City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

2019

Gender in Negotiation: Preparing Public Administrators for the 21st Century Workplace

Maria J. D'Agostino
CUNY John Jay College

Helisse Levine
Long Island University

Meghna Sabharwal
The University of Texas at Dallas

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_pubs/389

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Gender in negotiation: Preparing public administrators for the 21st century workplace

Maria D'Agostino, Helisse Levine & Meghna Sabharwal

To cite this article: Maria D'Agostino, Helisse Levine & Meghna Sabharwal (2019): Gender in negotiation: Preparing public administrators for the 21st century workplace, Journal of Public Affairs Education, DOI: [10.1080/15236803.2019.1579594](https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2019.1579594)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2019.1579594>

Published online: 21 Mar 2019.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 66

View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Gender in negotiation: Preparing public administrators for the 21st century workplace

Maria D'Agostino^a, Helisse Levine^b, and Meghna Sabharwal^c

^aJohn Jay College of Criminal Justice CUNY; ^bLIU Brooklyn; ^cUniversity at Dallas School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences

ABSTRACT

This exploratory study questions whether Master of Public Administration programs prepare future public administrators to how gender plays out in negotiations that occur in organizations. Negotiated Order and Second-Generation Bias perspectives provide the theoretical basis to understand that negotiations in organizations may privilege masculine practices. In light of this gender leaning, the classroom is a necessary incubator for understanding gender differences in negotiation. Curricula and survey response data retrieved from NASPAA accredited MPA programs suggest that gender in negotiation is not being addressed in the MPA classroom. Public managers must negotiate for scarce organizational resources including salary, promotion, and other workplace capital. Recognizing that gender in negotiation remains hidden under the shadow of second-generation bias is the first step to the success of future public administrators. We must begin to educate our future public managers with a distinctive negotiation skillset as they navigate the 21st century workplace.

Keywords

Bias; gender; negotiation; second generation gender bias

Introduction

Public managers negotiate many issues, in many contexts, on many days, if not every day. Several studies (e.g. Taylor, Mesmer-Magnus, & Burns, 2008) document the importance of effective negotiation with one's co-workers, superiors, and subordinates to achieve success in today's global workplace as both a central activity in the public sector (Bouwman, 2013) and a core skill for professionals, union management teams, government officials and community leaders (Cohn, Kovach, & de Backer, 2009). Effective negotiation enables managers to build, maintain, and improve important relationships, reach agreements, find solutions to tough problems, and achieve goals (HR.BLR.com, 2011).

Negotiation also relates to several important human resource workplace issues, including pay parity across gender. However, gender differences in managerial work do not indicate that men and women differ greatly in the competencies they possess. Yet, Blackaby, Booth, and Frank (2005) report that men receive more outside offers than women of comparable characteristics and

gain higher pay increases over time. Gender role stereotyping is pervasive and women are less likely than men to be perceived by both male and female managers as displaying the characteristics of an effective manager (Streber, Thompson, & Heron, 1997). Although the ability to navigate routine negotiations contributes to the effectiveness of job delivery, the personal stakes are much higher when it comes to negotiations that affect career progress, including salaries, promotions, working arrangements and learning and development opportunities (www.wgea.gov.au). Further, Small, Gelfand, Babcock, and Gettman (2007) suggest that not all situations are “transparently” negotiable. In other words, it may be typical to negotiate salary upon first being hired but becomes less clear what (and if) can be negotiated throughout one’s career; these are the situations that need to be recognized as negotiable. Moreover, emerging forms of organizations including flattened hierarchies, lower formalization, increased participation and employee turnover (Small et al., 2007) have added to the changing landscape of the 21st century workplace providing unprecedented opportunities for the need to negotiate beyond compensation and dispute resolution (Rousseau, 2005). Also contributing to negotiation challenges is an increase in workplace diversity and reliance on virtual technologies to communicate (Goldman & Shapiro, 2012).

Given the dynamic nature of public organizations in a global 21st century (Warner, 2010), the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions in both politics and business (Pande & Ford, 2011) and the pervasive wage disparity in the U.S. Labor market (Kalantari, 2012), this study examines whether Master of Public Administration (MPA) programs prepare future public administrators by providing the skills for dealing with gender in negotiation. Negotiated Order and Second-Generation Bias perspectives provide the theoretical basis to understand that negotiations in organizations may privilege masculine practices. We argue that in light of this gender leaning, the classroom becomes a necessary incubator for understanding gender differences in negotiation. In 2012 Beaty and Davis argued, “[a] guiding principle of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), the accrediting body for professional public affairs programs, is that graduate programs should demonstrate both insight and foresight to respond to changing needs” (p. 618). Accordingly, the MPA degree serves as the gateway to attain the skills and knowledge for pre and in-service public managers and is the widely accepted professional credential for a management career in public service. In addition, according to the Council of Graduate Schools’ (2014) CGS/GRE Survey of Graduate Enrollment and Degrees, of the total number of first-time graduate enrollment in public administration in Fall 2014, women accounted for 77.5% of new enrollees vs. 22.5% of men. Schachter (2017) suggested that one approach to learn about issues of gender and public management is to explore whether MPA programs have developed courses on gender and which issues such courses cover. Therefore, considering also that the majority of MPA

students are women (Perry, 2013), the MPA program serves as a suitable population to answer this study's research question: Do MPA programs prepare future public administrators for the 21st century workplace by providing the skills for dealing with gender in negotiation?

Analyzing survey responses retrieved from NASPAA accredited MPA programs this study adds to the literature by providing information regarding the importance of negotiation skills as a topic of research and an essential skillset that may be lacking in MPA programs across the country and abroad. Building on Beaty and Davis's (2012) claim for enhancing gender visibility within the MPA leadership curriculum, we argue negotiation skills are important for MPA students, particularly women, as they enter the job market or look for career advancement. We also argue that the importance of mastering negotiation skills extends to the day-to-day management of employees and the overall success of the organization. From a gendered perspective, traditional societal, institutional, and stereotypical gender roles may put women at a disadvantage when it comes to negotiating (Bowles & McGinn, 2009). Even small gender effects, Paddock and Kray (2011) caution, when aggregated over time, can have dramatic and detrimental effects. Understanding the effects of gender on negotiation, Bowles (2013) advises, provides important insights into how micro-level interactions contribute to larger social phenomena, such as gender gaps in pay and authority. Greig (2008) suggests that employees who have a propensity to negotiate are promoted on average 17 months more quickly than those who do not. We argue that negotiation skills is not only an important curriculum offering for MPA female students – rather, all students of public administration will be at a competitive *dis*-advantage if not equipped with the negotiation skills necessary to navigate the 21st century workplace and beyond.

