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Women-focused negotiation training:

A gendered solution to a gendered problem

The story by now is familiar: Women are reluctant to initiate negotiations in the workplace. When women do negotiate, they ask for too little, they are too willing to accept early offers, and they are too quick to accommodate. As a result, women are repeatedly disadvantaged in salary, developmental opportunities, and other resources that they need for successful careers. In this chapter, we consider whether women-focused negotiation training might offer a gendered solution to the gendered problems that women face in workplace negotiations. Historically, negotiation training has focused on best practices that are treated as gender-blind. In contrast, women-focused negotiation training assumes that gender matters a great deal. Guided by the same principles that underlie recommendations for women-focused leadership development programs, we investigate how gender colors and influences each stage of a successful negotiation: the pre-negotiation preparation and groundwork, the during-negotiation behaviors and dialogue, and the post-negotiation persistence. The chapter delivers a framework that outlines the “what” (content) and the “how” (delivery) that might constitute a women-focused negotiation training course. We expand the portfolio of trained behavior to include skills, strategies and tactics that might be particularly – and even uniquely – relevant to female negotiators.
Women-focused negotiation training:

A gendered solution to a gendered problem

Everyone wants to learn how to negotiate better outcomes for themselves. Industry publications regularly offer their readers tips on negotiating in the workplace (e.g., Finkel, 2018; Harroch, 2016). Negotiation is one of the key “people skills” trending in the employee training space (Harward & Taylor, 2017), and negotiation remains one of the most popular courses in MBA and executive education (Thompson & Leonardelli, 2004).

Negotiation education may be particularly important for women, who have historically been characterized as woefully poor negotiators (Mazei, Huffmeier, Freund, Stuhlmacher, Bilke, & Hertel, 2015; Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999; Walters, Stuhlmacher, & Meyer, 1998). If women negotiate unsuccessfully because they are uninformed of best practice (a “knowing” gap; Pfeffer & Sutton, 1999), gender-blind negotiation training could offer a quick and easy fix. However, the evidence points instead to a “knowing-doing” gap (Pfeffer & Sutton, 1999): When women enact best practice negotiation behaviors, they backfire, leaving female negotiators with poor negotiation outcomes and damaged work relationships. Therefore, any effort to train women to improve their negotiation skills needs to acknowledge the unique challenges women face in negotiations and present them with a broader portfolio of strategies than we traditionally offer in negotiation training. This chapter aims to move us closer to a women-focused negotiation training framework. We first explain what women need (and want!) from negotiation training. We provide a critical review of the negotiation training literature to demonstrate where traditional negotiation training fails to deliver. Finally, we draw on the literature focusing on women-focused leadership training to understand how women-focused negotiation training might be designed to close the knowing-doing gap and benefit women in the workplace.
WHAT MAKES WOMEN’S NEGOTIATIONS DIFFERENT THAN MEN’S?

Most workplace negotiations are mixed-motive situations, in which parties need to cooperate to develop mutually beneficial agreements (joint gains) and, at the same time, compete to achieve their personal interests (individual gains) (for reviews, see Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2011; Lewicki, Weiss, & Lewin 1992). In these mixed-motive situations, successful negotiators need to engage in both cooperative behaviors (employ integrative tactics to create joint value) and competitive behaviors (employ distributive tactics to distribute value). However, women frequently fail to deliver the elusive “just right” mix of cooperation and competition that underlies an effective problem-solving approach (Mazei et al., 2015; Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999; Walters et al., 1998).

A close look at the evidence demonstrates that gender differences have been documented before, during and after negotiations. Women are less likely to view resources as negotiable, and they have less confidence in their negotiating ability; therefore, they are less likely to initiate negotiations in the first place (Babcock, Gelfand, Small, & Stayn, 2006). When women do negotiate, they ask for too little and are too willing to accept early offers (Eckel, de Oliveira, & Grossman, 2008). They are reluctant to invoke alternative offers to improve their bargaining positions (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Kray & Thompson, 2005). When they face a tough negotiating partner, women exit the negotiation instead of persisting and pushing back (Gist, Stevens & Bavetta, 1991). But if women do tough it out, women who negotiate are likely to experience resistance from their negotiating partner, reducing the financial outcomes they had hoped to achieve (Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013). And even worse, women who negotiate are perceived as too demanding; people do not want to work with a negotiating woman (Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007).
The challenges that women experience in workplace negotiations are symptomatic of the broader problem that women face in organizational contexts. Organizations are inherently “gendered” (Bierema, 2017: 148), and gender stereotypes create expectations about how people should behave in the workplace. In most organizations, successful career outcomes hinge on enacting agentic, assertive and competitive behaviors that align with prescriptive stereotypes for men (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Ridgeway & Correll, 2000). Women, therefore, face a choice that seems impossible: If they limit themselves to behaviors that are consistent with prescriptive stereotypes for women (e.g., act communally and display warmth), they will be perceived as less competent and sacrifice valuable career outcomes. But if they adopt masculine behaviors (e.g., act agentically and display competence), they violate those prescriptive stereotypes and suffer backlash. Over time, women can internalize these prescriptive gender stereotypes so that they become unable to engage in the agentic behavior required for organizational success (Diehl & Dzubinski, 2016; Ely, Ibarra, & Kolb, 2011). Further, gender stereotypes can become so embedded in organizational structures (“second generation” biases; Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013) that people fail to notice their insidious effects. For example, embedded gender stereotypes may result in women being steered toward female-dominated occupations (Ibarra et al., 2013) and beliefs that men are more suited to managerial roles may generate inflexible time demands that do not accommodate family responsibilities (Stone & Hernandez, 2013).

So what’s a woman to do? How can she work effectively in an organization when the deck is stacked against her? Athanasopoulou, Moss-Cowan, Smets, and Morris (2018) considered these questions by asking 139 male and 12 female CEOs to identify the barriers they experienced in their careers and, based on their experience, to provide advice to a hypothetical young woman aspiring to a CEO role. Male and female CEOs agreed on some barriers (e.g., both
groups advised the young woman to consider work-family tradeoffs). However, the female CEOs’ responses were distinguished by their emphasis on the “self work” they had done to prepare themselves for the corner office. They agreed with the male CEOs that the ambitious young woman needed developmental opportunities and practical skills, but they also advised her to develop confidence, resilience and self-acceptance. The female CEOs emphasized that changing their own attitudes, and accepting their leadership potential, were critical first steps toward developing the skills and mindset to become a CEO.

