Gendered Organizational Order and Negotiations Research

Harris Sondak[1] and Alice F. Stuhlmacher[2]

1 Department of Management, David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, U.S.A.
2 Department of Psychology, DePaul University, Chicago, IL, U.S.A.

Keywords
gender, negotiation, organizational order, social order.

Correspondence
Harris Sondak, Department of Management, David Eccles School of Business, University of Utah, 1645 E Campus Ctr DR, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, U.S.A.; e-mail: sondak@business.utah.edu.

Abstract

The study of negotiations can be informed by conceptualizing gender, as well as negotiation, within the larger organizational and societal order. Expanding the definition of negotiation and gender begins with consideration of *who* negotiates, *what* is negotiated, *when* negotiations are undertaken, *how* negotiations proceed, and finally, *why* this research proceeds. By considering this broad set of questions, researchers can incorporate a wider range of perspectives about negotiation, gender, and organizational contexts into their work.

Negotiation research has provided many important insights about individual negotiators. Much of this work has been conducted in laboratory studies that, although often enacted under an organizationally relevant cover story, are quite decontextualized. This abstraction has been neither accidental nor fruitless. Laboratory methods are well suited to studying processes and theories that are expected to generalize across contexts (Mook, 1983). The knowledge generated by this approach to research has indeed proved quite useful to negotiators in many situations.

Gender, too, has been a focus of research in the social sciences broadly and in the organizational sciences more specifically. Much has been written on the gendered processes at work and in the access to positions of power (see Eagly & Carli, 2007). Where the gendered barriers have been labeled a glass ceiling since the 1980s, other metaphors include the conception of a glass escalator, where traditional groups advance faster (Maume, 1999), or a labyrinth (Eagly & Carli, 2007), with more obstructions for women to navigate than men. Gender researchers, while contributing to our understanding of human behavior, struggle with appropriately conceptualizing gender and gender identity, separating what is determined by biology from what is constructed through social

The order of the authors is alphabetical.

Volume 2, Number 1, Pages 107–120

processes, and distinguishing among factors that co-vary with gender such as status, power, and family responsibilities. Substantial controversies continue (see LaFrance, Paluck, & Brescoll, 2004) regarding the extent to which gender research leads to overlooking similarities between the sexes and ignoring the dissimilarities within each sex, or even if such studies inadvertently and unnecessarily foster gender polarization.

Our comments do not directly address these debates, but rather offer initial thoughts on broadening the contexts of gender and negotiation research. Our goal is to bring together concepts and research in negotiation and gender in a way that integrates the insights from idealized laboratory studies and contextualized gender research. We hope to further the research agendas of both lab and field researchers in both of these areas of research, whether or not those researchers make that integration an explicit goal of their own projects.

Over the last decade, the intersection of gender and negotiation has seen a resurgence of attention (e.g., Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007; Bowles, Babcock, & McGinn, 2005; Kolb, 2000; Kolb & Williams, 2000; Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002; Kray, Reb, & Galinsky, 2004; Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky, 2001; Small, Gelfand, & Babcock, 2007; Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999; Walters, Stuhlmacher, & Meyer, 1998). Research suggests that gender differences exist in several areas in negotiation, such as propensity to initiate negotiations (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Small et al., 2007), behavior during the negotiation process (Stuhlmacher, Citera, & Willis, 2007; Walters et al., 1998), and negotiation outcomes (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999). Although much of this research has focused on comparing men and women in search of differences between the sexes, the expectation is that documenting these effects can pave the way for a more complete understanding of when and why such differences occur.

The conference at which the papers in this issue were presented focused less on documenting differences between the sexes and more on contextualized approaches to gender and negotiation as experienced by women. While some of the research discussed at the conference built on the findings of laboratory studies, this issue focuses on the lived negotiation experiences of people embedded in organizational contexts. Gendered workplaces and the negotiations that occur in them are ultimately a part of the broader social order, that is, the relationships within and between individuals, groups, organizations, and nations. Strauss (1978) encouraged researchers to think of social order as negotiated—and conceptualized negotiation as the predominant mode of ''getting things accomplished'' (p. 234) in organizations. Similarly, this essay considers further how those who study negotiations can be informed by conceptualizing gender within the larger organizational and societal order. Here, we outline five questions relevant to the conceptualization of gender and negotiated order.

