



---

**ROBERT F. WAGNER  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF  
PUBLIC SERVICE**



**CEBMa**

*Helping people in organizations  
make better decisions*

## **CRITICALLY APPRAISED TOPIC:**

**Impact of Gender on Mixed-Gender Negotiations**

Roma Pielarska

**REFERENCE GUIDE**

BACKGROUND ..... 3

INCLUSION CRITERIA ..... 3

SEARCH STRATEGY ..... 4

STUDY SELECTION ..... 4

DATA EXTRACTION ..... 5

CRITICAL APPRAISAL ..... 5

RESULTS ..... 6

    Definitions ..... 6

    Causal mechanism ..... 6

    Main findings ..... 7

CONCLUSION ..... 7

LIMITATIONS ..... 8

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 8

REFERENCES ..... 9

## BACKGROUND

Negotiations are common place, they may be formal or informal, and can involve anything from contract and salary negotiations to permissions for less tangible privileges such as flexible working hours. Gender differences are commonly believed to affect the outcome of negotiations, with the mainstream notion being that women fare worse than men.

In an effort to better understand whether or not women truly are less effective at capturing value than their male counterparts, and so that I may be better equipped to identify the impact gender differences can have in professional mixed-gender negotiations, I have conducted a review of the available literature using the Critically Appraised Topic (CAT) assessment approach used by various evidence-based disciplines, such as nursing. Through my assessment I aim to answer the following questions:

What is known in scholarly literature about gender's impact on outcomes negotiated by women versus men? And what specifically about gender is it that is driving the difference (if any)?

It is worthwhile to note that although a CAT utilizes a systematic methodology, it is both a quick and succinct assessment of the available research and therefore it has one notable limitation, it may be more prone to selection bias than other methods.

The criteria for this CAT is not sector specific because negotiations in a mixed-gender context can take place anywhere, they can be in an academic setting, as part of a service provider-client relationship as well as in a professional environment, they can also take place in a domestic setting. What is key is the mixed-gender dynamic and its impact, if any, and the degree to which it may be generalized.

<b>POPULATION</b>	Women
<b>INTERVENTION</b>	Negotiation
<b>COMPARISON</b>	Men
<b>OUTCOME</b>	Identify whether gender differences account for outcome
<b>CONTEXT</b>	Mixed-gender negotiation

## INCLUSION CRITERIA

The inclusion criteria for this CAT are as follows:

1. Date: published in the period 1998 to 2017
2. Language: articles in English
3. Type of studies: peer-reviewed, quantitative, empirical studies.
4. Study design: meta-analyses, randomized and controlled
5. Measurement: studies in which the effect of gender on negotiation outcomes was measured
6. Outcome: better or worse negotiated outcomes
7. Context: mixed-gender negotiations

No exclusion criteria were identified.

## SEARCH STRATEGY

The ProQuest Central database was used to conduct the search of key terms and the following generic search filters were also applied during the search:

1. Scholarly journals with peer-reviewed articles
2. Published in the period 1998 to 2017
3. Articles in English

Search terms used throughout the process included: negotiation, negotiation outcome, gender, and “meta-analysis”, which was included in the search field as a filter could not be located.

### Search Strategy

Set#	Searched for	Databases	Results
S1	("negotiation outcome" AND "gender") AND peer(yes)	ProQuest Central	146°
S2	("meta-analysis" AND "negotiation outcome" AND "gender") AND peer(yes)	ProQuest Central	78°

## STUDY SELECTION

Selecting relevant studies took place in four phases. First, the titles and abstracts of 146 studies were screened for their relevance to question of gender impact on negation outcomes. Duplicate publications were removed automatically by the database. This first criterion yielded too many results and so instead of searching for “negotiation” the process was narrowed by searching for “negotiation outcome”. This second phase reduced the results to 78. Again the titles and abstracts of the 78 results were examined and 10 studies were chosen based on relevance to the CAT question described earlier. This last phase yielded 2 meta-analyses and 2 experimental studies, for a total of 4 studies, which were reviewed in full.

## DATA EXTRACTION

The data extracted from the studies produced by the selection process is presented in the table below. Organized according to study design, with the most desirable on top, and then in order of trustworthiness.