We hear a parallel message in our own research, where we focus specifically on gender and negotiation. We asked 36 women who had recently completed a negotiation in their workplace to tell us what women needed to learn about negotiation. Their responses are summarized in Table 1. Our content analysis identified some negotiation challenges that are likely to be common to both women and men: The women in our research wanted to know how to plan for negotiations, how to set goals, and how to act assertively. But many of the challenges in Table 1 are best described as “self work.” The women in our research wanted to understand how gender affects negotiations, how to develop positive beliefs in their negotiation abilities, and how to manage their emotions when negotiations failed.

**DOES NEGOTIATION TRAINING DELIVER THE GOODS?**

Acknowledging the mixed motive nature of workplace negotiations, most training programs are designed to teach trainees how to create *and* distribute value (Fisher et al., 2011; Patton, 1984), and direct trainees’ attention to economic/monetary outcomes *and* subjective outcomes such as post-negotiation satisfaction and relationship quality (cf. Lewicki, Saunders, & Barry, 2014). The key principles that underlie value creation can be presented using didactic methods; training facilitators can also outline idealized strategies that lead to win-win solutions.
However, heavy reliance on didactic, instructor-centered pedagogy is not effective in developing trainees’ skills (Nadler, Thompson, & Van Boven, 2003). Trainees may learn the abstract constructs, but they fail to apply the principles in practice.

Therefore, negotiation training usually includes a heavy dose of experiential activities. Trainees are more likely to develop behavioral skills and transfer those skills to real-world negotiations when the training promotes analogical reasoning and observational reflection (Gillespie, Thompson, Loewenstein, & Gentner 1999; Loewenstein, Thompson, & Gentner 1999), and both processes are activated by simulations and role plays. When trainees compare experiences across role plays, they learn how to identify common principles and situation-specific influences, helping the trainees to prepare for future negotiations (Moran, Bereby-Meyer, & Bazerman, 2008; Nadler et al., 2003). When trainees compare their own role play behavior with the videotaped behavior of expert negotiators, they broaden the portfolio of behaviors they can employ in future negotiations (Nadler et al., 2003). The iterative process of first learning the skills for a particular negotiation scenario, and then comparing skill sets across scenarios, teaches trainees how to adapt their tactics to situational demands (Thompson, Gentner, & Loewenstein, 2000).

Unfortunately, having addressed the core pedagogical issue (didactic instruction must be complemented by analogical reasoning and observational reflection), most negotiation training assumes that one size will fit all trainees. Training content and cases are designed to deliver best practices and tactics that work across people and situations (Movius, 2008). We know that a trainee’s goal orientation (i.e., having a learning goal rather than a performance goal) impacts training effectiveness (Bereby-Meyer, Moran, & Unger-Aviram, 2004; Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000). We know that trainees with low levels of self-efficacy learn less because they cognitively
withdraw from the training (they tune out during the debriefing rather than rehearsing future strategies) (Gist et al., 1991). But how can training inspire a learning goal orientation or boost trainee self-efficacy? The training literature pays no attention to the “self work” that might better prepare trainees (in general) and women (in particular) to learn negotiation skills that will be effective for them in real life.

Despite the large literature on gender and negotiation, the negotiation training literature is surprisingly quiet about the impact of gender on training effectiveness. The idea that women may need different types of training than men has received little attention from scholars to date (Barkacs & Barkacs, 2017). Most training studies only control for gender (e.g., Curhan, Elfenbein, & Kilduff, 2009), citing the meta-analytic evidence of gender differences on negotiation performance. For example, Melzer and Schoop (2016) investigated the efficacy of personalized training (training that was adapted to match the trainee’s learning style) for virtual negotiations, but they treated gender as a covariate without hypothesizing any gender effects. Without mindful attention to the unique challenges faced by female negotiators, facilitators might mistakenly assume that the participant’s gender is irrelevant (“add women and stir”; Martin & Meyerson, 1988: 312) or view the problem as exclusively located in the female trainee (“fix the women”; Ely & Meyerson, 2000). Either option only serves to teach women the “rules of the game as established by men” (Ely et al., 2011: 486) – a counterproductive strategy, since negotiating in a masculine way inevitably violates gender norms.

**TOWARD WOMEN-FOCUSED NEGOTIATION TRAINING**

What would it take for negotiation training to be more responsive to women’s needs? To answer this question, we considered the literature on women-focused leadership training. On the face of it, women-focused leadership training looks a lot like any other leadership training
program: It leverages experiential exercises and feedback to help trainees develop new skills. What differentiates women-focused leadership training is its emphasis on three key principles (Ely et al., 2011).

First, women-focused leadership training is designed to raise participants’ awareness of the subtle and pervasive effects of gender. This means that the facilitator presents academic research on gender and leadership, giving women a framework and a vocabulary for diagnosing gender dynamics in their organizations and intervening effectively in those dynamics. This explicit discussion of gender helps women to see how they may have internalized and even self-reinforced gender biases (e.g., by self-censoring in order to appear “nice” or displaying hypermasculine behaviors to conform to leadership expectations). Without that gender framework, women operate in a state of “gender unconsciousness” (Bierema, 2017: 156) where they are more likely to attribute failing moments in their careers to something lacking in themselves (“I knew I wasn’t good enough”) rather than something lacking in the environment (“this is a tough situation”) (Carter & Dunning, 2008).

Second, the facilitator uses the training sessions to create a safe space for learning and experimenting. Learning any new skill benefits from a supportive learning environment, but that support is especially important when women develop leadership skills because women are practicing gender stereotype-violating behavior that can generate backlash. A women-focused leadership program does not just teach women leadership behaviors; it also supports women to grow into those behaviors in the face of organizational obstacles (Ely et al., 2011). Women-focused leadership programs give women the chance to develop these behaviors surrounded by peers who can identify and empathize with each other (Debebe, 2011). The supportive
Third, women-focused leadership training anchors the new skills to women’s personal identities. For anyone, becoming a leader requires considerable identity work, an iterative process in which the leader accumulates experiences that inform his or her sense of self as a leader, as well as feedback about his or her fit for taking up the leader role (Ely et al., 2011). However, this process is more difficult for women, who are likely to experience heightened visibility in the workplace and have limited access to same-gender role models in male-dominated jobs, occupations, or organizations. Female leaders can feel less authentic because their preferred leadership styles are often misaligned with organizational expectations and are undervalued (Ruderman & Ohlott, 2005). However, as women grow to recognize gender dynamics, and practice leadership behaviors, they become better able to embrace a personal leadership style that feels more authentic (Ely et al., 2011). This means that a women-focused leadership training program may spend a great deal of time on the “self work” needed to boost women’s self-confidence and self-efficacy (O’Neil, Hopkins, & Bilimoria, 2015). A traditional leadership course might use practice to develop the trainee’s confidence that he or she can deliver the trained behavior, but a women-focused leadership course builds the trainee’s confidence that the behavior authentically reflects her personal identity and values.