Who, What, How, When, and Why

The questions of gender and negotiation are embedded in organizations. In expanding their conceptions of negotiations and negotiations research, we encourage laboratory and field researchers alike to review issues relating to *who* negotiates, *what* is being

negotiated, *when* are negotiations undertaken, *how* negotiations proceed, and finally, to recognize and reflect on *why* this research is done.

Who

Researchers who consider gender as part of a negotiated order have focused attention on questions of identity, or who comes to the negotiation table. Indeed gender, as distinct from sex, is inherently a question of identity as defined by the self and others (Pryzgoda & Chrisler, 2000; West & Zimmerman, 1987). This focus on questions of identity is in contrast to much of the laboratory work on negotiations that focuses on task-specific variables, for example, relative bargaining strength. Task-related variables have been found to be important factors in determining negotiated outcomes and, indeed, more important than a range of personality variables studied by researchers of an earlier generation. However, distinct from individual differences that exist independently of social interaction, tensions between various identities that organizational members adopt at work and the relationship among these identities and gender have received less attention by negotiation researchers.

Organizational members are situated in multiple and often competing identities. While we may be able to determine average or normative behavior, Yoder and Kahn (1993) speak to the fallacy of generalizing these norms to all members of a group. In reality, the idea of an average woman or man is statistical rather than actual. Scully (this issue) discusses tensions between identity silos (e.g., the interdependence of employee network groups for African-Americans, women's leadership, working parents), and how aspects of identity wax and wane with interests, issues, and context. More broadly, individual organizational members are embedded in social contexts that affect and reflect formal and informal power (Granovetter, 1985). Not only do organizational charts determine formal authority, but membership in particular functional areas and social networks also influences interests and performance (Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002). For example, in Golden-Biddle and Reay (this issue), nurse practitioners were negotiating their identity in the gendered contexts of clarifying their relationship to nurses and doctors as well as in relation to professional ethics of caring versus curing.

Furthermore, individual organizational members are also embodied consciousness, to borrow an idea from French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1962), a fact that considerations of gender in the workplace make impossible to ignore. A lobbyist we know, for example, has cerebral palsy, as well as an advanced degree from Berkeley, and is a highly effective negotiator during the state legislative session. He attributes his success in part to how often he is underestimated by his negotiation counterparts, a result of being in a wheelchair and having limited control over his own movements. As he puts it, "My body doesn't work very well, but there's nothing wrong with my mind." The salience of his physical state activates opponents' expectations (conscious and unconscious) about his mental and physical health. He is able to take advantage of his negotiation opponents' conflating his physical disability with his negotiating prowess. The salience of the body for negotiation is apparent in the case of gender where gender uniqueness (e.g., gender minorities) or gendered personal appearance (e.g., negotiators in feminine dress or pregnant; see Greenberg, Ladge, & Claire, this issue) draws attention to the individual.

That negotiators come to work with bodies, not just minds, is obvious to even the casual observer in regard to work in which the body has an explicit performative element. Careers in firefighting, modeling, sports, and performing arts strongly exhibit this characteristic (Riach & Wilson, 2007). In these occupations, among others, because bodily states are directly related to career success, negotiating the organizational social order explicitly involves one's physical self. Thus, negotiating pregnancy benefits, for example, takes on added dimensions for such workers.

Negotiation research has overlooked how identity within an organizational context and the personal bodily states of negotiators affect processes and outcomes, but certainly these are issues of practical and theoretical importance. Formal and informal organizational identities as well as physical states affect negotiators' expectations of themselves and others. How do these context-based expectations affect negotiation behavior and negotiated outcomes? In other words, when does the ''who'' of negotiation become relevant? Social role theory (see Eagly & Karau, 2002) suggests that the question of ''who'' has substantial influence on shared expectations. Putnam and Bochantin (this issue) highlight how the social construction of older women and physical appearance leads to negotiations on both personal and organizational responses to handling symptoms of menopause at work.

