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The salary equity gap continues to exist, with men earning more on average for every dollar a woman makes. Research suggests that women’s underdeveloped negotiation skills play a role in the continuation of the salary equity gap. Understanding the negotiation strategies and gendered communications traits women utilize may assist in enhancing their skills and in moving toward gender salary equity.

This study addresses the negotiation strategies and gendered communication traits of female administrators in higher education. Twenty-two women in administrative positions in institutions of higher education in West Michigan were interviewed to determine the strategies they utilized when negotiating for salary and other forms of compensation. Study participants held mid- or executive-level administration positions, beginning with directors and above but did not include presidents or chancellors.

Key findings from the study indicated that the position a woman holds is more important than the compensation she receives. In addition, these women perceive that they do not negotiate, while men do. Findings also revealed that women do utilize effective negotiation strategies, but they do not necessarily utilize them to negotiate for salary. When they did negotiate, participants primarily used masculine traits. Responses from participants depicted both effective and ineffective salary negotiation strategies.
In summary, women possess the ability to negotiate but have not fully utilized these strategies to increase their salaries. They place a lower priority on salary and often perceive negotiating in a negative manner. This, in turn, may negatively affect their ability to obtain increases in salary needed to decrease the salary equity gap.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Despite the fact that women are very capable in their positions and have proven their capability through performance, they continue to experience serious salary inequities (Collins, 1998). Overall, statistics show that women average less than 80 cents to every dollar men make (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Institute for Women's Policy Research, 2004a; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2003). This salary gap is a pressing gender equity issue and existing research findings suggest that one potential solution is for women to increase their initial salary negotiating skills (Johnsrud & Heck, 1994).

A review of the role of women in leadership and higher education is essential to understanding how the salary gap has been perpetuated. Due in part to traditional views of leadership being associated with masculinity, women have been largely excluded from formal leadership positions for most of recorded history (Rhode, 2003). Traditional views of leadership have focused on cultural metaphors associated with the masculine gender such as strength, determination, courage, and aggression (Nidiffer, 2001a). Because femininity has been stereotyped as dependent, submissive, and conforming, female leadership is not viewed as being strong from a traditional point of view (Burns, 1978).

Such gender stereotyping of leadership skills and attributes focusing on masculine traits has made it difficult for women to move into positions of leadership, especially at the executive level. While statistics indicate that women in higher education administrative positions have been steadily increasing since 1970, women are still undervalued (Wenniger & Conroy, 2001) and remain underrepresented in upper-level
administrative positions and over represented in lower-level administrative positions (Rhode, 2003). Women leaders are often assessed, evaluated and promoted within academic organizations based on a set of preconceived norms and attributes, leading to the contention that the differences in men’s and women’s leadership styles are actually perpetuated by institutional policies and practices (Twombly & Rosser, 2002). These preconceived norms and attributes relate back to the association of masculine traits with traditional views of leadership.

Female administrators are faced with many gender equity issues (Swiss, 1996). They are not afforded the same presumption of competence in their leadership abilities as their male counterparts (Rhode, 2003). Because of the shortage of female administrators in higher education, there is a lack of female mentors to help groom future female leaders (Fassinger, 2002; Rhode, 2003; Swiss, 1996). Another issue facing female administrators is that they must cope with a lack of sufficient information to do their jobs since much of the information made available to male administrators comes from their male colleagues (Ropers-Huilman, 2002; Smulders, 1998). This puts women at a disadvantage in obtaining the knowledge they need to succeed in their positions.

Occupational stereotyping is also a problem for female administrators. Some jobs are thought of as “men’s work” and some as “women’s work” (Johnsrud & Heck, 1994). These views keep women from being able to move into positions for which they may actually be more qualified than their male counterparts. In addition, women deal with multiple role issues, still spending more time on household and childcare issues than men, while also maintaining a job (Fassinger, 2002; Morrison, White, Van Velsor, & Center for Creative Leadership, 1987). This limits the amount of time they can devote to
work-related travel and longer working hours and gives men an advantage for promotion opportunities.

Overall, however, the salary gap is one of the most significant gender equity issues that continues to exist between male and female administrators in higher education due, in part, to the unwillingness of many females to negotiate for salary (Thompson-Stacy & Pogue, 1996). A study by Frieze, Olson and Good (1990) regarding the perceived and actual discrimination in salaries of male and female managers found that one of the most important determinates of salary was gender, with men earning more than women.

