

1-1-2010

What Travels: Teaching Gender in Cross Cultural Negotiation Classrooms

Andrea K. Schneider

Marquette University Law School, andrea.schneider@marquette.edu

Sandra Cheldelin

Deborah Kolb

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/facpub>

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Publication Information

Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Sandra Cheldelin & Deborah Kolb, What Travels: Teaching Gender in Cross Cultural Negotiation Classrooms, 31 Hamline J. Pub. L. & Pol'y 531 (2010) © by the Hamline Journal of Public Law & Policy

Repository Citation

Schneider, Andrea K.; Cheldelin, Sandra; and Kolb, Deborah, "What Travels: Teaching Gender in Cross Cultural Negotiation Classrooms" (2010). *Faculty Publications*. Paper 530.
<http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/facpub/530>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Marquette Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Marquette Law Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact megan.obrien@marquette.edu.

What Travels: Teaching Gender in Cross Cultural Negotiation Classrooms

*Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Sandra Cheldelin & Deborah Kolb*¹

I am not hindered by my gender; I use it to my advantage—being cute, young and naïve—to get better deals for my clients. (Israeli lawyer)

The likeability-competence stereotype doesn't fit the Turkish experience—the choice of competence is not one women can even consider—all leadership positions are held by men. (Turkish psychologist)

How do we help our students? In one class of all women, the professor failed half the class. (Turkish academic)

These comments were typical of the responses we received following our presentation on gender made at the *Second Generation Negotiation Teaching* conference held October 2009 in Istanbul, Turkey. Reflecting some of the current work on gender and negotiation, our presentation focused on the most recent findings on the stereotype content model, and the relationship between this model and gender issues in negotiation.² Using

¹ Andrea Kupfer Schneider is a Professor of Law at Marquette University Law School in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Her email address is andrea.schneider@marquette.edu. Sandra I. Cheldelin is the Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Professor at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University in Arlington, Virginia. Her email address is scheldel@gmu.edu. Deborah Kolb is the Deloitte Ellen Gabriel Professor for Women and Leader at the Simmons College School of Management in Boston, Massachusetts. Her email address is: kolb@simmons.edu.

² Amy J.C. Cuddy et al., *Stereotype Content Model Across Cultures: Universal Similarities and Some Differences*, 48 *BRITISH JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY* 1 (2009).

examples from the 2008 U.S. presidential elections and research on law students, we focused on the “likeability v. competence” dichotomy that women have faced in negotiations, particularly those concerning compensation.³ We illustrated how the dichotomy is operative for women in certain situations (the U.S. presidential elections and the portrayal of Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin) and not in others (particularly in certain professions, e.g., lawyers, and under certain conditions).⁴

We were simultaneously intrigued and surprised at some of the responses from colleagues, especially of other cultures, to our presentation on gendered perceptions of likeability and competence in negotiations. It became clear that we must include factors not previously considered, such as religion, family, power, voice and position; even when working within the likeability v. competence dichotomy. In retrospect, we are not shocked at the responses because our previous international experiences have repeatedly demonstrated that trainings applicable to an audience in the United States are often not fully transferrable to other countries.⁵ Still, for some attendees, the dichotomy resonated. There were similar examples of this dichotomy evident within their own cultures (Israeli presidential elections) and similar professional contexts (lawyers in Spain). Others, however, argue that the dichotomy cannot be found at all—that it already assumes a certain gendered order in which women could be seen as professionally competent and in which working women have certain legal rights, backed by

³ Hannah R. Bowles et al., *Social Incentives for Gender Differences in the Propensity to Initiate Negotiations: Sometimes it Does Hurt to Ask*, 103 *ORG. BEHAV. & HUM. DECISION PROCESSES* 84 (2007). Alice F. Stuhlmacher & Amy E. Walters, *Gender Differences in Negotiation Outcome: A Meta-Analysis*, 52 *PERS. PSYCHOL.* 653 (1999). Mary E. Wade, *Women and Salary Negotiation: The Costs of Self-Advocacy*, 25 *PSYCHOL. WOMEN Q.* 65 (2001).

⁴ Andrea Kupfer Schneider et al., *Likeability v. Competence: The Impossible Choice Faced by Female Politicians, Evaded by Lawyers*, *DUKE J. GENDER L. & POL'Y* (forthcoming 2010). Catherine H. Tinsley et al., *Women at the Bargaining Table: Pitfalls and Prospects*, 25 *NEGOTIATION J.* 233 (2009).

