

The Negotiation Minefield

A Literature Survey of the Challenges Women Face at the
Negotiation Table and Where to Go From Here

Eliza Brashares

Advisor: Professor Anthony Wanis- St. John
of the School of International Service

University Honors

Spring 2012

Abstract

This study looked at the literature surrounding gender in negotiation and gender roles. It also explored how gender roles vary cross-nationally, specifically in Denmark and the United States. The purpose of the study was to gain an in-depth understanding of the current research and to identify directions for further research. After a thorough literature review of the key authors in the various fields, the paper introduces the widely accepted theories and scrutinizes the implications of those theories. Despite the fact that women continue to join the workforce, a gendered wage gap still remains. Part of this wage gap may be due to the fact that women traditionally do not advocate for themselves as aggressively as men do. This study explores the possible reasons why. This may be crucial for efforts to diminish the wealth gap. This paper adds to the existing literature by providing an in-depth analysis of existing research and its implications.

Table of Contents

Personal Preface....	4
Introduction	5
Purpose of the Paper....	7
Literature Review....	7
Analysis....	17
Discussion....	24
Conclusion....	36

Personal Preface

The desire to learn about gender and its effect on negotiation began long before the first class of *Negotiation Analysis and Skills* met. Growing up, my parents engaged in professional negotiations on a daily basis. My mother, in particular, fascinated me. She works in finance and was one of five women in a business school class of 300. Even from a young age I knew that she was tough. She was great at her job and made no apologies. While at home, she was a wonderful, nurturing mother, I have no doubt she was a force to be reckoned with at the negotiation table. Once I joined the women's group on campus and learned more about gender roles, I began to appreciate how many molds she had to break to be successful in her line of work.

This paper was an opportunity for me to learn about two subjects I am very interested in and to package the information in an accessible paper. As a graduating senior, the topic of salary negotiation and the best way to approach it is an incredibly relevant topic to me, especially as a woman. I loved writing this paper. I have a new appreciation for the complexities of a topic that only comes from the combination of passion and hours and hours of research.

I hope that you enjoy the paper and that its contents encourage reflection of your own negotiation experiences, both in the professional and personal realm

Sincerely,

Eliza Brashares

Introduction

Negotiation is occurring all around us, all the time. It occurs at every level of an organization and between partners, family members, and friends. Negotiation is more than just a conversation; it is a combination of culture, identity, past experiences, and personality. As people become more connected throughout the world, and as the labor force grows, negotiation will become even more important going forward.

Countless books and articles have been written about how to negotiate. The books lay out strategies, preparation techniques, and ways to put oneself in the negotiating mindset. Some of the most difficult negotiations involve a conversation with an employer or supervisor. The most daunting of these negotiations is salary negotiation. A salary negotiation says something about how much someone is worth to the company and where both parties see the relationship in the future. Many how-to negotiation books state that the key to being a great salary negotiator is confidence in one's worth and the ability to convince others of that worth.

In many occupations, there is a significant wage gap between men and women, even accounting for education and rank. According to a newsletter published in Harvard Law School's program on negotiation, this wage gap can be substantial and lead to a difference of up to \$500,000 in life savings (Galinsky & Magee 2006, 2). When considering the cost of retirement or the cost of living in general, this is a troubling statement. Why is the gap not closing, despite a record number of women in law schools, business schools, and other post-graduate programs? While business schools still have predominantly male students, 31% of the students at the top 25 business schools were women in 2007, according to Bloomberg's BusinessWeek (n.d.). According to the Debra

Cassens Weiss, writing for the American Bar Association, in the 2009/2010 academic year, women made up 47% of the students at law schools (2011). Despite these impressive numbers, the wage gap remains.

Professors Galinsky and Magee have proposed that a contributing factor to this disparity is that women are less likely to negotiate for their salary. Again, given the advances by women in education, government, and business, this proposition begs the question why. When so many advancements are being made, why don't women negotiate that they are "worth more"? The purpose of this paper is to examine the research that exists on how gender identity affects negotiation, with a focus on salary negotiation. The research examined will come from several disciplines and across areas of expertise.

Despite the fact that women are reaching higher levels of education and seniority within organizations than ever before, a wage gap remains. Women are likely to have an equivalent education as other applicants, but are more likely to accept a first offer and not negotiate for a higher salary or better benefits. In order to combat the problem, it is essential to understand the research that already exists, in both negotiation studies and the study of gender roles.

Thesis

While significant research has been done on the field of gender and negotiation, more work still needs to be done. The current research offers an incomplete picture. As negotiation across genders and cultures happens more and more, a more comprehensive picture will be needed.

The Purpose of the Paper

As a survey paper, the purpose of this paper is to collect, merge, and understand the current literature on negotiation and social psychology. The paper will provide a critical assessment on the interdisciplinary subject of how masculinity and femininity affect salary negotiations. Rather than adding another theory to the research, the purpose of the paper was to look at what exists and suggest areas for additional research in the future.

It was necessary to contain the scope of the literature that was used in the survey. While the literature on negotiation as a whole was examined, the focal point of the paper is salary negotiation. A salary negotiation is one of the most critical negotiations that people encounter. As stated in the introduction, how strongly one negotiates can mean a difference of hundreds of thousands of dollars down the road. This is a subject that has been examined since the 1970s.

In order to examine the existing negotiation literature about gender, the societal differences between women and men must be studied. In order to do this, research about the psychology behind gender roles must be reviewed as well.

Literature Review

Negotiation is a common aspect in the lives of businesspeople, lawyers, and statesmen. People around the world utilize negotiation, as well as negotiation tactics, on a daily basis. Some speculate that managers can spend as much as 20% of their time in negotiations (Stuhlmacher & Walters 1999, 653). As one would expect, the field has grown measurably in both depth and diversity over the years. Though there have been many studies done by scholars from many different disciplines, gaps and openings in

their research allow for further study. The intersection between the social, cultural, and gender effects on negotiation leaves many topics to be explored. This paper section will introduce the critical scholars and their works in their respective fields.

The Field of Negotiation Studies

As negotiation, and the study thereof, became more institutionalized and studied, the literature about negotiation, as well as its implications, has grown. The works examined in this section will focus on studies regarding gender in negotiation. Most of the current articles in this field are authors building and responding to research by another author in the field. The prominent figures that will be discussed in this section include Deborah Kolb, Mary Wade, and Alice F. Stuhlmacher.