A background to negotiation in public organizations and a review of the gender in negotiation literature follow. We then offer an historical viewpoint of stereotypes in negotiation, and discuss Negotiated Order Theory and Second General Bias perspectives. Next, the study's methodology is explained. We conclude with the significance of the findings in terms of public administration education, and recommendations for a continued effort in gender in negotiation discourse.

Negotiation in public organizations

When looking at gender in negotiation, the general consensus of the literature is that women managers in particular encounter a different set of negotiations than their male colleagues for several reasons (Eagly & Carli, 2007). For one, invisible barriers to women's advancement arise from cultural beliefs about genders. Second, workplace structures, practices, and patterns of interaction exist that inadvertently favor men (Calás & Smircich, 1991; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Kolb & McGinn, 2009; Sturm, 2001). In terms of

workplace structure, Bowles (2013) for example has coined the term “offer behavior” as a strategic use of gender stereotypes reflected in initial proposals and the exchange of counter-proposals where negotiators adjust their offers depending on whether they are negotiating with a man or a woman (p. 6). Negotiation research has also documented a greater negotiation advantage for men than for women. For example, gender differences that are due to perceptions, in turn, may contribute to the persistence of salary and workplace inequity between women and men (Exley, Niederle & Lise Vesterlund, 2016; Guthrie, Magyar, Eggert, & Kain, 2009).

The definitions and literature on negotiation cross disciplines as varied as economics (Calcott, 2008), law (Bellucci & Zeleznikow, 2005), international relations (Schiff, 2014), psychology (Lens, 2004; Bendersky & Curhan, 2009), conflict management (Ma, 2007) and in the public (Association of Accredited Public Policy Advocates to the European Union, 2014; Caverley, Cunningham, & Mitchell, 2006; Twemlow & Sacco, 2003) and private (Roth, 2009) sectors. In 2008, Alfredson and Congu provided one of the most comprehensive reviews of negotiation literature, including theory and strategies. In terms of definition, Community Catalyst (2004) defines negotiation as “a way to resolve disputes and conflicts that arise when people and groups interact with one another” ... “a productive way to get at least some of what we want from others through compromise and agreement.” (p. 5). Within the public sector, negotiation is one approach to conflict resolution – and an integral part of the democratic decision-making process that provides a mechanism for coordinating interests, resolving conflicts, and averting deadlock, thereby promoting more inclusive policy formulation and more effective policy implementation (Association of Accredited Public Policy Advocates to the European Union, 2014). Writing for the National League of Cities, Bell (2014) noted:

The best public sector negotiators know the fundamentals of negotiations. They have not only good “table skills,” but a long term strategy for achieving their end goal. They learn how to say “no” and maintain the relationship. They learn not to close a deal too early – or too late. They know how to balance transparency, public disclosure and citizen involvement with the efficiency of the “back room deal.” They refrain from “argument dilution,” and present their most salient interests clearly.

The Negotiation Experts (n.d.), who provide training and consulting in sales and procurement negotiations, define negotiation as “an interactive process between two or more parties seeking to find common ground on an issue or issues of mutual interest or dispute where the involved parties seek to make or find a mutually acceptable agreement that will be honored by all the parties concerned.” As a strategy, negotiation can range from principled or interest-based (e.g. the current trend which is more cooperative or win-win in nature) as Fisher and Ury (2011) advocate, to a positional or more traditional adversarial style.

For the purpose of this study, negotiation is viewed as both a topic of research and a learned skill set (Movius, 2008) that moves beyond compensation negotiation (Babcock and Laschever (2007) and negotiation in collective bargaining (Fells, 2000; Rose, 2004), to also include agenda setting, policy formation and policy implementation negotiation (Fuller & Fritzen, 2007), negotiation in the workplace (HR.BLR.com, 2011), procurement (Matthews, 2011) and negotiating with constituents, neighboring municipalities, the press, colleagues, executive offices, the union and staff (Bell, 2014).

Gender in negotiation

Gender differences, several scholars claim (e.g. Mazei et al., 2015), continue to be among the most enduring issues in negotiation research. Not surprising, however, the motivation for much of the recent research on gender and negotiation has been an attempt to understand the wage and achievement gap (Kolb, 2013). The general conclusion of the literature is that there is a pattern that men gain greater negotiation outcomes than women (Miles & Clenney, 2010). Eckel, de Oliveira, and Grossman (2008) suggest that although women may be different from men in ways that affect their behavior and performance in a negotiation, stereotyping is much more likely to explain greater negotiation outcomes rather than any real underlying differences in behavior which may undermine an otherwise successful negotiation. Similarly, Paddock and Kray (2011) conclude that stereotypes contribute to the view that women are less competent negotiators than men. As a result, aware of these stereotypes and the associated disadvantages, women negotiators may experience stereotype threat, which, according to Kray, Thompson, and Galinsky (2001) often results in women's lower negotiation performance, in part because stereotype threat can reduce individuals' goals.

In addition to evidence of the disproportionate number of professional and managerial positions held by men in private (Niederle & Vesterlund, 2008) and government (D'Agostino & Levine, 2010) organizations, several scholars (e.g. Babcock, Gelfand, Small, & Stayn, 2006; Bowles, 2013; Bowles & McGinn, 2009; Small et al., 2007) document the implications of gender inequities in negotiation. For example, Babcock and Laschever (2007) report that men are four times more likely to ask for higher pay than are women with the same qualifications. Similarly, Barron (2003) illustrates that: 1) men make significantly higher salary requests, 2) women and men have different beliefs about requesting a higher salary, and 3) these beliefs were connected to the differing salary request. Furthermore, when looking at negotiations from a gendered perspective, one dimension of the inequities revealed is that fewer women than men are likely to negotiate (e.g. the "ask gap"). Notwithstanding the long list of explanations, including job choice, career interruption, experience levels, who's in a union, hours worked, discrimination, available child care (Barron, 2003) and occupation and industry sorting of

men and women into jobs that pay differently throughout the economy (Chamberlain, 2016) the ask gap is also a significant predictor of differences in starting salaries and a contributing factor in the overall salary differential between men and women (Paddock & Kray, 2011). Relatively minor gender differences in initiating a negotiation at the beginning of an individual's career, Babcock and Lashever (2003) assert, can result in substantial lost income over a lifetime, as a lower starting salary results in a smaller base on which interest can grow and subsequent raises and bonuses are based. Indeed, not only are women's earnings lower than men's at each level of educational attainment (Pathways, 2016), in 2015 in women working full time in the United States typically were paid just 80 percent of what men were paid, a gap of 20% (Proctor, Semega, and Kollar (2016).