⁵ Christopher Honeyman & Sandra I. Cheldelin, *Have Gavel, Will Travel: Dispute Resolution's Innocents Abroad*, 19 *CONFLICT RESOL. Q.* 363 (2002).

societal acceptance. Moreover, in many countries, the concept of a woman's "Best Alternative To A Negotiated Agreement" (BATNA) is irrelevant when the conditions under which women find themselves are not at all negotiable. In Ethiopia, a group of women reported they had already attained the best scientific jobs available to them (and that they considered themselves lucky in that accomplishment) so there was nothing left to negotiate. In the post-conflict environments of Bosnia and Liberia, women consider themselves extraordinarily fortunate if they are able to obtain employment at all. To these women, talking about negotiating salary or benefits seems irrelevant.

As we reflect on this feedback and consider the most current research on gender, especially work based on negotiated order, a number of questions arise. Women are subject to more negotiations than men in the United States,⁶ and this fact is also true in other societies. In the United States, our tendencies are to look at gender *differences*—even stereotypes—in negotiation, but we tend to ignore other dimensions that are most obvious in other societies. As an example, we know *identity* matters and is salient to negotiation. In the United States, we have a relatively narrow view of gender (does being female result in different treatment?) and yet there are multiple dimensions of *identity*, including family, religion, and class, which are rarely considered in the United States. Our colleagues from other cultures spoke of the important differences regarding their roles within their families, their religion, and their culture—these are all present within the negotiation context. What are the cues of salient identity aspects or shifts that can help us understand their impact during negotiations?

In reconsidering how we teach and talk about gender, we draw on different theoretical and empirical perspectives that, generally, have not been a part of the discourse on gender and negotiation as it has taken place in the Western academy. We focus

⁶ Deborah Kolb & Kathleen McGinn, *Beyond Gender and Negotiation to Gendered Negotiations*, 2 NEGOTIATION & CONFLICT MGMT. RES. 1 (2009).

on three approaches—the organizational, cultural and individual—to frame how gender can impact negotiations:⁷

- 1) Organizational or institutionalized expectations and assumptions create a negotiated order within which negotiation occurs. These expectations and assumptions reflect power differentials and position negotiators differently.⁸
- 2) Social and cultural expectations activate status-based stereotypes based on different dimensions of identity. These expectations affect the range of individual actions in the context of negotiated interactions.⁹
- 3) Individuals have choices in the roles they take up in a negotiation and these roles are quite fluid and variable reflecting the *intersectionality* of gender with other dimensions of identity.¹⁰

Based on these frameworks, we suggest how these three approaches might be incorporated into a pedagogy that can travel outside of the United States.

⁷ See THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SEXUAL DIFFERENCE 89-99 (D.L. Rhode eds., 1990) (referencing a social-psychological model of gender). Deborah M. Kolb, *Too Bad for the Women or Does It Have To Be? Gender and Negotiation Research over the Past Twenty-Five Years*, 25 NEGOTIATION J. 515 (2009). Barbara J. Risman, *Gender as a Social Structure*, 18 GENDER & SOC'Y 429 (2004).

⁸ See Kolb & McGinn, *supra* note 6.

⁹ See Cecilia L. Ridgeway & Shelley J. Correll, *Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations*, 18 GENDER & SOC'Y 510 (2004).

¹⁰ See generally Leslie McCall, *The Complexity of Intersectionality*, 30 SIGNS: J. WOMEN IN CULTURE & SOC'Y 1771 (2005).

Second Generation Gender Issues, Social Roles, and the Negotiated Order

One perspective, when considering how gender (in all its complexity) plays out in negotiations, includes consideration of the institutional factors, or negotiated orders, which shape negotiated interactions. From this perspective, institutions and organizations are not locations where gender differences occur, but rather the sites where gendering occurs. Two theoretical perspectives are relevant to understanding the role negotiated orders play in setting the context for negotiation. The first perspective is role theory that focuses on gendered role expectations based on the distribution of men and women into different social roles both in society generally, and in organizations and professions.¹¹ The second perspective is based on a consideration of *second generation gender issues*—a particularly relevant consideration as we move the pedagogy of teaching gender and negotiation forward. Second generation gender issues appear neutral and natural on their face, but they result in different experiences for, and treatment of, women and men and different groups of women and men.¹² As distinct from first generation discrimination involving intentional acts of bias, second generation gender practices appear unbiased in isolation, but they reflect masculine values and the life situations of men who have dominated the public domain of work.¹³ As a result, the negotiated order of most organizations privileges masculine and discounts feminine practices and assumptions.