While the authors discussed in this section focus their papers on gender in negotiation, it is important to note that gender was not discussed as a variable in negotiation until the mid-1970s (Kolb 2009, 517). Until recently, women were not present at negotiation table, therefore gender was not seen as something that needed to be examined. The fact alone that gender is being discussed in the literature shows progress. However, this is not solely a generational theme. Several present day negotiation scholars (Raiffa 2002, Lax & Sebenius 2006) do not discuss gender in their works. In the *Analysis* portion of this paper, some scholars that do not consider gender a prominent variable will be discussed. However, they still consider and examine gender, whereas previously gender had not even been considered.

For a long time, gender was not looked at as an aspect of negotiation. However, as more women have entered the labor force, negotiation became more closely studied. Women are receiving more education and working their way up the corporate ladder but

salary discrepancies remain. In her article, “Too Bad for the Women or Does it Have to Be? Gender and Negotiation Research over the Past Twenty-Five Years” (2009), Deborah Kolb discusses the research that has already been done and adds her own insights.

One of Kolb’s first points is that negotiation may have been studied incorrectly, in particular, how gender affects negotiation. When negotiation is studied, typically in a laboratory or undergraduate class setting, the negotiations are set up as distributive negotiations (2009). There is a single issue on the table, commonly price, that is being discussed. In these negotiations, the evidence has overwhelmingly shown that men tend to dominate these negotiations (2009, 520). Distributive negotiations, Kolb argues, are in and of themselves masculine. The players must be “...assertive, competitive, and analytical” (2009, 520), in order to take as much as possible. The qualities that are typically seen as feminine, such as cooperation and compassion, have no place in distributive negotiations.

Kolb argues that the format of laboratory negotiations are skewing the results of these exams and placing the blame for poor results on women (2009, 526), rather than the environment and individuals’ biases. It is impossible, according to Kolb, for individuals to move past gender in experiments, especially when they are structured in ways that highlight the differences in gender (2009, 526). In Kolb’s own words, “we have found that the [gender] issues are...part of the negotiation itself” (2009, 525). Kolb argues that people cannot move past gender, so therefore gender skews almost all negotiations. Given this, Kolb’s research demands that gender be the priority in negotiation studies.

The Shadow Negotiation by Deborah Kolb and Judith Williams (2000) changed the negotiation discipline. The book reads as a “how-to” for women in negotiation. As discussed earlier, the previous work had primarily studied dyadic, distributive negotiations. *The Shadow Negotiation* discussed how to move a negotiation from this win-lose state to a win-win state, where everyone should leave satisfied. Through interviews with many women, the authors broadened the types of negotiations women may have with new employers about issues other than salary, for example, maternity leave or requesting resources for a project (Kolb & Williams, 2000). Rather than trying to work within the frame work set down by the negotiations that were being studied, the authors encouraged women to push past these boundaries to become more collaborative, to engage their counterpart, and negotiate change (2000). *The Shadow Negotiation* was a major inspiration for many feminist scholars in the negotiation discipline.

Another negotiation scholar, Mary Wade, took up the study of an important concept that was discussed in *The Shadow Negotiation*: the issue of self-advocacy. Wade introduces the concept of advocacy after wondering why “even successful women who are armed with advanced education, business experience, and confidence” (2001, 65) were facing pay disparities. Advocacy in this case means, the willingness and ability to promote oneself. Wade, like Kolb, discusses the fact that women are stereotypically supposed to portray certain characteristics (2001, 65), such as compassion and cooperation. Self-advocacy does not fit into this set of values. Wade sought to find out what attributes to self-advocacy, or lack thereof, and narrowed down the factors that could influence this to five: power and influence, gender-linked stereotypes, roles and norms, likeability, and self-presentation goals (2001, 65). Each of these factors influence

the self-advocacy of women and, as Wade argues, drives them not to advocate for themselves. These factors are each integral pieces to the advancement of this discipline.

Power and influence have a sizable impact on the likelihood of women self-advocating for themselves. Wade's research indicates that women prefer to use power in order to produce change for others rather than themselves, whereas men engage readily in self-advocacy (2001). These results will be addressed further in a different section of this literature review. Gender-linked stereotypes as well as norms and roles were two more of the factors that Wade believes influence the likelihood that women will self-advocate. These factors harken back to Kolb's 2009 work. Stereotypically, women are supposed to be modest, have a more participatory style of leadership, and assume the role of facilitator in groups, whereas men are typically ambitious and autocratic in their leadership (2001).

One of the most important factors discussed in Wade's article is likeability, which will be discussed later on. Wade makes the point that if women ignore the norms laid out by the factors addressed above, their peers may punish them socially (2001, 71-72). Likeability is the key factor in Wade's work and appears consistently throughout her other works, including those published before her 2001 article (Janoff-Bulman & Wade 1996). The last factor is self-presentation. Again, Wade refers to the norms and social roles assigned to women (2001, 72-73) and the fact that women draw from these roles when they visualize how they want to be viewed by society. Given the societal expectations that women should be modest and cooperative, this is how women tend to portray themselves. In private, however, a different story emerged when "Wade (1995) showed that when given the opportunity to do so privately, women ask for higher salaries

for themselves than they do under public conditions” (2001, 73). The factors provided in this article have come to play a major role in the negotiation research done today.

DePaul professors Alice F. Stuhlmacher and Amy E. Walters gained notoriety in the field for their massive analysis of gender differences in negotiation outcome. Their paper looked at the abstracts of a large number of papers on the topic of negotiation that took examined the agreement reached, the satisfaction of both of the participants, and the identified gender of both of the participants (Stuhlmacher & Walters 1999, 660-661).

Their results, which included “...21 studies....with a combined 3,496 participants (1,946 men and 1,550 women)” (1999, 661) suggest that, “at every stage of their career, women appear less effective in gaining access to positions of power and status than men” (1999, 671). The key finding of the study is in the satisfaction behind the negotiators.

Stuhlmacher and Walters observed that the wage differences may not be a result of the women being less-skilled negotiators, but rather due to the value differences between men and women (1999, 670). The way men and women measure success may alter the way women approach the negotiation table.

The Field of Social Psychology

Psychological sex differences emerged as a major topic in social psychology in the mid-1970s (Eagly 1987, 1). The literature discussed gender roles; that men and women possessed different skill sets and social behaviors and thus were naturally inclined to different types of work¹. The two theories of how men and women acquire

¹ The definition of sex differences is “whether female and male behavior differs, given presumed equivalence in all contemporaneous factors other than sex” (Eagly 1987, 10). This is important to note due to the fact that sex differences are distinctly different from gender roles that are defined as “...those shared expectations (about appropriate qualities and behaviors) that apply to individuals” (Eagly 1987, 12).

various social attributes are described as either cultural or structural (Eagly 1987, 9). Structural explanations highlight that members of social groups experience common situations due to their position within organizations and families. Cultural explanations discuss socialization that occurs during childhood that steers children towards their respective gender characteristics (9).

