

## What Travels: Teaching Gender in Cross-Cultural Negotiation Classrooms

*Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Sandra Cheldelin  
& Deborah Kolb\**

*Editors' Note: Our cross-disciplinary team tackles the inconsistencies of gender teaching as seen from the perspective of law, business, and peace studies negotiation courses. In the process, they reconsider gender in the context of culture, demanding a forthright and coherent approach to topics now too often cut up into little boxes of "content."*

---

"I am not hindered by my gender; I use it to my advantage – being cute, young and naïve – to get better deals for my clients." (Israeli lawyer)

"The likeability-competence stereotype doesn't fit the Turkish experience – the choice of competence is not one women can even consider – all leadership positions are held by men." (Turkish psychologist)

"How do we help our students? In one class of all women, the professor failed half the class." (Turkish academic)

---

---

\* **Andrea Kupfer Schneider** is a professor of law at Marquette University Law School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Her email address is [andrea.schneider@marquette.edu](mailto:andrea.schneider@marquette.edu). **Sandra I. Cheldelin** is the Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch professor at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University in Arlington, Virginia. Her email address is [scheldel@gmu.edu](mailto:scheldel@gmu.edu). **Deborah Kolb** is the Deloitte Ellen Gabriel professor for women and leadership at the Simmons College School of Management in Boston, Massachusetts. Her email address is [kolb@simmons.edu](mailto:kolb@simmons.edu).

## Introduction

The comments above were typical of the responses we received following our presentation on gender made at the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching conference held October 2009 in Istanbul, Turkey. Reflecting some of the current work on gender and negotiation, our presentation focused on the most recent findings on the stereotype content model, and the relationship between this model and gender issues in negotiation (Cuddy et al. 2009; Bowles, Babcock, and Lai 2007). Using examples from the 2008 U.S. presidential elections and research on law students, we focused on the “likeability” vs. “competence” dichotomy that women have faced in negotiations, particularly those concerning compensation (Bowles, Babcock, and Lai 2007; Wade 2001; Stuhlmacher and Waters 1999). We illustrated how the dichotomy is operative for women in certain situations (the U.S. presidential elections and the portrayal of Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin) and not in others (particularly in certain professions, e.g., lawyers, and under certain conditions) (Tinsley et al. 2009; Schneider et al. 2010).

We were simultaneously intrigued and surprised at some of the responses from colleagues, especially of other cultures, to our presentation on gendered perceptions of likeability and competence in negotiations. We surmise that we must include factors that we had not previously considered, such as religion, family, power, voice and position; even when working within the likeability v. competence dichotomy, how these factors and culture affect behavior is an increasingly evident question. In retrospect, we are not shocked at the responses because our previous international experiences have repeatedly demonstrated that trainings applicable to an audience in the United States are often not fully appropriate in other countries (Honeyman and Cheldelin 2002). Still, for some attendees, the dichotomy resonated. There were similar examples of this dichotomy evident within their own cultures (Israeli presidential elections) and similar professional contexts (lawyers in Spain). Others, however, argue that the dichotomy cannot be found at all – that it already assumes a certain gendered order in which women could be seen as professionally competent and in which working women have certain legal rights, backed by societal acceptance. Moreover, in many countries, the concept of a woman’s “Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement” (BATNA) is irrelevant when the conditions under which women find themselves are not at all negotiable. In Ethiopia, a group of women reported they had already attained the best scientific jobs available to them (and that they considered themselves lucky in that accomplishment) so there was nothing left to negotiate. In the post-conflict environments of Bosnia and Liberia, women

consider themselves extraordinarily fortunate if they are able to obtain employment at all. To these women, talking about negotiating salary or benefits seems irrelevant.