Social roles can position men and women differently in the home, in the workplace, and often in the community—with

¹¹ ALICE H. EAGLY, *SEX DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL BEHAVIOR: A SOCIAL-ROLE INTERPRETATION* (1987).

¹² See Joan Acker, *Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations*, 4 *GENDER & SOC'Y* 139 (1990). Susan P. Sturm, *Second Generation Employment Discrimination: A Structural Approach*, 101 *COLUM. L. REV.* 458 (2001); Tinsley et al., *supra* note 4.

¹³ See JOYCE K. FLETCHER, *DISAPPEARING ACTS: GENDER, POWER, AND RELATIONAL PRACTICE AT WORK* (1999). Jane Flax, *Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory*, 12 *SIGNS* 621 (Summer, 1987).

implications for how they fare in negotiations. Disproportionately, women in most cultures have larger responsibilities in the family than their partners, and in some cultures, that responsibility has been labeled the *second shift*.¹⁴ A recent group of studies has considered these social roles—in particular, how pregnancy, birth, maternity leave, and work schedules position a mother differentially than those women who are not mothers.¹⁵ In Western cultures, mothers are routinely offered less desirable assignments and lower compensation than women without children.¹⁶ For example, in the U.S. Federal Circuit Court case *Lust v. Sealy, Inc.*, the plaintiff, a woman, was not considered for a promotion solely because the promotion entailed moving her family, which included her two small children, from Madison, Wisconsin to Chicago, Illinois.¹⁷ Mothering roles in other societies may be even more prominent, making it a challenge to negotiate at work and in the community.¹⁸

Social roles are translated into a sex-based division of labor, prominent in most industrial societies. Labor market structure often pushes men and women into different industries and occupations—with different pay structures. Within organizations, sex segregation can position women in staff roles and men in supervisory positions; different groups may find themselves at the bottom of the

¹⁴ See generally, ARLIE RUSSELL HOCHSCHILD & ANNE MACHUNG, *THE SECOND SHIFT: WORKING PARENTS AND THE REVOLUTION AT HOME* (Viking Penguin, 1997) (1989).

¹⁵ Kenneth G. Dau-Schmidt et al., *Men and Women of the Bar: The Impact of Gender on Legal Careers*, 16 MICH. J. GENDER & L. 49 (2009); Shelly J. Correll et al., *Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?*, 112 AM. J. SOC. 1297 (2007); See generally, LOUISE MARIE ROTH, *SELLING WOMEN SHORT: GENDER AND MONEY ON WALL STREET* (Princeton University Press 2006).

¹⁶ Heather Bennett Stanford, *Do You Want to be an Attorney or a Mother? Arguing for a Feminist Solution to the Problem of Double Binds in Employment and Family Responsibilities Discrimination*, 17 J. GENDER SOC. POL'Y & L. 627 (2009).

¹⁷ *Lust v. Sealy, Inc.*, 383 F.3d 580, 583 (7th Cir. 2004).

¹⁸ May Al- Dabbagh, *The Context for Intergroup Leadership Among Women's Groups in Saudi Arabia*, (Dubai Sch. Gov't Working Paper Series, Paper No. 08-03, 2008).

organization structure with little opportunity for advancement.¹⁹ These patterns apply to leadership roles as well, where there is an incongruity between gender role behaviors and the definition of leadership.²⁰ Consequently, opportunities for leadership are less likely to be offered to women and, when offered and accepted, women may be less likely to achieve success in those leadership roles. These effects are even more pronounced for African American women whose legitimacy is more likely to be challenged.²¹

The study of second generation gender issues unearths challenges to gender in workplace practices. Joan Acker suggests that there are four processes that render organizations gendered, positioning men and women differently when they negotiate. They are: 1) structural gender divisions that subordinate women; as well as 2) organizational symbols that justify these divisions; 3) interactions that often reproduce them; and 4) the organizational members' "mental work" that constructs and maintains an appropriate, gendered organizational persona.²² Together, these processes serve to render organizations "masculine," consequently disadvantaging those persons who do not fit the ideal of masculinity—women, and certain groups of men.