At their most basic level, gender roles can be separated into two dimensions: the communal dimension and the agentic dimension (Eagly 1987, 16). The communal dimension is the concern for the welfare of others. Attributes traditionally associated with the communal dimension include sympathy, helpfulness, and submissiveness. On the other hand, the agentic dimension includes aspects of assertiveness, self-sufficiency, and dominance (Eagly 1987). Gender roles can be internalized as well as pressed upon individuals by the influence of groups.

In *Sex Differences in Social Behavior*, Eagly brings gender roles and sex differences together by demonstrating how sex differences are determined by gender roles. Gender roles largely influence the skill sets acquired by each sex. Skills are often acquired by a sex because that sex is more likely to use or has used the skill in the past for a social role or occupation (1987, 29). For example, clerical work is more common among women, so a situation involving clerical work would cause men and women to react differently. The classic example is the domestic role. Homemakers are responsible for accomplishing multiple goals and working cooperatively with other members of the household, and, as Eagly comments, “often subordinating their own personal goals to those of family members” (29). The other key way that gender roles affect sex differences is in terms of the beliefs about consequences of behaviors. When an

individual was in an occupation that consistently favored various behaviors, the individual began to favor that behavior as a response. An example is that if an individual has spent time in military service, which emphasizes aggressive behavior, that individual “may acquire beliefs about the consequences of aggressive behaviors that tend to legitimize aggression” (Eagly 1987, 30). Common experiences among the sexes, for example, house work or military service, have a large effect on the sex differences seen today between men and women. These preferences for aggression as opposed to cooperation may partially determine how men and women approach salary negotiation.

The meta-analysis performed in Eagly’s *Sex Differences in Social Behavior* examined the gender role differences in helping and aggressive behavior. In the meta-analysis of helping behaviors, the behaviors typical of men tended to be risky and protective (1987, 49), which are consistent with agentic behaviors. Helping behaviors exhibited by women were communal in nature. Another observation was that men tended to help when helping itself was an assertive act and women tended to help when directly requested to (49). This theme of helpfulness is reminiscent of Wade’s ideas about self-advocacy.

An analysis for aggressive behaviors was also performed by Eagly. As expected, men are more aggressive than women, especially in terms of physical aggression (1987, 94). An interesting observation was that “women reported more guilt and anxiety as a consequence of aggression, more vigilance about the harm that aggression causes its victims...” (94). This observation fits well with the gender roles previously discussed. When women are aggressive, they feel guilty about it and may worry that they are stepping too far away from their prescribed gender role.

Professor Eagly and fellow Professor Steven J. Karau performed another meta-analysis in 1991 about the extent to which men and women emerge as leaders (1991, 1). The point of the study was to challenge the notion that the reason that men succeed more than women in business is because business is a more “natural setting” for men (1991, 1). The results from the study were profound for the social psychology discipline.

Consistent with the hypothesis of the authors, women emerged as leaders in scenarios that required a high level of social complexity (1991, 693), an example of which is a long-term rather than short-term relationship. Men emerged as leaders more frequently in groups “...with equal numbers of men and women [rather] than in groups with a female majority or male majority” (695). In addition, according to Table 1 (1991, 693), when the type of leadership activity is assessed, men have a tendency to emerge as task oriented leaders whereas women emerge as social oriented leaders. The findings, which include some of the themes from Kolb’s work, apply the research done in *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation* (1987) in a more concrete context.

Rather than focusing on the differences between the sexes, Joan Acker, of the University of Oregon, focused her work on gender in organizations. Acker takes a deep-seated stance against many organizations that exist today. She observes, “the most powerful organizational positions are almost entirely occupied by men, with the exception of the occasional biological female who acts as a social man” (1990, 139). Acker believes that the structure of organizations that exist today discriminate against women through their bureaucratic nature. According to Acker, the hierarchies of a company are built on the assumption that “those who are committed to paid employment

are “naturally” more suited to responsibility and authority; those who must divide their commitments are in the lower ranks” (Acker 1990, 149-150). Acker’s stipulation is that women are naturally going to be discriminated against in a career setting, especially one with a great deal of masculinity, because it is more likely that they will have to divide their time between work and the home (1990). A key takeaway from Acker’s work is that the organizational structure as it stands today has no place for compassion or divided loyalties.

The Field of Cultural Studies

The premier scholar in the field of cultural studies is Geert Hofstede, who coined the infamous “Hofstede’s Five Dimensions”. Geert Hofstede and Gert Jan Hofstede’s book, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* examines Hofstede’s dimensions in great detail, providing examples and analysis of how various aspects of each of the dimensions will take shape (2005). The MAS, or masculinity index, is the dimension that will be used in this paper.

The book ranks countries on a scale from masculine to feminine, using a factor score analysis (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p. 120). The score was computed using fourteen work goals². The countries score from 0 (most feminine country) to 100 (most masculine country) (p. 120). The ideas put down in this book identify and explain key social norms. These social norms have significant effects on the gender roles and sex differences in the various countries. As Hofstede writes in his 1994 article, “Business Cultures”, a masculine score demonstrates a country’s preference for assertiveness,

² Work goals were defined as follows. Respondents were asked “”Try to think of those factors which would be important to you in an ideal job; disregard the extent to which they are contained in yours present job...” (2005, p. 76). Respondents were then asked to rate each factor of a scale of 1(very important) to 5(little importance) (p. 76).

whereas a feminine score shows a preference for service (n.p.). These factors closely match the observations in Eagly's 1987 book.

A wealth of knowledge on negotiation, gender, and cultural perspectives already exist. However, there is still space for growth and understanding. Throughout the readings, it was common for negotiation scholars to reference the key gender scholars, but the articles only address a single culture. By utilizing Hofstede's work, the three arms of research can be combined into a cross-cultural survey.

Analysis

From the decades of negotiation literature that exists, four dominant theories have emerged. These theories try to explain the negotiation differences between men and women. While this short list is not inclusive, these are the four theories that have the most support. This section will provide a description of the theory as well as some of the research that supports and refutes it.