One reason women do not negotiate for salary is that it simply does not occur to them to ask for more money. They are not always prepared to negotiate, not knowing how much to ask for or feeling uncomfortable about negotiating. Other studies reveal that women set less aggressive goals than men when negotiating for salary (Babcock & Laschever, 2003) and that women are more cooperative and likely to accept an offer given (Eckel & Grossman, 2001).

In traditional negotiation models, exchange is a gendered activity and attributes of one gender are less valued than the other (Putnam & Kolb, 2000). Qualities of effective negotiation that are valued include independence, competition, forcefulness, analytic rationality, and aggressiveness, which are linked to masculinity. Feminine qualities or traits such as sense of community, intuition, emotionality, sympathy, and compassion are less valued for effective negotiation. Chapter 2 contains a detailed explanation of gendered communication traits, as well a table synthesizing these concepts.
Current research shows that women who do not negotiate for beginning salary or who are not effective in negotiating an equitable salary are faced with a problem at the beginning of their careers that increases their disadvantage as they progress (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Frieze et al., 1990; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994). In a study regarding the cumulative impact of gender on administrative promotion within a university, Johnsrud and Heck (1994) found that women received significantly lower salaries in their initial positions, which affected their compensation and was perpetuated over time. If women do not obtain an equitable beginning salary, the inequity grows larger, with men earning an even higher percentage over women in the same position for those with over ten years of experience (Swiss, 1996). This has a chilling effect on women’s earnings and increases the gender equity gap.

Overall, it is clear that women continue to face challenges as they strive for top leadership positions. Existing research documents salary inequities and different communication and leadership styles. It also hints at issues surrounding underdeveloped negotiating skills of women, and what role this plays in the overall issue. What is unclear is what kind of negotiation strategies, if any, women are utilizing to obtain compensation and what gendered communication traits they are exhibiting if and when they negotiate for compensation. This study focused specifically on these issues as well as the perception women have of their negotiation strategies compared to men’s strategies. A detailed description of negotiation strategies is contained in Chapter 2, as well as a table listing these strategies.
Research Questions

The main question in this research focused on what strategies, if any, female administrators at institutions of higher education used to negotiate for compensation at the time of initial hire and/or for additional job duties and what gendered communication traits they exhibited if and when they negotiated for compensation. This study also explored similarities and differences to previous findings on women’s negotiation strategies.

Female administrators were defined as director level or above, excluding the positions of president and chancellor. For purposes of this study, institutions of higher education were restricted to four-year public universities in West Michigan.

Specific research questions included:

1. What, if any, negotiation strategies did female administrators use to negotiate for compensation:
   a. at the time they were hired; and
   b. when additional job duties were assigned to them?

2. What gendered communication traits did female administrators exhibit if and when they negotiated for compensation:
   a. at the time they were hired; and
   b. when additional job duties were assigned to them?

3. If female administrators did not negotiate for compensation, what issues were defined as barriers to negotiating:
   a. at the time they were hired; and
   b. when additional job duties were assigned to them?
4. When female administrators did negotiate for compensation:
   a. what conditions existed for female administrators to feel confident in
      negotiating; and
   b. at what point did female administrators cease to negotiate for
      compensation, and why?

5. How, if at all, did women perceive that their negotiation strategies were
   different than men’s in reference to:
   a. types of strategies used; and
   b. any gender stereotypes implied?

6. What negotiation strategies did women perceive as most and least effective
   and what recommendations did they offer for other aspiring female
   administrators?

Significance of the Study

Understanding how female administrators negotiate for compensation and what
strategies may be employed to enhance their negotiation skills is an important step in
moving toward gender salary equity. This study added to the knowledge base on gender
equity issues and focused on the salary gender gap by exploring the strategies women
used to negotiate for salary and additional compensation. The study explored whether or
not they negotiated, why they may not have negotiated, women’s perceptions of how
their negotiation strategies differed from men’s, and what women perceived to be
effective negotiation strategies.
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was based on gender communication theory, including feminist communication theory (Gilligan, 1982; Kolb, 1992; Tannen, 1990). This framework assisted in understanding how men and women communicate, leading to a better understanding of how they may negotiate. Gender communication theory is based on the premise that gender is a social construct and a learned behavior. Socialization strategies learned in childhood carry over into adult lives. These learned behaviors affect the way men and women communicate based on the way they have interacted from an early age. Because men have learned to be independent and strive for status while women have learned to connect and build relationships, their communication styles are developed from very different perspectives. Men are more likely to communicate in ways to gain recognition while women communicate in ways that downplay their accomplishments (Kolb, 1992). This is how men and women have learned to achieve rewards from their peers. If a man has learned to seek recognition, he is likely to negotiate for salary in order to obtain the recognition he believe he deserves. A woman who has learned to downplay her accomplishments, on the other hand, is more likely to avoid negotiating and settle for what is offered (Eckel & Grossman, 2001).