This gendering of organizations positions negotiators differently. Jobs and opportunities are gendered in the sense that certain people are seen to "fit" a job and others are not. These issues of "fit" are often complicated by race, class, and ethnicity. Issues of "fit" apply to workers in a wide variety of professions—from shop floor supervisors to prison guards to Wall Street bankers

¹⁹ Barbara F. Reskin & Patricia A. Roos, *Status Hierarchies and Sex Segregation*, in *INGREDIENTS FOR WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT POLICY 3* (Christine Bose & Glenna Spitze ed., 1987).

²⁰ Alice H. Eagly & Mary C. Johannesen-Schmidt, *The Leadership Styles of Women and Men*, 54 *J. SOC. ISSUES*, 781 (2001).

²¹ See generally, ELLA L.J. EDMONDSON BELL & STELLA M. NKOMO, *OUR SEPARATE WAYS: BLACK AND WHITE WOMEN AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY* (Harvard Business School Press 2001).

²² Joan Acker, *From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions*, 23 *CONTEMP. SOC.* 565, 565-69 (1992).

to lawyers.²³ Negotiated orders define what constitutes work and how it gets valued. Joyce Fletcher described the unrecognized work of women engineers who try to anticipate problems before they happen, seek to integrate the work of others, and try to build a team.²⁴ These examples, found within contexts in which masculine approaches to work tend to be highly valued and feminine approaches to work underrated,²⁵ suggest that claiming the value of one's work so that it is recognized and rewarded is part of the gendering of negotiation because it occurs in a variety of workplaces.²⁶ But recognizing this unseen, unvalued work can shift the traditional notions of how jobs and roles are defined.²⁷ Furthermore, when women seek to succeed by adhering to the masculine ideal, they can suffer backlash because of their refusal to adhere to the feminine stereotype. In the U.S. Supreme Court case *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, Deborah Hopkins was denied partnership and told that she needed to wear more makeup and attend "charm school."²⁸ In the pending U.S. Federal District Court case *Kirleis v. Dickie, McCamey & Chilcote*, law firm partner

²³ JENNIFER PIERCE, *GENDER TRIALS: EMOTIONAL LIVES IN CONTEMPORARY LAW FIRMS* (University of California Press 1995); David B. Wilkins & G. Mitu Gulati, *Why Are There So Few Black Lawyers in Corporate Law Firms? An Institutional Analysis*, 84 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW 493 (1996); Dana M. Britton, *The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization*, 14 GENDER & SOC. 418 (2000); Roth, *supra* note 15; Eva Skuratowicz and Larry W. Hunter, *Where Do Women's Jobs Come From?* 31 WORK AND OCCUPATIONS 73 (2004).

²⁴ Dennis K. Mumby & Linda L. Putnam, *The Politics of Emotion: A Feminist Reading of Bounded Rationality*, 17 ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW 465 (1992); see generally FLETCHER, *supra* note 13.

²⁵ See generally, VIRGINIA VALIAN, *WHY SO SLOW?* (MIT Press 1998).

²⁶ Joanne Martin, *The Organization of Exclusion: Institutionalization of Sex Inequality, Gendered Faculty Jobs and Gendered Knowledge in Organizational Theory and Research*. 1 ORG. 401 (1994); Karen Lee Ashcraft, *Managing Maternity Leave: A Qualitative Analysis of Temporary Executive Succession*, 44 ADMIN. SCI. Q. 240 (1999).

²⁷ See generally FLETCHER, *supra* note 13.

²⁸ See *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, 490 U.S. 228 (1989).