The first theory is the theory of sex role socialization, also known as the gender role theory³. This theory is the oldest that has been used to explain the differences in the ways that men and women negotiate. As Carol Watson stated in her 1994 article, "Gender versus Power as a Predictor of Negotiation and Outcomes", the gender role theory is centered on the idea that men and women negotiate differently due to their respective gender roles (1994b, p. 119). In essence, the theory is that "because woman in U.S. society are expected to be nurturing and supportive, they should be softer, more cooperative negotiators than men" (Watson 1994b, p. 119). From the social psychology

³ It will be referred to as the gender role socialization theory. This is due to the fact that, according to Christian Nordqvist of Medical News Today, "sex refers to male and female, while gender refers to masculine and feminine" (2011). For the purposes of this paper, how an individual identifies will characterize them, rather than their biological features.

literature examined in the previous section, it is clear that this theory rests on substantive grounds.

The common perception is that cooperation in negotiation is a weakness and a bad attribute. Therefore, women should be less successful in negotiation. In Edgar Vinacke's 1959 article on three-person negotiations, his observations were that all-female triads were far more likely to arrive at a conclusion wherein all three people agreed to cooperate and were less likely to bargain (p. 356). Vinacke concludes "The reasonable interpretation of the over-all picture is that females are less concerned with winning...and are more concerned about arriving at...[a] friendly solution to the problem" (p. 357). Vinacke's article, written in the late 1950s, was one of the first articles to confront this issue and examine it. As previously mentioned, the study of gender in negotiation was not common until the mid-1970s. Therefore, the information presented in Vinacke's study was some of the only data available for quite some time.

Some scholars still subscribe to this theory. Deborah Kolb, the renowned feminist scholar whose work was reviewed in the literature review, acknowledges that gender plays a role in women's success in negotiation, particularly in salary negotiation. She states that in previous studies, women have been in less successful in distributive negotiations that would, by nature, favor a "more masculine style" (2009, p. 520). However, even when the game is changed to a more integrative style, "the findings are not that different...[even in] situations in which more feminine skills would be presumably be beneficial" (p. 520-521). Kolb takes this data and makes the assumption that the differences in negotiation success may be attributed to the natural negotiation skills of men and women.

However, many studies found no discernible differences in the way that men and women negotiate. A revolutionary literature review by Jeffrey Rubin and Bert Brown (1975) showed that no difference existed between the way that men and women negotiated in the thousands of studies that were included in the literature review. The inconclusive results of these studies led many scholars to seek alternate explanations for the differences in negotiation.

Another theory that has been used to explain the negotiating differences between men and women is the situational power explanation. This theory was popularized after Rosabeth Moss Kanter, a professor at Yale, published *Men and Women of the Corporation* in 1977. The theory focuses on power situations in a negotiation. According to Kanter, power is the "...ability to get things done, to mobilize resources, to get and use whatever it is that a person needs for the goals he or she is attempting to meet" (p. 166). Salary negotiation is a discussion over the desire for more resources. The power dynamics would clearly come into play during a discussion between a supervisor and a subordinate.

Kanter's research on women's relationship to situational power started with the idea that women do not make good leaders. In fact, both men and women seemed to think so. One respondent to Kanter's survey went so far as to call women "temperamentally unfit" for management (1977, p. 198). According to Kanter's research, when women are in the process of gaining power, but still have less power than their colleagues, they are judged more harshly than their male colleagues. However, when women have the same degree of power as their coworkers, they are judged similarly (1977). Kanter goes so far as to say that "power wipes out sex" (p. 200), and that women are just as dependable as

men when it comes to leading an organization. These findings have helped to refute the claims that women are not temperamentally fit for management.

These findings were supported by the literature review discussed earlier by Jeffrey Z. Rubin and Bert R. Brown. The 1975 book offered an alternative view to the gender role socialization theory that had been dominant for decades. While it is interesting to note that throughout the book, the authors use simply “he” instead of “he or she”, the book showed through its findings that the differences in the way that men and women approach negotiation could not be attributed to gender, but rather to the specific power situation.

As discussed in the Kanter book, women generally have a lower status at an organization. Women need to prove themselves to colleagues and superiors before they are accepted as competent (1977, p. 200). Those who have power, by and large, negotiate more assertively (Kanter 1977) and women typically hold roles with less access to power. Therefore, according to the situational power model, women are forced to behave in a cooperative and harmonious manner due to their low-power status within the organization. It is not gender roles that are holding women back from successful and lucrative negotiations, but low-power positions.

The third theory that negotiation scholars have come up with is called the additive hypothesis or the gender-plus-power explanation. According to this explanation, both the gender role socialization theory and the situational power theory are correct. The landmark study for this theory was performed in 1990 by George Mason University professor, Ellen A. Fagenson. The study led to support for the additive hypothesis

because multiple variables were taken into account, whereas previous studies had primarily focused on a single variable.

The study revealed support for both the gender role socialization theory and the situational power theory. In the results, “perceived femininity was found to be related to an individuals’ sex” (Fagenson 1990, p. 208). According to this study, which was a survey done by mail that asked men and women in the health care industry about attributes and power, women in both high and low power positions reported having more feminine attributes than their male counterparts (p. 208), which lends support to the gender role socialization theory. However, at the same time, both male and female individuals in high-power positions rate themselves as more masculine than their low-power counterparts (p. 208). This finding lends support to the power situation theory.

Other important findings from this study were produced. Feminine attributes appeared to be correlated with lower levels of education. A 1982 study performed by O.C. Brenner from James Madison University lends more support to Fagenson’s results. Brenner’s survey was conducted to understand the correlation between education levels and various personality attributes. For women, education was negatively correlated with nurturance (p. 382). Education was positively correlated to the three remaining personality attributes: achievement-orientation, aggression and dominance (p. 382, Table 2).

As shown in Table 2 above, at 9-11 years of education, men and women had very similar levels of nurturance (11.5 and 12, respectively). However, at a level of education beyond the Master of Arts, men and women have very divergent levels of nurturance. This finding gives opposing evidence to the power situational theory.

Table 2
Mean Scores on Personality Scales Subgrouped by Amount of Education and by Sex for Nurturance and Dominance

Amount of education	n	Achievement	Aggression	Dominance	Nurturance	n		Nurturance		Dominance	
						M	F	M	F	M	F
8 years or less	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9–11 years	6	9.5	7.8	7.3	11.8	2	4	11.5	12.0	13.5	4.3
12 years ^a	50	10.6	7.4	8.4	11.1	12	38	9.5	11.6	11.0	7.6
1–3 years college	65	10.7	8.5	10.0	9.7	39	26	8.6	11.3	9.3	10.9
4 years college ^b	55	12.1	7.3	11.5	9.4	32	23	9.5	9.2	12.4	10.2
Some grad. work	33	12.1	8.8	12.7	8.8	15	18	8.9	8.7	13.5	12.1
MA	28	13.3	9.1	12.2	9.3	11	17	9.9	8.9	13.3	11.5
Beyond MA	23	12.9	9.6	12.2	7.7	17	6	8.5	5.3	12.8	10.5
PhD	4	12.3	7.8	10.0	7.8	4	0	6.3	—	10.0	—
Total	264	11.6	8.2	10.7	9.6	132	132	9.0	10.1	11.6	9.8

Note. Grad. = graduate; MA = master of arts; M = male; F = female.