As we reflect on this feedback and consider the most current research on gender, especially negotiated order, a number of questions arise. Women are subject to more negotiations than men in the United States (Kolb and McGinn 2009), and this fact is also true in other societies. In the United States, our tendencies are to look at gender *differences* – even stereotypes – in negotiation, but what contributions or dimensions can other societies offer to our analysis of gender and negotiations? As an example, we know *identity* matters and is salient to negotiation. In the United States, we have a relatively narrow view of gender (does being female result in different treatment?) and yet there are multiple dimensions of *identity*, including family, religion, and class, which are rarely considered in the United States. Our colleagues from other cultures spoke of the important differences regarding their roles within their families, their religion, and their culture – these are all present within the negotiation context. What are the cues of salient identity aspects or shifts that can help us understand their impact during negotiations?

In reconsidering how we teach and talk about gender, we draw on different theoretical and empirical perspectives that, generally, have not been a part of the discourse on gender and negotiation as it has taken place in the Western academy. We focus on three approaches – the organizational, cultural, and individual – to frame how gender can impact negotiations (Risman 2004; Deaux and Major 1990; Kolb 2009):

- 1) Organizational or institutionalized expectations and assumptions create the negotiated order within which negotiation occurs. These expectations and assumptions reflect power differentials and position negotiators differently (Kolb and McGinn 2009).
- 2) Social and cultural expectations activate status-based stereotypes based on different dimensions of identity. These expectations affect the range of individual actions in the context of negotiated interactions (Ridgeway and Correll 2004).
- 3) Individuals have choices in the roles they take up in a negotiation and these roles are quite fluid and variable, reflecting the *intersectionality* of gender with other dimensions of identity (McCall 2005).

Based on these frameworks, we suggest how these three approaches might be incorporated into a pedagogy that can travel outside of the United States.

## Second Generation Gender Issues, Social Roles, and the Negotiated Order

One perspective, when considering how gender (in all its complexity) plays out in negotiations, includes consideration of the institutional factors, or negotiated orders, which shape negotiated interactions. From this perspective, institutions and organizations are not locations where gender differences occur, but rather the sites where gendering occurs. Two theoretical perspectives are relevant to understanding the role negotiated orders play in setting the context for negotiation. The first perspective is a role theory that focuses on gendered role expectations based on the distribution of men and women into different social roles both in society generally, and in organizations and professions (Eagly 1987). The second perspective is based on a consideration of *second generation gender issues* – a particularly relevant consideration as we move the pedagogy of teaching gender and negotiation forward. Second generation gender issues appear neutral and natural on their face, but they result in different experiences for, and treatment of, women and men (Tinsley et al. 2009; Sturm 2001; Acker 1990). As distinct from first generation discrimination involving intentional acts of bias, second generation gender practices appear unbiased in isolation, but they reflect masculine values and the life situations of men who have dominated the public domain of work (Flax 1990; Fletcher 1999). As a result, the negotiated order of most organizations privileges masculine and discounts feminine practices and assumptions.

Social roles can position men and women differently in the home, in the workplace, and often in the community – an implication for how they fare in negotiations. Disproportionately, women in most cultures have larger responsibilities in the family than their partners, and in some cultures, that responsibility has been labeled the *second shift* (Hochschild and Machung 1997). A recent group of studies has considered these social roles – in particular, how pregnancy, birth, maternity leave, and work schedules position a mother differentially than those women who are not mothers (Dau-Schmidt et al. 2009; Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Roth 2006). In Western cultures, mothers are routinely offered less desirable assignments and lower compensation than women without children (Stanford 2009). For example, in the 2004 U.S. Federal Circuit Court case *Lust v. Sealy*,<sup>1</sup> the plaintiff, a woman, was not considered for a promotion solely because the promotion entailed moving her family, which included her two small children, from Madison, Wisconsin to Chicago, Illinois. Mothering roles in other societies may be even more prominent, making it a challenge to negotiate at work and in the community (Al-Dabbagh 2008).

Social roles are translated into a sex-based division of labor, prominent in most industrial societies. Labor market structure often pushes men and women into different industries and occupations – with different pay structures. Within organizations, sex segregation can position women in staff roles and men in supervisory positions; different groups may find themselves at the bottom of the organization structure with little opportunity for advancement (Reskin and Roos 1987). These patterns apply to leadership roles as well, where there is an incongruity between gender role behaviors and the definition of leadership (Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt 2001). Consequently, opportunities for leadership are less likely to be offered to women and, when offered and accepted, women may be less likely to achieve success in those leadership roles. These effects are even more pronounced for African American women whose legitimacy is more likely to be challenged (Bell and Nkomo 2001).