Feminist communication theory added further insight to this issue, beginning with the goal of understanding and explaining gender (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004). Theorizing on communication, gender, and social change, feminist communication theory points out that because differences are practiced hierarchically, this creates groups who can be excluded from certain privileges afforded to some groups but not others. These differences can include sexuality, gender, race, culture, nationality, ability, and class.
This study on salary negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education was based on the premise that women, as a group, are limited in their access to leadership positions and equitable salaries. Feminist communication theory assisted in the understanding of gender communication differences and how those differences affect the salary negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education.

Research Design

A qualitative design was used for this research, which provided a wealth of information and a richness of data that would not have been possible in a quantitative study (Patton, 2002). A phenomenological approach was used, which consisted of interviews conducted with female administrators from four institutions of higher education in West Michigan. The four institutions chosen were in areas with similar regional characteristics, which allowed the findings to be comparable due to similarities in salary level and standard of living.

Phenomenology seeks out the meaning, structure and essence of the lived experience of a phenomenon for a person or group of people (Patton, 2002). Since the researcher is a female administrator and has first-hand experience in negotiating for beginning salary and additional compensation for additional duties, an ardent interest in this topic existed. While the researcher entered this study with certain views based on experiences, personal biases were reserved, so as not to taint the interview process. The methods section expands on the research methodology and further explains the processes used in this phenomenological study.
Summary

Overall, although women are still underrepresented in leadership positions in higher education, the numbers are slowly growing (Wenniger & Conroy, 2001). The salary gap, however, continues even in high-level administrative positions, and although a number of studies have explored the salary equity issue, not enough is known about the negotiation strategies of female administrators. Existing research studies have found that universities pay women less than men, and that women are leaving universities to seek better opportunities for career advancement (Collins, 1998). Women often accept a low initial salary, which means they must leave a university in order to earn a large increase, as universities will not often give the double-digit increase necessary to adjust the salary to an equitable level (Thompson-Stacy & Pogue, 1996). In addition, the pay disparity for women increases in higher level positions and the wage gap widens as women grow older (Swiss, 1996).

Existing research studies tell us that in traditional negotiation models, exchange is a gendered activity and is closely associated with masculine traits. The literature also indicates that women are less likely to negotiate, lack aggressive salary goals, and receive lower offers when negotiating for compensation. However, not enough was known specifically about the negotiation strategies used by female administrators in higher education. Because the lack of negotiation efforts or skills is one possible cause of the gender equity gap in salaries, continued study was necessary. This study added to the knowledge base on gender equity by exploring whether women leaders in higher education negotiated for their compensation and, if so, what strategies and gendered communication traits they used.
A thorough review of the literature was conducted to gain a better understanding of the issues related to the salary gender gap, and is presented in Chapter 2. The methods used to conduct this study are detailed in Chapter 3. The results and discussion are presented in Chapters 4 and 5.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

"You will never be married. Men hate intelligent wives." Quote by the father of Annie Nathan Meyer, Barnard College founder, to her when she announced in 1885 her intention to seek higher education (Nidiffer, 2001a, p. 18).

Early Role of Women in Higher Education

When higher education began in America in 1636 with the founding of Harvard College, the founders were men who had been educated in Britain at Oxford and Cambridge Universities (Nidiffer, 2002). The primary focus was to educate young men for the ministry and for future leadership positions within the colonial government. Because women were not considered at that time for the ministry or leadership positions, they were excluded from institutions of higher education.

Attitudes such as that of French Philosopher Jean-Jacque Rousseau (1762/1979) were pervasive to the education of women. In his book entitled, *Emile or on education*, his treatise on child development and pedagogy originally published in 1762 and translated to English in 1979, he indicated:

Thus the whole education of women ought to relate to men. To please men, to be useful to them, to make herself loved and honored by them, to raise them when young, to care for them when grown, to counsel them, to console them, to make their lives agreeable and sweet – these are the duties of women at all times, and they ought to be taught from childhood. (p. 365)

In the 1820’s and 1830’s, institutions of higher education expanded their curricula to include more practical subjects, with many of those focused toward women (Nidiffer,
2001a). However, most educators still believed that women did not have the intellectual capacity to study the same subjects as men, and thus were not included in professional curricula. Indeed, only a few opened their doors at all to women prior to the Civil War (MacDonald, 2002).