^a High school graduate. ^b Graduated.

(O.C. Brenner 1982, p. 382, Table 2)

On this table, the most interesting numbers in terms of the theory are the mean scores of nurturance for women with 9–11 years of education and women with a level of education beyond a Master of Arts degree. The difference between these two numbers (12.0 and 5.3 respectively) is dramatic, dropping 6.7 points. As a reference the men's mean scores dropped from 11.5 to 8.5, only 3 points (p. 382). These results lend support to the situational power thesis.

While perceived femininity seemed to be correlated with an individuals' sex, self-described masculinity was not. In Fagenson's 1990 study, both men and women in upper-tier positions in organizations see themselves as having relatively similar masculine attributes (p. 209). Fagenson suggests that these "masculine" attributes should be referred to as "upper-tier" attributes, since both men and women seem to possess them at the upper levels. Watson (1994a) found that "masculine" qualities increased with situational power and "feminine" qualities decreased with situational power (p. 194).

The fourth theory that has been used to explain the differences in the way men and women approach negotiation is the expectation states theory. The expectation theory revolves around the dynamics of mixed pair negotiations. Watson and Hoffman (1996) describes the theory as, “status characteristics (i.e. gender) establish performance expectations in small group settings; thus, high-status individuals (i.e. men) are expected to be more competent than low-status individuals (i.e. women)” (p. 120). Gender, they argue, is triggered as a status characteristic in mixed sex pairs because gender is the only characteristic that differentiates the participants (p. 120). In essence, being a woman only diminishes power when negotiating with a man and being a man only increases power when negotiating with a woman.

This theory was popularized in 1977 by Joseph Berger, M. Hammit Fisek, Robert Z. Norman and Morris Zelditch Jr.'s book, *Status Characteristics and Social Interaction*. Status characteristics are characteristics with distinct attributes expected of them (1977, p. 93). An example of a status characteristic would be, arguably, gender. The authors state, “...then...the evaluation of a female's performance is likely to be distorted by knowledge that the individual is female” (p. 23). Therefore, in negotiation, a female's mere presence with a male partner will trigger a set of expectations from both the man and the woman.

According to Watson's 1994 article, situational power seems to be the better predictor of negotiating behavior, rather than gender (1994b, p. 123). In the eight studies examined by Watson, power emerged as the main explanation for a negotiator's behavior in four of them. One of the defining findings of the study was that “managerial women reported less self-confidence than managerial men before they took part in a ...negotiation (1994b, p. 122). Despite the fact that women are as competent as men, they

doubt their abilities. This could be attributed to the fact that these female managers are already in “uncharted” territory and are already breaking several expectation rules.

Discussion

Now that the dominant theories have been reviewed, the larger implications of these theories can be examined. The larger implications are an examination of what each of these theories might mean for women negotiating in the workplace. This discussion will also focus on how these implications can be applied across cultures. The cultural importance of these findings should not be understated, as it is becoming increasingly common for people to work with members of different cultures. Many authors offered recommendations for how we can combat the problem facing women in negotiations. In addition, the works listed in this paper represent significant research and advancements made in the field, but this list is nowhere near exhaustive. There are several areas, many of which were not even recognized when these articles were written, that need to be further researched.

In all of the articles regarding gender role socialization, the primary concern was that when men or women act in “counter stereotypic” ways, they might be punished by their colleagues or supervisors for violating the agentic dimension of gender-stereotypic beliefs (Eagly 1987, p. 16). As mentioned in the *Analysis* portion of this paper, women are supposed to be softer and more cooperative negotiators, in accordance with their gender role as the nurturing caregiver. The seemingly simple fix to this situation is to encourage women to be more assertive during negotiations. However, there is evidence that this may do more harm than good.

In a study performed by Hannah Riley Bowles, Linda Babcock, and Lei Lai, it was found that when men and women initiate negotiations, they receive very different responses. While there is an acknowledged pay gap between men and women (O'Neill 2003), "women's reluctance [to negotiate] [is] based on an entirely reasonable and accurate view of how they were likely to be treated if they did [negotiate]" (Vedantam 2007). In the study mentioned above, both men and women were likely to punish a female counterpart that initiated negotiations, in a "phenomenon known as the backlash effect" (Rudman & Fairchild 2004, p. 157). The authors believe that the gender role socialization theory is being framed incorrectly. Rather than look at the problem as individuals differences, the gender role theory should be examined as social incentives.

In the four-experiment study, "male evaluators penalized women more than men for attempting to negotiate for higher compensation" (Bowles, Babcock & Lai 2007, p. 99). Women were punished monetarily for breaking the rules associated with their gender role. It gets even more serious. In the study, "men were significantly more inclined to work with nicer and less demanding women who accepted their compensation offers without negotiation than they were with those who attempted to negotiate" (p. 99). It should be noted that men rated women that negotiated as of the same competency as women who did not. Also troubling was the observation that women penalized other women more than they penalized men for negotiating salary. Despite this, women were still more hesitant to negotiate with men than with women (2007, p. 99). It is no wonder that women are reluctant to break away from their gender roles.

While trying to overcome gender roles, and be more assertive in salary negotiations, can financially help women, they may incur other costs: their co-workers

will not like them. In an article by authors Mary Beth Wade and Ronnie Janoff-Bulman show that there can be economic consequences of speaking up, as well as staying silent. They point out that women have to make the choice to be seen as being competent or being liked. While competency is the key determinant of appearing influential for men, being liked plays a similar role for women (1996, p. 148). For women, being liked is the key to influence, not competency. In a study (Carli 1990), it was recommended that women should speak in a less self-assured way. While women that did this were thought of as less competent, they had a greater impact on their audiences (Carli 1990). Women who spoke in a self-assured and confident manner had less influence than their less-assured counterparts.

Some scholars argue that in addition to having to choose between being competent and being likeable, women face an even more daunting negotiation game, which scholars Bowles and McGinn refer to as “the two-level game” (2008). They argue that when women negotiate with their employers, domestic issues are, by nature, an undercurrent in the negotiation. Differences in the outcomes of salary negotiations partially dictate the allocation of tasks and responsibilities in the home (p. 399). Even as more women enter the workplace, the “inequitable distribution of household labor” remains relatively unchanged (2008, p. 399).