The study of second generation gender issues unearths challenges to gender in workplace practices. Building from social roles, Joan Acker (1992) suggests that there are four processes that render organizations gendered, positioning men and women differently when they negotiate. They are: 1) structural gender divisions that subordinate women; as well as 2) organizational symbols that justify these divisions; 3) interactions that often reproduce them; and 4) the organizational members' "mental work" that constructs and maintains an appropriate, gendered organizational persona. Together, these processes serve to render organizations "masculine," consequently disadvantaging those persons who do not fit the ideal of masculinity – women, and certain groups of men.

This gendering of organizations position negotiators differently. Jobs and opportunities are gendered in the sense that certain people are seen to "fit" a job and others are not. These issues of "fit" are often complicated by race, class, and ethnicity. Issues of "fit" apply to workers in a wide variety of professions – from shop floor supervisors to prison guards to Wall Street bankers to lawyers (Pierce 1995; Wilkins and Galuti 1999; Britton 2000; Roth 2006; Skuratowicz and Hunter 2007). Negotiated orders define what constitutes work and how it gets valued. Joyce Fletcher (1999) described the unrecognized work of women engineers who try to anticipate problems before they happen, seek to integrate the work of others, and try to build a team (see Mumby and Putnam 1992). These examples, found within contexts in which masculine approaches to work tend to be highly valued and feminine approaches to work underrated (Valian 1998), suggest that claiming the value of one's work so that it is recognized and rewarded is part of the gendering of negotiation because it occurs in a variety of workplaces (Martin 1994; Ashcraft 1999). But

recognizing this unseen, unvalued work can shift the traditional notions of how jobs and roles are defined (Fletcher 1999). Furthermore, when women seek to succeed by adhering to the masculine ideal, they will suffer backlash because of their refusal to adhere to the feminine stereotype. In the U.S. Supreme Court case *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, Deborah Hopkins was denied partnership and told that she needed to wear more makeup and attend “charm school.”<sup>2</sup> In the pending U.S. Federal District Court case *Kirleis v. Dickie, McCamey & Chilcote*,<sup>3</sup> law firm partner Alyson Kirleis was told that she worked too hard and should be home more with her two children (Schneider et al. 2010).

### **Status, Hierarchy, Power and Privilege**

A second perspective by which to examine gender is to attach gender to status and hierarchy. Negotiations occur in institutional contexts that position negotiators differentially. Cecilia Ridgeway’s work on status construction theory (e.g., Ridgeway and Erikson 2000) provides evidence of how widely held beliefs about the assumed rightful status of members of any identity group spread through interaction. Existing structural conditions within organizations and society reflect a status ordering that places some groups higher than others. This creates a self-reinforcing system that attaches status and provides advantage to individuals because of their group identity. This also explains the backlash when women attempt to move into new professions – e.g., witness women in the U.S. presidential campaign.

When gender status beliefs are operative in interactions, they manifest men’s status value as superior and more competent than women. According to Ridgeway (2001), gender status beliefs have three implications for inequality, particularly in employment. First, they create expectations that men will be more competent than women. These expectations can become self-fulfilling prophecies that affect assertiveness and confidence in negotiation, both of which are necessary for effectiveness (Schneider 2002). Second, gender status beliefs can position men over equivalent women, as more deserving of benefits and rewards. Finally, those who are advantaged by gender status beliefs are less likely to attend to information that might challenge that belief. These status beliefs can be quite difficult to dislodge, often requiring multiple rounds of disconfirming evidence. This clearly has implications for how negotiators are positioned to negotiate.