Coeducation was introduced reluctantly and gradually by many institutions, with women being allowed in selected departments or courses of study (Nidiffer, 2001a). By the early nineteenth century, several women's colleges were established and coeducational colleges began cautiously, with Oberlin College being the first in 1837. The reluctance to promote coeducation was perpetuated by individuals such as Dr. Edward H. Clarke, a former member of the Harvard Medical School faculty. Nidiffer (2001a) discusses a 1873 book by Clarke, in which he concluded that women's brains were less developed than men's, they could not tolerate the same level of mental stimulation, nor could they be taught in the same manner as men. He further concluded that too much brain activity could cause a potential malfunction of the reproductive "apparatus," leading to a women's ruined health and the masculating or un-sexing of women. Unfortunately, many believed Dr. Clarke's conclusion and used it to oppose coeducation.

By 1880, even though discriminatory policies and practices still worked against women enrolling in U.S. colleges and universities, there were about 56,000 women enrolled. By 1900, that number had increased to 85,000. From 1900 to 1930 the number of women receiving bachelor's degrees increased significantly from 19 percent to 40 percent. However, after World War II and the advent of the G. I. Bill, there was a dramatic increase in male students and a major reduction in the number of females...
attending college. The percentage of women receiving bachelor’s degrees had fallen to 24 percent by 1950. Women were treated as second-class citizens during this time and found it difficult to get admitted into higher education, with priority given to veterans. By 1957, however, the number of women attending American institutions of higher education exceeded 1 million for the first time (Adair, 2002).

In 1970, congressional hearings brought to light persistent patterns of institutional discrimination against academic women. In November of 1972, the U.S. Congress approved a higher education bill including Title IX, which banned sex discrimination in all programs and activities of educational institutions that received federal grants and contracts. The act also extended Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to employees in public and private higher education as well as the Equal Pay Act of 1963. This prohibited discrimination in higher education based on race, sex, religion, color and national origin (Glazer-Raymo, 2002). This legislation had a significant impact on the enrollment of women in higher education. Today females represent over 8 million, or about 55 percent, of those enrolled in higher education (Glazer-Raymo, 2002; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2003).

While women have made significant strides in higher education, issues of gender stereotyping are still pervasive today, as exhibited by the recent claims of Harvard University President Larry Summers (Fogg, 2005). Not only did he suggest that fewer women make it to the top in science and math because of innate differences of ability from men, he also theorized that women with children are reluctant to work the long hours required to succeed in those fields. Summers’ implication that only men are willing to do high-powered, intense work is offensive to women who have made many
sacrifices for their work (Yellin, 2005). It also makes it challenging for women to succeed in obtaining positions traditionally held by men.

Women and Leadership

"Equity is the special province of a leader" (De Pree, 1992, p. 27).

Women's progress in obtaining positions of leadership has been slow. Rhode (2003) indicates that for most of recorded history, women have been largely excluded from leadership positions in general. She also points out that encyclopedia entries published after the turn of the last century cite only 850 eminent women throughout the preceding 2000 years. And most of these women did not acquire leadership positions through their own right but exercised influence thorough relationships with men. Women remain dramatically underrepresented in formal leadership positions in both private and public sectors.

While women today obtain positions in every discipline, including those reserved in the past for men, such as medical and engineering fields (Nidiffer, 2002), women are still not represented well in upper levels of university administration. Even though statistics indicate women in higher education administrative positions have been steadily increasing since 1970 (Wenniger & Conroy, 2001), women are highly represented at the lower levels and not well represented at the top (Lively, 2000; Nidiffer, 2002; Shepard, 1999).

In order to understand the breakdown of women and men in administrative positions, it is important to define the role of an administrator in institutions of higher education. Twombly and Rosser (2002) indicate there are three dimensions when describing higher education administrators. The first administrative dimension is in the
level of responsibility or authority. In this dimension, there are three categories. The first is the executive category, which includes senior-level positions. The next is mid-level administration. This would include directors, associate directors and department chairs, for example. The third category includes professional positions that do not have administrative authority, such as supervisory and budgetary responsibilities, attached to them. Many of these positions are entry-level positions, such as admissions counselors and residence hall coordinators.