According to the household bargaining model in economics, members of a household should specialize in an area where they have a comparative advantage (Bowles & McGinn 2008, p. 401). Typically, women have specialized in household labor and men in market labor. Even in homes where the woman is working, she typically does a disproportionate amount of the household labor (p. 400). Therefore, when a woman

enters a salary negotiation with an employer, it is expected that she will value a “flexible work schedule over money in anticipation of becoming a mother” (2008, p. 402). This expectation may affect the way a hiring manager approaches a negotiation with a woman, regardless of knowledge about her goals and plans.

While this “backlash effect” can have severe implications, are these “feminine” attributes in negotiation a bad thing? Women in the United States tend to consider their interests through a lens of how their decision will affect others (Cohen 1993, p. 178). Women put a high priority on empathizing with their counterpart in negotiations. Rather than focusing on their personal gains, they are more likely to focus on the gains of all parties (Nelson, Zarankin, and Ben-Ari 2010, p. 291). For women, overall harmony of the group is also of high importance in a negotiation. Success was not determined by reaching an agreement, but maintaining a relationship (2010, p. 291). In a world that is increasingly built on relationships, is this a behavior that should be discouraged in negotiations and “trained out” of women?

In Carol Watson’s 1994 study, power was the most powerful explanatory variable for the varied results between men and women’s negotiations (1994b). Up until recently, most women did not have access to positions of high power. As Eagly pointed out in her 1987 book, women may have trouble acting in high-power positions, as they have been “trained” for a position that holds little power (p. 11). In order to rise to high-power positions, women must act. Kanter stated in her 1977 book that women need to prove themselves to their colleagues before they are accepted as competent leaders. Again, women face a bind. As stated above, it has been shown through research that women have to make a choice between appearing competent and being likeable. If women act

“competently” they are making a trade-off for their likeability, which, according to the Wade and Janoff-Bulman study (1996), decreases their ability to influence those around them.

If women have to prove to others that they are competent in an organization, this inherently presents a bind. In the Stuhlmacher and Walters study, it was found that a small conversation at the beginning of a job has lasting effects (1999, p. 670). If, in an initial salary negotiation, women behave in a stereotypically female way, and negotiate less, they are less likely to be promoted over time. With fewer women at the top of organizations and in high-power positions, the low-high power dynamic will be skewed. Women will consistently be on the low-power end, which will reinforce the gender role stereotypes.

Sociology professor Joan Acker goes even farther. She argues that women were not considered when the idea of how an organization should run was popularized (1990). Therefore, women, in the aggregate, will never achieve the position needed to overcome the inequality that has been present since women began to enter the workforce. She argues that it has been concretely implanted in the hierarchy of organizations that women are subordinate to men in all things (1990, p. 140). Her conclusion is that unless the abstract idea of an organization is reframed, women will be unable to succeed in the male-dominated workforce.

The additive, or gender-plus-power, hypothesis states that a low-power man and a high-power woman should have similar levels of competitiveness and success in a negotiation. This is not the case. Contrary to the gender stereotypes, low-powered men were more cooperative than their low-powered female counter-parts (Molm 1986, p.

1381). The results for the additive hypothesis have been inconclusive and the hypothesis is commonly lumped-in with the expectation states theory.

The expectation states hypothesis is the most complicated of all the hypotheses, but is not supported by markedly more evidence than the other three. In a study that looked at power in male-male, male-female, female-male, and female-female dyads⁴, many different aspects of a relationship were examined. The gender of the dominant party did not affect the overall power use in the experiment. However, the gender of the dominant party did affect the way the parties interacted (Molm 1986, p. 1380). Dyads where the high-power member was a male tended to interact in a “tit-for-tat” style. On the other hand, in dyads where women were the high-powered party, an exchange from low-power dyad was likely to be mutually reciprocated by the high-power dyad.

Molm found that where there were differences in power use along gender lines, they tended to be with the low-power member of the dyad. As previously mentioned, lower power males gave more away than their low-power female counter-parts, which runs contrary to what the gender role socialization hypothesis would predict. Women also rewarded their counter-parts differently than men. Whereas men chose to give rewards as incentives, women tended to withhold rewards as a form of incentive (1986, p. 1381). This is understandable, as women traditionally come from low-power positions. This difference in reward schemes could potentially lead to tension between female managers and male subordinates, if male subordinates are expecting to be rewarded in a traditionally masculine way.

⁴ The first party listed is the “high-power” party in the dyad and the second party listed was the “low-power” party in the dyad (Molm 1986).

Earlier, it was discussed that competency was a huge issue for women. Women have to prove themselves before they are taken seriously, yet many women have to make the tough choice between being seen as competent or likeable. It was found that legitimization⁵ is a major issue for women in these dyads, especially when a high-power woman was partnered with a low-power man (Molm 1986, p. 1381). Legitimation also exaggerated gender differences. According to the situational power hypothesis, there should be differences between men and women when the power of the high-power participant is not legitimized, since the leadership qualities of women are questioned. The results of this study support the expectation hypothesis; gender is triggered as a status symbol when it is the only factor that differentiates between the two participants.

Due to globalization, it is more and more likely that people of different cultures will interact, both personally and professionally. The importance of learning about other cultures and how to interact with them cannot be understated. While the literature examined thus far has solely been from the United States, it is important to look at how gender affects negotiations in other countries as well. There are two reasons why gender will affect negotiation differently in other countries. Firstly, gender roles across cultures will vary wildly. Secondly, access to power will vary across countries. For instance, in a country that has more female executives or a more gender equal workforce, women will likely have greater access to power. This would affect all the theories that were previously reviewed.

⁵ Legitimation, in this study, means that participants were “assigned to the power positions based on the basis of their performance in a preliminary competition” (Molm 1986, p. 1361).

The two case studies that are going to be examined are the United States and Denmark. The purpose of the case studies is to determine if people from the United States went abroad to Denmark and engaged in a negotiation with a woman, what the literature says would most likely occur. Denmark and the United States were chosen because of their “relatively” feminine and masculine scores. Since all of the literature above is based on studies in the United States, the United States had to be one of the two countries compared.

Denmark is considered to be a relatively feminine country, with a score of 16 and a rank of 71 out of 74 countries that were rated for masculinity (Hofstede & Hofstede 2005, p. 120-121, 129)⁶. This score reflects the norms present in a society, in this case, the gender norms in a culture. For instance, in masculine cultures, such as the United States, a prevailing view is “Women’s liberation means that women should be admitted to positions hitherto occupied only by men” (Hofstede 1998, p. 17). In a feminine country, the prevailing idea is “Women’s liberation means that men and women should take equal shares both at home and at work” (17). In Denmark, people and relationships are considered the most important aspects in life; in the United States, money and things occupy that role (Hofstede 1998, p. 17).

