

# Preparing Women in Academic Psychology for Their First Compensation Negotiation: A Panel Perspective of Challenges and Recommendations

Laura D. Seligman  
University of Texas-Rio Grande Valley

RaeAnn E. Anderson  
Kent State University and University of North Dakota

Thomas H. Ollendick  
Virginia Tech University

Sheila A. M. Rauch  
Emory University School of Medicine and Atlanta VA Medical  
Center, Atlanta, Georgia

Wendy K. Silverman  
Yale University School of Medicine

Sabine Wilhelm  
Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, and  
Harvard Medical School

Douglas W. Woods  
Marquette University

Successfully landing and then negotiating for your first position is an exciting *and* challenging task. In this article, we use a narrative review to present the literature on gender and negotiation with a focus on academic psychology work contexts. We highlight important differences between factors that are within the individual's control versus factors at the institutional or societal level. Drawing directly from the research literature, we make several recommendations for women trying to manage negotiation in contexts that are likely biased against them at the institutional and cultural level. For example, we recommend that women take steps to reduce situational ambiguity, use niceness and assertion strategically, and cognitive reframing to improve performance. We also make parallel recommendations for institutions, to create a more equal playing field in employment negotiations in academia. We conclude

---

LAURA D. SELIGMAN received her MS and PhD in clinical psychology from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. She is currently a professor in the Department of Psychological Science at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. Her areas of professional interests include women's career issues, internalizing disorders in youth, comorbidity, and the implementation and dissemination of empirically supported treatments.

RAEANN E. ANDERSON received her PhD in clinical psychology from the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. She is currently an assistant professor in clinical psychology at the University of North Dakota. Her research focuses on understanding the psychological mechanisms of sexual violence victimization and perpetration in teens and young adults, including college students, in order to develop prevention interventions.

THOMAS H. OLLENDICK received his PhD from Purdue University in 1971. He is University Distinguished Professor in clinical psychology and director of the Child Study Center at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. The recipient of several NIMH grant awards, his clinical and research interests range from the study of diverse forms of child psychopathology to the assessment, treatment, and prevention of these child disorders from a social learning/social cognitive theory perspective.

SHEILA A. M. RAUCH received her PhD in clinical psychology from the University of North Dakota. She is currently an associate professor in psychiatry in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the Emory University School of Medicine. She also serves as clinical director of the Emory University Veterans Program and director of Mental Health Research and Program Evaluation at the Atlanta VA Medical Center. Her research focuses on the neurobiology of PTSD and PTSD treatment outcome and mechanisms.

WENDY K. SILVERMAN received her PhD from Case Western Reserve University. She is currently the Alfred A. Messer Professor of Child Psychiatry, professor of psychology, and director of the Yale Child Study Center Anxiety and Mood Disorders Program. Wendy's research focuses on anxiety and its disorders in children, particularly treatment development and evaluation. Her research has been funded by NIMH for over the last three decades. She also has served as editor or associate editor for a number of key journals in clinical psychology.

SABINE WILHELM received her PhD from University of Marburg, Germany. She is a professor at Harvard Medical School, and chief of psychology and director of the OCD and Related Disorders Program at Massachusetts General Hospital. She is currently president for the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT). She has been the principal investigator of several NIMH-funded grants, and her research interests focus on the assessment and treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder, body dysmorphic disorder, and tic disorders.

DOUGLAS W. WOODS received his PhD in clinical psychology from Western Michigan University in 1999. He is currently vice provost for Graduate and Professional Education, dean of the Graduate School, and professor of psychology at Marquette University. His research interests are in understanding, developing, and disseminating treatments for persons with obsessive-compulsive spectrum disorders and tic disorders.

Note: After Seligman and Anderson, co-authors are listed in alphabetical order.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THIS ARTICLE should be addressed to Laura D. Seligman, Department of Psychological Science, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, 1201 West University Drive, Edinburg, TX 78539. E-mail: [laura.seligman@utrgv.edu](mailto:laura.seligman@utrgv.edu)

with expert advice on how to manage the important task of negotiation throughout the career from successful psychologists to contextualize the research findings at the personal level.

**Public Significance Statement**

This article reviews the literature on gender stereotypes and how they may be related to gender differences in salary and compensation via negotiation. We then provide research-based and practical guidance for how individual women and institutions can promote gender equality in compensation through negotiation practices.