Historical view of stereotypes in negotiation

Early research on the study of gender in negotiation starts and ends with gender stereotypes. In other words, gender would function like a personality variable, predicting men and women's negotiation behavior and performance in gender-stereotypic ways. Namely, women would be relationship-oriented cooperators, and men would be analytically minded competitors. If men and women fulfilled these expectations, Lax and Sebenius (1986) pointed out, male negotiators would be more effective than female negotiators at "claiming value" (i.e., gaining a larger share of the value to be divided), and potentially also at "creating value" (i.e., searching for trades that expand the value to be divided). However, women might be more reliable advocates for peace in a conflict situation (Maoz, 2009). These early scholars of gender in negotiation had little success substantiating these stereotypes as consistent predictors of men and women's negotiation performance. Yet, as contemporary scholars have shown, these gender-stereotypic expectations continue to thrive, sometimes to virulent effect.

In the mid-1990s, psychological researchers started paying more attention to the social construction of gender in negotiation. Informed by advances in psychological research on gender in social behavior, they started investigating situational factors that might moderate gender effects in negotiation. Walters, Stuhlmacher, and Meyer (1998) published a path-breaking meta-analysis of gender and negotiation behavior. Synthesizing 35 years of research, they found a modest overall tendency for women to be more cooperative negotiators than men. However, this effect was driven by the results of face-to-face negotiations and did not appear to extend to anonymous bargaining exercises, such as matrix games, in which parties are typically physically separated and make a parsimonious set of behavioral choices with differential expected payoffs (e.g., "cooperate" or "defect" in the Prisoner's Dilemma). They proposed that the potential for stereotype conformity increased with the types of communication between negotiators (e.g., greater conformity in face-to-face interactions

than in written or scripted ones). During the same time period Stuhlmacher and Walters (1999) conducted a meta-analysis of 21 studies of explicit negotiations over issues, such as sales or compensation (i.e., no matrix games). They found that men negotiated higher individual payoffs than did women, but also observed preliminary evidence that stereotypic gender differences might be greatest in masculine-stereotyped negotiations (e.g., compensation or car sales) and when negotiation roles align with gender-stereotypic status differences (e.g., male employer, female candidate). These meta-analyses stoked researchers' curiosity about when, why, and how gender effects in negotiation emerge.

During the first decade of the 21st century, the content and implications of gender stereotypes in negotiation became an important research area. Kray and Thompson (2004) published an extensive qualitative review of the literature, theorizing that stereotypes were the root of gender effects in negotiation. Informed by their own work on stereotype fulfillment and reactance in negotiation (e.g. Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002; Kray, Reb, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004; Kray et al., 2001), they argued for a situational approach to the study of gender in negotiation. In their review, they illustrated ebbs and flows of gender effects across negotiation contexts. With the benefit of stronger psychological theory and empirical evidence than was available to Rubin and Brown in 1975, who argued almost four decades ago that men and women held different foci at the bargaining table – men on maximizing their own earnings either competed or cooperated – and women, on the other hand, who held an interpersonal orientation focused on relationships (Miles & Clenney, 2010). Kray and Thompson (2004) swept aside the notion of gender as a personality type and argued for deeper investigation of how stereotypes influence negotiation performance.

Second-generation gender bias in negotiation

Oftentimes, gender bias enters the workforce in a more subtle and unconscious manner. Instances include when women are designated as the note taker during meetings, are disadvantaged as a result of pregnancy, and feel pressured to balance assertiveness with warmth (King & Jones, 2016). A term used in the business management literature, Schachter (2017) notes that second generation forms of gender bias underscores that lived experience of women in public agencies include barriers that arise from cultural beliefs about gender and workplace practices that unintentionally favor men. According to Iberra, Ely and Kolb (2013a, 2013b) second-generation bias erects powerful but subtle and often invisible barriers for women that arise from cultural assumptions and organizational structures, practices, and patterns of interaction that inadvertently benefit men while putting women at a disadvantage. Without an understanding of second-generation bias, they maintain, people are left with

stereotypes to explain why women as a group have failed to achieve parity with men – if they can't reach the top, it is because they “don't ask,” are “too nice,” or simply “opt out.” As a result, issues that arise from second-generation gender bias shape particular negotiated orders such that they can have differential consequences for groups of women and men when they negotiate (Acker, 1990; Sturm, 2001). For example, Ely and Meyerson (2000) identify several different types of second-generation practices that may extend to and shape negotiations in organizations, including how jobs are formally defined, evaluation and performance reviews, and informal patterns of work. These practices reflect cultural narratives that define basic assumptions about how things get done in a particular organization.

Gendered practices also include the shaping of assumptions about who is seen as a leader and the legitimacy attached to the role, the value assigned to different skills and contributions, and how the lines between work life and life outside of work are evaluated. While all of these practices can seem benign to some of the people within and outside the organization, they may be experienced quite differently depending on the differential power people have and the positions people occupy. Bear and Babcock (2012) argue that gender differences in negotiation performance depend on the nature of the negotiation topic itself. When women are placed in gender-incongruent situations, such as when a woman occupies a masculine, agentic role (e.g., a top managerial position) they tend to behave in a counter-stereotypical way. These types of gender-incongruent situations they say, may lead to anxiety and role conflict and tend to elicit more negative evaluation. They recommend that negotiation researchers and those who teach courses on negotiation should pay attention to the materials they use – and in particular to whether the negotiation issues are masculine, feminine, or neutral. Proposing that opportunities for biases that infect decisions should be limited. King and Jones (2016) recommend that structured interviews (e.g., fixed format with a fixed set of questions to be answered based on the job in question) are better predictors of potential employee performance than unstructured interviews because less structure leads to more opportunities for bias to creep in. This includes, they suggest, the non-job related chit-chat that often occurs between an interviewer and applicant before an interview begins; subtle behaviors in this informal part of the interview can affect the likelihood of an employment offer. At the very least, understanding this type of tacit thinking begins to neutralize gender differences in the workplace in general, and negotiation specifically. As mentioned earlier in this article, Schachter (2017) argues that gender remains a systematic barrier to advancement, and calls on MPA programs to incorporate second-generation bias issues into the curriculum that focus on the actual experience of men and women in public workplaces.

