition 209) that prohibited differential treatment based on race/ethnicity, color, national origin, or sex. This law ended the existing affirmative action programs in the workplace and academia. Timothy Simon, a San Francisco attorney who is the first African American appointments secretary to four University of California law schools, reports that only 3 percent of students are black—half the 1996 percentage—and 8 percent are Latinos, down from 12 percent in 1996" (See Henry Weinstein, *Los Angeles Times*, 21 Jan. 2007).
7. U.S. Census Special Tabulation, 2002, www.census.gov.
8. Acker, "Class, Gender, and Relations of Distribution," 567.
9. Phyllis Horn Epstein, *Women at Law: Lessons Learned along the Pathways to Success* (Chicago: ABA Publications, 2004), 112-13.
10. Ibid., 117; Susan Martin Ehrlich and Nancy Jurik, *Doing Justice, Doing Gender: Women in Law and Criminal Justice Occupations* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1996), 127.
11. American Bar Association, "Miles to Go: Progress of Minorities in the Legal Profession," www.abanet.org, 2005.
12. West and Zimmerman, "Doing Gender"; Denise A. Segura, "Chicanas in White-Collar Jobs: 'You Have to Prove Yourself More,'" *Sociological Perspectives* 35, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 164; Sarah Fenstermaker and Candace West, "'Doing Difference' Revisited: Problems, Prospects, and the Dialogue in Feminist Theory," in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change* (New York: Routledge 2002), 206; 206-7.
13. Mona Harrington, *Women Lawyers: Rewriting the Rules* (New York: Plume Books, 1993).
14. Patricia Yancey Martin, "'Said and Done' vs. 'Said and Doing': Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender at Work," *Gender & Society* 17, no. 3 (2003): 354.
15. See Jennifer Pierce, *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); and Cynthia Siemsen, *Emotional Trials* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2004).
16. Yancey Martin, "'Said and Done' vs. 'Said and Doing,'" 355.
17. As cited in Kirsten Dellinger and Christine L. Williams, "Makeup at Work: Negotiating Appearance Rules in the Workplace," *Gender & Society* 11, no. 2 (1997): 151-77.
18. Judith Butler, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," *Theatre Journal* 40 (December 1988): 521.
19. See Robin J. Ely, "The Power in Demography: Women's Social Constructions of Gender Identity at Work," *Academy of Management Journal* 38, no. 3 (1995): 589-634; Pierce, *Gender Trials*; and Siemsen, *Emotional Trials*, 38.
20. Pierce, *Gender Trials*, 17.
21. Jeannette Rodriguez, *Our Lady of Guadalupe: Faith and Empowerment among Mexican-American Women* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994), 61.

22. Denise A. Segura and Jennifer L. Pierce, "Chicana/o Family Structure and Gender Personality: Chodorow, Familism, and Psychoanalytic Sociology Revisited," *Signs* 19 (Autumn 1993): 62-91.
23. See Aída Hurtado, *Voicing Chicana Feminisms: Young Women Speak Out on Sexuality and Identity* (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 94; Patricia Zavella, "Talkin' Sex: Chicanas and Mexicanas Theorize about Silence and Sexual Pleasure," in *Chicana Feminisms*, ed. Gabriela F. Arredondo, Aída Hurtado, Norma Klahn, Olga Nájera-Ramírez, and Patricia Zavella (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003), 228-53.
24. See Hurtado, *Voicing Chicana Feminisms*, 73-93.
25. Susan Keefe and Amado Padilla, *Chicano Ethnicity* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987); Rodríguez, *Our Lady of Guadalupe*; Vicki L. Ruiz, *From Out of the Shadows* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 81-86.
26. Yancey Martin, "'Said and Done' vs. 'Said and Doing,'" 359.
27. Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1959); Erving Goffman, "Gender Display," *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication* 3 (September 1976): 69-77; Denise A. Segura, "Navigating between Two Worlds: The Labyrinth of Chicana Intellectual Production in the Academy," *Journal of Black Studies* 34, no. 1 (2003): 28-51; Patricia Zavella, "Reflections on Diversity among Chicanos," *Frontiers* 12, no. 2 (1991): 73-85.
28. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999), 60-61.
29. See Yolanda Niemann-Flores, "The Making of a Token: A Case Study of Stereotype, Threat, Stigma, Racism, and Tokenism in Academe," *Frontiers* 20, no. 1 (2002): 111-34.
30. Harrington, *Women Lawyers*, 124.
31. Epstein, *Women at Law*, 128.
32. Dellinger and Williams, "Makeup at Work," 173.
33. Segura, "Navigating between Two Worlds."
34. Norma González, *I Am My Language* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001), 56.
35. Maxine Baca Zinn, "Chicano Family Research: Conceptual Distortions and Alternative Directions," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 7 (Fall 1979): 59-71; Alfredo Mirandé and Evangelina Enriquez, *La Chicana* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); Segura and Pierce, "Chicana/o Family Structure and Gender Personality," *Signs* 19 (Autumn 1993): 62-91.
36. For examples, see Gloria Anzaldúa, "La Prieta," in *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, ed. Gloria Anzaldúa and Cherrie Moraga (Watertown, Mass.: Persephone Press, 1981), 198-209; Carla Trujillo, "La Macha: Toward a Beautiful Whole Self," in *Chicana Lesbians: The Girls Our Mothers Warned Us About*, ed. Carla Trujillo (Oakland, Calif.: Third Woman Press, 1991), 24-48.

Copyright of Feminist Studies is the property of Feminist Studies, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.