*Keywords:* negotiation, gender, stereotype threat, professional development

By the time you receive your first offer for an academic position, you have likely spent at least four years taking classes, thousands of hours in the clinic and more in the laboratory. Whether or not you feel like it, you are ready to join the ranks of the academy. What you might not be prepared for is the negotiation that will ensue once you get that initial offer. However, the way you navigate this conversation will have a large effect on how well you are compensated, the resources you have to ensure your success, and even when, or if, you will be able to retire comfortably (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). But, and this is an important caveat, successful negotiation requires that you start the conversation—one many women starting in academic psychology in the United States have relatively little experience with having and one that can often feel uncomfortable. Research shows that women are less likely to initiate compensation negotiations (Babcock, Gelfand, Small, & Stayn, 2006), have lower compensation expectations (Major & Konar, 1984; Major, Vanderslice, & McFarlin, 1984), and are less successful when they negotiate in the typical employment situation (Mazei et al., 2015). Given that salary increases are often based on initial salary, as are retirement contributions, failure to negotiate or poor outcomes when doing so have been estimated to cost women over \$500,000 over the course of a professional career (Babcock & Laschever, 2003).

Academia is not immune to pay disparities. In fact, recent data suggest that male full professors earn approximately \$6,000 more a year on average than female full-professors; salary disparities at the associate level and assistant level are approximately \$3,000 (Shulman et al., 2017). Moreover, for women in academic psychology, negotiations can have an impact that extends much beyond one's salary. Negotiations in academia also affect the time (e.g., dedicated research time, course load), personnel (access to research assistants, administrative staff), laboratory and office space, and equipment (both office supplies and complex laboratory tools) one has access to, all factors that can impact success in the tenure and promotion process. These packages can range quite widely in monetary value; so-called "start-up packages" that delineate research space and equipment can be valued in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Without adequate resources, women may start their tenure clock already significantly behind; as such, negotiation in academia can affect not only compensation but one's ability to meet proscribed productivity goals for tenure and promotion.

**The Current Article**

Although the stakes are high, the so-called rules or norms around negotiation in academia are often ambiguous, vary greatly,

and are rarely discussed. For these reasons, the Women's Issues in Behavior Therapy Special Interest Group sponsored a panel discussion at the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT)'s annual meeting in 2015. A desire to bring transparency to negotiation, knowledge about the continued national gender gap in salary, and an awareness of the literature suggesting that women are at a disadvantage during employment negotiations inspired the panel. The goal of this discussion was to provide practical advice to those engaging in the process of career negotiations, specifically with respect to challenges faced by women in academic psychology in the United States. Building on that initial panel discussion, in this article we seek to share some of this advice and to expand on the discussions that ensued. First, we present a brief overview of the relevant research on women and negotiations. The original panelists then reviewed this research and integrated the information into their professional expertise in responding to the questions we presented to them. Our goal is to present a brief overview of the scientific literature on the effects of gender and negotiation and to apply it in such a way as to provide a practical guide for readers. To this end, we discuss suggestions for women entering negotiations and for academic institutions wishing to change the process of negotiation to offer a more equal playing field. Of course, negotiation is just one aspect that academic institutions must consider in their efforts to increase diversity; the interested reader is referred to Mitchneck, Smith, and Latimer (2016) and Smith, Handley, Zale, Rushing, and Potvin (2015) for a discussion of these related topics.

**You Shouldn't Worry About Being So Nice—Or Should You?**

At one time, it was commonly assumed that there was something about women that resulted in both the hesitancy to negotiate and poorer results upon doing so—a so-called person-centered explanation. Research, however, calls such explanations into question (Kennedy & Kray, 2015; Mazei et al., 2015). Across several experiments, Bowles, Babcock, and Lai (2007) found women were more likely to be penalized for negotiation than men, particularly by men. Notably, this research was done with a variety of samples including college students, community adults, and hiring managers and asked participants to evaluate candidates based on multiple mediums such as resumes, interviews, and interview transcripts—indicating the pervasiveness of this effect. Moreover, the effect was driven by perceptions that women who initiate negotiations are less likable (i.e., not as nice and more demanding), consistent with American stereotypes about gender and behavior (Ellemers,

2018; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Importantly, the goal of an employment negotiation is typically to maximize economic outcomes as well as social ones because, unlike a negotiation for a house or car, employment negotiations are between partners who can expect an ongoing, interdependent relationship. It seems that women who negotiate get penalized on both fronts and, importantly, that these are related.

Given these findings, it would be surprising if women were *not hesitant* to negotiate—a woman with the ability to get far enough in her career to have the opportunity to negotiate is likely to have learned the negative consequences associated with gender atypical behavior. In fact, the female participants in the Bowles et al. (2007) study reported greater anxiety to negotiate and less of an inclination to do so when the negotiation partner was male—the exact situation in which they, realistically, would be most likely to be penalized. This is also the situation women most frequently face when negotiating for a professional position. Women who face the dilemma of advocating for themselves may experience anxiety and seek advice from mentors, colleagues, or friends who advise them that they “should not worry so much about being nice.” In other words, they should not be constrained by the stereotypically female desire to please others, but should instead focus on the economic cost and benefits in the negotiation situation as opposed to the social costs and benefits. Although on the face of it, this advice makes sense, the reality is that economic benefits are tied to social perceptions. There is a real long-term cost to not being perceived as nice in an employment situation. Moreover, both social (e.g. being perceived as demanding or mean) and economic costs (e.g., lower salaries) are more likely to be incurred by female negotiators, and the effect is likely to be greater for women, or as Bowles et al. (2007) put it, “sometimes it does hurt to ask.” But, why is this and does this always occur? Can women and employers do something about it?