WHAT WOULD WOMEN-FOCUSED NEGOTIATION TRAINING LOOK LIKE?

There are clear parallels between the challenges that women face in negotiations and those that they face in a broad range of leadership situations. A successful negotiator needs to know what to ask for, but he or she also needs to feel legitimate during the ask (Kolb & Williams, 2000). To get to that point, female negotiators must push through a series of gendered
challenges: she must appreciate her own value and find ways to make it visible, learn how other women have fared in similar circumstances, develop an appreciation for why her negotiations may be resisted, and find ways to regain her footing when challenged (Kolb, 2004; Kolb & Williams, 2000). Therefore, the same principles that underlie women-focused leadership training might be usefully applied to women-focused negotiation training. Women and men enact negotiations in different ways, and the same negotiation behavior generates different responses when it is enacted by women and men (Mazei et al., 2015).

Moving toward women-focused negotiation training requires a framework that addresses the Table 1 themes in terms of both the training content (the What) and the training delivery (the How). Negotiation training research has confirmed the value of analogical reasoning and observational reflection in training delivery, but negotiation training emphasizes content that is generalizable across contexts and people (Movius, 2008; Nadler et al., 2003). Because women cannot simply adopt the negotiation behaviors that are best practice for men, they need to translate those behavioral recommendations into a personal style that works within gendered contexts (first principle). Women are more likely to achieve that translation in a safe space where they have the freedom to fail without being judged and without putting their personal relationships at risk (second principle). Further, those translated negotiation behaviors need to be anchored in women’s personal and authentic identities (third principle). This is not an overnight process. In order for women to develop a negotiation style that works for them in their organizational context, they need to go outside their comfort zone and make mistakes so that they can learn from their experiences (Molinsky, 2016).

With those principles in mind, we returned to the Table 1 “wish list” generated by our research participants. We noticed that some of the challenges in Table 1 (e.g., gender awareness)
could be addressed by bringing the literature on gender and negotiation (see Kulik & Olekalns, 2012 for a review) directly into the training room. Moreover, we noticed that some “self work” challenges were related to manipulations and interventions previously published in the gender and negotiation literature.

In the following section, we summarize six challenges for the female negotiator, derived from the themes presented in Table 1. For each challenge, we make recommendations about the content (What) and delivery (How) that might be built into women-focused negotiation training. These recommendations are intended to integrate women’s expressed training needs with the gender and negotiation research findings on interventions that reduce gender gaps in negotiations. The integration is far from perfect. Our framework takes the first steps toward women-focused negotiation training – but it also identifies the need for an expanded gender and negotiation education research agenda.

**Pre-Negotiation Challenge 1: Gender Stereotype Awareness**

Women are regularly exposed to gender stereotypes suggesting that women should be communal and cooperative. After a lifetime of socialization, these stereotypes become internalized, so that women are no longer aware of the effects gender stereotypes have on their own behavior (Bowles, 2012). The fundamental misalignment between the female stereotype and the expectation that an effective negotiator is tough and dominant can lower women’s confidence in their negotiation abilities and reduce their motivation to plan and initiate negotiations (Kray, 2007). Our research participants confirmed this phenomenon, telling us that most women are not aware of how gender might disadvantage them in negotiations (see Table 1 for quotes).

**What?** Women-focused negotiation training, therefore, should aim to raise trainees’ awareness of gender stereotypes and the way they influence negotiations. Trainees need to
recognize their own stereotypes, and the stereotypes that are likely to be held by others. In addition to the focus on internal stereotypes, trainees need to learn to recognize second-generation bias as it operates in the organizational context (Bowles, 2012). Then, once trainees are aware of stereotypes and their effects, women-focused negotiation training can help women to “regenerate” stereotypes (Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002) and rewrite their personal and social scripts around women negotiators.

**How?** Training facilitators can bring the research literature into the training room, not as a standalone topic, but as an ongoing contextual influence on negotiation (Menkel-Meadow, 2000). Training facilitators can demonstrate the incongruence between prescriptive gender stereotypes and “good negotiator” stereotypes by constructing role plays in which some women are instructed to behave in gender stereotype-congruent ways (e.g., display warmth and cooperative behaviors) and others are instructed to behave in gender stereotype-incongruent ways (e.g., display agentic and competitive behaviors). The role play could lead to a discussion of the characteristics associated with being an “effective negotiator”, how those characteristics align (or misalign) with gender stereotypes (Kray & Thompson, 2005), and the way that gender influences the interpretation of behavior (e.g., when a behavior will be perceived as “assertive” or “aggressive”).

Having surfaced gender issues in the discussion, the facilitator can then explain the situational “gender triggers” that make gender stereotypes particularly salient and prompt gender-related behavioral responses (Bowles, Babcock, & McGinn, 2005). For example, when women are told that their performance on a competitive negotiation will be viewed as diagnostic of their negotiation ability, they experience stereotype threat and perform poorly (Bowles et al., 2005). And when women negotiate in situations that provide few cues about what is negotiable
and what constitutes a good outcome, they are more likely to fall back on gender-congruent behavioral patterns and over-accommodate (Bowles et al., 2005). However, some of these gender effects are reduced when organizational norms put negotiations in a positive light (Kray & Gelfand, 2009 Experiment 2). This research can be part of a training exercise in which women learn to identity gender triggers and consider how their organizational contexts (e.g., local norms about negotiating) might influence their own negotiations (Kray & Shirako, 2012). Just raising awareness of gender triggers might make women more resistant to stereotype threat and self-fulfilling prophecies (Thompson, 2008).