### **Gender, Identity, and Intersectionality**

In the popular view, gender is an individual characteristic. Gender is reflected in who people are, how they behave, and how they see

themselves (Wharton 2005). This perspective is embodied in sex difference research, where the issue of differences between all men and all women overwhelms the study of intra-group differences. Embedded in this field of work is the notion that one's gender is an essential and stable attribute of the individual and that the "master" category of gender represents the experience of most men and women (Shields 2008).

Feminists have argued that rather than being an essential property of the self, the degree to which a negotiator takes up a gendered role and how that role is expressed is likely to be fluid and fragmented and differentially assumed (Deaux and Major 1990; Ely and Padavic 2007). Individuals have multiple, intersecting, identity memberships that can lead to qualitatively different meanings and experiences that enable (and constrain) their actions within a negotiation. Typically, these dimensions include physical markers such as sex, race, age, and ethnicity, and personal identity markers such as social class, religion, sexual orientation, and social roles in the family, community, and at work.

The intersectionality of gender builds on both gendered order and positioning theory. From our perspective, gender status beliefs need to be elaborated beyond just men and women to consider what happens at the intersection of gender with other aspects of identity. Robin Ely and Irene Padavic (2007) suggest that working class masculinity (brawn) is contrasted to upper class masculinity (brains) and with femininity. Raewyn Connell (2002) describes "subordinated masculinity" as one too closely identified with femininity. Similarly, Ely and Padavic (2007) suggest that stereotypes about women of Asian descent as extremely feminine, for example, place them far from masculine images of success— which center on assertiveness and self-confidence – and therefore disadvantages their career prospects. The process differs for women of color, particularly African American women. When they act competently, assertively, and with self-confidence, they often are perceived as controlling, manipulative, and aggressive (Bell and Nkomo 2001; Collins 2004). These stereotypes can limit their success. Indeed, research suggests that different stereotypes are evoked when gender and race are considered together than when they are considered separately; when we invoke the stereotype of woman, it is white women who are likely to be overrepresented (Warner 2008).

A major challenge for the feminist perspective expressed above is that although intersectionality conceptually makes sense, it is complex both to study, and to implement in practice (Warner 2008; McCall 2005). The reason for this complexity is that one can find herself making a long list of categories – e.g., she is a white, married,

middle class, Christian woman – and then whom do we compare her to – e.g., a white, married, middle class Christian man, or an African American, married, middle class Christian woman, or do we start to change categories of class, sexual orientation, religion, and so on? Because men and women vary on so many dimensions – race, social class, religious beliefs, age, abilities, cultural background – it is important to be clear about which categories of identity are of interest. Some identities matter most of the time while others become more crucial in particular historical moments or contexts (Warner 2008). The former have been called “master” categories, while others might be more emergent (McCall 2005).

More recently, Joan Acker (1992) has expanded her view of gendered organizations to explicitly include intersectionality. She makes this expansion by focusing on what she calls “inequality regimes” (Acker 1992: 565-569). These are defined as the interlocked practices and processes that result in continuing inequalities along the lines of class, race, gender, sexuality, religion, and physical disability, among others, as they play out in work organizations. Case-based examples demonstrate the ways these inequality regimes work in practice and the possibilities for changing them. Telling new stories and making alternative narratives visible can be an intervention for changing dominant organizational discourses (Kolb et al. 2002; Ely and Meyerson 2000).

### **Teaching Gender in a Cross-Cultural Negotiation Classroom**

Since organizations more and more reflect a global community with multi-cultural constraints, we need to prepare ourselves and our students better to be culturally sensitive to gender-based issues in negotiations. We offer a few suggestions framed within various contexts considering how gendered issues play out in negotiations: social roles, negotiated order, status, hierarchy, power and privilege, identity and their intersectionality.

We know that second generation gender issues may, on the surface, appear gender neutral, yet there are distinctly different experiences for women and men; although intentional bias is not so much the focus (as in first generation issues), masculine values dominate the public domain of work. When gender status beliefs are operative, they reflect men’s status as superior and more competent than women. The implications for inequality are critical – men are perceived as more competent and more deserving of rewards (and therefore less likely to relinquish this status). Creating case-based examples to demonstrate the “inequality regimes” in work practices

will highlight the students' understanding of the implications of these regimes when trying to negotiate change.

