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INTRODUCTION

Despite the substantial progress women have made in the workplace over the last century, striking gender gaps in pay and advancement persist in the 21st century. In this chapter, we examine gender differences in business contexts by exploring how men and women approach and experience the negotiation process. With women comprising approximately 30% of current enrollment for a master's in business administration (MBA) at top business schools, the gender disparity in business is alarming. Although professional degree programs such as law and medicine have achieved gender parity in enrollment, women's absence in the MBA classroom persists. Not surprisingly, women are also relatively scarce in the upper echelons of business. Although women make up 46% of the U.S. labor force, they comprise just 3% of Fortune 500 chief executive officers (CEOs) and only 15.2% of Fortune 500 board seats ("U.S. Women in Business," 2009). This gender disparity extends to differences in earnings as well: In 2009, the median annual income for women working full time was 23% lower than that of similarly employed men ("The Gender Wage Gap: 2009," 2010). With typical explanations such as differences in experience or education falling to fully explain the wage gap (Blau & Kahn, 2006, 2007), researchers have pointed to negotiation differences between the sexes as a likely contributor to this disparity (Bowles & McGinn, 2008).

While substantial efforts have been made over recent decades to close the gap between men and women in the workplace, persistent differences in pay and advancement exist in the 21st century that cannot be ignored.
We contend that negotiating effectiveness is central to business leadership (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2009); thus, identifying differences in how men and women experience negotiations may shed light on gender gaps in compensation and business participation (cf. Bowles & McGinn, 2008). This leads to the key questions that we address in this chapter: Why do gender differences in negotiation persist in the 21st century workplace? What workplace characteristics impede the resolution of these differences?

To shed light on these questions, we organize this chapter in four sections. First, we describe the multifaceted ways in which gender differences emerge at the bargaining table in the 21st century workplace. Whereas it may be empirically true that men typically demonstrate small but significant economic advantages relative to women in negotiations (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999; Walters, Stuhlmacher, & Meyer, 1998), the reasons behind this difference are complex and depend more on the situation than on innate biological factors (Kray & Thompson, 2005). By reviewing the growing literature on gender issues in negotiation, we hope to better understand why gender differences persist. Second, we outline several actions that have been theorized to help close the negotiation gender gap. Third, we discuss unique aspects of the 21st century workplace that present obstacles hindering the degree to which these actions may succeed in leveling the playing field. Fourth, based on the challenges presented by today’s workplace, we identify opportunities for the next wave of gender and negotiation research.

SECTION 1: WHY DO GENDER DIFFERENCES IN NEGOTIATION PERSIST IN THE 21ST CENTURY WORKPLACE?

One likely reason why gender differences in negotiation persist is that, until recently, they have been poorly understood both empirically and theoretically. Although gender differences are a perennially popular topic for armchair philosophers, scholarly interest in this question in the negotiation domain has waxed and waned over time. However, substantial strides have been made recently on both fronts, which we review below.

While gender was part of the early investigation of individual differences in negotiation processes and outcomes (e.g., Rubin & Brown, 1975), it
quickly fell to the wayside as an uninteresting question that accounted for little variance and lacked theoretical depth. As the negotiation literature became intensely focused on social-cognitive heuristics and biases (Neale & Bazerman, 1991), gender had little to contribute to this conversation.

Another factor inhibiting the study of the negotiation gender gap is the methodological difficulty in doing so. Negotiations are highly interdependent interactions involving multiple parties, thus creating complexity for researchers interested in understanding an individual difference such as gender. As each party in an interaction contributes to the final outcome, even the simplest: dyadic negotiation requires a consideration of both negotiators' gender. Negotiation studies are more labor intensive than studies of individual decision making, and the additional complexities introduced by considering each negotiator's gender may have deterred researchers from tackling this topic. Indeed, Kray and Thompson's (2005) review of the literature revealed a deficit of studies examining the full range of possible dyadic compositions (i.e., male–male dyads, female–female dyads, male–female dyads). With few exceptions, studies that do fully explore possible dyad compositions rely on judgments in hypothetical scenarios rather than behavior in negotiation tasks. Finally, perhaps as a result of differences in how gender composition was handled by researchers, contradictions emerged regarding gender's impact in negotiations, rendering unclear conclusions about its explanatory power. In combination, research on gender in negotiations stagnated for decades.

Despite the challenges in studying gender differences at the bargaining table, rising concern over persistent disparities between men and women in career attainment led scholars to continue their efforts. Recent development and application of powerful social psychological theory to explain these differences has provided a boon to this research domain. Rather than asking whether real biological differences exist between men and women negotiators (i.e., sex differences), the question became one of differences deriving from societal expectations due to differential social roles (i.e., gender differences; Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; Eagly, 1987). Arguably, the modern-day turning point in this nature-versus-nurture debate was the introduction of the highly influential stereotype threat theory (Steele, 1997; Steele & Aronson, 1995). In exploring racial and gender gaps in academic achievement, Steele contended that negative stereotypes of social groups created a "threat in the air" that undermined group members' performance. Regardless of whether the stereotype is believed to be true, the mere
knowledge that a negative stereotype exists about a social group can create a self-fulfilling prophecy for its members. With this conceptualization of social category-based performance differences deriving from negative stereotypes, the gender conversation in negotiations fundamentally shifted.