The second dimension of administrators in higher education institutions involves the distinction between nonacademic and academic administrative hierarchies (Twombly & Rosser, 2002). On the academic side, this includes positions such as provost, academic dean and department head. There is typically a requirement that individuals holding these positions have served as faculty. Nonacademic administrative positions would include those such as registrar and positions within various support units of the university such as financial management, alumni affairs, and human resources.

The third dimension of higher education administrative positions relates to the functional identification within a specific college or unit (Twombly & Rosser, 2002). Each area within the institution of higher education may have its own specialty subunits. An example of this would be the student affairs area, which includes housing, dining services, judicial services, and others.

These definitions of administrative positions will assist in the analysis of the subjects in this study in reference to the types of experiences they have had in the workplace. This will be important in understanding the negotiation and communication skills of these female administrators for salary and additional compensation.
Leadership Theories

Women face many challenges in not only obtaining positions of leadership but also in maintaining positions they have achieved. A review of leadership theories assists in understanding why women have struggled to increase the percentage of administrative positions held. Twombly and Rosser (2002) share two perspectives on the role of female leadership in higher education. The first is how people lead and whether or not women have different leadership styles than men. Many studies (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Kolb, 1992; Rhode, 2003; Tannen, 1990) on this topic show that women lead differently than men. Twombly and Rosser (2002) indicate that women leaders face preconceived ideas on which they are evaluated and promoted, showing that institutional policies and practices can perpetuate male and female leadership differences.

Twombly and Rosser’s (2002) other perspective on the role of female leadership in higher education examines who holds positions of leadership, how they got there, and what they do. It is assumed in this perspective that individuals who have attained top-level positions are leaders and exert leadership qualities.

Generally leadership is viewed as the ability to influence and inspire others to act in the pursuit of some type of common goals (Rhode, 2003). Both transactional and transformational leadership theories have ramifications for female administrators. Transactional leadership occurs when a person initiates contact with another person for the purpose of exchanging something of value (Burns, 1978). These leaders approach their followers with the goal of exchanging something for something else, such as jobs for votes or subsidies for campaign contributions. This exchange could be economic, political, or psychological. The individuals have a relationship based on a related
purpose but they have no long-term reason to hold them together, unless they are bound together by pursuing a higher goal.

Transformational leadership on the other hand is problem-oriented and focuses on developing self and others (Burns, 1978). It is usually more potent than transactional leadership. While transformational leaders identify and use existing needs or demands of possible followers, they also look for potential motives in followers, seek to satisfy higher needs, and engage the full person of the follower. This approach results in a relationship that converts followers into leaders and leaders into moral agents.

While both transactional and transformational leadership are needed at times, women, in general, very rarely focus exclusively on tasks. They tend to be more participatory and democratic in their leadership style, leaning toward transformational leadership (Nidiffer, 2001b).

In addition to transactional and transformational leadership styles, Bolman and Deal (2003) describe a four-frame leadership model. This model includes structural, human resource, political, and symbolic leadership frames. These frames are also important in understanding women’s leadership styles. Bush’s (1995) leadership frames overlap Bolman and Deal’s four-frame model, referring to the structural frame as formal. In the structural leadership frame, the central concepts are related to rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, and environment. The leader’s role from this perspective is to formulate goals and see to it that they are accomplished efficiently (Marion, 2002).

The central concepts of the human resource frame include needs, skills and relationships (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Bush (1995) refers to the human resource frame as collegial. In the collegial frame, members have the right to participate in affairs of the
institution, be a member in a company of scholars, and realize equal worth of knowledge (Birnbaum, 1988).

In political frames, there is a dependence on social exchange (Birnbaum, 1988). The political frame focuses on power, conflict, competition, and organizational politics (Bolman & Deal, 2003). From a political perspective, organizations are viewed as coalitions of diverse individuals with enduring differences. There are scarce resources, conflict is present, and power is the most important asset. Bargaining and negotiating are also an inherent part of this model.

The symbolic or cultural frame as defined by Bush (1995) is immersed in culture, meaning, metaphors, rituals, and ceremony. De Pree (1989) refers to culture as a particular state or stage of civilization. The culture of an organization expresses the values or social ideas and beliefs that its members share (Birnbaum, 1988; Bolman & Deal, 2003; De Pree, 1989; Kezar, 2001).