AUTHOR & YEAR	SECTOR/ POPULATION	DESIGN & SAMPLE SIZE	MAIN FINDINGS	EFFECT SIZE	LIMITATIONS	LEVEL & TRUSTWORTHINESS
Stuhlmacher & Walters (1999)	"Organization"; US & Canada; 14 years or older	Meta-analysis of 21 studies N=3,496 Female=1550 Male=1956	Men appear to negotiate better outcomes than women, however the gap seems to be narrow.	large	Quality of the studies included was not assessed	A, High @ 90%
Stuhlmacher, Citera & Willis 2007	General population within the studies used	Meta-analysis of controlled studies; no sample size provided	Women negotiated higher profits in virtual negotiations as opposed to face-to-face but the effect was small.	small	It is likely important studies were missed, quality of the studies included was not assessed	B, Limited 70%
Miles, LaSalle 2008	MBA students in the US	Randomized, controlled; no sample size provided	Male-male dyads created more value than female-female dyads in both study 1 and study 2. No differences were found in the proportion of the negotiation "pie" claimed by men versus women. These combined results indicate that, in mixed-motive negotiations, gender differences in individual-level outcomes are a function of the amount of value created by the dyad, not in differences in the division of value.	large	Precision for the effect size was not reported.	A, High 90%
Sutter, Bosman, Kocher, et al. 2008	Undergraduate students, location not provided	Randomized, controlled; N=125	There are no significant differences in men and women per se, however, when looked at in the context of same and mixed gender pairings, more value is destroyed in same gender scenarios	small	Not ideal for measuring effect or impact	A, High 90%

## CRITICAL APPRAISAL

After the critical appraisal of 5 studies, 4 were included. The overall quality and internal validity was *high*, with one *limited* study. Of the two meta-analyses, one examined controlled 21 studies and was graded with an A and a high level of reliability; it also provided a large effect size making it an excellent source. The other meta-analysis did not expressly state the number of studies or what types of studies were examined and as a result it was graded as B with a limited level of reliability, it also provided a small effect size.

In addition, two A-grade randomized, controlled experiments were examined, both with a high level of reliability, one of which demonstrated a large effect size, while the other a smaller one and both help to further explain the findings demonstrated by the meta-analyses.

On the issue of effect size, given the fact that negotiations can take place over a wider array of issues, impact size can be highly subjective. For example, receiving \$2,500 less than one attempted to negotiate on a \$100,000 salary may not seem like a lot, after all it's only 2.5%, however, over the

course of one's career this \$2,500 shortfall has a cumulative effect and could have a large impact, this is despite that fact that a given study can call the effect small.

## RESULTS

### Definitions

The definitions related to this search include to concept of negotiation but in this context this concept is more accurately expressed by the word *negotiate* which is defined as, "to confer with another so as to arrive at the settlement of some matter"<sup>1</sup> Specifically, examined is dyadic mixed-gender negotiation. A *dyad*, sociologically and pedagogically speaking, refers to a group of two people and gender is defined as, "Either of the two sexes (male and female), especially when considered with reference to social and cultural differences rather than biological ones."<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this CAT, the outcome of an attempt to negotiate refers to the amount of the existing or created value that is either captured or yielded by one of the counterparties to the other.

Intercreative negotiation is an approach that is converse to distributive negotiation, which assumes there is a fixed amount of value (a "fixed pie") to be divided between the parties, *integrative negotiation* often attempts to create value in the course of the negotiation ("expand the pie").<sup>3</sup> It can also be referred to as *value creation*.

Lastly, *effect size* refers to the practical, not statistical, relevance of a given study. In other words, the level of impact a particular finding is likely to have in a real-world setting.

### Causal mechanism

One of the causal principles posited by Stuhlmacher & Walters (1999) is that men achieve more because of perceptual, behavioral, and contextual differences. One of these perceptual differences is the simple expectation that women are less effective than men and so the stereotypical behavior is triggered. Women's perception of themselves as negotiators also impact this stereotypical behavior. This is also support by Stuhlmacher, Citera, and Willis' (2007) finding, where women fared better when negotiating virtually. Lastly, women are thought to value intangible benefits more than men, like building interpersonal relationships, and so they are less likely to pursue tangible "wins" appear as though they do not create or capture as much of the value as possible. In addition, and as is discussed by Miles and LaSalle, the causal relationship is the makeup of the negotiating dyad, male-male (MM), female-female (FF), or female-male (FM/MF), and not the actual division of the value. In short, it's the makeup of the dyad that has the most impact on the outcome not the gender itself.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negotiate>

<sup>2</sup> <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/gender>

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negotiation#Integrative\\_negotiation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negotiation#Integrative_negotiation)

## Main findings

### *Men negotiate better outcomes than women (level A)*

A meta-analysis of 21 studies indicates that men appear to negotiate better outcomes than women, however the gap seems to be narrow and could not be eliminated by removing moderators and so it is concluded that the gap is real (Stuhlmacher & Walters 1999). A large effect size is reported with this meta-analysis.

### *Women negotiated higher profits in virtual negotiations (level B)*

This meta-analysis examines how “social roles create conflicting behavioral expectations for female negotiators; however, virtual negotiations reduce social pressures.” In virtual negotiations women appear to be more aggressive and can ignore other social cues or pressures to be collaborative and permits to handle the task at hand, and not be concerned with relationship building (Stuhlmacher, Citera & Willis 2007). The effect of this study is believed to be small, although this is subjective due to the cumulative nature of negotiations described earlier.