Almost immediately after Steele introduced his theory, its potential contribution to the negotiation literature was appreciated. Researchers began measuring and manipulating the activation of gender stereotypes and examining their impact on how men and women negotiated (Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002; Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky, 2001). By holding constant the mixed-sex composition of dyads and simply manipulating the content of activated stereotypes, performance differences between men and women were shown to flip-flop and even disappear. Rather than being a product of innate differences, the situation emerged as the primary driver of how men and women divide the proverbial pie. On top of this support for nurture-based gender differences, negotiators’ beliefs about the role of nature versus nurture in determining negotiating success were also shown to be critical determinants of performance at the bargaining table (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007). In other words, the belief itself that good negotiators are born that way inhibits negotiators’ effectiveness by lowering their goals, reducing their perseverance in pursuit of those goals, and limiting their willingness to risk failure in attempts to learn and develop as negotiators. This belief is also likely to correspond to the endorsement of masculine stereotypes of successful negotiators (cf. Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995). As a result, this dysfunctional belief increases women’s vulnerability to the pernicious effects of negative stereotypes and lowers their negotiation performance (Kray, Locke, & Haselhuhn, 2010). In combination, this research provided strong evidence to suggest that gender differences are more a function of negotiators’ awareness of and belief in stereotypes than any innate sex differences. To the extent that these stereotypes persist in the 21st century workplace, an in-depth exploration of the effects of gender stereotypes may aid our understanding of the negotiation gender gap in today’s organizations.

The Power of Gender Stereotypes

It has long been assumed that men and women differ in the way that they approach negotiation and conflict resolution (e.g., Rubin & Brown, 1975). Underlying these assumptions are gender stereotypes, or lay perceptions
about which traits and behaviors characterize an effective or ineffective negotiator. Successful negotiators are typically thought to be assertive, aggressive, and rational. In contrast, unsuccessful negotiators are assumed to be submissive, weak, and emotional (Kray et al., 2001). These perceptions link directly with traditional gender stereotypes: Men are perceived to be independent, assertive, and rational, while women are perceived to be emotional and passive and to demonstrate a concern for others (Bem, 1974; Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Williams & Best, 1982). The congruency between the masculine stereotype and the lay theory of the successful negotiator leads to positive negotiation stereotypes for men. Likewise, the congruency between the feminine stereotype and lay beliefs about unsuccessful negotiators leads to negative negotiation stereotypes for women (Kray & Thompson, 2005).

Given the centrality of stereotype threat theory to understanding gender differences in negotiations, we begin with a brief review of its key tenets. Stereotype threat is characterized by concerns about confirming a negative stereotype about one's social group in a relevant performance domain (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Psychologically, stereotype threat involves both physiological and cognitive stress derived from increased performance monitoring and attempts to suppress negative thoughts and emotions (Schmader, Johns, & Forbes, 2008). Important for understanding the perniciousness of stereotypes are two observations: First, a threatened party need not believe the stereotype to be affected by it; second, greater identification with a domain increases vulnerability to stereotype threat. In other words, the more individuals care about a domain, the more they are likely to be mindful of negative expectations. For example, women majoring in mathematics at an elite university performed worse on a standardized math test when stereotype threat was triggered via a simple request that they check off their gender on an exam prior to commencing the exam relative to when this question was not asked (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999).

Women Negotiators Face Negative Stereotypes

Building on Steele's work in academic settings, Kray et al. (2001) proposed that negative female stereotypes could be a catalyst for gender differences in the negotiation domain. Challenging the notion that low expectations of women negotiators are caused by their historically poor negotiation performance, Kray and colleagues explored whether these stereotypes
were in fact causing the observed differences in performance. When negative female stereotypes are "in the air," women are expected to experience stereotype threat and confirm the negative stereotype by demonstrating relatively low performance. Because the belief that core abilities are being measured can trigger stereotype threat (Steele, 1997), the perceived diagnosticity of a negotiation was manipulated for mixed-sex negotiating dyads. Claiming performance would be used to diagnose ability was expected to cause negotiators to question what it takes to succeed, thereby activating stereotypically masculine traits (e.g., rationality, assertiveness) and triggering performance deficits for women. Indeed, this claim was sufficient to reduce women's negotiation performance relative to men; under baseline conditions, both genders performed comparably.

Prejudice and Discrimination

The preceding section addressed how stereotypes affect women negotiators' thoughts and behaviors; here, we consider whether gender stereotypes also influence how women negotiators are perceived and treated by others. We distinguish between prejudice, involving negative attitudes toward social groups, and discrimination, involving behavior aimed at denying social groups positive outcomes (Allport, 1954).

To explain why women negotiators may experience these negative hurdles, we consider both the descriptive and prescriptive components of stereotypes: The descriptive aspect of gender stereotypes describes how men and women are generally anticipated to behave in negotiation (i.e., men may be aggressive, women may focus on the relationship). The prescriptive aspect of gender stereotypes describes how men and women ought to behave. Violating prescriptive stereotypes and their concomitant normative expectations, particularly for low-status groups like women, often produces social sanctions (e.g., Rudman, 1998; see also Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). In negotiations, behavior such as initiating a negotiation or holding firm in the face of requests for concessions may violate prescriptions for women to be agreeable and relatively unconcerned about their own outcomes.

Social Sanctions for Women Negotiators

Women are uniquely faced with a trade-off between increased perceptions of competence (or in negotiations, economic outcomes) at the risk of social
censure, termed the *backlash effect* (Rudman, 1998). For example, using a vignette involving an attempt to negotiate a job offer in which the protagonist’s gender was manipulated, Bowles, Babcock, and Lai (2007) demonstrated that women who initiated negotiations were perceived to be less nice and more demanding than were men who made the same requests. Importantly, female negotiators anticipated these negative evaluations—in a follow-up study, women were less likely than men to initiate a negotiation, reporting greater apprehension about anticipated backlash (see also Amanatullah & Morris, 2010). Violating the prescriptive gender stereotypes may lead to severe social consequences, particularly when negotiating with men: Women who show concern for their own interests without demonstrating equal care for others are seen as threatening by men and are met with more hostile forms of sexism, such as derogation and active harassment (Berdahl, 2007).

Beyond negotiations, women who violate feminine stereotypes and act in a self-promoting manner (i.e., act according to masculine stereotypes) are seen as less likeable, more dominant, and more arrogant than men who demonstrate similar behavior (Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 1999. In sum, female negotiators are faced with a trade-off between the material outcomes they could gain from a negotiation and the social consequences of acting in a self-promoting manner. Apparently, women can either succeed economically at the expense of social perceptions (and possibly in terms of future opportunities; Bowles et al., 2007), or they can accept fewer rewards at the bargaining table and maintain positive social standing.