Organizational and personal responses often go beyond a single body in the negotiation mix; many organizational members are negotiating as agents or as mediators and these roles also entail gendered contexts. There are of course some individuals who negotiate only on their own behalf, but the majority of negotiations include a broader network (spouses, partners, colleagues, and children) who in effect have a stake in the outcome. Relevant to who is at the table, Bowles et al. (2005) found that while there are no differences between women's and men's agreements when they negotiate for themselves, women negotiate better deals for their protégées than do men. While agents' social bonds with principals make a difference (Bottom, Holloway, Miller, Mislin, & Whitford, 2006), little work has considered how organizationally embedded negotiators approach their task when representing others with whom they have a close personal relationship and how these relationships are gendered. The papers in this issue offer further illustrations on how gendered identity and bodily states are relevant to *who* comes to the negotiation table.

What

Besides issues that are directly attributable to sex, we see a wide range of subjects that come to be part of a gendered negotiated organizational order. Popular wisdom and negotiation instructors say that much is negotiable, but what issues get actually defined as on the table? Viewing organizations as gendered social orders helps reveal a broad range of issues that can be negotiated.

In one of our communities, for example, a municipal bus operator was terminated because of disagreement over an issue that normally is not up for negotiation. The problem arose when a bus operator who had been hired as a man told her supervisor that in fact she was transsexual. She was planning to have gender reorientation surgery, was still saving money to pay for the procedure, and would begin to present herself as a

woman. In this community, bus operators are expected to use public restrooms at various locations along their routes and management was concerned about which restrooms this operator would use. Although no complaints had been received by the transit agency, the operator was terminated because of fear of liability because she, despite being (for the present) biologically male, intended to use female restrooms.

While which restroom to use is not likely to be a common topic for workplace negotiation, the fact that organizational members are situated and embodied raises issues that are in fact, sooner or later, unavoidable. Discussion of specific tasks and topics—from negotiating the purchase of military jets to negotiations over family leave—may trigger gendered social processes. Childbearing can only be done by women of a certain age range and careers are often built during the childbearing years. Even more broadly, child rearing is not restricted to women—in theory and in frequent practice, if not yet in some people's understanding. Those organizational members who want or who have families must balance their responsibilities to themselves, their loved ones, and their work. To what extent are issues such as these entirely personal rather than topics for negotiation at work? More broadly, what legitimizes issues as negotiable in a work setting? Greenberg et al. (this issue) discuss the dilemmas for pregnant women in determining public versus private roles and requirements. Given the legal environment in which they operate, organizations must accommodate some of these individual choices, and so employees are empowered to participate in creating the negotiated order. But organizations differ in the extent to which they go beyond legally required minimum benefits, for example, and researchers could attempt to explain this variation. Likewise, these variations and broader patterns are central to recognizing second generation gender issues—practices that appear gender neutral but still result in adverse impact in relation to access and opportunity that may only be detected with a systemic and macro focus (see Kolb & McGinn; Roth; Sturm; all this issue).

The *what* in the bargaining mix requires recognizing the status quo, as well as being sensitive to emerging social orders. Roth (this issue) shows how the *what* in financial sector services firms has changed in part through law suits. However, some of the underlying issues (e.g., access to social networks, going golfing with the guys) are still not up for negotiation. The negotiations are around the outcomes rather than the root causes.

In an empirical example, Rothhausen-Vange, Arnold, and Power (2008) recruited former employees who voluntarily left one of four corporate headquarters. A portion of the sample was interviewed about their reasons for leaving the organization. Forty-eight facets were generated about the root causes for their departure. Several factors beyond traditional job turnover and job satisfaction concepts emerged. A remaining sample of participants was surveyed in more detail supporting the additional predictors of turnover (travel, hour flexibility, corporate executive support, and identity). These new predictors were integral to gender and identity and included dimensions relating to respect, allowance for spiritual values, and work–life balance. The demographics of society and workplace have certainly changed since most models of job satisfaction and turnover were developed, but the reliance on previous models has limited researchers' ability to recognize other factors. Much work remains to be done on identifying and

understanding issues that, while important to organizational members who help construct the social order at work, are overlooked by current negotiation research.