A key difference between Denmark and the United States is the attitude towards assertiveness and modesty. In countries like Denmark, modesty is considered a virtue and that excellence is a private matter (Hofstede 1998). In masculine countries, assertiveness is considered a standard virtue, but “the ambition of the girls may be directed towards the achievements of their brothers and later of their husbands and sons” (p. 84). During an

⁶ The score of the United States was 62, making it the 19th most masculine country out of the 74 countries that were ranked (2005, p.121).

interview, Hofstede remarked that the Dutch⁷ frequently remarked that Americans as a group thought very highly of themselves and were quite vocal about their entitlements (p. 87). While Americans as a whole were more assertive than the Dutch, Dutch men and women were more likely to have similar levels of modesty and assertiveness.

These values have permeated the professional world. Denmark currently has a female prime minister and seeks to elect a large number of women into political positions. Only 16.8% of Congressmen and women serving in the 112th Congress are women (Center for American Women in Politics). In Denmark, job opportunities offered to women are thought of as equal to those that are offered to men (Hofstede 1998, p. 103). Denmark was also one of the first countries in the OECD where women entered the work force (Smith, Smith, & Verne 2011, p. 157). Danish women likely have greater access to situational power than their American counterparts.

The Danish welfare system is known throughout the world for its extensive and diverse coverage. It is quite possible that the system would alter the way that women negotiate. In a personal communication with a Dane working in an executive position in Denmark, she stated that due to the extensive healthcare and childcare system, she felt that all she had to negotiate over was salary. In the United States, maternity leave is an important part of a woman's employment contract. Danish women have less of a "two-level" game to play with employers due to their maternity leave and subsequent compensation being secured by the government regardless of employment position or salary.

⁷ The Netherlands were ranked 72nd out of 74 countries on Hofstede's 2005 Masculinity/Femininity Index

According to the literature reviewed, it can be referred that Danish women would approach negotiation in a more assertive manner than their American counterparts.

Danish women were raised with the notion that they deserved the same treatment from employers that their brothers got. In addition, they were also raised to believe that their husbands would be participatory in domestic housework, raising children, and cooking. Danish women have access to power in the workplace and in government that does not exist in the United States. In essence, Danish women have been raised with the notion that there is no reason they should not ask for as high a salary as they feel they deserve.

Many authors have made recommendations for women on how to best confront salary negotiations. Catherine Tinsley et al, believe that gender roles and the punishment for breaking them, so inhibit a woman's ability to negotiate, that the way to succeed is to play within those stereotypes, or even play them up. Tinsley et al reference back to Wade's theory of self-advocacy and suggest that the way for women to succeed in negotiations is to make requests on behalf of the team, rather than for themselves (2009, p. 241). In addition to this, the authors suggest that women should "time their battles and evaluate when requests are going to be perceived as less rather than more threatening" (p. 242). Women should avoid activities that would trigger any expectation of gender stereotypic behavior from their counterparts. The downsides of this approach are obvious. Rather than being accepted as part of an organization, in order to succeed, women should refrain from asking for their entitlements if it is a bad time for their supervisors.

The opposite viewpoint also exists: that women should be trained to be more aggressive in negotiations. Some women react against their stereotypes by learning to be "tough" negotiators and how to engage in distributive bargaining. In these courses,

women will be coached on how to negotiate less cooperatively and to share less information (Menkel-Meadow 2000, p. 358). However, this may lead to social punishment for breaking gender roles, which may cause the woman to be viewed as unlikeable. This could have long-term effects with co-workers.

The most common suggestion for combating the problem of negotiation is reframing the way negotiation is taught and how success is measured. Tinsley et al suggest that, when teaching negotiation, it is important that gender stereotypes are discussed (2009, p. 244). In their experience, it is socially undesirable to discuss biases and therefore many may be reluctant to share their thoughts. The authors suggest the use of teaching devices and exercises so that students can realize their own biases. An example given was that men and women should reverse roles and play out various scenarios. The debrief of the exercise would provide a good transition to discussing stereotypes. While, in theory, reframing how women approach negotiation is a useful tool, in practice it is a daunting task. It is very typical, especially in distribute negotiations, for the end goal to be represented by a dollar amount. Reframing success would highlight the importance of maintaining a relationship with a negotiation counterpart, an attribute that women tend to prioritize.

There has already been a great deal of research done on the subject of gender and negotiation, but many possibilities exist for future research. A key area that must be examined is how other gender identities react to negotiation. As society recognizes more gender identities than simply men and women, how these gender identities approach negotiation should be examined. It is unfair to say that there are only two gender-identities worth studying, when a part of the population is excluded from that research.

As more women enter the workplace and achieve top managerial position, this topic should be re-examined. It is plausible to think that as more women gain more managerial positions, especially at the executive level, the corporate culture would be altered, allowing for an acceptance of more “feminine” negotiation styles. However, as seen in earlier sections (Rudman & Fairchild 2004), women also punish other women. Merely having more women at the top of the corporate ladder is not going to guarantee the shift in attitude that is needed. To reach the point where women can expect to negotiate as equal to anyone across the table, changes must be made.

While having more women atop the corporate and political ladder will not solve the problem, it will open up doors. As more women are promoted to the top positions, women may focus on promoting other women, rather than attempting to enjoy the title as only woman at the top. In a personal communication with an American businesswoman, she stated that she preferred to work with men, as opposed to women, because women were “catty”. It will be impossible to advance women’s position at the bargaining table if women are their own worst enemies.

What is needed to truly equalize the bargaining table is a cultural shift. The United States and other more masculine countries can take hints from countries like Denmark. While Denmark is not perfect, as a society it has come to value relationships as well as money (Hofstede 1998, p. 17). For many reasons, this is something that the United States should strive for. However, for the purposes of this paper, this value shift would allow both traditionally masculine and feminine personalities to flourish. In addition, the United States should consider the policies that Denmark has implemented that make it easier for mothers to take maternity leave. All employers would be required

to offer a set maternity leave, which women have one less aspect of their employment contract to negotiate.

It is not enough to try to train the femininity out of women or to force women to play up their gender stereotypes in negotiations. A fundamental shift in values is needed for women to be able to come to the negotiation table without fears that there are unreasonable expectations on their performance. Rather than sweeping the gender issue in negotiation under the rug, it needs to be discussed so that both men and women can become aware of their own biases. A shift like the one needed is going to require effort and the confrontation of sensitive issues. However, the payoff will be well worth the effort.