**Gender Stereotypes: Beyond Warmth and Competence**

To understand why backlash occurs, we first consider two fundamental dimensions of social perception: warmth and competence (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Whereas warmth conveys an actor’s intention to behave in a cooperative versus competitive manner, competence conveys his or her ability to carry out this intent. Individuals are initially judged in terms of warmth and then in terms of competence (see Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008, for a review). The traditional female stereotype is derived from these dimensions: Women are typically seen to be warm but not necessarily competent (e.g., Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007). This is congruent with typical stereotypes of female negotiators—that they have positive
intentions (e.g., concerned about the feelings of the other party) but do not possess the skills necessary to achieve their goals (e.g., are passive and emotional). When women are not perceived as warm, not only are they violating gender prescriptions but it may also imply an "uppity" desire to move up the social hierarchy. Backlash functions to bring the violator of social order back down.

Although the bulk of research examining how stereotypes affect perceptions of negotiators has focused on the mandate that women be agreeable and warm, Kray (2012) examined whether subtler aspects of female stereotypes suggesting that women are more gullible, impressionable, and naïve than men (Prentice & Carranza, 2002) may produce negative outcomes for women negotiators. Expectations about women's naïveté were hypothesized to work in concert with women's own admission of their lack of knowledge about negotiating (Babcock, Gelfand, Small, & Stayn, 2006; Kray & Gelfand, 2009) to render women more vulnerable to deception in strategic interactions than men. Building on Ayres and Siegelman's (1995) initial demonstration that women experience gender discrimination at car dealerships (i.e., higher asking prices than their male peers), Kray asked whether women negotiators are especially likely to be deceived in strategic interactions. In an archival study of deception in a real estate transaction simulation in the MBA classroom, female negotiators were significantly more likely to be blatantly deceived compared to male negotiators. Buyers were charged with purchasing a property that would be put to a use inconsistent with sellers' interests. To make this deal, buyers were three times more likely to negotiate in bad faith by blatantly lying to female sellers compared to male sellers. Because both males and females lied more to women than they did to men, it suggests this pattern is driven by a strategic consideration of the likely consequences of engaging in deception (Gneezy, 2005).

Beyond Gender Stereotypes: Emphasizing Economic Outcomes Favors Men

In the previous section, we reviewed the multifaceted effects of gender stereotypes in negotiation. In the next two sections, we discuss other factors that bring about gender differences at the bargaining table. We first consider whether perceptions of gender differences may be exaggerated by an overly narrow focus on economic negotiation outcomes.
The prototypical negotiation may involve a buyer and a seller haggling over the price of a good or service; in reality, however, negotiations often involve multiple dimensions that vary in their quantifiability. Negotiators may be concerned not only with material or financial outcomes (e.g., price of a car), but also with a wide array of nonquantifiable outcomes (e.g., color of the car) and social outcomes (e.g., establishing a solid relationship with the car dealership for ongoing service of the vehicle) (Thompson, 1990). Broadening the spectrum of outcomes to be considered raises the question of whether men and women adopt similar or distinct goals at the bargaining table. A long-standing hypothesis is that men are more concerned with the financial aspects of negotiation, while women place a relative premium on the relationships they form and develop through the negotiation experience (Rubin & Brown, 1975). Because empirical negotiation research has typically relied on quantifiable measures of negotiation performance, for instance, “points” earned in laboratory research or monetary outcomes in salary negotiations, researchers may be “stacking the deck” in favor of male negotiators (Kolb & Coolidge, 1991). While this argument is not new, it is only since 2000 that researchers have begun systematically measuring subjective and relational concerns. In the following, we consider the complementary frameworks in the literature and then consider the ramifications of this research for understanding gender differences.

Negotiators’ concerns extend beyond the tangible outcomes of the negotiation (e.g., Thompson, 1990). Recent theoretical and methodological advances shed light on the multifaceted nature of negotiations. For example, Curhan, Elfenbein, and Xu (2006) proposed and tested a four-factor model of subjective value in negotiation. According to this framework, negotiators care about the process, their instrumental outcome, the relationship with their counterpart, and how the negotiation made them feel about themselves (see Chapter 5, this volume). Do men and women differ in the subjective value they gain for themselves and create for their counterpart? Curhan, Elfenbein, and Kilduff (2009) proposed that women may derive less subjective value from negotiations than do men, possibly stemming from lower overall performance expectations by women. Despite these proposed links, most empirical work to date controls for gender rather than examining how it relates to subjective value (e.g., Curhan et al., 2009; Curhan, Elfenbein, & Eisenkraft, 2010).

In contrast to this approach by which gender is statistically eliminated, a growing body of work has specifically examined gender differences in
relational concerns that may combine with or supersede economic goals. Considering that negotiation is inherently a relational process (Gelfand, Major, Raver, Nishii, & O'Brien, 2006; McGinn, 2006), negotiation research has arguably focused too much on the negotiators as individuals. Instead, a complete understanding of negotiation requires an account of both individual and relational concerns (Barley, 1991; Gray, 1994).

A number of constructs have been introduced to capture the degree to which individuals demonstrate a concern for their counterpart's interests or for the relationship between the two parties. For instance, Rubin and Brown (1975) discussed the *interpersonal orientation*, whereby negotiators with this orientation are particularly sensitive to the actions of their counterparts. Similarly, Van Lange (1999) discussed the *prosocial orientation*, which describes the degree to which negotiators focus on enhancing social gains rather than personal gains. More recently, Gelfand et al. (2006) proposed that relational self-construals are particularly important in the negotiation context. Relational self-construals are perceptions of the self in terms of the interconnections and relationships one shares with others. This construal provides a relational lens through which affect, cognition, and behavior are interpreted and evaluated based on how they influence these connections.