In the experimental laboratory tradition, the *whats* of the negotiation scenario are often overlooked because the topic of negotiation is assumed to be less important than the negotiation processes and structure. But negotiated social order recognizes that negotiation legitimizes individuals' claims on organizational resources. *What* is negotiated involves not just a specific set of predetermined issues but also how these issues interact within the backdrop of workplace policies and existing paradigms of recruitment, placement, appraisals, and retention.

Once issues are on the table, the fact that some issues are often part of the core identities of organizational members may mean that negotiation processes are not well captured by traditional negotiations research. For example, in marrying a single mother whose child's father has joint custody, an organizational member lessens his bargaining power for salary because his mobility is decreased. His Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA) vis-à-vis his boss has certainly diminished, and if salary is all that is on the table, this individual's negotiating position and his likely outcomes are hurt. But perhaps because of his unwillingness to put work concerns before the opportunity of creating a new family, issues are raised by this negotiation that have new and positive effects on others in the organization. For example, the organization's effort to create a workable solution for this individual can perhaps help transform the work of the organization more broadly. Introducing flex time, increasing the use of technology, or providing help with college savings plans are all ways in which the negotiation with this particular individual might have broader ramifications for the organization as a whole. Thus, in a work context, integrative negotiation strategies spurred by having inviolable or sacred values might help raise issues that are perhaps somewhat external to the present negotiation but that help renegotiate the organizational order. Negotiation researchers might consider how important, new, and perhaps unexpected issues are added to the bargaining mix.

How

Related to what items are on the table are questions of how external interests get raised and the processes of how negotiation unfolds. How negotiations proceed and are talked about can violate the negotiated order of the organization and be particularly taboo when it reveals that order. For example, in her study of gender conflict in organizations, Martin (1990) shows how policies and positions thought by organizational authorities to be supportive of women can in fact be oppressive. Negotiation researchers might conceive of negotiation strategies and tactics as indicators of ideological assumptions, power relationships, and suppressed conflict. Indeed, as suggested by all of the papers in this issue, negotiating the gendered order could lead to radical transformation of an organization and how it is seen by its members.

Expanding the "how" of negotiation can illustrate the process of effective transformation compared to stagnation or decline. Several years ago, for example, one of our institutions wanted to create a benefit for parents that went beyond the Family and Medical Leave Act. This effort was in reaction to the then-current pregnancies of two assistant professors. The policy was intended to help junior faculty members and be

gender-neutral in that both new mothers and new fathers would be eligible for an extension of their tenure clocks upon the birth or adoption of a child. However, because one of the pregnant professors was married to another assistant professor at the college, the drafters of the policy felt a specific need to address the question of what would happen if both parents were faculty members. Their solution was to state that only one faculty member could receive the benefit—the faculty member who provided ''greater than 50% of the care'' to the child. But was the proposed policy really consistent with furthering the interests of both mothers and fathers in this organization? Might not such a structure almost inevitably lead to recreating traditional gender roles because it creates a barrier to both parents' participation in child rearing? We have little doubt that while well-intentioned, this policy would most likely limit the fathers' role and pressure the female faculty members of academic couples to take on the bulk of the responsibility for child care. As such, this policy would, as Martin stated, ''reify, rather than alleviate, gender inequalities,'' (1990, p. 339). Even though alternatives were suggested, including both a more expansive universal family benefit for all untenured faculty members regardless of their marital situations and a more targeted pregnancy benefit, arguments against the proposal were seen as opposition to helping these specific young faculty members in particular, and against motherhood in general. Thus attempts to renegotiate this aspect of the emerging gendered order of the college failed and the proposed policy was implemented.

As the above example illustrates, organizational negotiations proceed within a culture that is recreated by those negotiations. Negotiators' outcomes depend not just on power but on how claims to resources are legitimized, which is a matter of historical, relational, and organizational context. How negotiations between parties are affected by past negotiations and by negotiations among related parties, for example, are areas of research that emerge as particularly important once we focus on the gendered organizational context of negotiations. More specifically, how negotiations proceed, even if material accommodations are provided, can reflect and reinforce the gendered organizational order, even when the negotiations are very personal. According to Riach and Wilson (2007), for example, when office romances fall apart women are more likely than men to suffer reassignment or leave the employer entirely. This imbalance reflects how the gendered negotiated order of the organization affects and is affected by dyadic relationships.