### When and Why Do Women Get Penalized in Negotiations?

One of the issues that women face when entering the negotiation situation is that gender stereotypes are both descriptive—describing how men and women behave—and prescriptive—describing how men and women *should* behave. Descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes suggest that men are and should be competitive and ambitious whereas women are and should be caring, accommodating, and conciliatory (i.e., nice; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Unfortunately, these traits and behaviors closely align with the traits that typically result in positive (male stereotype) or negative (female stereotype) economic outcomes in the typical employment negotiation (Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky, 2001; Kulik & Olekalns, 2012). Internalization of these stereotypes affects both the candidate and the employer in negotiation contexts.

### How Stereotypes Affect the Candidate

Because gender stereotypes are descriptive, when one violates them, the behavior is more noticeable. The implication is, if a woman and a man are equally ambitious in a negotiation, it is more likely that one will notice and recall the woman’s behavior. Because gender stereotypes are prescriptive, when one violates them, there is backlash. This means that the types of assertive behaviors

that men can use in a negotiation are more likely to be noticed when they are used by women and women are more likely to be penalized when they are noticed. This explains why the common advice for women to act more like a man in the workplace often backfires. In fact, the assertiveness inherent in the act of just coming to the negotiation table reaches the threshold to be noticed and penalized for women (Bowles et al., 2007), suggesting that women start off the typical employment negotiation with a disadvantage compared to their male counterparts.

### How Stereotypes Affect the Organization

It is important to remember those who are the subject of a stereotype are not immune to its effects; women internalize gender-based stereotypes just as men do. The stereotype threat model (Steele, 1997) suggests that the behavior of an individual who is the subject of a negative stereotype is affected when the stereotype is triggered, because anxiety about confirming the stereotype interferes with performance. This can also work in reverse, enhancing performance when a positive stereotype is activated. Thus, stereotypes about effective negotiation result in enhancement of men’s performance on one hand and denigration of performance for women on the other, resulting in even larger discrepancies in outcomes between the two groups.

That is the bad news for women. The good news is that such an understanding allows us to see that it is the *situation* in which women negotiate that is responsible for women’s poorer outcomes. Women are not inherently bad negotiators as suggested by a person-centered approach, but knowing that they are expected to be poor negotiators can cause anxiety and negatively impact women’s negotiating behavior. However, when women are put in a negotiation situation that aligns with a female stereotype, one in which assertive behavior is consistent with the female stereotype (i.e., a positive stereotype activation), they excel. For example, when 176 female and male senior executives were asked to negotiate salary on behalf of themselves or a mentee in an experimental situation, women negotiating for their mentees achieved the best outcomes, negotiating a salary of \$167,250, compared with \$147,667 negotiated by men for their mentees and \$146,093 that men negotiated for themselves (Bowles, Babcock, & McGinn, 2005, Experiment 3<sup>1</sup>). Perhaps this resulted from the mentor situation being consistent with the female stereotype of caring for others.

### Research-Based Recommendations for Individual Women and Their Colleagues

Knowledge about when and why women are disadvantaged in employment negotiations helps to understand the actions women and employers can take to level the playing field. Importantly, not all research-based recommendations are consistent with the “common sense” on which many of us have traditionally relied. We provide recommendations for both female job-seekers and academic institutions. These recommendations are summarized in Table 1.

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with what one would expect, however, women negotiating for themselves negotiated the lowest salaries of \$141,643 (Bowles et al., 2005).

Table 1  
*Summary of Recommendations From the Literature and Panelists*

Individual Job Candidates	Academic Institutions and Mentors
Reduce Situational Ambiguity	
1. Ask what areas past candidates have been able to negotiate. 2. Find out what the realistic limits are for negotiation items, for example, find local data on salaries (glassdoor.com) or consult the APA data on workforce salaries*.	1. Tell candidates that some negotiation of the terms is expected. Be upfront about what the boundaries of negotiation are, for example, "We have some flexibility on salary but not on start-up funds." 2. Provide opportunities for trainees to learn about negotiation.
Strategic Niceness	
3. Begin and end your negotiation with accommodating behavior, "Is now a good time to talk?" 4. Frame requests using language that conveys warmth and neediness, "I would really appreciate your help with this issue." 5. Frame requests in a communal context, "It will really help the department goals of increasing grant funding if I am able to have summer salary support."	3. Train those negotiating on behalf of the institution to think of negotiation in more "feminine" terms and to understand the link between traditional feminine traits and employee success. 4. When writing letters of recommendation, create a positive and feminine first impression by praising traits such as collegiality and teamwork <i>while also</i> praising competence and specific skills.
Strategic Assertiveness	
6. Frame requests as coming from outside sources, "APA salary data suggest that #X is a fair salary for this position." 7. Sandwich requests that may be perceived as "aggressive" in the middle of the negotiation.	5. When advising colleagues and mentees, advise them to attribute specific requests to your advice. 6. Minimize backlash by reducing situational ambiguity.
Rethinking Negotiation	
8. New thought: Good listening can help you perform well in negotiations. 9. New thought: View negotiation as an opportunity to make requests. 10. Write a script using the above recommendations and practice.	7. Make more intentional, evidence-based decisions about who negotiates, what the goals of a negotiation should be, and what mediums are used for negotiation.