Understanding transactional and transformational leadership as well as the four-framed leadership model assists in analyzing the leadership styles of men and women and how they may differ. Research and writing on leadership, such as that previously discussed, has focused predominately on men until recently, assuming that leadership was basically a male activity. According to Bolman and Deal (2003), research regarding gender differences in leadership is equivocal. They indicate that we might expect that women would be associated with the human resource frame of leadership, exhibiting a warm, supportive and participative style and not the political frame associated with power, shrewdness and aggressiveness. Bolman and Deal (2003) contend that research gives little support to the notion that there are significant gender differences in leadership.
styles. This leads to a debate as to whether gender differences have practical significance. Many studies, however, have shown that leadership styles of men and women do differ (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Gilligan, 1982; Kolb, 1992; Tannen, 1990), with women placing greater emphasis on team and community and men placing greater emphasis on outcomes or results of change (Diamond & Spuches, 2002).

**Gendered Leadership**

Including gender in the study of leadership in higher education allows for a bigger picture of characteristics and perspectives that comprise leadership (Twombly & Rosser, 2002). The feminist conceptual model assumes that leadership manifests itself when there is an action to bring about change to make a positive difference in people's lives (Astin & Leland, 1991). In terms of feminine and masculine stereotypical expectations in leadership contexts, the preferred style has typically been masculine. Leaders acting from a feminine leadership perspective position themselves at the center of a communication web and at the heart of the activity instead of at the top. They believe their strength is in connection and in sharing of information (Fine & Buzzanell, 2000).

Women have been seen as lacking in leadership abilities over the centuries due to the stereotyping of femininity as dependent, submissive, and conforming (Burns, 1978). Traditional views of leadership have been based on people's need for a strong leader to help them master change, create a vision and not feel powerless (Senge, 1990). The privilege of leadership and power are assigned to men in a patriarchal society. For example, during a caucus panel discussion among female leaders in higher education administration at the American Association of Higher Education National Conference in March 2001, one of the participants indicated that women must understand the male
culture to survive, as administrative positions are based on male norms (Women in Higher Education, 2001a). This issue appears repeatedly in the literature, with the patriarchal tradition in higher education being a recurring theme.

Because of the traditional views on leadership being associated with masculine traits, the skills and attributes valued as part of a man’s masculinity become the qualities sought in a leader (Nidiffer, 2001a). Cultural metaphors used to describe a leader, which are associated with the masculine gender, are words like boss, hero, titan, daring pioneer, superman, pilot, and quarterback. Other masculine traits associated with leadership attributes are aggression, vision, strength, determination, and courage. Because of this association, female candidates for leadership positions may not look like leaders in the minds of a search committee. The vice president for a search firm serving higher education and other nonprofit organizations indicated that search committees may actually expect candidates to have backgrounds in disciplines which are male dominated, thereby limiting the pool of female candidates (Dowdall, 2003). This makes it difficult for women to achieve administrative positions in higher education.

In research conducted by Kouzes and Posner (2002) regarding the values people look for and admire in their leaders, the top four responses indicated that people want a leader who is honest, forward-looking, competent and inspiring. These are qualities that appear to be gender neutral. However, forward-looking can be associated with daring pioneer, which has been described as a masculine trait, as have qualities of competency and inspiration (Nidiffer, 2001a).

Rhode (2003) presents information on gender stereotypes, indicating that characteristics of women are at odds with characteristics of leadership. Women who
attain leadership positions are confronted with subtle biases. There are double standards and double binds for women. They risk the appearance of being too soft or too strident or being too aggressive or not aggressive enough. What may seem assertive in a man may appear as abrasive in a woman. Another characteristic of an effective leader is the ability to see shades of gray inherent in a situation (Gayle, Tewarie, & White, 2003). This may actually work against women, as they could be seen as weak and indecisive in their leadership abilities by looking at various sides of an issue.

Women in Upper-level Leadership Positions

Why are women still not represented well in upper-level positions? A study by Stuhlmacher and Walters (1999) helps point out some of the issues women face in promoting to upper administration. This study was a meta-analysis on gender differences in negotiations, which included the analysis of several other studies on this topic. One of the studies they analyzed included research by Martell, Lane and Emrich (1996) using a computer simulation. The simulation varied the bias of women's performance ratings to look at promotion rate. They hypothesized that given the pyramid structure of most organizations and the fact that early success is necessary for subsequent opportunities, even a very small bias in performance ratings would be meaningful. The study revealed that because of the bias effect, promotion rates for women were lower even when male-female differences in performance ratings created by the bias were very small. Results also revealed that substantially fewer women were promoted to senior leadership positions. From the initial pool of subjects, 53 percent were women, but only 35 percent made it to top-level positions. This study showed that even though the bias effect in
performance ratings was very small, lower promotion rates for women were obvious. A larger bias effect would have had an even greater impact.