We suggest two cases. The first, *Marisol's Mandate*, was developed by Fleur Weigert (2000) under Deborah Kolb's supervision. Marisol is a director of programs for an agricultural research and development organization and is responsible for managing several of the agency's international portfolios. She is dealing with a struggling seed dissemination initiative in Peru, working in collaboration with a local partner and her organization's regionally-based representative, both of whom are men. In the process of working on the problems she is surprised to find herself sidelined and bypassed. The dynamics reflect gender, power and conflict avoidance issues. The *Marisol* case can lead to an interesting class discussion and might conclude by having students consider alternative strategies to the gender-status dilemma. In addition, ask students to consider the same case but have Marisol as a man (and therefore, too, working with all men). In what ways would the issues be different? Or, what if Marisol's local partner was a woman? Would that difference likely change the dynamics and if so, in what ways and why?

The second case, *Allison's Arrangement*, was developed by Deborah Kolb (2001). Allison is a senior research scientist working at an international center with its home base in Europe. Her husband works in North Africa and she is now pregnant. She wants to arrange a long-distance telecommuting schedule (from North Africa), but finds the workplace has no work and family policy, and that her boss is reluctant to agree to her proposal. Allison's case has leading questions for students, and forces them to consider what one does to prepare for negotiating under these conditions – how to get her boss to take her seriously – and to develop proposals that would meet the parties' needs. The case could be modified to focus on gender and culture by placing Allison in different places around the world – in Africa or South America or Asia, etc. – and see how students would view the case. Like the modification of the *Marisol* case, what if Allison was a male Ali – how would the students respond differently? Would Ali face even more backlash for following his spouse?

### ***Teaching Gender Status, Hierarchy, Power and Privilege***

Most faculty teaching negotiation are familiar with power-based simulations such as *StarPower*<sup>4</sup> (Shirts 1969) that offer students ways to progress through various levels of society by acquiring wealth. Ultimately, those with the most resources are able to make the rules for the entire group; usually, those with fewer resources experience resentment and frustration. Most of the power-based simulations

work; gender can be superimposed on the same games where women have limited abilities/access to wealth.

To begin a discussion on gendered issues related to status, hierarchy, power and privilege, ask students to consider the possibility that they will awaken tomorrow as a person of the opposite sex. What would be different in their daily lives, and why? After they articulate these likely differences, focus the discussion on issues of power and privilege.

Though more complicated, we encourage replicating or creating variations on the experiments by Catherine Tinsley and her colleagues (2009) that demonstrated ways women and men are treated differently based on the likeability vs. competence dimension. Tinsley put together a series of videos manipulating the behavior of a director (alternatively male and female) to two situations: a work-related technology crash and a family-related sick child problem. The director either stayed at work to deal with the information technology crisis or went home to care for the child. The students then rated the director on questions related to likeability and competence. Female directors were rated more competent if they stayed at work, but less likeable, and were rated less competent if they chose to go home, but more likeable. The ratings for the male directors were consistent: they were always judged competent and likeable regardless of staying at work or going home.

Similarly, a teacher could divide the class into four groups, have them read a similar scenario and instruct the class to rate the director on likeability v. competence. These types of simulations and experiments, where students see ways their own ratings are influenced by gender, enrich the discussion that should follow. Guide student reflection by asking them such pertinent questions as: how did it feel to be able to make the rules for the entire group? What were the reactions of the others? What would you do to negotiate on behalf of those persons who are less powerful?

### ***Teaching the Intersectionality of Gender With Other Aspects of Identity***

There are a number of ways educators and scholars can teach how gender intersects with identity. Scholars have captured the complexity of intersectionality by focusing on individual narratives and stories. As Aida Hurtado has suggested, when different groups of women, in her case, Latina, tell their stories, they can shift from one group's perception of social reality to another, and at times, are able simultaneously to perceive multiple social realities without losing their sense of self-coherence (Hurtado 1989). These stories can bring to light alternative accounts and perspectives that might not other-

wise be obvious. Individual stories shift experiences from that of a “generalized other” to a “concrete other,” enabling people to connect in ways more abstract accounts do not (Benhabib 1992; Cobb 2000). If a class is sufficiently diverse, ask students in small groups to tell their stories about experiences that reflect this intersectionality of gender and identity. If the class is not diverse, case studies can capture intersectionality, particularly if they reveal different perspectives on the same phenomenon. In this way, comparisons among groups can be made.