Negotiated order theory

Gertrude Stein's notable phrase "a negotiation is a negotiation is a negotiation" has been critiqued because of the focus on negotiation processes as if they were all the same, without consideration of context in shaping these processes (Strauss, 1978, p. 7). This critique lends itself to Negotiated Order Theory because it highlights that negotiations are ongoing/present across organizations and are not one-shot deals. Rather, according to Negotiated Order Theory, negotiations reflect the societal and organizational structures that have historically benefited men and overlooked different groups, including women, the presence of women and men power position, and the extent to which negotiations have included or benefitted men and women differently in the past (Kolb & McGinn 2009).

Kolb and McGinn (2009) identify three main features of Negotiated Order Theory that are relevant when considering gender in negotiation. First, the subject of negotiation is structured around the work that is done. Strauss (1978) explains that "negotiated order on any given day is the sum total of an organization's rules and policies, along with whatever agreements, understandings, pacts, contracts, and other working arrangements currently obtained." These include "agreements at every level or organization, of every clique and coalition, and include covert as well as overt agreements" (pp. 5–6). In other words, "the subject of negotiation is structured around the work that is done" (Kolb, 2013). For example, negotiations mark the activities involved in designing jobs, doing work, avoiding work, achieving status, and establishing boundaries of authority and responsibility, among a host of other potential issues. Because jobs, work, status, and authority are gendered, this view of organizational negotiations Kolb and McGinn (2009) argue, contrasts sharply with the transactional, economic perspective that forms the basis for much of the current negotiation research.

A second relevant aspect of negotiated order theory is that negotiators are organized actors. What this means is that each 'situation' is influenced by the contexts within which actions occur. What matters to each actor depends on their position in the organization and personal preferences. Controlling the situation is critical and in organizations, the status and power of the 'negotiator' defines the situation. For example, individuals may define the situation because of their position, gender or other attributes.

Third, is that organizational structure, practices and policies are products of previous negotiations. The key here is that although the negotiated order may be stable within a given context or situation, the ongoing negotiations have the potential to change the order over time with a succession of small wins.

Sturm (2001) notes that although second-generation gender issues appear neutral and natural on their face, they result in different experiences for and treatment of women and men. Distinct from first-generation gender

discrimination which involve intentional acts of bias, second-generation gender practices seem unbiased in isolation, but 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. What this means is that women will face a different set of negotiations than their male colleagues (Eagly & Carli, 2007) because they have to negotiate over issues that men can take as givens – such as opportunities for promotion and training, mentoring, client assignments, partnership arrangements, resources, and office space, among others. As highlighted by Kolb and McGinn (2009) when such negotiations occur, they take place in the context of a particular *negotiated order* that is within cultural patterns and work practices. These authors underscore the importance of how these patterns and practices might shape our understanding of gender and negotiation in the workplace and the implications of this framing for research and practice. Kolb and Putnam (1992) warned that the issues themselves are not clearly defined but rather are socially constructed as part of the negotiation. These negotiable, but socially constructed and gendered issues include the parameters of jobs, understandings of leaders and leadership, gaining credit for work, building and sustaining personal networks, and beliefs about the ideal worker.

One of the premises of negotiated order theory is that individual negotiations accumulate to alter the existing order (Fine, 1984). Kolb and McGinn (2009) suggest that this is an important second-generation gender negotiation issue – it is not about bargaining for a certain job and the accompanying compensation but of first, redefining the norms and expectations around what it takes to be seen as an appropriate fit and second, to succeed in a given job or at a given level in an organization. This argument concerns the experience women have accrued relative to their male counterparts. Too much time in a staff role or scattered assignments may not build the kind of résumé leaders look for when they make promotion decisions. Negotiating about second-generation gender issues, such as concern about maternity, child care, and flexible work arrangements can also challenge deeply held beliefs that may not be directly voiced or addressed but are part of the shadow negotiation (Kolb & Williams, 2000).

Data and methods

Given the increasingly collaborative organizational landscape, escalating number of women working in the public sector, and continued gendered inequalities, the need to prepare public administrators to negotiate in the everyday workplace is imperative. The purpose of this study was to answer the question: Do MPA programs prepare future public administrators for the 21st century workplace by providing the skills for dealing with gender in negotiation?

This two-phase, cross-sectional, exploratory research design began with an Internet search of course descriptions and course syllabi of NASPAA's 180 accredited institutions to determine whether the MPA curricula included courses in negotiation in general. Web-based searches have been used in prior public administration literature to retrieve program and course descriptions (Levine, Christian & Lyons, 2013; Sabharwal, Hijal-Moghrabi, & Royster, 2014). Initial search words included course titles that included traditional negotiation offerings including compensation, collective bargaining, and procurement negotiation. However, it may be possible that negotiation skills are taught in courses that do not explicitly include the word 'negotiation' in the title or extend beyond the standard negotiation courses, such as Labor Relations or Conflict Resolution. Therefore to determine first whether MPA curricula include negotiation courses and second, whether elements of gender are incorporated into those courses, an Internet questionnaire was distributed to MPA program directors via survey monkey in September 2016. Our sample consisted of NASPAA accredited MPA program directors. We identified our targeted group of MPA directors as an appropriate population for a web-based research method because coverage bias (due to sampling people without access to the Internet) is not an issue since most university personnel use emails and access the Internet frequently each day (Solomon, 2001); an official email list was obtained from NASPAA.

Emails were also sent to MPA Directors at each of the 180 NASPAA accredited schools requesting participation in the study and provided an embedded link to an online questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 13 questions, including two open-ended questions to provide additional contextual information about negotiation courses. Respondents were asked whether the topic of gender in negotiation was addressed in the curriculum. Questions around gender in negotiation were also developed to gather more nuanced information on course curriculum including specificity of negotiation skills covered, courses, and aspects of gender negotiation.

To increase response rate, follow up emails were sent to elicit additional responses approximately 14 days after the initial emails were generated. In general, web surveys have a lower response rate than mail surveys (Couper & Triplet, 1999; Solomon, 2001); however, this effort was able to generate an acceptable response rate. A total of 75 responses were collected for a 50% response rate.