Then, the facilitator can help women to regenerate stereotypes using time-tested analogical and observational negotiation training methods. Stereotype regeneration is a process by which the behaviors and traits associated with a group are modified or redefined (Kray et al., 2002). When Kray et al. (2002 Experiment 1) primed participants with information associating effective negotiation with female stereotype-congruent attributes (e.g., the ability to express their thoughts verbally, good listening skills, and insight into the other negotiator’s feelings), women set higher goals and achieved better outcomes in a negotiation. Negotiation trainers can modify the Kray et al. intervention to engage women in reframing exercises that reinforce the value of gender stereotype-congruent attributes in effective negotiations. The activities could include explicitly priming trainees about the value of their stereotype-congruent attributes before a role play and group discussions about how trainees have used stereotype-congruent behaviors like proactive listening or asking questions in their negotiations. These activities could boost women’s confidence by demonstrating that they already have many of the attributes needed to become effective negotiators and increase their motivation to experiment with different negotiation styles.
Pre-Negotiation Challenge 2: Goal Setting and Planning

Both men and women prefer to make same-sex comparisons (Major & Forcey, 1985; Major & Testa, 1989). This means that women are likely to base their expectations of “reasonable” negotiation outcomes on comparisons to other women (Belliveau, 2005; Ibarra, 1993) and, since women routinely achieve lower outcomes than men, women set their negotiation goals too low (Stevens, Bavetta, & Gist, 1993). Our research participants may not be consciously aware of these informational biases, but they did tell us that they needed to learn how to better prepare for negotiations – particularly with respect to the pre-negotiation information gathering and goal setting (see Table 1 for quotes).

What? Women-focused negotiation training, therefore, needs to provide targeted advice on searching for unbiased information, committing to high goals, and leveraging social networks.

How? Traditional negotiation training acknowledges the importance of social outcomes (including relationship quality) alongside economic outcomes (Lewicki et al., 2014) but women weight social outcomes more heavily than men (Loewenstein, Thompson, & Bazerman, 1989; Novemsky & Schweitzer, 2004). For women, relational goals are chronically accessible, especially in work contexts where negotiators are likely to be in an ongoing relationship (Gelfand, Major, Raver, Nishii, & O’Brien, 2006). Therefore, women-focused negotiation training needs to examine how the trainees define negotiation “success” in different situations and ensure that women do not view economic and socio-relational outcomes as an either-or choice (Bowles & Babcock, 2013). Trainers can leverage the empirical research on inter-goal facilitation (cf, Riediger, 2001) to develop activities that teach trainees how to identify instrumental connections between goals and develop overlapping goal attainment strategies. Intergoal facilitation has been linked to goal pursuit in experimental studies (Reidiger &
Women-focused negotiation training (Freuend, 2004). Using the Intergoal Relational Questionnaire as a learning tool (Riediger, 2001), women can list their economic and socio-relational goals and reflect on each goal’s potential to facilitate, and/or interfere with, other goals as they generate compatible goal attainment strategies.

Women-focused negotiation training should encourage women to reflect on the information sources they use to set targets for economic outcomes, and identify alternative information sources that might be less biased. Gender differences in negotiation behavior are less visible in industries where salary information is widely available (Bowles et al., 2005 Study 1) and when negotiators have access to benchmarks about a “good” outcome (Bowles et al., 2005 Study 2). This research can be incorporated into training exercises in which women consider ways that they can access benchmarks for negotiations they would like to initiate.

Women’s networks are more homophilous (same-gendered) than men’s (Braddock & McPartland, 1987; Seidel, Polzer, & Stewart 2000). When women’s networks are dominated by other women, their networks can deliver biased information about what is negotiable, what their skills are worth, and what economic outcomes they could achieve in a negotiation (Belliveau, 2005; Seidel et al., 2000; Sturm 2009). If women learn to evaluate their own and other people’s social networks, they will be better positioned to build strong networks of their own and will be less likely to be excluded from formal work networks and informal friendship networks (Perrewe & Nelson, 2004). In women-focused negotiation training, facilitators can engage women in an analysis of their social networks (e.g., Ibarra’s 1997 Network Assessment Exercise), helping trainees to identify strategies to broaden and diversify their networks to include sponsors, allies and critical influencers (Scully, 2009). Incorporating a focus on social networking skills into the negotiation course can help women to see the connections between long-term network
development and the short-term information search and planning associated with specific negotiations.

Stevens et al. (1993) anticipated that either goal-setting training (training negotiators to set high goals) or self-management training (training negotiators to anticipate obstacles that might interfere with goal achievement) would help women to achieve better negotiation outcomes. However, only self-management training had a discernable effect: Setting aspirational goals is not helpful if negotiators fail to persevere toward those goals. Therefore, in women-focused negotiation training, the facilitator needs to move beyond general advice about setting aspirational goals and focus on planning to overcome obstacles to those goals. When women plan, they can too easily imagine negative outcomes they might personally experience as a result of negotiating (e.g., retaliation and social rejection); anticipating these negative outcomes lowers their aspirations and motivates them to make quick concessions (Amantullah & Morris, 2010). However, when women imagine themselves negotiating for a friend during the planning stage (even though they were going to negotiate for themselves), women set higher goals and achieved higher performance (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Bear & Babcock, 2017 Study 2). This kind of exercise could help women to vividly imagine the obstacles they might encounter (and strategies for overcoming them), but with the benefit of emotional distance. Other mental imaging exercises could help women to identify attractive Plan Bs if the negotiation is not successful; knowing that there is a “quite favorable” backup motivates people to negotiate better outcomes for themselves (Kray, Reb, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004: 402 Experiment 1).

**Pre-Negotiation Challenge 3: Self Work**

Women generally feel less entitled than men and express more discomfort declaring their worth (Babcock et al., 2006; Barron, 2003). Our research participants repeatedly emphasized the
need for self work that would reduce those gender differences. They wanted to develop greater self-confidence and more positive beliefs about their own value. They felt that they underestimated their power and were overly critical, eroding their own confidence before the negotiation even started. They wanted to learn to not be afraid to negotiate (see Table 1)!

**What?** Women-focused negotiation training must recognize that female negotiators, in particular, need to realistically assess their personal resources and overcome their fear of negotiation. For any negotiator, experience increases performance; even a single negotiation experience improves performance (Thompson, 1990; Zerres, Huffmeier, Freund, Backhaus, & Hertel, 2013) and reduces gender differences in performance (Mazei et al., 2015). However, if women have historically avoided negotiation, they may need to accumulate a larger volume of “safe place” negotiation experiences to build confidence and overcome fear.