Another approach is to use cultural scripts around certain social phenomena of interest (Holvino 2009). For example, one can consider a factor like “being emotional” and consider its meanings for different groups – white women (upset), black men (hostile), Asian women (reserved) (Warner 2008). These approaches, in capturing the simultaneity of different identities, help us appreciate their dynamic character. Identities are not static; instead, they are repeatedly negotiated as people take action. Each of these ways of approaching intersectionality has implications for teaching about the “who” in negotiation.

At the Istanbul conference, we engaged in several experiential activities. Divided into small teams with diverse membership – by gender, nationality, religion – we were given assignments to conduct a negotiation in the spice market, to purchase something for the group’s afternoon snack, to capture an image on camera that reflected something dangerous, and to capture an image that reflected the intersection of the sacred and the secular. These activities – called *Adventure Learning* – worked because the subsequent debriefing provoked a number of responses that ultimately led to writing about various topics pertinent to second generation teaching. With greater intentionality regarding the conference assignment, these activities can become gender-based learning. For example, in what ways does the spice market, though public, reflect the underlying task of women purchasing food for the family (private domain)? Are women just as capable or successful in their negotiations as men at the market? Do cross-cultural partnerships (Turkish and American women) make a difference, and in what ways? Do men and women translate “danger” in different ways? What about differences in the meaning of sacred and secular? Add dimensions of religion, ethnicity and race with gender. What happens? Though spice markets are not so available in most of our cities, there are farmers’ markets, flea markets, hotel chains, restaurants, etc., where students could experiment with these complexities as they conduct negotiations in the field. (For a “post-Istanbul” experiment, see Manwaring,

McAdoo, and Cheldelin, *Orientation and Disorientation*, in this volume.)

Cases and experiments allow students to speculate on ways negotiations can address these gendered complexities, domestically and cross-culturally. Telling the stories and articulating the narratives of actors across different axes of power and identity practices is an important intervention for changing dominant organizational discourses. The process of story-telling brings to light alternative narratives that seldom find their way into mainstream accounts and organizational mythologies (Calás and Smircich 1999; Ely and Meyerson 2000).

Faculty should encourage students to think broadly about ways negotiation is changing (second generation). For example, returning to the situation in Turkey where a male faculty member failed half of his all-women class, what could the female students have done? If half of an all-male class had failed, what would the male students have done? Are the same options available to women? (Schneider 1994) Why or why not? Perhaps the students should enlist allies, seek assistance from a third party, or advocacy group – for example, by enlisting the parents of the female students. This kind of discussion can also lead to considering ways to avoid backlash (advocating on behalf of a group rather than individual cases, or seeking assistance from a third party or advocacy group) and being more effective in that particular gendered order (Tinsley et al. 2009).

## Conclusion

Our intention with this article is to articulate ways to move away from the dominant approach of teaching gender (first generation) – often viewed as “fixing women” or dealing with stereotypes – to providing a smorgasbord of approaches that faculty can use to raise gender issues as they travel around the world (second generation). We have presented three different models – gendered orders, power and hierarchy, and intersectionality – with the hope that faculty will be able to raise with their students a variety of issues around gender that both women and men must address within different cultures, and to provide a richer context for gender (along with culture, religion, ethnicity, and education) as it plays out in negotiations.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> *Lust v. Sealy*, 383 F.3d 580, 583 (7th Cir. 2004).  
<sup>2</sup> *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, 490 U.S. 228 (1989).  
<sup>3</sup> *Kirleis v. Dickie, McCamey & Chilcote*, 560 F.3d 156 (2009).  
<sup>4</sup> Available for purchase through Simulation Training Systems, <http://www.stsintl.com/> (last accessed June 20, 2010).