**Relational Concerns Are Stronger for Women**

The distinction between economic and relational concerns in negotiation may be helpful for understanding gender differences at the bargaining table. Relational concerns in negotiation are congruent with the traditional feminine stereotype of the caring and nurturing woman (Gelfand et al., 2006). Thus, it may be the case that women are more concerned than men in building and maintaining relationships through negotiation and may be more concerned with relationship outcomes than with material gains (Kolb & Coolidge, 1991).

Empirical research appears to support this position. For instance, Cross, Bacon, and Morris (2000) found that general relationship self-construals are more accessible for women than for men, suggesting that women are more likely to interpret their interactions with others in terms of the relationship. In a negotiation context, Kray and Gelfand (2009) provided some of the first empirical evidence that women actively pursue different goals in negotiation than do men. Specifically, when considering a hypothetical
employment negotiation, women reported greater concern over developing a relationship with a potential employer than did men and were in fact more concerned with the relational outcome than with their distributive success. In contrast, men showed equal concern for relational and distributive outcomes. Interestingly, these differences were eliminated when the ambiguity about the appropriateness of negotiating economic terms was reduced: In this case, both men and women reported caring equally about relational and economic terms. If women place greater value on relational outcomes compared to economic outcomes, this may help to explain why they trail men in quantifiable measures of negotiation success—perhaps women are simply prioritizing different objectives altogether.

Negotiators Value Emotional Outcomes

Emotions play a key role in negotiation and can have substantial influence over the negotiation processes and outcomes (e.g., Carnevale & Isen, 1986; Forgas, 1998). Moreover, affect is an important negotiation outcome in and of itself, irrespective of objective gains from the negotiation (e.g., Barry, Fulmer, & Goates, 2006; Barry, Fulmer, & Van Kleef, 2004). Affect, generally, serves a motivational function (Schwarz & Clore, 1983)—individuals are motivated to have positive emotions and to avoid negative emotions. This is particularly true in interactive, competitive domains, such as negotiation, in which individuals act to maximize their overall happiness (Haselhuhn & Mellers, 2005; Mellers, Haselhuhn, Tetlock, Silva, & Isen, 2010).

One important emotional outcome is regret. People are strongly motivated to avoid regret and feel relief when they are able to avoid a potentially regretful outcome (e.g., Richard, van der Pligt, & de Vries, 1996). Both actual and anticipated regret affect negotiator behavior. Galinsky, Seiden, Kim, and Medvec (2002) argued that certain negotiation outcomes, such as having one's first offer accepted, trigger feelings of regret as negotiators consider the counterfactual reality that they should have asked for more. Experiencing this regret can lead to behavioral change—for instance, negotiators who have their first offer accepted in one negotiation may spend more time preparing for future encounters to ensure that it does not happen again (Galinsky et al., 2002).

Building on this work, Kray and Gelfand (2009) argued that feelings of regret in such situations may be primarily a male phenomenon. Given
the rampant potential for social backlash, women may feel more anxiety and anticipated regret over the negotiation process than men. In contrast, men’s experience of regret may be limited to the quality of the deal they achieve. Consistent with this hypothesis, Kray and Gelfand demonstrated that women were more likely to feel relieved if their first offer was accepted compared to when they achieved the same outcome following several offers and counteroffers. In contrast, men felt more relieved when the negotiation included a series of offers and counteroffers compared to when their first offer was accepted. If men and women have different affective reactions to negotiation outcomes, as this research suggested, the universal motivation to achieve positive emotions and avoid negative emotions may manifest in different goals and behaviors for men and women.

**Beyond Gender Stereotypes: Sex Versus the Situation**

The preceding section calls into question the dependent variables in the gender and negotiation framework. In other words, can we be sure that men really are better negotiators than women, or has research focused too narrowly on only one dimension of performance? Others have taken a different approach, calling into question whether scholars are looking at the correct independent variable. This line of research asks whether gender (or sex) is truly the driver of the performance differences reported in the literature to date, or if there are situational factors or confounding variables that have been overlooked in previous work.

**Gender Triggers**

Providing more evidence for the “nurture” perspective on gender differences in negotiation, researchers have identified numerous situational factors that elicit gender differences that may not otherwise emerge. In effect, aspects of the situation “trigger” gender-specific concerns or actions that, in turn, lead men and women to negotiate differently. Traditional gender stereotypes, as discussed above, are one example of social or situational factors that elicit gender differences. Other factors, such as the semantics of negotiation or the role negotiators play, have been shown to trigger gender differences as well.

The language of negotiation is one source of gender differences: The term negotiation in and of itself can serve as a gender trigger. Whereas terms
such as *negotiation* or *bargaining* connote gendered associations and stereotypes, functionally equivalent terms, such as *asking* or *debating* may not have the same implicit connections. To test this proposition, Small, Gelfand, Babcock, and Gettman (2007) examined gender differences in the initiation of negotiation. Following a task with ambiguous performance criteria, participants were given the chance to negotiate their compensation with the experimenter. Some participants were told that people often “negotiated” for a higher payment than they were originally offered, while other participants were told that people often “asked” for additional money. Women were significantly more likely to request a higher payment when it was framed as asking for additional money, compared to when it was framed as a negotiation. In fact, women “asked” for a higher payment just as often as did men. Thus, simply by referring to social interactions as negotiations, researchers and managers may be inadvertently triggering performance differences between men and women.

Another situational cue that can trigger gender differences is a negotiator’s role. Bowles, Babcock, and McGinn (2005) demonstrated that whether individuals are negotiating for themselves or on behalf of another party determines whether gender differences emerge in negotiation. Bowles et al. argued that women who negotiate on behalf of someone else are freed from the fear of social backlash effects that accompany self-promotion by women. Results from a simulated salary negotiation supported this assertion (see also Amanatullah & Morris, 2010): While men demonstrated the same level of performance regardless of whether they negotiated for themselves or on behalf of another party, women negotiated a significantly higher salary when negotiating for someone else.