Results

The overview of the NASPAA accredited website reveals that only 36 courses, or 20%, of the programs offer a course on negotiation. Twenty-one courses contained the term 'negotiation', two courses contained the term 'bargaining' and four courses contained the term 'mediation', seven courses contained the terms

Table 1. NASPAA Accredited programs negotiation courses overview.

NASPAA Accredited MPA/MPP Program	Course with Negotiation/Bargaining/ Mediation in Title		Course Description Available
	Yes	No	5
180	36	144	21

‘conflict’ and six courses contained the term ‘dispute resolution’ (Table 1). On average, 90 students were enrolled in programs offering a stand alone negotiation course ranging from 28 to 300 students with 59% of the students being female. On the other hand, the number of students enrolled in programs not offering a stand alone negotiation course averaged 119 students, ranging from 15 to 650 students with 67% of female students. In terms of programs that “addressed gender in negotiation” we found on average, student enrollment consisted of 55% women compared to 63% of women in programs that did not offer this option. Also, 117 students on average, ranging from 28 to 300 were enrolled in programs that “addressed gender in negotiation” as compared to 82 total students, ranging from 29 to 114, enrolled in programs without any like courses. Overall, 84% of the respondents offered MPA degree and the remainder offered an MPP/both/Master’s in public management/Master’s in public and nonprofit management. The majority of the respondents were program directors or department chairs. More than half the enrollment in these programs comprised of female students (57%) further reinforcing the need for this study. Over half the programs (55%) indicated that negotiation skills were taught in the MPA curriculum either in the form of lecture/workshops/simulations/case studies in human resource classes. Informal negotiation, building collaborative planning and policy strategies, dealing with complex issues, negotiating and resolving public disputes were the most common negotiation skills taught by the programs. Table 2 provides details of various negotiation skills taught in the master’s programs.

Respondents were also asked if they offered a specific course on negotiation. More than half the programs, which taught negotiation skills, offered a stand-alone course on negotiation (56%). The titles of the courses ranged from Introduction to

Table 2. Which of the following negotiation skills are taught in your program? (N = 27).

Response	Percentage (%)	N
Informal negotiation (e.g. issues that arise in routine work)	81.5	22
Building collaborative planning and policy strategies	77.8	21
Dealing with complex problems	77.8	21
Negotiating public disputes	66.7	18
Resolving public disputes that result in fair and sustainable outcomes	55.6	15
Contract negotiation	48.1	13
Eliminating conflict	44.4	12
Pay negotiation	37.0	10
Minimizing the sense of competition	11.1	3
Other	3.7	1

Table 3. Aspects of gender and negotiation addressed in the curriculum (N = 9).

Response	Percentage (%)	N
Negotiation and career implications	66.7	6
Gender roles and negotiation	66.7	6
Gender stereotypes and negotiation	55.6	5
Negotiators use of gender stereotypes as strategic information	44.4	4
Negotiating to challenge the status quo	44.4	4
Women negotiate over issues taken for granted by men (e.g. opportunities for mentoring, training, office space)	33.3	3
Gendered organizations and differential consequences on negotiation	33.3	3
Other (please specify)	11.1	1
Second-generation gender bias (covert)	0.0	0
First-generation bias (intentional)	0.0	0

Collaborative Policy Making, Advanced Practice in Collaborative Policy, Negotiation and Conflict Management, Collective Bargaining/Negotiations, Public Sector Labor Relations, Dispute Resolution/Negotiation, Negotiation Theory and Practice, Alternative Dispute Resolution to Accountability, Performance Measurement, and Contracting in the Public Sector. Most of the courses examined the theory and practice of collaborative policy-making, dispute resolution, labor relations, negotiation, conflict resolution, and mediation. The classes are usually geared toward mid-career professionals who desire to increase their skills in using collaborative methods. Some of the courses required students to participate in and evaluate negotiation simulations. Only one-third of those who offered a stand-alone course on negotiation made it a required course in the MPA curriculum.

We also queried the aspects of gender and negotiation addressed in the MPA curriculum. [Table 3](#) expands on topics addressed in negotiation courses that focus on gender. The most common aspects were related to career planning, gender roles and stereotypes. None addressed either first or second-generation bias.

Respondents were then asked to link NASPAA competencies that addressed gender and negotiation in the curriculum. Almost all of the respondents agreed that courses that integrate elements of gender and negotiation fulfill key competencies that relate to leading and managing in public governance and interacting with a diverse workforce and citizenry (see [Table 4](#) for more details).

Table 4. Which of the following NASPAA competencies do you believe teaching gender and negotiation cultivate? (N = 26).

Response	Percentage	N
Leading and managing in public governance	100.0%	26
Communicating and interacting productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry	96.2%	25
Participating in and contributing to the policy process	65.4%	17
Analyzing, synthesizing, thinking critically, solving problems, and making decisions	61.5%	16
Articulating and applying a public service perspective	57.7%	15

Discussion and conclusion

Consistent with Burnier (2005) and Schachter (2017), who recognize the importance of MPA education in addressing imbalances through increased attention to the role of women in administration, this article argues that MPA programs need to be accountable to future public administrators, especially women by offering courses beyond labor relations and standard contract mediation that expose students to how gender plays out in negotiations that occur within organizations. First introduced by Strauss in 1978, the Theory of Negotiated Order is used as a framework to illustrate how everyday negotiated interactions between different groups of professionals create and recreate organizational structures, privileging some over others. Negotiated order also highlights the relevance of second-generation bias in negotiation in the workplace. As Kolb and McGinn (2009) explain second-generation gender issues result in “the negotiated order of most organizations privilege[ing] masculine and discounts feminine practices and assumptions” (p. 2).

An important finding in this study is that unlike courses that focus on gender roles and negotiation (66.7%), and gender stereotypes and negotiation (55.6%), courses that do focus on second-generation bias issues are *not* explicitly covering them as part of negotiation courses in the curriculum.. Although second-generation bias is more subtle and lacks the discriminatory intent inherent in first-generation bias, it is indeed bias nonetheless “derive[d] largely from gender stereotypes and conventional expectations of men and women, about what society perceives that people want, how they behave and who they are” (Rifkin, 2005). This finding also supports Schachter’s (2017) work that illustrates introductory textbooks in public administration and most leadership courses do not include material on second-generation bias issues. This finding is not surprising given that most second-generation bias literature comes from business management and not from public sector research (Sabharwal et al., 2014; Schachter, 2017).