## References

- Acker, J. 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society* 4(2): 139-158.
- Acker, J. 1992. From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology* 23(5): 565-569.
- Al-Dabbagh, M. 2008. The context for intergroup leadership among women's groups in Saudi Arabia. *Working Paper Series*. Dubai, UAE: Dubai School of Government.
- Ashcraft, K. L. 1999. Managing maternity leave: A qualitative analysis of temporary executive succession. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44 (2): 240-280.
- Bell, E. L. J. and S. M. Nkomo. 2001. *Our separate ways: Black and white women and the struggle for professional identity*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Benhabib, S. 1992. *Situating the self: Gender, community and postmodernism in contemporary ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Borzak, L. (ed.) 1971. *Field study: A source book for experiential learning*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Bowles, H. R., L. C. Babcock, and L. Lai. 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.
- Britton, D. M. 2000. The epistemology of the gendered organization. *Gender and Society* 14(3): 418-434.
- Calás, M. B. and L. Smircich. 2009. Feminist perspectives on gender in organizational research: What is and is yet to be. In *Handbook of Organizational Research Methods*, edited by D. Buchanan and A. Bryman. London: Sage.
- Cobb, S. 2000. Imagine co-existence: Narratives from fieldwork in Rwanda. *CGO Learning Seminar*. Boston: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons School of Management.
- Collins, P.H. 2004. *Black sexual politics: African Americans, gender, and the new racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Connell, R. W. 2002. *Gender*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Correll, S. J., S. Benard, and I. Paik. 2007. Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5): 1297-1338.

- Cuddy, A. J. C., S. T. Fiske, V. S. Y. Kwan, P. Glick, S. Demoulin, J. Ph. Leyens, and M. H. Bond. 2009. Stereotype content model across cultures: Universal similarities and some differences. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 48(1): 1-33. Available at <http://www.people.hbs.edu/acuddy/2009,%20cuddy%20et%20al.,%20BJSP.pdf> (last accessed May 18, 2010).
- Dau-Schmidt, K. G., M. S. Galanter, K. Mukhopadhaya, and K. E. Hull. 2009. Men and women of the bar: The impact of gender on legal careers. *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law* 16(1): 49-145.
- Deaux, K., and B. Major. 1990. A social-psychological model of gender. In *Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference*, edited by D. L Rhode. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Eagly, A. H. 1987. *Sex difference and social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagly, A. H., and M. C. Johannesen-Schmidt. 2001. The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 781-797.
- Eagly, A. H. and L. C. Carli. 2007. *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Ely, R. J. and D. Meyerson. 2000. Theories of gender in organizations: a new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 22: 103-151.
- Ely, R. and I. Padavic. 2007. A feminist analysis of organizational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review* 32(4): 1121-1143.
- Flax, J. 1990. Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory. In *Feminism/postmodernism: Thinking gender*, edited by L. J. Nicholson. New York: Routledge.
- Fletcher, J. K. 1999. *Disappearing acts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. and A. Machung. 1997. *The second shift: working parents and the revolution at home, 2nd edn*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Holvino, E. (forthcoming). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work and Organization (special issue on gender and ethnicity)*.
- Honeyman, C. and S. Cheldelin. 2002. Have gavel, will travel: Dispute resolution's innocents abroad. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 19(3): 363-372.
- Hurtado, A. 1989. Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of white women and women of color. *Signs* 14(3): 833-855.
- Kolb, D. A., and R. Fry. 1975. Toward an applied theory of experiential learning. In *Theories of group process*, edited by C. Cooper. London: John Wiley.
- Kolb, D. M., J. K. Fletcher, D. Meyerson, D. Merrill-Sands, and R. J. Ely. 2002. Making change: A framework for promoting gender equity. In *Reader in gender, work, and organization*, edited by R. J. Ely, E. G. Foldy, and M. A. Scully. Victoria, Australia: Blackwell Publishing.