**How?** What differentiates women-focused negotiation training from traditional negotiation training is the recognition that women’s fear of negotiation needs to be addressed directly. Barkacs and Barkacs (2017) have developed an evidence-based role play simulation (focusing on an intra-organizational budget negotiation) that demonstrates how many gender differences (differences in propensity to initiate negotiations, different aspirational and confidence levels, and differential access to information) impact negotiation processes. Seeing gender differences “come alive” in the training room can motivate a self-assessment on these dimensions, and that self-assessment can, in turn, create a felt need for change and motivate self work. Also, Kray and Haselhuhn (2007) found that trainees with “incremental” beliefs (beliefs that negotiation skills were malleable) benefited more from a 15-week negotiation course than trainees with “entity” beliefs (beliefs that negotiation skills were fixed). Therefore, facilitators should demonstrate that women can and do develop negotiation skills over time (e.g., by
presenting testimonials from previous trainees) and debunk myths that negotiation skills are exclusive to one gender (e.g., by showing videos depicting effective female negotiators in action). Addressing these beliefs directly may help women to develop a learning orientation toward the course content so that they more fully engage in the learning process (Bereby-Meyer et al., 2004; Colquitt et al., 2000). Fear of negotiation may also be overcome by giving women an early success experience. For example, research demonstrates that women are effective negotiators when the topic is gender-congruent (e.g., Bear, 2011; Bear & Babcock, 2012). Facilitators could use a “feminine” simulation early in the training (e.g., negotiating the price of beads for jewelry-making rather than halogen headlights for motorcycles; Bear & Babcock, 2012) to convince trainees that they have “the right stuff.”

The long-term aim of women-focused negotiation training should, of course, be about building confidence and maintaining it across negotiations. However, it might also be useful to teach women in-the-moment “hacks” that help them to manage their discomfort and overcome their fear of negotiating. For example, Small, Gelfand, Babcock and Gettman (2007 Study 5) found that gender differences in negotiation outcomes were reduced when women had reflected on a time when they had felt powerful and in control before they began the negotiation. Teaching women to reframe negotiating as “asking” (Small et al., 2007 Studies 3 and 4) might encourage them to actively engage with negotiation training materials and to initiate actual negotiations on the job.

**During-Negotiation Challenge 4: Balance Agentic (Competent) and Communal (Warm)**

Women need to deliver the right combination of competence and warmth in order to succeed in negotiations (Kulik & Olekalns, 2012). They are expected to strike a balance between male stereotype-congruent agentic behavior and female stereotype-congruent communal
behavior. When women display overt confidence, task competence and self-interested assertiveness (male stereotype-congruent behaviors), they encounter resistance (Carli, La Fleur, & Loeber, 1995; Rudman & Glick, 1999). Our research participants did not always express their needs in terms of “balance”, but their responses reflect the tensions between these two behavioral sets: the women wanted to learn how to be more assertive during negotiations, and they wanted to maintain their identities as warm and communal (see Table 1).

**What?** To teach assertive behaviors, facilitators can draw on a wealth of evidence in the general negotiation literature about the kinds of behaviors and tactics that help negotiators to acquire and leverage power. Negotiators are more likely to achieve high economic outcomes for themselves when they open with realistic but strong anchoring offers (Galinsky & Mussweiler, 2001), recognize their walkaway points (Kristensen & Gärling, 1997), and make moderate but few concessions (Carnevale & Pruitt, 1992). These strategies are taught in most negotiation training courses using role play exercises (e.g., Coffee Contract; Simons & Tripp, 1999). However, women-focused negotiation training needs to acknowledge that women incur social costs when they use these assertive tactics (Kulik & Olekalns, 2012).

**How?** Here, the facilitator can draw on a large body of gender and negotiation research that has tested interventions designed to help female negotiators maintain warmth as they pursue their economic goals. Some of this research suggests that women reap social value from overt displays of warmth, including measured doses of “feminine charm” (e.g., smiling and paying compliments; Kray, Locke, & Van Zant, 2012 Experiments 2, 3, and 4) and “small talk” (Shaughnessy, Mislin, & Hentschel, 2015 Study 2). Other research suggests that women can soften the effects of agentic tactics by using humor (Schnurr, 2008) or relational accounts (Bowles & Babcock, 2013) that express concern for organizational members. The negotiator
might explicitly express the value she places on colleagues (“my relationship with people here is very important to me”; Bowles & Babcock, 2013 Study 1) or on the other negotiator (“this seemed like a situation in which I could get your advice”; Bowles & Babcock, 2013 Study 1).

She might emphasize how her negotiation outcomes will benefit other people (“this will benefit the entire team”; suggested by Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013). Or she might explain how her relationships led her to the negotiation (“my team leader…told me that I should talk with you”; Bowles & Babcock, 2013 Study 2).

These evidence-based strategies could easily be incorporated into women-focused negotiation training. For example, trainees could develop, and practice, negotiation scripts that include relational accounts. However, none of these strategies are full-fledged solutions. While the strategies consistently have positive effects on a negotiator’s impression management goals, their impact on economic goals can be “complicated” (Kray et al., 2012: 1354). Because people consistently associate high warmth with low competence (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999), a woman’s warmth displays can signal “unmitigated communion” (Amanatullah, Morris, & Curhan, 2008) that make her vulnerable to exploitation.

Further, consciously and deliberately projecting warmth in a negotiation may feel inauthentic to trainees (Bowles & Babcock, 2013). The “safe place” created in women-focused training sessions allows trainees to candidly discuss whether acting on one’s core values (e.g., caring about relationships) is illegitimate if the action has instrumental benefits (Ely, Padavic, & Thomas, 2012). These conversations give trainees opportunities to understand how other women balance agency-communion paradoxes in their worklives. For example, ascribing communal motives to agentic behaviors is not just an impression tactic directed toward the other negotiator;
it can also be a powerful reframing strategy that reconciles the need for agency behavior with one’s own underlying communal values (Zheng, Surgevil, & Kark, 2018).

Finally, women-focused negotiation training can make women aware that, in addition to acting agentically, an effective negotiator must be prepared to respond to the other negotiator’s “moves” (Kolb, 2004). Moves are initiated by a person who is trying to control his or her opponent. Moves include behaviors like demeaning the opponent’s offer, challenging the opponent’s expertise, or making threats. Women-focused negotiation can help trainees to recognize these power moves and, rather than responding with a power counter-move, “turn” them using indirect tactics. Indirect “turns” are usually more effective for women than direct “moves” because turns are less likely to violate gender stereotypes. A wide variety of actions can work as turns (Kolb & Williams, 2003): suggesting a break, taking a drink of water, or getting up from the table. Questioning an opponent’s move suggests puzzlement and throws responsibility back to the opponent to explain his or her position (Kolb, 2007).