Intriguingly, ambiguity appears to moderate gender differences. Negotiators who have a clear sense of the negotiation parameters (e.g., knowing the range of acceptable or possible outcomes, understanding market values or social norms of fairness, etc.) are less affected by factors that would otherwise trigger gender differences (Bowles et al., 2005). Likewise, Kray and Gelfand (2009) found that gender differences in emotional reactions to having a first offer accepted disappeared when ambiguity about the appropriateness of negotiating was reduced. When it was clearly understood that negotiation attempts are valued, men and women had similar reactions to the negotiation process.
Gender as a Proxy for Status

In addition to raising the question of whether situational factors trigger gender effects, researchers have asked whether the observed differences between male and female negotiators have to do with gender at all. According to this perspective, gender is merely a proxy for other key factors that affect negotiation outcomes, with status being a primary correlate.

The perspective that social status underlies gender differences is not new. For instance, Eagly and Steffen (1984) proposed that traditional gender stereotypes (e.g., women are communual, men are agentic) arise as a result of men and women occupying different positions in society, both today and in the past. Even as contemporary society moves toward greater gender equality, the parameters and constraints of organizational life have been defined in times when men enjoyed far greater opportunities and general success (Kolb & McGinn, 2009). As a result, men are more likely to be in positions of status and power in the workplace, which gives rise to the stereotype of the assertive, agentic man. Women, in contrast, are more likely to be in low-status positions in the workplace (or to be absent from the workplace altogether), leading to the stereotype of the community-focused woman who sacrifices herself for the greater good. In this way, stereotypes that we typically associate with gender are actually reflecting historical differences in social status.

In the negotiation domain, differences in status or power may explain why men and women differ in how they negotiate (Kray & Thompson, 2005; Watson, 1994). According to status-based models of gender and negotiation (Miles & Clenney, 2010), men are perceived as more competent than women, and their actions are seen as more legitimate due to their relatively high social status (Eagly & Wood, 1982). These perceptions then give male negotiators the latitude to employ a wide range of competitive and cooperative negotiation tactics. Due to men's high status, others perceive their agentic behavior as legitimate attempts to achieve negotiation success; thus, these tactics are considered acceptable. In contrast, because women are relatively low status, using the same tactics may be perceived as an attempt to climb up the social ladder; women may then incur backlash as a result of these perceptions. In sum, the status ascribed to men allows them flexibility in the negotiation that women lack. Importantly, it is the relative social status of men and women that is argued to drive these effects rather than gender itself.
Complementing this approach, Galinsky, Shirako, and Kray (2012) examined the necessary and sufficient conditions for stereotype threat in negotiation. Galinsky et al. proposed that negotiator status interacts with performance concerns, such that low-status negotiators feel anxiety in situations in which they feel pressure to perform that high-status negotiators do not feel. These differences in anxiety, then, are expected to lead low-status negotiators to perform worse when their ability is in question—a stereotype threat-like change in performance. Consistent with this prediction, negotiators in low-status roles (e.g., a job candidate as opposed to a recruiter) demonstrated patterns of behavior consistent with those of stereotype threat, achieving less success in situations for which their ability was called into question. Extrapolating these results to the question of gender, it may be that women do not fall prey to stereotype threat due to their gender per se; instead, it may be women’s relatively low social status that creates this vulnerability.

Analogous to this line of work, Bowles and Gelfand (2010) examined how status influences the evaluation of deviant workplace behavior. Bowles and Gelfand proposed a model in which high-status individuals were simultaneously more critical of the deviant behavior of low-status individuals and less likely to follow the rules themselves (see Lammers, Stapel, & Galinsky, 2010, for analogous effects of power). Intriguingly, when gender was substituted for status in empirical tests of this model, precisely the same effects emerged—men were more critical of the behavior of women than of other men, while women evaluated the behavior the same regardless of the transgressor’s gender. This suggests that in workplace interactions (such as negotiations), gender and status may be inextricably intertwined.

SECTION 2: HOW TO LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD

As the previous section has detailed, women’s negotiation performance suffers mainly as a result of the presence of various situational threats. The very nature of situational factors, however, means that these factors can change. In this section, we describe a variety of possible actions that can be taken by individuals or organizations to help close the gender gap at the bargaining table. Given the prominent function of stereotypes in
driving gender differences, we begin with an in-depth discussion of how the pernicious effects of negative female stereotypes can be counteracted. We then turn our attention to actions that can be taken by organizations to level the playing field between men and women.

Countering Negative Stereotypes

Stereotype Reactance: A Motivated Disproval of Negative Stereotypes

Importantly, the existence of negative gender stereotypes need not always harm negotiation performance. When the stereotype is blatantly activated, it can actually motivate women to disprove it. In the work of Kray et al. (2001), while subtle suggestions that stereotypically masculine traits were important to negotiation success led to stereotype threat, the explicit endorsement of gender stereotypes (i.e., stating that men typically do better in negotiation because they possess desirable traits) led to stereotype reactance, by which women outperformed their male counterparts. This finding is important for understanding gender differences for two reasons. First, it demonstrates that the same stereotype can trigger different kinds of gender effects depending on how consciously the stereotype is considered by its target. Second, it provides decisive evidence against an innate difference perspective. If varying the level of explicitness of a gender stereotype determines whether men versus women outperform each other, then it cannot be the case that men are innately superior to women in this domain.

Emphasizing Positive Stereotypes Eliminates Threat and Reverses Gender Gap

Beyond considerations of how stereotypes are activated, the content of the stereotype also affects negotiation performance. Building on their previous work, Kray et al. (2002) examined whether negotiators would change their behavior when stereotypically positive female traits (e.g., good listening skills, patience) were associated with negotiation success. When these traits were emphasized, the typical gender effect was reversed, with women negotiators outperforming their male counterparts. This once again demonstrates that it is not the case that stereotypes are drawing out inherent differences between men and women negotiators, but rather that the content of the stereotype causes these differences in performance. While
activating negative stereotypes can reduce negotiation performance, they
can also be neutralized by considering that stereotypically feminine traits
predict negotiation success. When being female psychologically shifts
from being a liability to an asset, performance shifts accordingly.