Similarly, Liu and Buzzanell (2004) report that women often conceived of maternity leave as a renegotiation of their organizational roles while supervisors saw the issue in terms of minimizing workflow disruption and inconvenience. The women Liu and Buzzanell studied felt disempowered and marginalized by overt and covert communication processes from their supervisors and by institutional arrangements created by their organizations. As a result, despite having been satisfied with their work experience prior to their pregnancies, most of the women left their places of work following maternity leave. Greenberg et al. (this issue) also offer illustrations of how pregnancy leads to negotiations and renegotiation at work. The authors also reflect on how negotiations proceed intrapersonally; that is, they consider the internal negotiations that accompanied pregnancy and evaluation of roles and aspirations for work and motherhood for the pregnant woman.

Interpersonal conflicts are a more common frame for negotiations than intrapersonal deliberation, but gendered social order is often negotiated across multiple levels. For example, models of organizations as tournaments (Capelli & Casio, 1991; Hurley & Sonnenfeld, 1997) in which individual organizational members compete with each other for a few spots at the top may be revealed as inherently gendered. The paucity of women in upper management positions and feminization of entire fields suggests that negotiation might work differently than most negotiation researchers think. Each individual may be choosing between his or her current offer and BATNA, but large scale demographic changes need to be accounted for either by showing how individual choices lead to those outcomes or the more macro forces at work (see Schelling, 2006). In either case, bias may be entrenched in organizational contexts despite individuals' efforts to combat them (Sturm, this issue).

Golden-Biddle and Reay (this issue) illustrate how job boundaries and social order were negotiated by nurse practitioners (NPs) across organizational levels. The descriptions of how NPs communicated their value and identity are a long way from negotiation laboratory research that uses the clear payoff matrices of, say, a job applicant and employer. The NPs taught co-workers about their job, looked out for the interests of others, sought input, and created a sounding board for problem solving. Golden-Biddle and Reay's paper offers a broader view of how negotiations evolve beyond the transactional approaches that are traditionally considered negotiation within laboratory research (Putnam & Kolb, 2000). Putting negotiation and gender in context offers insight into how negotiations actually proceed in organizations.

When

While the study of how items get on the table is essential, an overarching question in contextualizing negotiation is examining when negotiation is favored over other ways of restructuring the organizational order, for example, persuading, forcing, manipulating, or invoking authority (Strauss, 1978). *When* negotiation is desirable or needed is brought into question by considering individuals as being situated in their organization or as embodied selves. For example, bringing issues to the table may result from strategic thinking (e.g., leaving the difficult issues for last), or may be required as a result of life or organizational events beyond one's control.

Strauss (1978) points out that negotiation outcomes are delimited by time and are eventually "reviewed, reevaluated, revised, revoked, or renewed," (p. 5). Specific negotiations have a history and temporal dependence that most research ignores (for further discussion see Bendersky & McGinn, 2008; Okhuysen & Bonner, 2006; Okhuysen, Galinsky, & Uptigrove, 2003). There is not much behavioral work on how issues are renegotiated after one or another party finds that performance of the terms of the deal are simply not possible (economists have studied the question of what they call incomplete contracts; see, e.g., Guriev & Kvasov, 2005). One's own aging, for example, and other life progressions may require the renegotiations of even longstanding arrangements. To take gendered illustrations, as women age, issues of appearance may be negotiated in regard to hair color, makeup, dress, and—as Putnam and Bochantin (this issue) suggest—responses to menopausal symptoms. In the case of pregnancy (Greenberg et al.,

this issue), fatigue, nausea, or doctor visits may also trigger negotiations and renegotiations about work responsibilities and roles.

The need for renegotiation might suggest that researchers consider when negotiators combine the exchange of resources with dispute resolution. Research and teaching in negotiations have tended to address these processes independently. Individuals may have developed unique coping skills to deal with a particular supervisor or may have negotiated idiosyncratic deals that only exist when someone has a certain track record. Similarly, a woman whose religious affiliation prohibits traveling alone with an unrelated man may find herself unexpectedly renegotiating the terms of her career advancement when assigned to a new sales account. Negotiations over such social orders are both dispute resolving and transactional.