**During-Negotiation Challenge 5: Managing Emotions**

Felt and expressed emotions in negotiations provide information about one’s own and the other negotiator’s interests (van Kleef & Côte, 2007); emotions can be used strategically in negotiations to overcome impasses and build trust (van Kleef & Côte, 2018). Women experience greater authenticity than men when they are able to openly express emotion (and greater stress when they have to suppress emotion) (Pugliesi & Shook, 1997; Simpson & Stroh, 2004). However, emotional display rules associated with gender stereotypes drive what, how, when and where emotions can be expressed by males and females (Brody & Hall 2008; Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000). For example, women are expected to suppress gender-incongruent emotions such as anger, fearlessness, irritation or detachment while displaying positive emotions
such as warmth, enthusiasm, sympathy and cheerfulness (Simpson & Stroh, 2004; Steinberg, 1999). Our research participants recognized the important role that emotions play in negotiation, identifying the need to learn how to manage their emotions (See Table 1 for quotes).

**What?** Negotiation training does not usually address emotion management, but women-focused negotiation training can explicitly target this challenge. Women need to learn how to set a positive emotional tone at the start of the negotiation (Gottman, Driver, & Tabares, 2015), monitor the emotional tone of a negotiation as it unfolds (Slaski & Cartwright, 2003; Groves, McEnrue, & Shen, 2008), detect and react to emotional manipulation (Fulmer, Barry, & Long, 2009), and control (Shapiro, 2002) and strategically display (Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006) their own emotions during the negotiation.

**How?** Expressing happiness at the start of a negotiation signals trustworthiness and cooperative intentions (Fridlund, 1994; Knutson, 1996). The good news for women is that expressing happiness, even when it is not authentic, improves negotiation outcomes and relationships (Kopelman et al., 2006). Further, because happiness is a gender-congruent emotion, displaying happiness may deliver additional benefits to women. Negotiation research suggests several simple strategies that can lift an opponent’s mood: using humor, offering food, paying a compliment, or building rapport before the negotiation begins. Compliments may be especially effective for women because research shows that flattery and flirting – used judiciously – can increase women’s likeability (Kray & Locke, 2008).

Facilitators can build women’s emotional intelligence, especially in the context of negotiations, by helping trainees to identify the emotional tone of the negotiation and develop skills to detect emotional manipulations that might be used by counterparts. Katz and Sousa (2015) identify three key competencies that define emotional intelligence. Two of these
competencies – social awareness and self-regulation – help women to read and manage the emotional tone of the negotiation. Social awareness refers to the ability to accurately identify and respond to others’ emotions. A critical element in this diagnostic process is the ability to discern when the other negotiator’s expressed emotions are spilling over from unrelated events and when they are the direct result of the current negotiation. Another aspect of this diagnostic process involves identifying whether the other negotiator’s expressed emotion is a manipulation tactic designed to elicit concessions and compliance. Emotional deception in negotiation can take the form of false negative or positive emotional displays such as pretending to be angry or sympathetic (Fulmer et al., 2009). Facilitators can raise awareness about emotional deception and help women recognize when their negotiation partners are trying to intimidate with a strategic display of anger (Kopelman et al., 2006) or are displaying inconsistent emotions such as a mix of sympathy and disgust (Sinaceur, Adam, van Kleef, & Galinsky, 2013).

Self-regulation also enables women to avert cycles of emotional contagion. Reflective appraisal is a key cognitive strategy for managing strong emotions: individuals who step back from anger-inducing experiences and focus on the reasons underlying the anger reduce the intensity of experienced negative emotions (Kross, Ayduk, & Mischel, 2005). Exploring the reasons for felt anger offers women two benefits. First, if women pause and reflect, they may opt to explain their anger rather than express it. Expressed anger, including fake anger, elicits anger from counterparts (Campagna, Mislin, Kong, & Bottom, 2016; Friedman, Brett, Anderson, Olekalns, Goates, & Lisco, 2004), so a more constructive response reduces the risk of emotional contagion and averts escalatory cycles. This is especially important in ongoing relationships, where the damage caused by negative emotions may spill over from one interaction to the next (Becker & Curhan, 2018). Second, reflective processing may enable women to step back from
the other negotiator’s anger. This psychological distance might curb women negotiators’ impulse to offer concessions to angry opponents (van Kleef, Manstead, & De Dreu, 2004). To reduce dysfunctional responses to anger, facilitators can teach women to step back from the situation, and try to understand the underlying reasons for their own emotions and the emotions of the other negotiator.

The third component of emotional intelligence is self-awareness, the ability to understand emotional triggers (Katz & Sousa, 2015). Strong emotions are most likely to surface when a core identity concern (autonomy, status, affiliation, or appreciation) is under threat (Shapiro, 2002). Understanding their own emotional triggers, and understanding that the same identity concerns can trigger strong emotions in other negotiators, will prepare women to manage emotions during the negotiation. Trainees can learn to recognize their emotional triggers by keeping an emotion diary (Shapiro, 2006). Recording the events that generated strong emotions, and explicitly labeling those emotions, will help women to identify the early warning signs that they are at risk of emotional “flooding” (i.e., being overwhelmed by a powerful emotion) (Potworowski & Kopelman, 2008). As part of this approach, women can learn about specific tools such as “going to the balcony” (Ury, 1991). Rather than reacting immediately to “no” or to attacks, women can take a moment to reflect on how they might redirect the negotiation to a more constructive process (also, Kolb, 2004).

Finally, because women may experience a tension between their desire for authenticity and the need to limit emotion expression in a negotiation, they may benefit from explicit discussions of this tension. Facilitators may explore the costs and benefits of expressing felt emotions versus displaying socially acceptable or strategic emotions to gain value in negotiations (Olekalns & Druckman, 2014). We know that certain negative emotions signal unmet
expectations and call for behavioral adjustment (Averill, 1983; Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999; Keltner & Haidt, 1999). Women may opt to display an authentic negative emotion such as disappointment in order to convey their experienced inequity and signal their need to negotiate change (Morris & Keltner, 2000; van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2006). There are benefits to be gained from the controlled and strategic expression of emotions (Kopelman et al., 2006). Emotional misrepresentation is judged less harshly than other unethical tactics used in negotiation (Fulmer et al., 2009).

**Post-Negotiation Challenge 6: Being Persistent**

Women negotiate in gendered work environments with institutionalized norms and “second generation” biases operating in the background (Kolb, 2009: 523) that make it difficult for women to persist in the face of resistance. Our research participants did not necessarily view persistence as a gendered problem, but they were aware of the importance of not letting everyday negotiation opportunities slip away and the need to come back to the table after hearing an initial “no” (see Table 1).