\* APA salary data are published bi-annually by the Center for Workforce Studies online at <http://www.apa.org/workforce/publications/index.aspx>

### Reduce Situational Ambiguity—Context Is Everything

When there are clear expectations in a negotiation situation, the effects of individual differences are minimized (Bowles et al., 2005). Both parties in the negotiation have the same view of what is the appropriate behavior. Therefore, behaviors are more likely to be seen as a result of the situation rather than one's gender—for both the candidate and the organization.

Employers can decrease situational ambiguity by clearly stating the expectation that negotiation will take place (e.g., we will be sending you a written offer and then we will contact you on Thursday to negotiate final terms). First, by initiating the negotiation and setting an expectation that the offer is not final, the employer eliminates the possibility that women will not negotiate, that is, that behavior will be constrained by gender stereotypes. Second, the possibility that women will experience backlash for doing so is diminished because negotiation behavior is now viewed as being driven by the clear boundaries of the situation. Employers can also decrease situational ambiguity by routinely disclosing the boundaries of negotiation, or which areas are open for negotiation, which ones are not, and limiting factors (e.g., "We have some flexibility on salary but not start-up funds," "Our assistant professors currently start off between \$X and \$Y depending on Z.") Of course, doing so requires academic institutions to give some thought to their negotiation boundaries, and ideally this is done in the abstract rather than with an individual candidate in mind. Some may view this recommendation as institutions giving away their advantage, but this is only true if one assumes that it is advantageous for an institution to negotiate the lowest possible compensation package. In the long run, this may not be the case,

as a substandard offer may result in failed or less competitive recruitment efforts, lower employee morale, greater turnover, and decreased productivity—particularly if a faculty member is unable to negotiate the resources needed for her or his research program or if a high percentage of faculty time is devoted to serving on search committees that do not result in hires. Furthermore, many institutions include promoting equality as part of their mission and should view fair hiring practices as an opportunity to behave consistently with this value.

For those looking for a position, having high-quality data on what would be considered a good outcome in the specific situation can decrease ambiguity. This can be done in the abstract when necessary (e.g., using American Psychological Association data on salary distributions, glassdoor.com) but is likely to be more helpful when institution-specific data are available or are obtained through professional and personal networks. Although ideally undertaken by the employer, the candidate can encourage the employer to decrease the ambiguity of the negotiation situation (e.g., "What are some of the areas past candidates have been able to negotiate?").

Lastly, to a lesser degree, structural ambiguity can be decreased before one ever begins to look for their first professional position when mentors or training programs allow students/trainees a view of the negotiation process throughout their training. This can take place through casual discussions when a department brings in a new member ("We will be having two great faculty join us next year because Professor X negotiated a position for her husband after we made her an offer") or through more formal workshops or discussions. Of course, who makes what and who got which resources are often sensitive topics, so these discussions need to be

done in a thoughtful way. In fact, the discomfort around such discussions may be enough for many of us to avoid them; however, having open discussions of sensitive topics is part of standard training in many areas of psychology. As such, we are uniquely equipped with the skills to embark on these discussions with our students and trainees.

### Strategic Niceness for the Individual Woman

Although this is distasteful advice for many women, the fact remains that accommodating behavior and niceness is an inherent part of the female stereotype while agency is not (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). This means that women must be extraordinarily personable for their “niceness” to even be noticed. It also means that women risk backlash if they violate the stereotype and that this backlash can continue beyond the context of the one negotiation—not a desirable place to be in an ongoing employment situation. Kulik and Olekalns (2012) suggest women can “reap the benefits of an accommodating style” (p. 1395) by engaging in tactics that maximize positive violations of feminine gender norms. In other words, women can benefit when their accommodating behavior is more noticeable. Consistent with what we know about primacy and recency effects in behavioral interactions (Miller & Campbell, 1959), one way to do this may be to start and end interactions with stereotype-consistent accommodating behavior. For example, one could begin by asking, “Is now still a good time to meet?” Or, in a multi-issue negotiation, discussing the issues that are less important to you at the beginning and end of discussions with the most pivotal issues on which you will hold more firm sandwiched between.