**Does Enhanced Likeability Mitigate Women Negotiators' Social Backlash?**

If women face economic sanctions for acting in accordance with female stereotypes (i.e., warm but not competent) and social censure for acting counterstereotypically (i.e., competent but not warm), is there any way for women to capture value at the bargaining table while avoiding social sanctions? One idea for handling this predicament is for women to combine warmth and competence to achieve their goals without bearing social costs (e.g., Babcock & Laschever, 2003). By adopting a "feminine" manner, women are "allowed" to pursue their goals. In support of this assertion, Carli, LaFleur, and Loeber (1995) demonstrated that women who delivered persuasive messages to men using a social style (i.e., leaning toward their counterpart, making eye contact, having a friendly expression) were perceived as more likeable and, as a consequence, were more influential compared to women who delivered the same message using a task-focused style (i.e., firm tone of voice, upright body posture). Similarly, Heilman and Okimoto (2007) found that the backlash effect for fictional female managers was reduced when the managers were described as being communal and generally supportive of their employees' needs. A social style appears to signal good intentions, thus enhancing receptivity to women's messages.

**Organizational-Level Actions**

Kray and Shirako (in press) proposed several steps that organizations can take to reduce the destructive effects of negative stereotypes. For instance, organizations can counteract the effects of gender stereotypes by changing their content—focusing on the positive female characteristics that can lead to negotiation success and deemphasizing the negative aspects of the female stereotype. Individuals' beliefs about the link between gender and negotiation have been shown to be relatively malleable and subject to change, either through regenerating the content of stereotypes (e.g., by associating feminine traits with negotiation success; Kray et al., 2002)
or through education (Rudman, Ashmore, & Gary, 2001). Organizations should take advantage of both approaches by highlighting the positive qualities of their female members and by educating all organizational members in reducing prejudice and bias.

Finally, organizations have a responsibility to provide both women and men the tools they need to be successful in negotiations. Negotiation training and education are key in teaching men and women alike the strategies and tactics they need to achieve success at the bargaining table, but this training may be particularly important for women. As noted by Bowles and McGinn (2008), recent legislation in the United States has allocated resources for training women and girls in negotiation, ostensibly because this education is expected to help reduce the wage gap.

While education can help mitigate gender differences by giving both men and women confidence that they can attain positive outcomes, it may help in directly reducing gender stereotypes as well. Novice negotiators are unsure about the traits and characteristics that lead to negotiation success and may therefore be relatively reliant on stereotypes to inform how they approach negotiations. Exposure to a wide range of negotiation situations, and a wide range of negotiators, should help individuals to recognize that both stereotypically masculine and stereotypically feminine traits are necessary for optimal negotiation performance (cf. Lax & Sebenius, 1986).

Indeed, the most powerful impact of training programs for women may be simply to instill the belief that it is possible to improve as negotiators. Individuals hold implicit beliefs about the fixedness or malleability of negotiation skill, and these beliefs have important implications for the goals negotiators set and the outcomes they are able to attain (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007). Individuals who believe that negotiation is an innate ability focus on their immediate performance, reduce effort in the face of challenges, and ultimately fail to achieve their goals when the going gets tough. Individuals who believe that negotiation is a skill that can be developed are primarily concerned with improving and growing as negotiators over time and exert effort at the bargaining table regardless of their perceived chances for immediate success. This perseverance serves them well and allows them to both create and claim greater value at the bargaining table.

While implicit negotiation beliefs have not been shown to differ by gender, our research has shown that women's implicit beliefs are critical in determining their response to negative stereotypes. Whereas previous
research has shown a general pattern of reactance, by which women react against negative stereotypes by improving their performance (Kray et al., 2001; Kray, Reb, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004), we demonstrated that only women with malleable implicit negotiation beliefs are able to dedicate the effort and wherewithal necessary to achieve success. Thus, teaching women that they can become better negotiators through negotiation education may aid women not only by minimizing gender stereotyping or bias but also by giving women the beliefs necessary to overcome the challenges that they may face.

SECTION 3: CHALLENGES IN CLOSING THE GENDER GAP IN THE 21st CENTURY WORKPLACE

The preceding section outlined several strategies for individuals and organizations to close the negotiation gender gap. However, the ability of negotiators to make use of this information to reduce the gender gap may be constrained by the organizational context. In this section, we describe two attributes of the 21st century workplace that present significant challenges to the application of the actions described. In particular, we focus on the tendency of the contemporary workplace to minimize the discussion of gender, as well as the increased reliance on competition and narrowly defined performance metrics in the workplace.

Unintended Consequences of the Gender-Neutral Workplace

The 21st century workplace is often characterized by a commitment to gender neutrality. In short, many companies endeavor to treat all organizational members equally, regardless of gender. While the intention behind a gender-blind workplace may be noble, such policies have unintended consequences that may ironically impede organizations' efforts to achieve equality at the bargaining table.

At a basic level, organizational commitment to a gender-blind workplace inhibits companies' ability to learn about and capitalize on inherent (and unavoidable) differences between men and women. This is a potential concern for several reasons. First, by eliminating gender from the conversation, companies may not address gender-specific issues (e.g., pregnancy).
Failure to address such issues directly can inadvertently cause greater bias against women as they must negotiate issues that are not shared by men (e.g., Greenberg, Lodge & Clair, 2009). By attempting to take gender out of the equation altogether, organizations may be unable to account adequately for genuine biological differences between men and women.

Biological differences aside, a commitment to a gender-neutral workplace may also hinder companies’ ability to understand how men and women react to their environment at a sociocognitive level. While academic research has furthered our understanding of how female stereotypes affect women’s experience at the bargaining table, we know relatively little about how gender stereotypes, either positive or negative, affect men. Organizational attempts to move the focus away from gender exacerbate this knowledge gap. Thus, attempts to educate organizational members may be challenged by an organization’s incomplete understanding of the comprehensive effects of gender stereotypes.