Conceiving of organizations as gendered and negotiated social orders also raises the question of when a discussion is a negotiation and when is it not. Women appear more likely to initiate a negotiation when it is framed with more gender consistent norms: women, in general, were more comfortable when situations were labeled as an opportunity for ''asking'' for rather than ''negotiating'' for resources (Small et al., 2007). Overall, few models clarify the differences in labels and behaviors among negotiation and related behaviors such as persuading, threatening, or flattery, but as Kolb and McGinn (this issue) suggest, the dynamic and evolving nature of negotiation deserve further attention.

Why

Finally, *why* gender is studied shapes the questions asked and the potential impact of that research. In this section we outline several different reasons why researchers may focus on gender. Many of the reasons for studying gender may co-exist, of course, and the papers in this issue reflect a number of motivations. Researchers may explicitly state their purposes and research questions; however, as with some organizational practices (Martin, 1990), there may be unrecognized or unacknowledged implications of research agendas that could be made more transparent.

Sometimes why gender is included is hard to account for, unless merely as a way to satisfy journals' requirements. For example, APA guidelines now require the reporting of sex composition of participant samples, whether or not the variables of interest have any relevant connection to sex. If research contains no emphasis on the organizational or institutional context in which gender is embedded, nor interactions of gender and variables more central to the research questions being posed (e.g., interactions with status, power, or resources), it seems to us likely to have unintended effects. In particular, gender may be selectively reported based on significant findings, obscuring where it is of central importance. More important, while gender differences may be salient interpersonally or politically, in social science few variables are unrelated (Meehl, 1997), and we wonder if the insistence on reporting the sex of participants may in fact help reify sex differences rather than merely reveal them.

Other times, the study of gender in negotiation appears to be primarily a convenient variable to test underlying psychological phenomena such as the effects of highlighting group differences. Kray et al.'s (2001) paper on gender stereotypes in negotiation, for

example, addresses gender as one highly salient difference that is associated with strong stereotypes that can be activated or overcome through various techniques. A similar study might have been conducted on other group difference variables. While documenting these effects is really quite important, considering the social order supports moving beyond demographic diversity to other forms of gendered diversity. Over time, surface level diversity (e.g., sex, age, race) becomes less important on team outcomes and performance than psychological diversity (e.g., attitudes and interests; Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002) and group demographic differences may not be as salient within an established social order.

Much research on gender that pertains to negotiated organizational order may be motivated by researchers trying to understand, communicate, and manage their own experiences. It is suggestive of much concern for academics' own experiences, for example, that two full issues in five years of *Gender, Work, and Organizations*—March 2003 and May 2008—have focused on women in academic contexts. As academics ourselves we certainly appreciate the usefulness of research about academic institutions; indeed, some of our examples in this essay are instances of similar self-reflection. It is interesting to note that the rise of gender research is associated with the increase of female researchers in academia as well as of female employees in the broader workplace. However, given the composition of the professoriate, this self-reflection could lead to a narrow focus on gender and negotiation from a predominately white middle-upper class straight American perspective (Yoder & Kahn, 1993).

Research on gender and negotiated social order may also seek to explain gender based performance or achievement differences between men and women. Some of this work focuses more on "fixing" women to negotiate within a system than on how to renegotiate a system to work for everyone. While many researchers would likely hesitate to assume that it is women who must adjust to organizational systems rather than organizations that should accommodate women's concerns, current research often misses the opportunity to acknowledge the assumptions of the broader social order. For example, in a recent *Harvard Business Review* article, Brizendine (2008) argues that women may be underrepresented in top management positions because the opportunities for advancement come at the wrong time for women, in part because of the brain chemistry that affects women who have children or those who are approaching menopause. The research behind this practitioner-oriented article seems to suggest that organizations should simply wait for women to pass this stage and consider promoting women later than men. As Brizendine writes, "The very woman who could not find the capacity to green-light her own promotion in her forties can be, in her fifties, ready to take on the world," (p. 36). However, promoting women a decade later than men could, among other effects, mean lower lifetime earnings for women, reifying income differences that are already large.