Additional suggestions by Kulik and Olekalns (2012) include framing negotiation statements in a feminine way by using tentative and inclusive language or statements that convey warmth and neediness (“I would really appreciate it if you could help me with this issue”). When possible, women can also frame their points in a communal context (Kulik & Olekalns, 2012), for example, “it would really help the department’s goal of achieving X, if I am able to purchase this piece of equipment” versus “I really need this piece of equipment for my research program.” Although such an explicit statement that women need to engage in these behaviors to increase their chances of success is distasteful to many, research shows that women who engage in such tactics can benefit from them (Reid, Keerie, & Palomares, 2003; Reid, Palomares, Anderson, & Bondad-Brown, 2009), and recognition of this fact gives one the ability to make informed decisions. Specifically, across a series of studies conducted in an academic context, women who used tentative language were perceived as more influential than women who used assertive language. Only when the educational level was salient were men influenced by assertive women (Reid et al., 2003, 2009). We choose to (optimistically) view these recommendations as stop-gap procedures; as more academic institutions adopt strategies such as the ones we suggest here to address the contextual factors that lead to an unequal playing field, these strategies on the part of women should become less necessary.

Individuals within institutions can help in this regard by linking the feminine stereotype with negotiation behavior. For example, when the negotiators within an organization (e.g., deans and department chairs) are trained to acknowledge stereotypically female characteristics, such as good listening skills and understanding of

others, as integral to effective negotiation, they are more likely to be appreciative of a more feminine approach to negotiation and to use a more feminine approach themselves (Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002; Kulik & Olekalns, 2012).

Finally, mentors and colleagues can help female negotiators by helping a woman create a feminine first impression when writing letters of recommendation. Collegiality and willingness to work as part of a team may be more important to emphasize and detail when writing a letter for a woman than a man. However, it is important to note that niceness coupled with clear information on competence is viewed positively, whereas niceness in the absence of explicit and strong indicators of competence is often viewed as an indicator of lack of competence (Connor & Fiske, 2018; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). This means that women and their letter writers need to be willing to put forward specific and strong examples of qualifications alongside statements emphasizing congruence with the feminine stereotype. Even something that may be overlooked by many letter writers, such as referring to our male mentees in our letters as Dr. X, while referring to our female mentees by their first names, represents an implicit gender bias that serves to further support the feminine stereotype (e.g., he is a professional doctor first; she is a personable nice woman first).

### Strategic Assertiveness for Individual Women

On the one hand, women must be accommodating to maximize the social benefits needed for successful negotiation; on the other hand, they also need to engage in behavior counter to the feminine stereotype to get the desired economic outcomes on the table. Doing so without losing the benefits of behaving in a stereotype-consistent manner can be tricky—women need to make sure that stereotype violations are done in such a way to minimize detection. Kulik and Olekalns (2012) suggest that this can be done primarily by framing assertive requests as coming from outside sources (e.g., “My mentor suggested that I talk with you about summer salary” or “The APA salary data suggest that \$X would be fair for someone at my rank with my years of experience”). Additionally, women may want to consider refraining from putting out explicit negotiating anchors until they have maximized impressions consistent with the feminine stereotype. This would allow women the freedom to make assertive first offers when they do suggest specific figures, as initial bids have been shown to predict the ultimate outcome of negotiation and being the one to make the first offer can have positive effects for women (Gunia, Swaab, Sivathan, & Galinsky, 2013). For example, once a woman has established her ability to work as a team player or to accommodate in areas of less importance to her, she can put out an assertive starting point for something of greater importance. This would be the time to violate gender norms—a woman may feel more comfortable asking for the median salary for someone in her position, as this is more consistent with the feminine stereotype of not being too self-assured or greedy—but she will likely achieve a better outcome by starting off with a higher figure—after doing everything she cannot to provoke backlash. Colleagues and mentors can assist female negotiators by not only making recommendations regarding negotiating but also explicitly suggesting that the woman attribute the suggestion to them (e.g., “I really think you are going to need a minimum of \$X to get your program of research started

off right. Feel free to mention to the Chair that I suggested this amount as a starting place.”).

### Rethink Your Approach to Negotiation

By this, we mean different things for employees and academic institutions. We discussed previously the negative implications for female negotiators that follow from the stereotype threat model. However, this same theory also offers possible interventions to boost women’s performance (Bowles et al., 2005; Steele, 1997). In a typical negotiation situation, men’s performance is enhanced by the fact that stereotypically male characteristics are linked to successful negotiation (Bowles et al., 2007). With some simple cognitive restructuring—a skill many psychologists already have in our arsenal—women too can benefit from similar performance enhancing effects. In a series of experiments, Kray et al. (2002) found that when participants were told that skilled negotiators were highly verbal good listeners with the ability to gain insight into others’ feelings—stereotypically feminine traits—women outperformed men. Furthermore, they found that this effect was driven by women’s increased expectations for themselves with the regenerated stereotype. Others have also recommended capitalizing on a similar idea, by suggesting that women reframe the negotiation context as an opportunity to ask as opposed to viewing negotiation as an adversarial interaction (Small, Gelfand, Babcock, & Gettman, 2007).