### *The negotiated outcome is highly depended on the gender(s) of the negotiating dyad, with MM creating the more value than FF (level A)*

Male-male dyads created more value than female-female dyads in both studies examined. No differences were found in the proportion of the negotiation “pie” claimed by men versus women. These combined results indicate that in mixed-motive negotiations, gender differences in individual-level outcomes are a function of the amount of value created by the dyad, not in differences in the division of value (Miles, LaSalle 2008). This conclusion carries with it a large effect size.

### *Value is more likely to be destroyed in same-gender dyads than in mixed-gender dyads (level A)*

There are no large differences in negotiations amongst men and women per se, however, when looked at in the context of same versus mixed-gender pairings, more value is destroyed in same gender scenarios (Sutter, Bosman, Kocher, et al. 2008). However, since the effect size is small this study is not ideal for measuring effect or impact.

## CONCLUSION

The critically appraised scholarly literature on the topic of gender’s impact on negotiation outcomes by women versus men indicates that there is indeed a difference; in mixed-gender (MF/FM) negotiations, women tend to fare more poorly than men, although that gap is narrow (Stuhlmacher & Walters 1999). The research also indicates that these dynamics are lessened if not removed when the negotiations are conducted virtually and women can ignore the social cue pressures which are present in fact to fact negotiations building (Stuhlmacher, Citera & Willis 2007). Additionally, there is evidence that supports the driver behind the difference is closely related to the make-up of the negotiating dyad, with FF dyads creating the least amount of value, while MM dyads creating the most, and MF dyads falling somewhere in the middle (Miles, LaSalle 2008). But more specifically, there is evidence suggesting that the issue does not lay in the gender differences in individual-level outcomes but instead it is the amount of value created by the dyad, not in differences in the division of value (Sutter, Bosman, Kocher, et al. 2008).

## **LIMITATIONS**

The major and overarching limitation of the studies examined is that none were conducted in a sector-specific setting, or the sector/population wasn't clearly described, or the participants were students only. This means that it would be difficult to apply the conclusion described above to a specific group of professionals, such as doctors or those working in financial services, where the ability to negotiate may not be as gender-dependent. A second limitation exists in the case of both meta-analyses where the quality of the studies included was not assessed, this is due to the fact that the information was not provided by the authors.

Lastly, all research examined only discusses negotiations amongst dyads, it does not examine same-gender groups or mixed-gender groups and so it would be impossible to generalize this research to a group dynamic.

Given these limitations, although we can assume that gender plays a profound role in negotiations, we cannot safely generalize this conclusion as it will be dependent on the population/sector in question.

## **IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Gender's impact on the negotiation process amongst men and women cannot be ignored because research demonstrates that it exists and its existence, even if seemingly small, shows that women fare more poorly than men and these losses are highly likely to have cumulative impacts.

The evidence gathered in the CAT calls for attention to be paid to the gender make-up of the negotiating dyad as this seems to bear a great deal of weight on the integrative value created or the overall outcome, with especially close attention being paid to female-female dyads, which research indicates are least likely to create value.

The research also indicates that the best negotiated outcomes will be achieved by male-male dyads followed by male-female/female-male dyads, however women will claim the least amount of the value in these mixed-gender cases.

In closing, logic would dictate that from a management perspective negotiating should be left to male-male dyads. However, this doesn't benefit women and it isn't likely given the gender diversity of modern workplaces. In order to overcome the male-female/female-male dyad disparity I recommend that employers, as well as educators, implement integrative negotiation skills classes into professional development plans and academic curriculums.

## REFERENCES

- Miles, Edward W., and Margaret M. LaSalle. "Gender and Creation of Value in Mixed-Motive Negotiation." *International Journal of Conflict Management* 20.3 (2009): 269-86. *ProQuest*. Web. 28 Mar. 2017.
- Stuhlmacher, Alice F., and Amy E. Walters. "Gender Differences in Negotiation Outcome: A Meta-Analysis." *Personnel Psychology* 52.3 (1999): 653-77. *ProQuest*. Web. 28 Mar. 2017.
- Stuhlmacher, Alice F., Maryalice Citra, and Toni Willis. "Gender Differences in Virtual Negotiation: Theory and Research." *Sex Roles* 57.5-6 (2007): 329-39. *ProQuest*. Web. 28 Mar. 2017.
- Sutter, Matthias, et al. "Gender Pairing and Bargaining--Beware the Same Sex!" *Experimental Economics* 12.3 (2009): 318-31. *ProQuest*. Web. 28 Mar. 2017.