While some suggest that the “ask gap” (e.g. Bowles, 2013; Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007) may have more to do with the treatment of women when they negotiate than it has to do with their confidence or skills at negotiation, it may also be that any gender specific negotiation skills taught in the classroom depends upon a professor’s own knowledge and commitment to mainstreaming gender rather than a program’s curriculum, objectives, and mission. Whether such topics are included in course syllabi are oftentimes the individual faculty member’s decision. As a follow up to this preliminary study, empirical analyses questioning whether a professor’s gender and rank impacts negotiation is an area ripe for future study. Our descriptive findings also indicate that programs that teach ‘gender in negotiation’ are smaller in terms of enrollment, and number of women students as compared to programs that do not address gender in negotiation. Future research should also examine the underlying

reasons for differences in program size and type (public or private institution), faculty interest/expertise on the topic and other available resources.

Another important takeaway is while almost all respondents in this study agree that teaching gender and negotiations align with two key NASPAA competencies, “Leading and managing in public governance” and “Communicating and interacting productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry” which is important to the MPA accreditation process, there is no ‘visible’ push to incorporate it in the curriculum. This is despite the fact that the majority of the student body is female. In addition, only five of the programs have made negotiation a required course in their curriculum. This may be explained by Schachter’s (2017) suggestion that public administration faculty may not be seeing “cutting edge” articles and, therefore, do not include them in their classes. Also, public administration literature lacks a gender in negotiation focus. As well, there seems to be very little importance placed on teaching future public administrators the value of negotiation beyond labor, mediation, and contracts. This may be why very few programs offer courses on negotiation to begin with and of those that do, only one-third offers courses that include gender and negotiation.

The purpose of this exploratory study was to identify whether MPA programs offered courses in negotiation beyond the traditional ‘collective bargaining’ and ‘procurement’ models. However, the study was limited in that only five programs provided these syllabi online. Sabharwal et al. (2014) point out that retrieval of course syllabi is problematic given they are not standardized, may not include classroom discussions, and may not list all the readings that are assigned on Blackboard, eLearning or some other internal website (p. 228). However, despite this limitation this study is a first step in understanding whether MPA programs prepare future public administrators for the 21st century workplace

While exploratory, we have positioned the groundwork for future study. First, we must advance the gender in negotiation discourse through academic scholarship and build a presence at national conferences, forums and lectures. Future studies that empirically correlate and/or regress negotiation outcomes (e.g. salary and promotions) on type of degree earned, skillset, rank relative to men, and perceived degree of bias in the organization are recommended. Cultural background would be a valuable factor in understanding gender differences and negotiation outcomes.

As we have learned from this study, the MPA classroom is not addressing issues of gender in negotiation. Given first that gender disparities exist, and second that the majority of the MPA student body is female, we must continue to critically consider if we are preparing our students (especially women students) to face the challenges of the future workplace. Public managers must negotiate for scarce organizational resources including salary, promotion, and other workplace capital to achieve important goals. Recognizing that gender in negotiation is hidden under the shadow of second-generation bias is the first

step to the success of future public administrators. Equally important, we must begin to educate our future public managers (especially women future managers) with a distinctive negotiation skill set as they navigate the 21st century workplace. Although the study concentrated on gender impact, our findings may also be relevant to other groups such as ethnic minorities and disabled people. Further research should also examine whether negotiation is addressed in other professional degree programs. By incorporating issues and understanding of second-generation bias in public administration education we begin to move the gender discussion beyond the notion of typical stereotypes to better explain the lack of women in leadership roles and persistent inequities in the workforce.

Notes on contributors

Maria D'Agostino is an Associate professor in the Department of Public Management at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Dr. D'Agostino's recent research has focused on women in public service including two co-edited books, *Governing in A Global World* (Forthcoming 2017) and *Women and Public Administration: Theory and Practice*. She recently collaborated as a guest editor for the Women and Public Administration symposium published in *Administration and Society*, and published *A Narrative Approach to Understanding the Difference Women Make*.

Helisse Levine is a professor of public administration and director of the MPA program at Long Island University Brooklyn. Dr. Levine's research focuses on state and local government resource allocation, capital markets and public organizations, and issues of public financial management. She has over 25 publications that have appeared in journals such as the *Review of Public Personnel Administration* and *State and Local Government Review*.

Meghna Sabharwal is an associate professor and director of the Ph.D. program in the Public and Nonprofit Management program at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her research focuses on public human resource management, specifically related to workplace diversity, job satisfaction, performance, and comparative human resource management. She has published three books and more than 30 articles in outlets such as *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, and *Review of Public Personnel Administration*.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139–158. doi:10.1177/089124390004002002
- Association of Accredited Public Policy Advocates to the European Union. (2014). *Negotiation skills for effective public policy advocacy activity*. Retrieved from <http://www.aalep.eu/negotiation-skills-effective-public-policy-advocacy-activity>
- Babcock, L., Gelfand, M., Small, D., & Stayn, H. (2006). Gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations. In D. De Cremer, M. Zeelenberg, & J. K. Murnighan (Eds.), *Social psychology and economics* (pp. 239–262). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Babcock, L., & Laschever, C. (2007). *Women don't ask: The high cost of avoiding negotiation—and positive strategies for change*. New York: NY: Bantam Books.