Finally, companies that endorse a gender-blind approach may inadvertently promote, rather than mitigate, gender differences in negotiation (cf. Kray & Shirako, in press). Research on racial stereotypes suggests that stereotype threat may be heightened in organizations that adopt color-blind policies and procedures rather than explicitly valuing racial diversity in the workplace (Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008). Organizations may observe similar effects with regard to gender stereotypes. In contrast to a gender-neutral workplace, acknowledging gender stereotypes gives women the chance to react against the negative perceptions instead of allowing the dangerous beliefs to remain “in the air” (Kray et al., 2001).

Stacking the Deck: Male-Centered Policies in the 21st Century Workplace

More than ever before, the 21st century workplace is characterized by a competitive, performance-driven mind-set. Recent high levels of unemployment highlight the competition inherent in securing and maintaining positions at all levels of the organization. Companies that evaluate employees along a standard measure may do so in the name of fairness—after all, men and women alike are held to the same set of standards. At the same time, however, companies that narrowly define performance along metrics of material gains and losses may inadvertently tilt the playing field in
favor of male employees. Organizations that focus exclusively on observable, short-term outcomes (e.g., immediate financial performance) rather than longer-term performance measures (e.g., building client relationships) may stack the deck in favor of men in three ways: First, as outlined in detail above, women and men may prioritize different goals at the bargaining table, and an overly narrow focus on short-term performance outcomes may overlook valuable contributions women make to the organization.

Second, holding men and women to the same rigid set of standards ignores historical imbalances that lead men and women to face different challenges at the bargaining table. For example, individuals—both men and women—generally benefit from being part of an extensive social network (see Chapter 9, this volume). Having a broader set of social connections leads to greater access to unique resources, provides possible alternatives to a current negotiation, and can generally provide information needed to help to reduce the ambiguity of a negotiation (Kolb & McGinn, 2009; Seidel, Polzer, & Stewart, 2000). However, because men have been in the workplace longer than women, and networks tend to be homophilous (Brass, 1985), men, on average, have access to a more extensive network of possible negotiation partners and counterparts than do women. This discrepancy in social networking adds yet another barrier for women to overcome at the bargaining table.

Finally, the competitive atmosphere promoted by many 21st century organizations may set expectations for how negotiations should be conducted in the workplace. These expectations may feed into stereotypes of how negotiators should behave, which may in turn hinder efforts of female negotiators to overcome negative stereotypes. Specifically, we previously described research in which women were able to avoid social backlash by cloaking agentic behavior with a warm, personal approach. However, this research primarily investigated perceptions in a general workplace context. How does this advice translate at the 21st century bargaining table, which fundamentally involves competition? Kray and Locke (2012) proposed that women’s demonstration of warmth signals a lack of competitive intent that may lead them to be perceived as “softies” at the bargaining table. If women negotiators are perceived to be more cooperative, they may indeed reap social rewards by being well liked, but at the economic cost of counterparts acting more competitively to take advantage of their cooperation (cf. Lax & Sebenius, 1986). Essentially, acting warmly may signal that a negotiator has relatively modest demands, which allows their counterparts to demand more (Van Kleef & De Dreu, 2010).
Consistent with this theorizing, women who negotiated with a social style in a distributive negotiation were perceived as more likeable by their counterparts but suffered economically as their counterparts (both men and women) negotiated more aggressively (Kray & Locke, 2012). Importantly, though, men who adopted a social style suffered no economic penalty for doing so. Kray and Locke also found that women who adopt a social style are indeed able to leverage their perceived cooperative intent to expand the pie in an integrative context, but once again, their counterparts claimed the entirety of the created value. Finally, relying too heavily on likeability may increase women’s vulnerability to benevolent sexism (Good & Rudman, 2010; cf. Glick & Fiske, 1996). Taken together, this suggests that it may be premature to conclude that this Catch-22 is solved by having women cloak their competitive negotiation goals with communal styles.

SECTION 4: UNANSWERED QUESTIONS IN GENDER AND NEGOTIATION RESEARCH

In Section 3, we outlined two aspects of the 21st century workplace that may hinder efforts to level the playing field between male and female negotiators. Of particular import, we argued that attempts to promote a gender-blind work environment provide a unique challenge to reducing the negotiation gender gap as such policies mask important biological and social psychological differences between men and women. In the final section of the chapter, we describe two areas of future research that are guided by these challenges: taking the male perspective to understand better how men experience negotiation in the face of positive or negative stereotypes and reexamining fundamental, biological factors in the negotiation process.

Taking the Male Perspective

Much of the research on gender in negotiation has focused on the barriers and challenges women face at the bargaining table. It is important, however, also to understand the pressures that men may face and how these pressures may affect the negotiation process. To the extent that the
male perspective has been considered, men are often assumed to enjoy an advantage in terms of positive performance expectations and outcomes (e.g., Kray et al., 2001; Kray & Thompson, 2005; cf. Walton & Cohen, 2003). Intriguing contradictions, however, have emerged in empirical work. For example, Kray et al. (2001) demonstrated that when negative female stereotypes (and thus positive male stereotypes) were explicitly activated, men paradoxically did worse in a negotiation compared to when these positive masculine stereotypes were implicit. This finding suggests that the weight of positive expectations directed at men created a pressure that ultimately undermined their performance.

Recent research has begun to investigate the effects of positive masculine stereotypes from the male’s perspective. Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, and Weaver (2008) introduced the concept of precarious masculinity, which posits that men feel pressure to uphold societal perceptions of “manliness.” They proposed that manhood, but not womanhood, is perceived to be a malleable characteristic that requires constant validation. Thus, in the face of explicit positive stereotypes, men may feel pressure to live up to these descriptions of the “typical” man to maintain their masculinity. More recently, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, and Rudman (2010) suggested that this concern has merit. In videos of simulated job interviews, men who violated typical gender stereotypes by demonstrating modesty were judged as less likeable and of lower status. Thus, it appears as though the backlash effect is germane to men as well as to women—men who fail to act in accordance with prescriptive masculine gender stereotypes are subject to social sanctions as well.