**What?** Women need to manage two roadblocks to successful negotiation outcomes: their reluctance to “push through” moments of adversity during a negotiation, and their disinclination to return to the negotiating table after a “no.” Women-focused negotiation training should aim to develop women’s awareness of, and ability to, more effectively manage these gender-specific roadblocks.

**How?** Research shows that women are less willing to persist when they encounter sticking points during their negotiation (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). There are two ways to tackle this issue: by better positioning themselves to address sticking points before embarking on a negotiation, and by managing disruptive inflections during a negotiation (Kolb & Williams,
2000). To better position women prior to negotiating, facilitators can engage women in both self- and process-work. Self work involves an additional layer of preparation, one in which women identify their goals for the negotiation but also try to anticipate the ways in which their opponent might try to block goal attainment (Kolb, 2004). Women need to recognize these disruptive inflection points – moments when a negotiation stalls, when the other negotiator says “no”, or when tensions escalate – and develop a behavioral repertoire for responding to those blocks (e.g., Kolb, 2004). Anticipating an opponent’s blocking moves helps women to respond constructively rather than being derailed by them. The self work might include preparing a “rejection then moderation” strategy (Cialdini, Vincent, Lewis, Catalan, Wheeler, & Darby, 1975), so that women can immediately present an alternative smaller proposal if their first proposal is rejected. For example, if a woman’s request for a promotion is rejected, she may be able to successfully negotiate a developmental opportunity that makes her more promotable in the future.

Process-work requires individuals to engage in shadow negotiations (Kolb & Williams, 2000). These informal interactions take place before a negotiation with the goal of structuring formal negotiation process in a way that supports goal attainment (also, Lax & Sebenius, 2003). Women can learn to set a problem-solving frame that encourages consensus and, where needed, enlists the support of others prior to the negotiation (Kolb & Williams, 2000). Tools such as the Caitlin’s Challenge video case (Kolb, 2012) allow women to analyze other negotiators’ actions and to discuss effective strategies for managing disruptions to the negotiation.

Women also need to develop resilience to adverse experiences, and to be willing to return to the negotiation table after contentious negotiation processes or poor negotiation outcomes. In general, high self-efficacy enables negotiators to develop more constructive responses to
negotiation adversity (Caza & Olekalns, 2012), suggesting that women will benefit from training that enhances their sense of self-efficacy. Cognitive re-appraisal is effective in reducing negative affect and increasing relationship satisfaction; this strategy can overcome difficult negotiations (Lewis, Olekalns, Smith, & Caza, 2018) and make it easier to initiate subsequent negotiations. The effectiveness of a cognitive re-appraisal hinges on the post-negotiation narrative that women develop to explain their experiences. Women who choose to look backwards and focus on the negative consequences (harm-find) will experience more negative affect and less relationship satisfaction than women who choose to look forward and focus on what they have learned to improve their negotiation (benefit-find). Facilitators could encourage women to keep a negotiation diary, in which they record the most critical moments in their negotiation, reflect on what they learned, and consider how this knowledge will improve the planning and execution of future negotiations.

**WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?**

In this chapter, we outlined a bare-bones framework for women-focused negotiation training. Reflecting on the principles inherent in women-focused leadership training, we suggested that negotiation training could (1) raise women’s awareness of the subtle and pervasive effects of gender in workplace negotiations, (2) create a safe place for women to learn new skills and experiment with alternative ways of negotiating, and (3) anchor negotiation skills to women’s personal identities and create an authentic sense of self as an effective negotiator. In developing the framework, we considered the skills that women need (and ask for) before, during and after a negotiation.

Throughout the chapter, we drew on the evidence base available in the burgeoning gender and negotiation literature. This process identified a clear imbalance. Some topics (e.g., tactics for
conveying and preserving warmth during a negotiation) have been heavily researched; we had the luxury of cherry picking highlights from a large database. Some topics (e.g., gender’s impact on pre-negotiation planning and goal-setting) have been lightly touched; here we could offer only a few options. And some topics (e.g., managing emotions and persisting) are still at early stages of development.

We emphasize that the framework we present is preliminary and warrants caution. Even for topics where there is a large amount of research information, many of our recommended interventions (e.g., the effects of primes and relational accounts) have only been studied in the laboratory, and only their short-term effects are known. We encourage researchers to field-test these interventions in real-world organizations and in the context of ongoing work relationships. Most importantly, we encourage more research focusing on the effects of negotiation training itself, and for the questions addressed in this research to go beyond contrasting delivery modes (e.g., Nadler et al., 2003) and participant reactions (e.g., Taylor, Mesmer-Magnus, & Burns, 2008). We would welcome research that, rather than studying the short-term effects of individual tactics in a single negotiation, studied the effects of participation in a women-focused negotiation training course on a series of negotiations in the context of ongoing employment.

Further, we recognize that women-focused negotiation training is likely to be controversial. Both the academic (e.g., Martin & Phillips, 2017) and practitioner (e.g., Tinsley & Ely, 2018) literatures have suggested that “gender blindness” (downplaying gender differences and focusing on gender similarities) may be an alternative to highlighting gender effects in the workplace. For example, Martin and Phillips (2017) demonstrated that women who endorse more gender-blind beliefs also express more workplace confidence. However, even its advocates acknowledge that gender blindness is only “a short-term fix” that “leaves structural problems in
place” (Martin & Phillips, 2017: 41). Gender blindness, and gender-blind negotiation training, may help individual women to succeed in the workplace. However, gender awareness and women-focused negotiation training may be more effective in helping women to recognize workplace barriers and motivating them to dismantle those barriers as a collective. For example, Ely et al. (2011: 484) describe how cohorts participating in the authors’ women-focused leadership courses initiated systemic changes in their home organizations’ performance appraisal and promotion processes. Similarly, women-focused negotiation courses may be the catalyst for organizational changes that make employment terms more transparent and establish zones of negotiability that reduce gender differences in negotiation success (Kulik & Olekalns, 2012 Table 1).