Alyson Kirleis was told that she worked too hard and should be home more with her two children.²⁹

Status, Hierarchy, Power and Privilege

A second perspective by which to examine gender is to consider gender in the context of status and hierarchy. Negotiations occur in institutional contexts that position negotiators differentially. Cecilia Ridgeway's work on status construction theory³⁰ provides evidence of how widely held beliefs—about the assumed rightful status of members of any identity group—spread through interaction. Existing structural conditions within organizations and society reflect a status ordering that places some groups higher than others. This creates a self-reinforcing system that attaches status and provides advantage to individuals because of their group identity. This also explains the backlash when women attempt to move into new professions—e.g., witness women in the U.S. presidential campaign. When gender status beliefs are operative in interactions, they manifest men's status value as superior and more competent than women. According to Ridgeway, gender status beliefs have three implications for inequality, particularly in employment.³¹ First, they create expectations that men will be more competent than women. These expectations can become self-fulfilling prophecies that affect assertiveness and confidence in negotiation (both of which are necessary for effectiveness).³² Second, gender status beliefs can position men over equivalent women, as more deserving of benefits and rewards. Finally, those who are advantaged by gender status

²⁹ Kirleis v. Dickie, McCamey & Chilcote, 560 F.3d 156 (2009); see also Andrea Kupfer Schneider et al., *supra* note 4.

³⁰ Cecilia L. Ridgeway & Kristan G. Erickson, *Creating and Spreading Status Beliefs*, 106 AM J. SOC. 579 (2000).

³¹ Cecilia L. Ridgeway, *Gender, Status, and Leadership*, 57 J. SOC. ISSUES 637 (2001).

³² Andrea Kupfer Schneider, *Shattering Negotiation Myths: Empirical Evidence on the Effectiveness of Negotiation Styles*, 1 HARV. NEGOT. L. REV 143 (2002).

beliefs are less likely to attend to information that might challenge that belief. These status beliefs can be quite difficult to dislodge, often requiring multiple rounds of disconfirming evidence. This clearly has implications for how negotiators are positioned to negotiate.

Gender, Identity, and Intersectionality

In the popular view, gender is an individual characteristic. Gender is reflected in who people are, how they behave, and how they see themselves.³³ This perspective is embodied in sex difference research, where the issue of differences between all men and all women overwhelms the study of intra-group differences. Embedded in this field of work is the notion that one's gender is an essential and stable attribute of the individual and that the "master" category of gender represents the experience of most men and women.³⁴

Feminists have argued that rather than being an essential property of the self, the degree to which a negotiator takes up a gendered role and how that role is expressed is likely to be fluid and fragmented and differentially assumed.³⁵ Individuals have multiple, intersecting, identity memberships that can lead to qualitatively different meanings and experiences that enable (and constrain) their actions within a negotiation. Typically, these dimensions include physical markers such as sex, race, age, and ethnicity, and personal identity markers such as social class, religion, sexual orientation, and social roles in the family, community, and at work.

³³ AMY S. WHARTON, *THE SOCIOLOGY OF GENDER: AN INTRODUCTION TO THEORY AND RESEARCH*. (Blackwell 2004).

³⁴ Stephanie A. Shields, *Gender: An Intersectionality Perspective*, 59 *SEX ROLES* 301-11 (2008).

³⁵ Kay Deaux & Brenda Major, *A Social-Psychological Model of Gender*, In D. L. Rhode, ed. *THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SEXUAL DIFFERENCE* (Yale University Press 1990); Robin Ely & Irene Padavic, *A Feminist Analysis of Organizational Research on Sex Differences*, 32 *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 1121-43 (2007).

The intersectionality of gender builds on both gendered order and positioning theory. From our perspective, gender status beliefs need to be elaborated beyond just men and women to consider what happens at the intersection of gender with other aspects of identity. Robin Ely and Irene Padavic suggest that working class masculinity (brawn) is contrasted to upper class masculinity (brains) and with femininity.³⁶ Raewyn Connell describes “subordinated masculinity” as one too closely identified with femininity.³⁷ Similarly, Ely and Padavic suggest that stereotypes about women of Asian descent as extremely feminine, for example, place them far from masculine images of success—which center on assertiveness and self-confidence—and therefore disadvantages their career prospects.³⁸ The process differs for women of color, particularly African American women. When they act competently, assertively, and with self-confidence, they often are perceived as controlling, manipulative, and aggressive.³⁹ These stereotypes can limit their success. Indeed, research suggests that different stereotypes are evoked when gender and race are considered together rather than when they are considered separately; when we invoke the stereotype of woman, it is white women who are likely to be overrepresented.⁴⁰

A major challenge for the feminist perspective expressed above is that although intersectionality conceptually makes sense, it is complex to study, and to implement in practice.⁴¹ The reason for this complexity is that one can find herself making a long list of categories—e.g., she is a white, married, middle class, Christian woman—and then whom do we compare her to—e.g., a white, married, middle class Christian man, or an African American,

³⁶ See generally Ely & Padavic, *supra* note 35.