A negative connotation is given to a woman with the same leadership attributes as a “good” male leader (Tannen, 1990). While a male leader who is forceful, logical, direct, masterful, and powerful has a positive connotation, a female leader who is referred to in the same manner puts herself at risk of devaluing herself as a woman. She is thought to be aggressive and unfeminine, while the male is considered strong and masculine.

Discussions which took place in October 2001 with several female presidents of community colleges during 13 roundtables (Women in Higher Education, 2001b) bring to light more of the issues females face in securing positions of leadership. According to participants, “Boards are often still uncomfortable with women presidents” (p. 10). This is especially true with a mostly-male board. If a female president negotiates too hard, she is perceived as not being collegial. If she accepts what is offered, she isn’t considered tough enough for the job. These women indicated that when female presidents are brought in during troubled times to clean up problems, they are often hired for their interpersonal skills. They are expected to fix the problems, nurture the staff, include others in their decisions, but not eliminate positions. These kinds of expectations make it difficult to take the strong actions which may be necessary in certain situations and may actually set a female president up for failure.

Understanding traditional views of leadership and their tie to masculine traits is important because it helps explain the challenges women have faced in obtaining positions of leadership in higher education. Because of the issues that confront women,
such as not yet achieving the same participation rate as men in leadership positions, feminist theory was created.

Feminist Theory

"In the most basic sense, a feminist is a person – male or female – who believes in equality, especially sex and gender equality" (Ivy & Backlund, 2004, p. 39).

The purpose of feminist theory is to help give an understanding of how women are affected by circumstances in their lives, and propose strategies to change inequitable conditions in which women work and live (Kolmar & Bartkowski, 2000). Feminist theory is a way of viewing the world. Feminists in general have three main beliefs. They believe that women have something valuable to contribute to every aspect of the world. They believe that women have been and continue to be oppressed and therefore unable to achieve their full potential or gain their full rewards. They also believe this situation should change. Feminists assert that women have not been allowed the same access to knowledge and knowing as men (Ropers-Huilman, 2002). This premise led feminists to decide that a critical analysis of knowledge and knowledge processes was needed and, therefore, feminist communication theory was created.

Feminist communication theory begins with the goal of understanding and explaining gender (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004). It theorizes on gender, communication and social change. Feminist communication theory points out that because differences are practiced hierarchically, this creates groups who can be excluded from certain privileges afforded to some groups but not others. These differences can include sexuality, gender, race, culture, nationality, ability, and class.
MacDonald (2002) indicates that gender theorists have conducted numerous studies on the apparent differences between men and women. Within higher education, the issue of gender differences led to a disagreement about the teaching and learning styles of men and women. Using men as the norm for both student and teacher in approaches to education gave men the advantage and was detrimental to women, making it seem that women were less effective learners. The inequity in this thinking led to the emergence of feminist theories. Some of these theories are presented in this literature review.

One feminist theory concludes that gender behavior is mainly the result of childhood socialization (MacDonald, 2002). This is known as liberal feminism and is based on the belief that the removal of gender stereotypes in education would allow the development of children as individuals without being encumbered by what type of behavior is expected of them because of their gender (Kolb, 1992; MacDonald, 2002). Liberal feminists believe that men and women are essentially the same and should have equal access to, and success in, structures and processes that are neutral (Blackmore, 1999).

Another feminist theory indicates that imposing “femininity” on women is one of the main tools of patriarchal power (MacDonald, 2002). This group, known as radical feminists, believes that institutions of higher education have been historically aligned with patriarchy. They believe this makes it difficult for women to break with patriarchal hierarchical structures within institutions of higher education. While they view women’s attributes, moral sensibilities and affective relational skills as different from men’s, they question how women can separate their true nature and ethics from patriarchy when they
were developed within it. This makes it difficult for women to demonstrate their differences through their own ways of knowing because being different within this patriarchal institution can be challenging and could hold them back from goals like obtaining leadership positions.

Cultural feminists believe that organizations and knowledge have historically been constructed to give privilege to men (Blackmore, 1999). Believing femininity is a profound source of female power, they stress it is something society and women themselves need to value more. One way cultural feminists addressed this issue was to introduce alternatives to learning in classrooms and even create women's universities and colleges to serve as models of feminist culture and practice (MacDonald, 2002).