One limitation of our framework is that we did not discuss how effective negotiation might vary as a function of gender composition (male-female vs female-female dyads) (Kray & Thompson, 2005; Miles & LaSalle, 2009; Stuhlmacher & Linnabery, 2013). The research findings here are not sufficiently consistent that we felt confident in making recommendations. Nonetheless, knowing your opponent, and predicting your opponent’s moves and reactions, are important skills for all negotiators, and the opponent’s gender is likely to influence how the negotiation unfolds. We also did not address a key question about whether women-focused negotiation training should be women-exclusive. Women-focused leadership training does sometimes occur within mixed groups, but more frequently occurs in women-exclusive training groups. Scholars suggest that limiting the sessions to female participants fosters learning by putting women in a majority position (Ely et al., 2011). It creates opportunities for women to learn from similar others who are uniquely positioned to give support, validation, and social comparison (Debebe, 2011). Over the long term, these cohorts create supportive networks to
provide ongoing help as participants move up the career ladder (Ngunjiri & Gardiner, 2017).

However, male leaders and managers can also benefit from women-focused training. Ely et al. (2011) suggest that women-focused training can make male managers more aware of the subtle biases that influence the feedback they give to women and the way they assess women’s potential – creating more channels for internal organizational change.
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**Table 1. Women-focused Challenges: Qualitative themes from the interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation Stage</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Detailed Description of Challenges</th>
<th>Illustrative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Pre-Negotiations</td>
<td>1. Gender Awareness</td>
<td>Interviewees noted that some women may not even recognize that gender may be a factor in negotiation. Women need to acknowledge and become more aware of the role of gender. They mentioned affinity groups or forums where women could discuss their experiences without the fear of being judged and thereby learn more about gender-based disadvantages that others faced when negotiating. These “safe place” discussions could also allow women to develop a broader awareness of what types of issues are likely to be negotiable.</td>
<td><em>Awareness:</em> &quot;I just wonder maybe we’ve tried to take over the years the gender out of things so much that actually it’s been a disadvantage, maybe we should acknowledge&quot;; &quot;If you can name the difficulty it is easier to manage it. I think women need forums where they can practice doing that&quot;; &quot;I think helping women to learn to identify the factors that influence negotiations will help to increase everybody's awareness of that...&quot;; &quot;So maybe it’s just about an awareness of negotiating something for yourself.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | 2. Goal Setting and Planning | Interviewees described their need to set aspirational goals, and to learn how to plan better so that explicit and implicit negotiation issues are thoroughly considered prior to negotiation. Interviews emphasized the need to maintain aspirations/goals while engaging in a critical analysis of all potential stakeholders and their potential arguments. | *Goal Setting:* "So, you have got to be very clear about what it is that you want, like the outcome of it."; "To know what you want before you go in. I think it’s very easy to walk into negotiation and take what’s offered but not to actually think about what you want yourself..."; "...I think women just have to ask they just have to try - instead of assuming that we can’t do, and assume that we can...”  
*Planning:* "...probably just to make sure that ...you’ve considered every other outcome and that you have all your ‘ducks in a row’ before you go into the negotiation"; "...you’ve got your understanding of both positions, and you know what they’re trying to get to, so you have a little bit of information before you go in," |
3. Self-Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interviewees described their need to develop greater self-confidence and positive self-beliefs about their own value and power in negotiations. They wanted to learn how to better assess their own power and how to avoid confidence drops triggered by critical assessments of their power before a negotiation. They wanted to overcome fear, reduce anxiety and learn not to be afraid of negotiating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | Self-Worth: "We can downplay it a lot ...we can be our own worst enemy."; "need to upsell yourself"; "improve my confidence in doing it, not just accept the first thing that someone tells me..."
Confidence: "if you have confidence and have that self-belief and assertiveness, then I think those skills are good for really thinking about what you want"; "one thing I’ve learnt is to recognize your own power probably. Because I have come out of sort of negotiations/discussions and gone, “Oh yeah, I did actually have some power in that.”; “So, remembering that it kind of makes you temper what you do with people, but it also gives you some confidence as well.”
Fear & Anxiety: "... I think they need to not be scared to stand "; "...Don’t be so scared of it. I don’t know how you teach don’t be so scared of it but it’s okay to ask for things you want."; "I think, as women, we overthink the issue and therefore don’t ask, don’t negotiate, a lot of the time, because we think we know where things are going to go anyway." |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Women-focused negotiation training</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don’t go in blind.”; “…you’ve got to watch, look at the whole situation, it's a battlefield, you’ve got to watch who the players are, where they're standing.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  | 52 |
| Stage 2: During Negotiations | 4. Balance between Agentic (Competent) and Communal (Warm) | Interviewees described their need to develop more assertiveness during negotiations, but they also acknowledged the importance of being communal. | *Agentic:* "be as assertive as possible but also know when to pick your battles, just because it can be challenging..."; "because the male is the aggressor and he’ll put his point across, whereas the women will just back off a little bit"; "we consider others a lot and so we don’t have such good role models to actually be able to stand up for ourselves"; "so I think you just have to be direct, tell them what you want, assertive but not aggressive."
*Communal:* "Put others’ needs as a rationale for your ask"; "...being to the point is one thing but being very demanding and aggressive is not so much favorable"; "doing it in a way that’s not perceived as aggressive."

| 5. Managing Emotions | Interviewees described their need to learn how to manage emotions during negotiation. They discussed the need to recover from negative feedback during negotiations. They wanted to be more thick-skinned about disagreements and not take it personally. | *Emotional Regulation:* "But take the emotion out of it to make it a factual event, a procedural – a task-based event, rather than being driven from the emotion of trying to get what you want. Because I think as soon as it becomes about trying to get what you want, and you feel personally connected to it, I think you lose your impact in the actual negotiation"; “The worst part I suppose as a female is that I get emotional, I get hurt”; “if it doesn’t work out not to beat themselves up as well but to go back...”

| Stage 3: Post-Negotiations | 6. Being Persistent | Interviewees described their need to not let small everyday negotiations slide and to not miss opportunities to initiate a negotiation even if larger negotiations fail at first. They also stressed the importance of practice and a learning mindset to help internalize negotiation skills and improve persistence. | *Not let things slide:* "would be the most important thing I think to let people know, is talk about when they’re small issues, not when they’re big issues"; "...women will let things slide, and let things slide, and let things slide, until they get really emotionally engaged and then it will come out, and that’s not the best way to do it."
*Get past "No":* I think don’t be put off by the initial response that you get from someone ..."; "So I think don’t be put off by difficulties – I suppose regroup and try again or get more information..."
Practice to persist: “I guess maybe the more practice you have the better you get at it”; "Practice it with someone who knows the issues and could give feedback around the sorts of language to use”; "Negotiate at least one thing for yourself a year just to get into the habit of it..”; "just by watching and observing, and maybe analyzing those situations, you know, watching a video and then sort of analyzing it."