Conclusion

While many disagree on the reasons for women's negotiation styles, scholars from many disciplines can agree that the effects are far-reaching. Women's likelihood to negotiate, or lack thereof, is commonly stated to be part of the current wage gap. The literature offered some explanations as to why this might be happening, but thus far no theory is conclusive. More importantly, no one solution for the problem has been agreed upon.

The literature has illuminated several factors that may be affecting women's willingness to negotiate for higher salaries, with the fear of backlash and the low access to power just being a few of them. These factors inhibit women from reaching their true potential in an organization. No one course of action has been determined to promote women negotiating for their own interests. It is essential women feel that they can advocate for themselves. Women must come to the negotiation table preceded by the

same expectations and encountering the same challenges as their male colleagues. Then, and only then, will the hidden minefield disappear, allowing for a more profitable and equitable conversation.

List of References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4(2), 139-158.
- Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1972). Status Characteristics and Social Interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 37(3), 241-255.
- Bloomberg's Business Week. Women in Business School. Retrieved from: <http://bx.businessweek.com/women-in-business-school/>.
- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1), 84-103. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.09.001
- Bowles, H. R., & McGinn, K. L. (2008). Gender in Job Negotiations: A Two-Level Game. *Negotiation Journal*, 24(4), 393-410. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2008.00194.x
- Brenner, O. C. (1982). Relationship of education to sex, managerial status, and the managerial stereotype. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 380-383. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.380
- Carli, L. L. (1990). Gender, Language, and Influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 941-951. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.941
- Cohen, A. (2003). GENDER: AN (UN)USEFUL CATEGORY OF PRESCRIPTIVE NEGOTIATION ANALYSIS?*. *Texas Journal of Women and the Law*, 13(1), 169-196.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior : a social-role interpretation* (Vol. 1985). Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagly, A. H. S. J. K. (1991). Gender and the Emergence of Leaders: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Volume 60(5)(May 1991), p 685-710.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1990). Perceived Masculine and Feminine Attributes Examined as a Function of Individuals' Sex and Level in the Organizational Power Hierarchy: A Test of Four Theoretical Perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(2), 204-211. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.75.2.204
- Galinsky, A. D., & Magee, J. C. (2006). Power Plays. In Negotiation (Ed.), *Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School* (Vol. 7, pp. 3).

- Hofstede, G. (1994). Business cultures. *The Unesco Courier*, 12-12.
- Hofstede, G. a. G. J. H. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (2nd Edition ed.). New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. H., & Arrindell, W. A. (1998). *Masculinity and femininity: the taboo dimension of national cultures* (Vol. 3). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Wade, M. B. (1996). Viewpoint: The Dilemma of Self-Advocacy for Women: Another Case of Blaming the Victim? *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 15(2), 143-152. doi: 10.1521/jscp.1996.15.2.143
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kolb, D. M. (2009). Too Bad for the Women or Does It Have to Be? Gender and Negotiation Research over the Past Twenty-Five Years. *Negotiation Journal*, 25(4), 515-531. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2009.00242.x
- Kolb, D. M., & Williams, J. (2000). *The shadow negotiation: how women can master the hidden agendas that determine bargaining success*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lax, D. A., & Sebenius, J. K. (2006). *3D Negotiation: Powerful Tools to Change the Game in Your Most Important Deals*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2000). Teaching about Gender and Negotiation: Sex, Truths, and Videotape. *Negotiation Journal*, 16(4), 357-375. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2000.tb00764.x
- Molm, L. D. (1986). Gender, Power, and Legitimation: A Test of Three Theories. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(6), 1356-1386.
- Nelson, N., Zarankin, A., & Ben-Ari, R. (2010). Transformative Women, Problem-Solving Men? Not Quite: Gender and Mediators' Perceptions of Mediation. *Negotiation Journal*, 26(3), 287-308. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2010.00274.x
- Nordqvist, Christian. (2011, August 05). What is the difference between sex and gender [Web log post]. Retrieved from: <http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/232363.php>
- O'Neill, J. (2003). The Gender Gap in Wages, circa 2000. *The American Economic Review*, 93(2), 309-314.
- Raiffa, H., Richardson, J., & Metcalfe, D. (2007). *Negotiation analysis: the science and art of collaborative decision making*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap.

- Rubin, J. Z., & Brown, B. R. (1975). *The social psychology of bargaining and negotiation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to Counterstereotypic Behavior: The Role of Backlash in Cultural Stereotype Maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 157-176. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157
- Smith, N., Smith, V., & Verne, M. (2011). The gender pay gap in top corporate jobs in Denmark. *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(2), 156-177. doi: 10.1108/01437721111130189
- Tinsley, C. H., Cheldelin, S. I., Schneider, A. K., & Amanatullah, E. T. (2009). Women at the Bargaining Table: Pitfalls and Prospects. *Negotiation Journal*, 25(2), 233-248. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2009.00222.x
- Vedantam, S. (2007). Salary, Gender and the Social Cost of Haggling: FINAL Edition, *The Washington Post*, p. A.7. Retrieved from http://american.summon.serialssolutions.com/link/0/eLvHCXMwQ7QykcsDYyLKAZNLUxNdM_AoN-LgfaTC3k2UQc7NNcTZQxdWaMan5OTEg86LsTSztATWRHwn3h5d9Nbe33x-eNOFV4Wr_wEApXEs9A
- Vinacke, W. E. (1959). Sex Roles in a Three-Person Game. *Sociometry*, 22(4), 343-360.
- Wade, M. E. (2001). Women and Salary Negotiation: The Costs of Self-Advocacy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25(1), 65-76. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.00008
- Watson, C. (1994a). *Gender Differences in Negotiating Behavior and Outcomes: Fact or Artifact?* Cresskill, N.J: Hampton Press.
- Watson, C. (1994b). Gender versus power as a predictor of negotiation behavior and outcomes. *Negotiation journal-on the process of dispute settlement*, 10(2), 117-127.
- Watson, C., & Richard Hoffman, L. (1996). Managers as negotiators: A test of power versus gender as predictors of feelings, behavior, and outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(1), 63-85. doi: 10.1016/s1048-9843(96)90035-1
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 653-677.
- Weiss, Debra Cassens. (2011, Nov. 10). Have Women's Law School Numbers Peaked? NAWL Report Suggests the Pipeline May Be Shrinking. Retrieved from: http://www.abajournal.com/news/article/have_womens_law_school_numbers_peaked_nawl_report_suggests_the_pipeline_is/