³⁷ See generally R.W. CONNELL, *GENDER* (Blackwell Publishing 2002).

³⁸ See Ely & Padavic, *supra* note 35, at 1129.

³⁹ See generally EDMONDSON BELL & NKOMO, *supra* note 21; PATRICIA HILL COLLINS, *BLACK SEXUAL POLITICS: AFRICAN AMERICANS, GENDER, AND THE NEW RACISM* (Routledge 2005).

⁴⁰ See generally Leah R. Warner, *A Best Practices Guide to Intersectional Approaches In Psychological Research*, 59 *SEX ROLES* 454 (2008).

⁴¹ See generally *id.* See also generally McCall, *supra* note 10.

married, middle class Christian woman, or do we start to change categories of class, sexual orientation, religion, and so on? Because men and women vary on so many dimensions—race, social class, religious beliefs, age, abilities, cultural background—it is important to be clear about which categories of identity are of interest. Some identities matter most of the time while others become more crucial in particular historical moments or contexts.⁴² The former have been called “master” categories, while others might be more emergent.⁴³

More recently, Acker has expanded her view of gendered organizations to explicitly include intersectionality.⁴⁴ She makes this expansion by focusing on what she calls “inequality regimes.” These are defined as the interlocked practices and processes that result in continuing inequalities along the lines of class, race, gender, sexuality, religion, and physical disability, among others, as they play out in work organizations. Case-based examples demonstrate the ways these inequality regimes work in practice and the possibilities for changing them. Telling new stories and making alternative narratives visible can be an intervention for changing dominant organizational discourses.⁴⁵

Teaching Gender in a Cross Cultural Negotiation Classroom

Since organizations more and more reflect a global community with multi-cultural constraints, we need to prepare ourselves and our students better to be culturally sensitive to gender-based issues in negotiations. We offer a few suggestions framed within various contexts considering how gendered issues

⁴² See generally Warner, *supra* note 40.

⁴³ See generally McCall, *supra* note 10.

⁴⁴ See generally Acker, *supra* note 12.

⁴⁵ See generally Deborah Kolb et al., *Making Change: A Framework for Promoting Gender Equity in Organizations*, in *READER IN GENDER, WORK, AND ORGANIZATION* 204 (Robin J. Ely et al. eds., Blackwell Publishing 2003). See also generally Robin J. Ely & Debra E. Meyerson, *Theories of Gender in Organizations: A New Approach to Organizational Analysis and Change*, 22 *RES. IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAV.* 105 (2000).

play out in negotiations: social roles, negotiated order, status, hierarchy, power and privilege, identity and their intersectionality.

We know that second generation gender issues may, on the surface, appear gender neutral, yet there are distinctly different experiences for women and men; although intentional bias is not so much the focus (as in first generation issues), masculine values dominate the public domain of work. When gender status beliefs are operative, they reflect men's status as superior and more competent than women. The implications for inequality are critical—men are perceived as more competent and more deserving of rewards (and therefore less likely to relinquish this status). Creating case-based examples to demonstrate the “inequality regimes” in work practices will highlight the students' understanding of the implications of these regimes when trying to negotiate change.

We suggest two cases. The first, *Marisol's Mandate*, was developed by Fleur Weigert under Deborah Kolb's supervision.⁴⁶ Marisol is a director of programs for an agricultural research and development organization and is responsible for managing several of the agency's international portfolios.⁴⁷ She is dealing with a struggling seed dissemination initiative in Peru, working in collaboration with a local partner and her organization's regionally-based representative, both of whom are men.⁴⁸ In the process of working on the problems she is surprised to find herself sidelined and bypassed.⁴⁹ The dynamics reflect gender, power and conflict avoidance issues. The *Marisol* case can lead to an interesting class discussion and might conclude by having students consider alternative strategies to the gender-status dilemma. In addition, ask students to consider the same case but have Marisol as a man (and therefore, too, working with all men). In what ways would the issues be different? Or, what if Marisol's local partner was a

⁴⁶ Deborah Kolb, *Marisol's Mandate* (2002) (on file with author at kolb@simmons.edu).