Many organizations probably use the same negotiation processes today that they have for decades, giving little thought as to why this is what they do and whether these procedures are in line with their goals. This can create a tunnel vision in which it is assumed that what “is” is the only option. Moreover, the individuals negotiating on behalf of the organization may have little training in negotiation, and some may not have the time, background, or contextual knowledge to enter negotiations with an explicit understanding of what a good outcome for the organization would look like. As a result, a short-term win could really be a long-term loss. For example, getting an employee to take a lower salary may save money in the short term, but it may also result in greater turnover and a related long-term increase in costs to an organization. Presenting poor first offers in the hopes of arriving at a reasonable final offer may backfire for organizations, as women may choose to move on to the next offer to avoid negotiation.

Some academic institutions have begun to rethink their search processes in an effort to get the best pool of candidates, but it is unclear the same level of deliberation has gone into sealing the deal once a finalist has been identified. We suggest academic institutions give explicit thought to who negotiates, the communication mediums used, and who controls the budget. For example, a faculty candidate may negotiate with a department chair, but it may, in fact, be the dean who has control over the resources. Third-party intermediaries have their own interest in the negotiations, and this does, in fact, play a role in the outcome (Bazerman, Neale, Valley, Zajac, & Kim, 1992; Valley, White, Neale, & Bazerman, 1992). The role of the intermediary is complex and needs to be better understood—when academic institutions use this type of process, there should be an explicit discussion to align the intermediary’s goals with that of the organization. Moreover, the medium in which negotiation takes place should be considered. Many of us enjoy the ease of using e-mail, but some research

suggests that the backlash against women negotiators can be intensified with the use of e-mail (Kulik & Olekalns, 2012). Last, as we discussed above, more training in how to approach negotiation on the employer end is needed. Thinking of negotiation in more feminine terms may have benefits for academic institutions as well as the women they are attempting to recruit (Kennedy & Kray, 2015).

### Our Panelists Respond

In the next section, we asked our panelists of esteemed psychologists to respond to a series of questions posed by the conference audience. For the panel, we (Drs. Seligman and Anderson) recruited experienced, highly successful academic clinical psychologists who varied in age, gender, and work setting. Some panelists have experience in negotiation on both sides.

**1. Taking into account your own experiences, what advice would you give mentees about negotiating for their first academic position? What advice would you give a more senior colleague to get additional resources within an institution? Does your advice differ if a mentee is male versus female?**

Dr. Rauch: Pay attention to your end goal and what will contribute to your overall career and life success. If your research line requires equipment or core resources, ensuring you get the funds to support your goals may be more important than a slightly higher salary. It is good to ensure that in your initial request you have items that are key and items that you are more flexible to negotiate. I would give this same advice to junior and more senior mentees, but our discussion would focus on goal shaping specific to their career stage. Finally, I tend to give similar advice to men and women but also discuss the issues presented in this article and how women and men are perceived differently.

Dr. Ollendick: Salary and benefits are certainly important but so too are responsibilities associated with the position (e.g., research, teaching, and service), and the relative weighting of these responsibilities for the first job versus a midcareer job versus a job toward the end of one’s career. Additionally, it is important to explore policies for a leave of absence (e.g., pregnancy, illness in self or family, etc.) as well as possibilities for sabbatical leaves (I have had four of them in my career). What has also been very important to me is the level of collegiality in the department or setting and if and how collaboration is not only possible but how highly it is facilitated and valued. Quality of life is also important. My mantra to my mentees over the years has been “carry on, but family first.” I encourage my mentees (now 42 in number) both female and male to inquire about such matters and to negotiate them if necessary.

Dr. Woods: I tell mentees that after a university makes you the initial offer, then everything is up for negotiation. Do not be shy, and do not expect to get everything you request. You should try to get your initial salary as high as possible, because your future raises will be based on this initial amount. However, other things are also important. You should think about what you will need to be successful on your path toward tenure. If you need a reduced teaching load during your pretenure period, ask for it. If you need graduate student assistants, ask for them. If you need equipment, software, or lab remodeling to facilitate your research, ask for it. If you need funding to pay participants, purchase time in an fMRI device, or funding to hire a statistical consultant or grant writer, then make the request. Obviously, you do not want to be over-the-

top with the requests, but you do want to ask for the things you will need to be successful. When making your request, it is best if you can have a conversation with the chair or dean to explain your logic and why you think each item is important in order to be successful. Remember, they want you to succeed. I do not really differ in the advice I would give to women and men, or whether or not someone is more junior or senior.