Future research should carefully examine the implications for precarious masculinity in a negotiation context. If men feel pressure to perform, or to act in ways that are consistent with traditional male stereotypes (e.g., agentic, competitive), this may predict how men will behave in negotiation. In initial research to this end, we have examined how social pressure may underlie gender differences in ethical behavior (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2012; cf. Gilligan, 1982). We argued that the pressure felt by male negotiators to live up to positive gender stereotypes would lead them to process ethical dilemmas pragmatically and to view ethically questionable negotiation tactics as legitimate means of achieving negotiation success. As individuals often engage in unethical behavior as a way to reach goals that they might not otherwise achieve (Schweitzer, Ordóñez, & Douma, 2004), men may be more likely to engage in strategic justification of questionable
tactics as a way to fulfill the social stereotype of the successful male negotiator. Consistent with this prediction, we found that men were more pragmatic in their ethical reasoning, demonstrating egocentrism in their ethical judgments and endorsing unethical negotiation tactics as a means of attaining their goals.

Reexamining Sex Differences

For several reasons, research examining inherent differences between men and women in negotiations has fallen out of favor. This is partially attributable to the current political climate, in which the mere suggestion of possible intrinsic sex differences is met with an outcry, as evidenced by the firestorm that erupted after Larry Summers remarked that women may lack “intrinsic aptitude” to succeed at the upper echelons of science and engineering (Kray, 2007). Another primary reason for the lack of recent research is that little evidence exists that inherent sex differences matter, at least not to the same degree as socially constructed and construed differences. However, recent advances in technology have made it possible to understand better the precise factors that may mediate or moderate differences in how men and women negotiate.

For instance, as previously discussed, emotions are key factors in determining negotiation processes and outcomes (Barry et al., 2004, 2006). Recent application of functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) technology to simplified negotiation situations has not only confirmed the critical role of emotion in making decisions in these contexts but also has isolated the specific neuroactivation that occurs when the decisions are made. For instance, the bilateral anterior insula cortex, an area associated with negative emotion, is activated when individuals are faced with what they perceive to be an unfair offer (Sanfey, Rilling, Aronson, Nystrom, & Cohen, 2003). In fact, rejecting perceived unfair offers can be its own reward: de Quervain et al. (2004) demonstrated that punishing unsporting behavior in abstracted bargaining games activated the same brain circuits involved in reward processing. The fMRI technology could be used to answer conclusively questions about how men and women negotiate. For example, both men and women believe that women are more emotional than men in negotiation, and men are more rational than women (Kray & Thompson, 2005). Observing patterns of brain activation during simplified negotiation exercises could conclusively answer the question of whether there is a biological basis for these common lay beliefs.
Other recent developments have identified biological moderators of behavioral sex differences. For instance, anthropological research has established the facial width-to-height ratio as a sexually dimorphic trait that is independent of body size (Weston, Friday, & Lib, 2007). Intrasex differences in facial structure have been linked to aggression and dominance in men only, with wider facial width-to-height ratios associated with more aggressive behavior (Carré & McCormick, 2008; Carré, McCormick, & Mondloch, 2009). For instance, men with wider facial ratios are more likely to retaliate to perceived slights by others (Carré & McCormick, 2008) and are more likely to act in their own self-interest, even if it means violating another’s trust (Stirrat & Perrett, 2010). Researchers have theorized that intrasex selection has allowed physically (facially) imposing men more leniency in their behavior toward others as their stature minimizes the chance of retribution for their actions (Stirrat & Perrett, 2010).

Building on this work, Haselhuhn and Wong (in press) examined whether facial characteristics moderated gender differences in the propensity to engage in unethical behavior during a negotiation. Ethically questionable tactics, such as deception, are common in negotiation (O'Connor & Carnevale, 1997; Schweitzer, 2001), and research has demonstrated that men are more likely to engage in these tactics than are women (e.g., Dreber & Johannesson, 2008; Lewicki & Robinson, 1998). As hypothesized, facial width-to-height ratios moderated this gender effect, with this ratio correlating positively with deception by male negotiators and unrelated to female negotiators’ use of deception.

**CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, we have highlighted advances over the past decade in understanding gender differences in negotiation in order to understand why these differences persist in the 21st century workplace. We examined the pernicious stereotypes that threaten female negotiators’ ability to achieve success at the bargaining table, both from the perspective of the focal negotiator (i.e., stereotype threat) and from the perception of their counterparts (i.e., prejudice and discrimination). To reduce many stereotype threat effects, it is important to consider the content of the activated stereotype and how consciously it is considered, along with implicit beliefs.
about what drives success in negotiations. For gender effects derived from social perception, more research is needed to understand how these negative consequences can be avoided. At this point, one practical contribution of this research is to show a reflection of the predicament women face at the bargaining table, without necessarily offering definitive solutions. We are optimistic that seeing the role of prejudice and discrimination more clearly is the first step toward moving beyond the difficulties they create for women negotiators.

Our perspective on the literature to date is that we have made considerable progress in understanding the power of gender stereotypes, yet we continue to have an incomplete understanding of gender differences in negotiation more broadly. To this end, our chapter includes an examination of additional negotiation outcomes, typically harder to quantify than dollar figures, differing in likely importance to men and women. Given the host of situational factors that trigger gender differences, issues of status and power may be at the heart of the gender gap. And, though our perspective is deeply rooted in the nurture-based view of gender differences, we acknowledge that very real nature-based differences between the sexes must also be considered for a comprehensive picture of gender to emerge. Given that a full consideration of these differences is difficult in today’s gender-blind workplace, it is imperative for future academic research to address such issues. Our goal for this chapter was to highlight the many subtleties and complexities that characterize the relationship between gender and the task of negotiating. Only by understanding all aspects of the negotiation—the negotiators, the situation, and the organizational context—can 21st century organizations begin to level the playing field between the sexes.
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