- Babcock, L., & Lashever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Barron, L. A. (2003). Ask and you shall receive? Gender differences in negotiators' beliefs about requests for a higher salary. *Human Relations*, 56(6), 635–662. doi:10.1177/00187267030566001
- Bear, J. B., & Babcock, L. (2012). Negotiation topic as a moderator of gender differences in negotiation. *Psychological Science*, 23, 743–744. doi:10.1177/0956797612442393
- Beaty, L., & Davis, T. (2012). Gender disparity in professional city management: Making the case for enhancing leadership curriculum. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 18(4), 617–632. doi:10.1080/15236803.2012.12001705
- Bell, S. (2014). Negotiating skills for public officials. *National League of Cities*. Retrieved from <http://www.nlc.org/article/negotiation-skills-for-public-officials>
- Bellucci, E., & Zeleznikow, J. (2005). Developing negotiation decision support systems that support mediators: A case study of the family winner system. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 13(2), 233–271. doi:10.1007/s10506-006-9013-1
- Bendersky, C., & Curhan, J. R. (2009). Cognitive dissonance in negotiation: Free choice or justification? *Social Cognition*, 27(3), 455–474. doi:10.1521/soco.2009.27.3.455
- Blackaby, D., Booth, A. L., & Frank, J. (2005). Outside offers and the gender pay gap: Empirical evidence from the UK academic labour market. *The Economic Journal*, 115, F81–F107. doi:10.1111/j.0013-0133.2005.00973.x
- Bouwman, R. (2013). *Public sector negotiations: An exploration of how public servants negotiate the context of public sector*. 3789837 Research Master Public Administration and Organizational Science. Erasmus University Rotterdam, Utrecht University and Tilburg University.
- Bowles, H. R. (2013). Psychological perspectives on gender in negotiation. In M. K. Ryan & N. R. Branscombe (Eds.), *The sage handbook of gender and psychology* (pp.465–485). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1), 84–103. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.09.001
- Bowles, H. R., & McGinn, K. L. (2009). Untapped potential in the study of negotiation and gender inequality in organizations. In J. Walsh and A. Brief (Eds.) *Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 99–132. doi:10.5465/19416520802211453
- Burnier, D. (2005). Public leaders are gendered: Making gender visible in public affairs leadership education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 11, 181–192. doi:10.1080/15236803.2005.12001392
- Calás, M., & Smircich, I. (1991). Voicing seduction to silence leadership. *Organization Studies*, 4, 567–602. doi:10.1177/017084069101200406
- Calcott, P. (2008). Negotiation versus consultation in the development of a regulation. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 39(2), 75–82. doi:10.1007/s10640-007-9092-9
- Caverley, N., Cunningham, B., & Mitchell, L. (2006). Reflections on public sector-based integrative collective bargaining: Conditions affecting cooperation within the negotiation process. *Employee Relations*, 28(1), 62–75. doi:10.1108/01425450610633064
- Chamberlain, A. (2016, March). Demystifying the gender pay gap: Evidence from glassdoor salary data. Retrieved from <https://www.glassdoor.com/research/studies/gender-pay-gap/>
- Cohn, H., Kovach, L., & de Backer. (2009). We came, we trained, but did it matter? In C. Honeyman, J. Coben, & G. De Palo (Eds.), *In rethinking negotiation teaching* (pp. 329–342). St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.

- Community Catalyst. (2004) *The ABC's of negotiation: An advocate's guide to negotiating with providers to improve access to health care services*. Retrieved from http://www.communitycatalyst.org/docstore/publications/the_abcs_of_negotiation_feb04.pdf
- Council of Graduate Schools. (2014). Retrieved from http://cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/E_and_D_2014_report_final.pdf
- Couper, M. P., & Triplett, T. (1999). A comparison of mail and e-mail for a survey of employees in US statistical agencies. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 15(1), 39.
- D'Agostino, J., & Levine, H. (2010). The career progression of women in state government agencies. *Gender in Management: an International Journal*, 25(1), 22–36. doi:10.1108/17542411011019913
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders. In *Harvard business review*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Eckel, C., de Oliveira, A., & Grossman, P. (2008). Gender and negotiation in the small: Are women (Perceived to Be) more cooperative than men? *Negotiation Journal*, 24(4), 429–445. doi:10.1111/nejournal.2008.24.issue-4
- Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Theories of gender: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 103–151.
- Exley, C. L., Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2016). Knowing When to Ask: The Cost of Leaning in NBER Working Paper No. 22961.
- Fells, R. (2000). Labour-management negotiation: Some insights into strategy and language. *Relations Industrielles*, 55(4), 583–605. doi:10.7202/051350ar
- Fine, G. A. (1984). Negotiated orders and organizational cultures. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10(1), 239–262. doi:10.1146/annurev.so.10.080184.001323
- Fisher, R., Patton, B., & Ury, W. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Flax, J. (1990). *Thinking fragments: Psychoanalysis, feminism, and postmodernism in the contemporary west*. Berkeley, CA: Univ of California Press.
- Fletcher, C. (1999). The implications of research on gender differences in self-assessment and 360 degree appraisal. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9(1), 39–46. doi:10.1111/hrmj.1999.9.issue-1
- Fuller, B. W., & Fritzen, S. (2007). Negotiation and conflict management: A public policy perspective. In J. Rabin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public administration and public policy* (pp. 69–102). New York, NY: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Goldman, B., & Shapiro, D. L. (2012). *The psychology of negotiations in the 21st century workplace: New challenges and new solutions*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Greig, F. (2008). Propensity to negotiate and career advancement: Evidence from an investment bank that women are on a “Slow Elevator”. *Negotiation Journal*, 24, 495–508. doi:10.1111/nejournal.2008.24.issue-4
- Guthrie, S. R., Magyar, T. M., Eggert, S., & Kain, C. (2009). Female athletes do ask! An exploratory study of gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiation among athletes. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 18(1). doi:10.1123/wspaj.18.1.90
- HR.BLR.com. (2011, February 18). Why are good negotiation skills important? *HR and Employment Law News*. Retrieved from <http://hr.blr.com/HR-news/HR-Administration/Communication/Why-Are-Good-Negotiation-Skills-Important/>
- Ibarra, H., Ely, R., & Kolb, D. M. (2013a, September). Women rising: The unseen barriers. *Harvard Business Review*, Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/09/women-rising-the-unseen-barriers>
- Ibarra, H., Ely, R., & Kolb, D. M. (2013b, August). Educate everyone about second-generation gender bias. *Harvard Business Review*, Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/08/educate-everyone-about-second>