Dr. Silverman: I would like to echo and add nuance to Dr. Woods when he notes that he tells mentees, “that after a university tells you they want to hire you, then everything is up for negotiation.” It might seem obvious, but this means it is fine and expected that one asks general questions about resource support for new hires, teaching load, and so forth. However, it would be premature to suggest that one would not even consider the position unless specific conditions are met, when the position has not yet been offered. In other words, there is the “must-have” list versus the “wish-list” that would be wonderful “icing on the cake” but I am willing to forgo because there are so many other things about this position that are just as important, if not more (e.g., colleagues/collaborators, family matters).

Dr. Wilhelm: I also tell my mentees to equip the person they are negotiating with specific information about their value (has had so many grants, has won X awards, etc.) in addition to stating their requirements for the position. The advice above regarding the salary is critical, but I also agree that it is important to discuss what else is of interest. For example, space, office furniture, start-up research funds, research assistant support, equipment, course load and course assignments, flexibility, start-up funds, travel money, research leave, moving expenses, and possibly even spousal hires. For positions in academic medical centers the number of patients required to be seen and protected research time are often aspects of the negotiation process. My negotiation advice might differ somewhat depending on the gender of my mentees, as it is often useful to have very direct conversations about negotiation styles with my female mentees. We discuss that women are often hesitant to negotiate, and they frequently simply accept what they are being offered, without negotiating at all. Thus, when mentoring women, I encourage them to be aware of gender differences in negotiations, and I often suggest that they ask for more than what they were originally aiming for. However, they have to be careful while doing so, as it might backfire if they appear too confrontational. Therefore, I talk to my female mentees about being vigilant of gender stereotypes, as assertive female negotiators are more likely to be perceived as unlikable and pushy. Unfortunately, if they are not liked, the probability that they get what they want decreases. I often recommend books such as *Women Don't Ask* (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; see also newer editions). It is unfortunate that a successful negotiation strategy for women is typically more complex than it is for men; it's critical for women be aware of what works, so they can make informed choices with regard to the approach they choose.

**2. Have you seen your organization implement any changes to address sex differences in negotiations? If so, what were they? Were they successful? How could your department implement these policies? How easy or difficult might that be?**

Dr. Ollendick: Our department has attempted to address some of these changes over the years I have been at University 2—for both male and female job applicants. For example, it is made clear to the applicant that the initial offer is not necessarily the final

offer—negotiation is openly invited on whatever aspect of the offer the candidate wishes to pursue. Spousal/partner hires are also put on the table once the initial offer has been made to the candidate. In this regard, we also explore any “family” factors that might need to be considered (e.g., young children and teaching schedules).

The remaining panelists reported being unaware of any systematic efforts related to this issue.

**3. How might this advice be tailored for women seeking VA careers or other types of careers in the federal government?**

Dr. Rauch: With federal jobs, there is often less ability to negotiate salary since it is set by the job itself. However, there are lots of other items that can be negotiated that can increase your quality of life and success. This may include patient workload, administrative responsibilities, leadership roles, and so forth. The key here is ensuring that you know what the service line needs and how you may help the service line [note: the department or unit] achieve goals. Then show them your previous success or relevant skills and suggest a plan that leads to mutual success.

**4. Do you have any additional advice for women in dual-career situations?**

Dr. Rauch: Remember to evaluate your success together as a team and not just looking at initial job pay for both partners. While one partner may be able to receive a higher pay check initially, this may not show who can have more income potential across time in a career. Ensure you talk it out together and include the whole of the jobs required to maintain your household, including household maintenance and chores distribution. As Sheryl Sandberg asserted in *Lean In* (Sandberg, 2013), early childcare costs should be considered an investment in the future, not a current cost–benefit analysis. Quality childcare is expensive, but it allows parents to feel safe that their child is well taken care of so that they can continue their career or educational trajectory to allow for higher monetary compensation later.

Dr. Woods: I agree that you have to look at your entire situation as a package. One or both members of a dual-career couple may be forced to sacrifice some salary or prestige, but may be willing to do so to ensure that both are employed and living reasonably close to each other. Even in a single-career situation, there are only so many degrees of freedom with respect to salary, teaching load, start-up, prestige of program, cost of living, and area of the country. When you add a dual-career situation to the mix, your degrees of freedom to find the best job shrinks.

**5. Have you ever experienced backlash for negotiating [for your own contract] and how did you handle it?**

Dr. Ollendick: I have not. Certainly, not all of my recommendations have been accepted over the years, but I have never been subject to backlash as a result.

Dr. Woods: I have not. I have not received everything I requested, nor did I expect to. I have never been subject to backlash for any of my requests.