Given the human tendency for attribution biases (e.g., Ross, 1977), we are more likely to attribute low performance of women to internal or dispositional causes (skill, behaviors, personality) than external causes within the environment (e.g., discrimination, reduced network opportunities). While making internal attributions about women may be an initial propensity, scholars who explicitly observe external factors about gendered

negotiated social order quickly note the importance of power and status for determining women's negotiation behavior and outcomes. For example, research that indicates that woman do not as easily bear family and top-level responsibility as men because of physiological differences could be interpreted to show that organizational processes might be changed more fundamentally to accommodate childbearing by women and child rearing by both sexes. Research might show, in other words, that to the extent that being situated entails having a unique perspective, inherited policies or procedures will be revealed by particular events as being too general and thus insidious. Indeed it appears that understanding the gendered context is central to addressing inequities within organizations as well as understanding and dealing with the conflicts that lead to these outcomes.

As Sturm (this issue) suggests, renegotiating the gendered order in organizations in fact can expose a broader humanistic effort. While some researchers might not want to embrace such a practical turn, doing so facilitates accountability and catalyzes action by organizational members (whether in academia or not). Explications of gender and negotiation may go so far as to be an indictment of current social arrangements and a call for its fundamental transformation. Martin (1990) provides an example of this kind of work in organizational contexts, as do papers by Ely and Meyerson (2000a, 2000b) and discussions of ''small wins'' by Meyerson and Fletcher (2000). Recently, Ely and Padavic (2007) provided an extensive review of work on gender in organizations and offered suggestions for increasing the transformative effects of future research.

Conclusion

The concept that gender is part of a negotiated order suggests that the order can be renegotiated. For negotiation research to go forward as useful to those who are embedded in, interested in, and/or formally study organizations, we should keep in mind that negotiations are carried out by those who are concerned with real, lived processes, not just decisions in labs. The papers included in this issue support the assertion that larger structural issues need to be openly linked to more micro analyses of negotiation (Strauss, 1978) to provide a complete understanding of gendered and negotiated organizational orders.

Negotiation research in organizational contexts reveals that negotiation makes claims on organizational resources. This recognition of and demand for organizational resources can shift focus from individuals to social systems. Strauss (1978) suggests that to understand negotiation as central to social order, more research is required on a fuller range of negotiations, on the actors' own theories of negotiation, and on how negotiations relate to other modes of action and larger structural contexts. Macro variables, such as organizational climate and structure, can then be seen as part of the foundation for understanding micro variables such as interpersonal relationships, the nature of hierarchy, the nature of work, support, and rewards that are being continually negotiated and renegotiated.

This issue attempts to bring gender more fully into the conversation. We believe that organizational order is negotiated whether particular research projects acknowledge it or not, and that gendered processes are an important part of these negotiations. The current papers are examples of how understanding the specific processes in explicitly gendered contexts can provide a deeper analysis and insight into negotiations more

generally. As such, we encourage negotiations researchers who work both in the field and in the lab to consider the realities of organizational life and the embedded and embodied people who participate in it and what their perspectives can tell us about negotiations. These considerations can help point the way for future negotiations research and help inform the next wave of lab as well as field research.

References

Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bendersky, C., & McGinn, K. (2008, August). *Incompatible assumptions: Barriers to producing multidisciplinary knowledge in communities of scholarship*. Academy of Management Proceedings, Retrieved November 29, 2008, from AOM Archive database.

Bottom, W. P., Holloway, J., Miller, G., Mislin, A., & Whitford, A. (2006). Building a pathway to cooperation: Negotiation and social exchange between principal and agent. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*, 29–58.

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*, 84–103.

Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & McGinn, K. L. (2005). Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 951–965.

Brizendine, L. (2008). One reason women don't make it to the C-Suite. *Harvard Business Review*, *86*, 36.

Capelli, P., & Casio, W. F. (1991). Why some jobs command wage premiums: A test of career tournament and internal labor market hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 848–868.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the Labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573–598.

Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000a). Advancing gender equity in organizations: The challenge and importance of maintaining a gender narrative. *Organization*, *7*, 589–609.

Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000b). Theories of gender in organizations: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *22*, 103–153.

Ely, R., & Padavic, I. (2007). A feminist analysis of organizational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 1121–1143.

Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, *91*, 481–510.

Guriev, S., & Kvasov, D. (2005). Contracting on time. *American Economic Review*, *95*, 1369–1385.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 96–107.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H., & Florey, A. T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Review*, *45*, 1029–1045.

Hurley, A. E., & Sonnenfeld, J. A. (1997). A study of the tournament model with female managers. *Women in Management Review*, *12*, 3–10.

Kolb, D. M. (2000). More than just a footnote: Constructing a theoretical framework for teaching about gender in negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, *16*, 347–356.

Kolb, D. M., & Williams, J. (2000). *The shadow negotiation: How women can master the hidden agendas that determine bargaining success*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kray, L. J., Galinsky, A., & Thompson, L. (2002). Reversing the gender gap in negotiations: An exploration of stereotype regeneration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *87*, 386–409.

Kray, L. J., Reb, J., & Galinsky, A. D. (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*, 399–411.

Kray, L. J., Thompson, L., & Galinsky, A. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*, 942–958.

LaFrance, M., Paluck, E. L., & Brescoll, V. (2004). Sex changes: A current perspective on the psychology of gender. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (pp. 328–344). New York: Guilford Press.

Liu, M., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2004). Negotiating maternity leave expectations: Perceived tensions between ethics of justice and care. *Journal of Business Communication*, *41*, 323–349.

Martin, J. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. *Organization Science*, *1*, 339–359.

Maume, D. J., Jr. (1999). Glass ceilings and glass elevators: Occupational segregation and race and sex differences in managerial promotion. *Work and Occupations*, *26*, 483–509.

Meehl, P. E. (1997). The problem is epistemology, not statistics: Replace significance tests by confidence intervals and quantify accuracy of risky numerical predictions. In L. Harlow, S. Mulaik & J. Steiger (Eds.), *What if there were no significance tests?* (pp. 393–425). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *The phenomenology of perception* (translated by Colin Smith). London: Routledge.

Meyerson, D., & Fletcher, J. (2000). A modest manifesto for shattering the glass ceiling. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*(1), 126–136.

Mook, D. G. (1983). In defense of external invalidity. *American Psychologist*, *38*, 379–387.

Okhuysen, G. A., & Bonner, B. L. (2006). Future thinking in disadvantaged situations: The role of outcome delays and competitive issues in negotiation. *Motivation and Emotion*, *29*, 465–479.

Okhuysen, G. A., Galinsky, A. D., & Uptigrove, T. A. (2003). Saving the worst for last: The effect of time horizon on the efficiency of negotiating benefits and burdens. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *91*, 269–279.

Polzer, J. T., Milton, L. P., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2002). Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*, 296–324.

Pryzgoda, J., & Chrisler, J. C. (2000). Definitions of gender and sex: The subtleties of meaning. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, *43*, 553–569.

Putnam, L. L., & Kolb, D. M. (2000). Rethinking negotiation: Feminist views of communication and exchange. In P. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 76–104). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Riach, K., & Wilson, F. (2007). Don't screw the crew: Exploring the rules of engagement in organizational romance. *British Journal of Management*, *18*, 79–92.

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 173–220). New York: Academic Press.

Rothhausen-Vange, T. J., Arnold, J. K., & Power, S. J. (2008). *Toward a content theory of retention in a tight labor market: An exploratory study of job and organizational facets that cause turnover*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology, San Francisco, CA.

Schelling, T. C. (2006). *Micromotives and macrobehavior*. New York: Norton.

Small, D. A., Gelfand, M., & Babcock, L. (2007). Who goes to the bargaining table? The influence of gender and framing on the initiation of negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 600–613.

Strauss, A. (1978). *Negotiations: Varieties, contexts, processes, and social order*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stuhlmacher, A. F., Citera, M., & Willis, T. (2007). Gender differences in virtual negotiation: Theory and research. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 329–339.

Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *52*, 653–677.

Walters, A. E., Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Meyer, L. L. (1998). Gender and negotiator competitiveness: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *76*, 1–29.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, *1*, 125–151.

Yoder, J. D., & Kahn, A. S. (1993). Working toward an inclusive psychology of women. *American Psychologist*, *48*, 846–850.