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ *Id.*

woman. Would that difference likely change the dynamics and if so, in what ways and why?

The second case, *Allison's Arrangement*, was developed by Deborah Kolb.⁵⁰ Allison is a senior research scientist working at an international center with its home base in Europe. Her husband works in North Africa and she is now pregnant. She wants to arrange a long-distance telecommuting schedule (from North Africa), finds the workplace has no work and family policy, and that her boss is reluctant to agree to her proposal. Allison's case has leading questions for students, and forces them to consider what one does to prepare for negotiating under these conditions—how to get her boss to take her seriously—and to develop proposals that would meet the parties' needs. The case could be modified to focus on gender and culture by placing Allison in different places around the world—in Africa or South America or Asia, etc.—and see how students would view the case. Like the modification of the *Marisol* case, what if Allison was a male Ali—how would the students respond differently? Would Ali face even more backlash for following his spouse?

Teaching Gender Status, Hierarchy, Power and Privilege

Most faculty teaching negotiations are familiar with power-based simulations such as *StarPower*⁵¹ that offer students ways to progress through various levels of society by acquiring wealth. Ultimately, those with the most resources are able to make the rules for the entire group; usually, those with fewer resources experience resentment and frustration. Most of the power-based simulations work; gender can be superimposed on the same games where women have limited abilities/access to wealth.

To begin a discussion on gendered issues related to status, hierarchy, power and privilege, ask students to consider the

⁵⁰ Deborah Kolb, *Allison's Arrangement* (2001) (on file with author at kolb@simmons.edu).

⁵¹ Garry Shirts, *StarPower* (Simulation Training Systems 1979), available for purchase at http://www.stsintl.com/schools-charities/star_power.html.

possibility that they will awaken tomorrow as a person of the opposite sex. What would be different in their daily lives and why? After they articulate these likely differences, focus the discussion on issues of power and privilege.

Though more complicated, we encourage replicating or creating variations on the experiments by Catherine Tinsley and her colleagues⁵² that demonstrated ways women and men are treated differently based on the likeability v. competence dimension. Tinsley put together a series of videos manipulating the behavior of a director (alternatively male and female) to two situations: a work-related technology crash and a family-related sick child problem. The director either stayed at work to deal with the information technology crisis or went home to care for the child. The students then rated the director on questions related to likeability and competence. Female directors were rated more competent if they stayed at work, but less likeable, and were rated less competent if they chose to go home, but more likeable. The ratings for the male directors were consistent: they were always judged competent and likeable regardless of staying at work or going home.

Similarly, a teacher could divide the class into four groups, have them read a similar scenario and instruct the class to rate the director on likeability v. competence. These types of simulations and experiments, where students see ways their own ratings are influenced by gender, enrich the discussion that should follow. Guide student reflection by asking them such pertinent questions as: how did it feel to be able to make the rules for the entire group? What were the reactions of the others? What would you do to negotiate on behalf of those persons who are less powerful?

Teaching the Intersectionality of Gender with other Aspects of Identity

There are a number of ways educators and scholars can teach how gender intersects with identity. Scholars have captured

⁵² See Tinsley et al., *supra* note 4, at 236-40.

the complexity of intersectionality by focusing on individual narratives and stories. As Aída Hurtado has suggested, when different groups of women, in her case, Latina, tell their stories, they can shift from one group's perception of social reality to another, and at times, are able simultaneously to perceive multiple social realities without losing their sense of self-coherence.⁵³ These stories can bring to light alternative accounts and perspectives that might not otherwise be obvious. Individual stories shift experiences from that of a "generalized other" to a "concrete other," enabling people to connect in ways more abstract accounts do not.⁵⁴ If a class is sufficiently diverse, ask students in small groups to tell their stories about experiences that reflect this intersectionality of gender and identity. If the class is not diverse, case studies can capture intersectionality, particularly if they reveal different perspectives on the same phenomenon. In this way, comparisons among groups can be made.

Another approach is to use cultural scripts around certain social phenomena of interest.⁵⁵ For example, one can consider a factor like "being emotional" and consider its meanings for different groups—white women (upset), black men (hostile), Asian women (reserved).⁵⁶ These approaches, in capturing the simultaneity of different identities, help us appreciate their dynamic character. Identities are not static; instead, they are repeatedly

⁵³ See Aída Hurtado, *Relating to Privilege: Seduction and Rejection in the Subordination of White Women and Women of Color*, 14 SIGNS: JOURNAL OF WOMEN IN CULTURE AND SOCIETY 833 (1989).