*Author's note: All of the female panelists reported they have experienced backlash. We have chosen not to disclose further details.*

## Summary and Recommendations for Future Research

In sum, negotiation is an important professional task yet little is known about what the current practices are in academic institu-

tions regarding negotiation; see also Table 1. More data are needed to serve as a baseline to monitor progress, and more research is required into the conditions that lead to institutional change. We also recommend future research that utilizes an intersectional perspective in understanding negotiation. It is likely that the barriers experienced by women are increased for women of color and women who are sexual minorities (Best, Edelman, Krieger, & Eliason, 2011; Syed, 2007), yet these perspectives are underrepresented in research. Finally, formal comprehensive negotiations often take place early in the employment relationship, but minor, informal negotiations take place throughout one's career, with the potential to impact the retention and promotion of women in academia.

## References

- Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Babcock, L., Gelfand, M., Small, D., & Stayn, H. (2006). Gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations. In D. De Cremer, M. Zeelenberg, & J. K. Murnighan (Eds.), *Social psychology and economics* (pp. 239–259). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bazerman, M. H., Neale, M. A., Valley, K. L., Zajac, E. J., & Kim, Y. M. (1992). The effect of agents and mediators on negotiation outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 53, 55–73. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(92\)90054-B](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(92)90054-B)
- Best, R. K., Edelman, L. B., Krieger, L. H., & Eliason, S. R. (2011). Multiple disadvantages: An empirical test of intersectionality theory in EEO litigation. *Law & Society Review*, 45, 991–1025. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00463.x>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.09.001>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.951>
- Connor, R. A., & Fiske, S. T. (2018). Warmth and competence: A feminist look at power and negotiation. In C. B. Travis & J. W. White (Eds.), *APA handbook of the psychology of women*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ellemers, N. (2018). Gender stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 275–298. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011719>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>
- Gunia, B. C., Swaab, R. L., Sivanathan, N., & Galinsky, A. D. (2013). The remarkable robustness of the first-offer effect: Across culture, power, and issues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 1547–1558. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167213499236>
- Kennedy, J. A., & Kray, L. J. (2015). A pawn in someone else's game? The cognitive, motivational, and paradigmatic barriers to women's excelling in negotiation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 35, 3–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2015.09.002>
- Kray, L. J., Galinsky, A. D., & Thompson, L. (2002). Reversing the gender gap in negotiations: An exploration of stereotype regeneration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 87, 386–410. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2979>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.942>
- Kulik, C. T., & Olekalns, M. (2012). Negotiating the gender divide: Lessons from the negotiation and organizational behavior literatures. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1387–1415. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206311431307>
- Major, B., & Konar, E. (1984). An investigation of sex differences in pay expectations and their possible causes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 777–792.
- Major, B., Vanderslice, V., & McFarlin, D. B. (1984). Effects of pay expected on pay received: The confirmatory nature of initial expectations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 399–412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1984.tb02247.x>
- Mazei, J., Hüffmeier, J., Freund, P. A., Stuhlmacher, A. F., Bilke, L., & Hertel, G. (2015). A meta-analysis on gender differences in negotiation outcomes and their moderators. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 85–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038184>
- Miller, N., & Campbell, D. T. (1959). Recency and primacy in persuasion as a function of the timing of speeches and measurements. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 59, 1–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0049330>
- Mitchneck, E., Smith, J. L., & Latimer, M. (2016). A recipe for change: Creating a more inclusive academy. *Science*, 352, 148–149.
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 269–281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066>
- Reid, S. A., Keerie, N., & Palomares, N. A. (2003). Language, gender salience and social influence. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 22, 210–233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0261927X03022002004>
- Reid, S. A., Palomares, N. A., Anderson, G. L., & Bondad-Brown, B. (2009). Gender, language, and social influence: A test of expectation states, role congruity, and self-categorization theories. *Human Communication Research*, 35, 465–490. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2009.01359.x>
- Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Knopf.
- Shulman, S., Hopkins, B., Kelchen, R., Persky, J., Yaya, M., Barnshaw, J., & Dunietz, S. J. (2017). Visualizing change: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2016–17. *Academe*, 103, 1–64.
- Small, D. A., Gelfand, M., Babcock, L., & Gettman, H. (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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.600>
- Smith, J. L., Handley, I. M., Zale, A. V., Rushing, S., & Potvin, M. A. (2015). Now hiring! Empirically testing a three-step intervention to increase faculty gender diversity in STEM. *Bioscience*, 65, 1084–1087. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biv138>
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air. How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52, 613–629. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.6.613>
- Syed, J. (2007). "The other woman" and the question of equal opportunity in Australian organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18, 1954–1978. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0958190701638184>
- Valley, K. L., White, S. B., Neale, M. A., & Bazerman, M. H. (1992). Agents as information brokers: The effects of information disclosure on negotiated outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 51, 220–236. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(92\)90012-V](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(92)90012-V)

Received January 1, 2018

Revision received July 11, 2018

Accepted July 11, 2018 ■