- Kolb, D. M. and K. L. McGinn. 2009. Beyond gender and negotiation to gendered negotiations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* 2(1): 1-16.
- Kolb, D. M. 2001. *Allison's Arrangement*. Unpublished case, available from author at the Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons Graduate School of Management.
- Kolb, D. M. 2009. Too bad for women or does it have to be? Gender and negotiation research over the past 25 years. *Negotiation Journal* 25(4): 515-531.
- Koller, V., S. Harvey, and M. Magnotta. *Technologically based learning strategies*. Oakland, CA: Social Policy Research Associates. Available at <http://www.business-access.com/about/techbasedlearningstrategies.pdf> (last accessed Apr. 2, 2010).
- Martin, J. 1994. The organization of exclusion: Institutionalization of sex inequality, gendered faculty jobs and gendered knowledge in organizational theory and research. *Organization* 1(2): 401-431.
- McCall, L. 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs* 30(3): 1771-1800.
- Miller, J. B. 1976. *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mumby, D. K. and L. L. Putnam. 1992. The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded rationality. *Academy of Management Review* 17 (3): 465-485.
- Pierce, J. 1995. *Gender trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Reskin, B. F. and P. A. Roos. 1987. Status hierarchies and sex segregation. In *Ingredients for women's employment policy*, edited by C. Bose and G. Spitze. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ridgeway, C. 2001. Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(4): 637-655.
- Ridgeway, C. and S. Correll. 2004. Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender and Society* 18(4): 510-531.
- Ridgeway, C.L. and K. G. Erickson. 2000. Creating and spreading status beliefs. *American Journal of Sociology* 106(3): 579-615.
- Risman, B. J. 2004. Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender and Society* 18(4): 429-450.
- Roth, L. M. 2006. *Selling women short: Gender and money on Wall Street*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schneider, A. K. 1994. Effective responses to offensive comments. *Negotiation Journal* 10(2): 107-115.
- Schneider, A. K. 2002. Shattering negotiation myths: Empirical evidence on the effectiveness of negotiation styles, *Harvard Negotiation Law Review* 7: 143-233.
- Schneider, A. K., C. H. Tinsley, S. I. Cheldelin, and E. T. Amanatullah. 2010. Likeability v. competence: Why political candidates face it but lawyers do not. *Duke Journal of Gender Law and Policy* (forthcoming).

- Shields, S. A. 2008. Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles* 59(5-6): 301-311.
- Shirts, R. G. 1969. *StarPower: A simulation for understanding power and empowerment*. Del Mar, CA: Simulation Training Systems. Available at <http://www.stsintl.com/> (last accessed June 20, 2010).
- Skuratowicz, E. and L. W. Hunter. 2004. Where do women's jobs come from? *Work and Occupations*. 31(1): 73-110.
- Stanford, H. B. 2009. Do you want to be an attorney or a mother? Arguing for a feminist solution to the problem of double binds in employment and family responsibilities discrimination. *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & The Law* 17(3): 627-657.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., and A. E. Walters. 1999. Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology* 52(3): 653-677.
- Sturm, S. 2001. Second generation employment discrimination: A structural approach. *Columbia Law Review* 101(3): 458-568.
- Tinsley, C. H., S. I. Cheldelin, A. K. Schneider, and E. T. Amanatullah. 2009. Women at the bargaining table: Pitfalls and prospects. *Negotiation Journal* 25(2): 233-248.
- Valian, V. 1998. *Why so slow?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wade, M. E. 2001. Women and salary negotiation: The costs of self-advocacy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 25(1): 65-76.
- Warner, L. R. 2008. A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research. *Sex Roles* 59: 454-463
- Weigert, F. 2000. *Marisol's Mandate*. Unpublished case available from Deborah Kolb, Simmons Graduate School of Management.
- Wharton, A. S. 2005. *The sociology of gender: An introduction to theory and research*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wilkins, D. and G. Mitu Gulati. 1996. Why are there so few black lawyers in corporate law firms: An institutional analysis. *California Law Review* 84: 493-625.