- Kalantari, PhD., M. P. A. (2012). The influence of social values and childhood socialization on occupational gender segregation and wage disparity. *Public Personnel Management*, 41 (2), 241–255. doi:10.1177/009102601204100203
- King, E., & Jones, K. (2016). *Why subtle bias is so often worse than blatant discrimination*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-subtle-bias-is-so-often-worse-than-blatant-discrimination>
- Kolb, D., & Williams, J. (2000). *The shadow negotiation: How women can master the hidden agendas that determine bargaining success*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Kolb, D. M. (2013). Negotiating in the shadows of organizations: Gender, negotiation, and change. *The Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 28(2), 241–262.
- Kolb, D. M., & McGinn, K. L. (2009). Beyond gender and negotiation to gendered negotiations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 2(1), 1–16. doi:10.1111/ncmr.2009.2.issue-1
- Kolb, D. M., & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The multiple faces of conflict in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(3), 311–324. doi:10.1002/(ISSN)1099-1379
- Kray, L. J., Galinsky, A. D., & Thompson, L. (2002). Reversing the gender gap in negotiations: An exploration of stereotype regeneration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 87, 386–409. doi:10.1006/obhd.2001.2979
- Kray, L. J., Reb, J., Galinsky, A. D., & Thompson, L. (2004). Stereotype reactance at the bargaining table: The effect of stereotype activation and power on claiming and creating value. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(4), 399–411. doi:10.1177/0146167203261884
- Kray, L. J., & Thompson, L. (2004). Gender stereotypes and negotiation performance: An examination of theory and research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26, 103–182. doi:10.1016/S0191-3085(04)26004-X
- Kray, L. J., Thompson, L., & Galinsky, A. (2001, June). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80 (6), 942–958.
- Lax, D. A., & Sebenius, J. K. (1986). *The manager as negotiator: Bargaining for cooperation and competitive gain*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Lens, V. (2004). Principled negotiation: A new tool for case advocacy. *Social Work*, 49(3), 506–513.
- Levine, H., Christian, N. J., & Lyons, B. P. (2013). Organizational change skill acquisition and change agency preparedness in U.S. NASPAA-accredited MPA programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 19(3), 479–492. doi: 10.1080/15236803.2013.12001747
- Ma, Z. (2007). Conflict management styles as indicators of behavioral pattern in business negotiation: The impact of contextualism in two countries. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 18(3), 260–279. doi:10.1108/10444060710825990
- Maoz, I. (2009). The women and peace hypothesis? The effect of opponent negotiators' gender on the evaluation of compromise solutions in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *International Negotiation*, 14(3), 519–536. doi:10.1163/138234009X12481782336267
- Matthews, (2011). The need for negotiation. *Government product news*. American City and County. Retrieved from <http://americancityandcounty.com/negotiating/need-negotiation>
- Mazei, J., Alexander, P., Hüffmeier, J., Stuhlmacher, A., Bilke, L., & Hertel, G. (2015). A meta-analysis on gender differences in negotiation outcomes and their moderator. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(1), 85–104.
- Miles, E. W., & Clenney, E. F. (2010). Gender differences in negotiation: A status characteristics theory view. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 3, 130–144. doi:10.1111/ncmr.2010.3.issue-2

- Movius, H. (2008). The effectiveness of negotiation training. *Negotiation Journal*, 24(4). doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.2008.00201.x
- Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2008). Gender differences in competition. *Negotiation Journal*, 24(4). doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.2008.00197.x
- Paddock, E. L., & Kray, L. J. (2011). The role of gender in negotiation. *Negotiation excellence: Successful deal making*, 229–245. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business. Retrieved from http://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research/3176http://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research/3176
- Pande, R., & Ford, D. (2011, April 7). *Gender Quotas and Female Leadership: A Review. Background Paper for the World Development Report on Gender*. Retrieved from http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/rpande/files/gender_quotas_-_april_2011.pdf
- Pathways to Equity: Narrowing the Wage Gap by Improving Women's Access to Good Middle-Skill Jobs (2016, March). IWPR #C438, *Institute for Women's Policy Research*. Retrieved from http://womenandgoodjobs.org/app/uploads/2016/03/Middle-skills_layout-FINAL.pdf
- Perry. (2013). Women earned majority of doctoral degrees in 2012 for 4th straight year, and outnumber men in grad school 141 to 100. *American Enterprise Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.aei.org/publication/women-earned-majority-of-doctoral-degrees-in-2012-for-4th-straight-year-and-outnumber-men-in-grad-school-141-to-100/>
- Proctor, B. D., Semega, J. L., & Kollar, M. A. (2016). U.S. Census bureau, current population reports. *Income and poverty in the United States: 2015*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rifkin, G. (2005). Second generation gender bias. *Korn Ferry Institute*. Retrieved from: <http://www.kornferry.com/institute/second-generation-gender-bias?popular>
- Rose, J. B. (2004). Public sector bargaining: From retrenchment to consolidation. *Relations Industrielles*, 59(2), 271–292. doi:10.7202/009542ar
- Roth, L. M. (2009, February). Leveling the playing field: Negotiating opportunities and recognition in gendered jobs. *Negotiation & Conflict Management Research*, 2(1), 17–30. doi:10.1111/ncmr.2009.2.issue-1
- Rousseau, D. (2005). *I-deals: Idiosyncratic deals employees bargain for themselves*. New York, NY: Sharpe.
- Sabharwal, M., Hijal-Moghrabi, I., & Royster, M. (2014). Preparing future public servants: Role of diversity in public administration. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 38, 206–245.
- Schachter, H. L. (2017). Women in public administration: Giving gender a place in education for leadership. *Administration & Society*, 49(1), 143–158. doi:10.1177/0095399715611173
- Schiff, M. (2014). Small states, micro states, and their international negotiation and migration. *Journal of Economic Integration*, 29(3), 430–449. doi:10.11130/jei.2014.29.3.430
- Small, D. A., Gelfand, M., Babcock, L., & Gettman, H. (2007, October). Who goes to the bargaining table? The influence of gender and framing on the initiation of negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 600–613. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.600
- Solomon, D. J. (2001). Conducting web-based surveys. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*, 7(19). Retrieved from <http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=7&n=19>
- Strauss, A. (1978). *Negotiations: Varieties, contexts, processes, and social order*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Streber, Thompson, & Heron (1997). *Skills, competencies and gender: Issues for pay and training*. Institute for Employment Studies Report 333
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 653–677. doi:10.1111/peps.1999.52.issue-3

- Sturm, S. (2001). Second generation employment discrimination: A structural approach. *Columbia Law Review*, 101, 458–568. doi:[10.2307/1123737](https://doi.org/10.2307/1123737)
- Taylor, K. A., Mesmer-Magnus, J., & Burns, T. M. (2008). Teaching the art of negotiation: Improving students' negotiating confidence and perceptions of effectiveness. *Journal of Education for Business*, 83(3), 135–140. doi:[10.3200/JOEB.83.3.135-140](https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.83.3.135-140)
- The Negotiation Experts. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.negotiations.com/>
- Twemlow, S. W., & Sacco, F. C. (2003). The management of power in municipalities: Psychoanalytically informed negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, 19(4), 369–388. doi:[10.1111/nej.2003.19.issue-4](https://doi.org/10.1111/nej.2003.19.issue-4)
- Walters, A. E., Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Meyer, L. L. (1998). Gender and negotiator competitiveness: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 76(1), 1–29.
- Warner, M. E. (2010). The future of local government: Twenty-first-century challenges. *Public Administration Review*, 70, S145–S147. doi:[10.1111/puar.2010.70.issue-s1](https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.2010.70.issue-s1)