⁵⁴ See generally SEYLA BENHABIB, *SITUATING THE SELF: GENDER, COMMUNITY, AND POSTMODERNISM IN CONTEMPORARY ETHICS* (Routledge 1992); SARA COBB, *IMAGINE COEXISTENCE: NARRATIVES FROM FIELDWORK IN RWANDA. BUILDING ALLIANCES ACROSS DIFFERENCES?* CENTER FOR GENDER IN ORGANIZATIONS, http://www.simmons.edu/som/docs/centers/imagine_coexistence.pdf (2000).

⁵⁵ Evangelina Holvino, *Intersections: The Simultaneity of Race, Gender and Class in Organization Studies*, GENDER, WORK & ORG. (forthcoming, published online 2008) available at <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/120123915/issue>.

⁵⁶ See Warner, *supra* note 40, at 418.

negotiated as people take action. Each of these ways of approaching intersectionality has implications for teaching about the “who” in negotiation.

At the Istanbul conference, we engaged in several experiential activities. Divided into small teams with diverse membership—gender, nationality, religion—we were given assignments to conduct a negotiation in the spice market, to purchase something for the group’s afternoon snack, to capture an image on camera that reflected something dangerous, and to capture an image that reflected the intersection of the sacred and the secular. These activities—called *Adventure Learning*—worked because the subsequent debriefing provoked a number of responses that ultimately led to writing about various topics pertinent to second generation teaching. With greater intentionality regarding the conference assignment, these activities can become gender-based learning. For example, in what ways does the spice market, though public, reflect the underlying task of women purchasing food for the family (private domain)? Are women just as capable or successful in their negotiations as men at the market? Do cross-cultural partnerships (Turkish and American women) make a difference and in what ways? Do men and women translate “danger” in different ways? What about differences in the meaning of sacred and secular? Add dimensions of religion, ethnicity and race with gender. What happens? Though spice markets are not so available in most of our cities, there are farmers’ markets, flea markets, hotel chains, restaurants, etc., where students could experiment with these complexities as they conduct negotiations in the field.

Cases and experiments allow students to speculate on ways negotiations can address these gendered complexities, domestically and cross-culturally. Telling the stories and articulating the narratives of actors across different axes of power and identity practices is an important intervention for changing dominant organizational discourses. The process of story-telling brings to

light alternative narratives that seldom find their way into mainstream accounts and organizational mythologies.⁵⁷

Faculty should encourage students to think broadly about ways negotiation is changing (second generation). For example, returning to the situation in Turkey when a male faculty member failed half of his all-women class what could the female students have done? If half of an all-male class had failed, what would the male students have done? Are the same options available to women?⁵⁸ Why or why not? Perhaps the students should enlist allies, seek assistance from a third party, or advocacy group—for example, by enlisting the parents of the female students. This kind of discussion can also lead to considering ways to avoid backlash (advocating on behalf of a group rather than individual cases, or seeking assistance from a third party or advocacy group) and being more effective in that particular gendered order.⁵⁹

Conclusion

Our intention with this article is to articulate ways to move away from the dominant approach of teaching gender (first generation)—often viewed as “fixing women” or dealing with stereotypes—to providing a smorgasbord of approaches that faculty can use to raise gender issues as they travel around the world (second generation). We have presented three different models—gendered negotiated orders, power and hierarchy, and intersectionality—with the hope that faculty will be able to raise with their students, a variety of issues around gender that both women and men must address within different cultures, and to

⁵⁷ See Ely & Meyerson, *supra* note 45, at 105; Marta B. Calás & Linda Smircich, *Feminist Perspectives on Gender in Organizational Research: What Is and Is Yet to Be*, in David Buchanan and Alan Bryman Eds., *HANDBOOK OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH METHODS*, 246-269 (Sage 2009).

⁵⁸ Andrea Kupfer Schneider, *Effective Responses to Offensive Comments*, 10 *NEGOT. J.* 107 (1994).

⁵⁹ See Tinsley et al., *supra* note 4.

provide a richer context for gender (along with culture, religion, ethnicity and education) as it plays out in negotiations.