Feminists strive not only for a better understanding of the inequities women are confronted with, they also work toward changing this situation. It is important to understand their purpose and ways of looking at inequitable conditions, because feminists' ultimate goal is to propose ways to correct these situations and help women to achieve equality, which is an essential part of the analysis in this study. This involves analyzing the conditions in which women work. One of the issues that must be explored further when analyzing the conditions of women in the workplace is the differences in gender communication. For purposes of this study, this will lead to a better understanding of how differences in communication between men and women affect women's ability to move into positions of leadership in institutions of higher education and to ultimately negotiate for equitable compensation.
Gender Communication

An awareness of the differences in gender communication is vital to examining the inequities faced by women in the workplace, specifically in institutions of higher education. Tannen (1990) contends that the risk of ignoring these differences is greater than the danger of naming them. This examination must begin with a review of gender.

Kolb (1992) refers to gender as a social construct, indicating that the way gender is displayed is viewed as a learned behavior through family, friends, acquaintances and societal influences. Research on gender communication has generated much literature on the differences between feminine and masculine communication styles (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Buzzanell, 2000; Gilligan, 1982; Koch, 2004; Tannen, 1990, 1995a). This type of research explores several aspects of addressing these gender differences.

Tannen (1995), as well as others (Gilligan, 1982; Kolb, 1992), contend that lessons learned in childhood regarding socialization carry over to adulthood and into the workplace. Men are more likely to behave in ways to get themselves recognized by those in power, while women take a low-key approach. Because of childhood socialization, men learn early on that their peers reward them for speaking about their accomplishments. Women learn they must downplay their accomplishments in order to be rewarded by their peers.

Women's Ways of Knowing

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986) discuss women’s ways of knowing, which impacts the way they communicate. They define five epistemological categories of women’s perspectives to knowing. These perspectives lead to a better
understanding of how women think and rationalize, whether or not they speak for themselves, and why they may or may not be willing to negotiate. In the first category, women can find themselves in a position of silence, where they have no voice, are mindless, and are controlled by an external authority. From this perspective, women feel “deaf and dumb” as if they cannot learn from the words of others and because they feel they have no voice. They see authority as being all-powerful and thus feel powerless to stand up to it.

Women who have a perspective of received knowledge believe they can receive and reproduce knowledge they have received from external authorities but they cannot create knowledge themselves. These women believe that truth comes from others and they have little confidence in their own ability to communicate, being quiet while others speak (Belenky et al., 1986).

Women with a subjective knowledge perspective believe that truth and knowledge are conceived as personal, private, and intuitively known. From this perspective, truth resides within the person and answers from the outside world can be negated from applying this knowledge. This leads to greater autonomy and independence. Women with subjective knowledge tend to be immune to other people’s ideas (Belenky et al., 1986).

From a procedural knowledge perspective, a woman is invested in learning and applying objective procedures for obtaining and communicating knowledge through the use of reasoned reflection. She realizes that different people have a right to different opinions based on experiences they have had. They view knowledge as a process and pay attention to objects in the external world (Belenky et al., 1986).
Women with a constructed knowledge perspective believe they are creators of knowledge. They view knowledge as contextual and value both subjective and objective strategies of knowing. They reclaim self by integrating knowledge they believe was learned intuitively with knowledge learned from others. These women have a desire to avoid compartmentalizing thought and feeling, home and work, self and other, something they perceive to be a shortfall of many men. They wish to communicate their understanding of life’s complexity by developing their own voice (Belenky et al., 1986).

Understanding women’s ways of knowing is important to understanding how women negotiate for compensation. Because women’s self-concepts and ways of knowing are intertwined, their ways of knowing shape the way women define themselves, see the world, and participate in it (Belenky et al., 1986). This can have a profound impact on how women communicate and interact in the workplace as well as the sense of control they have over events, views of learning, and conceptions of morality. In reference to salary negotiations, if they take a position of silence, feeling they have no voice, they may not negotiate. If, however, they come from a constructed knowledge perspective, they develop their own voice and are more likely to speak for themselves and negotiate.

*Relationships versus Individualization*

Identifying how feminine and masculine moral judgments are different assists in the analysis of women’s ways of knowing and how they react in the workplace. While feminine judgments are tied to feelings of empathy and compassion, masculine judgments are tied to social power (Tannen, 1990). The essence of a moral decision is that one has the right to exercise choice and then to accept the responsibility that comes
with that choice. From a feminine point of view that could mean destroying a relationship, so the choice is often to silence the voice and not be heard in an effort to maintain the relationship. This could mean not negotiating for a salary increase if a woman believes it will damage a relationship.

Gilligan (1982) distinguished between different voices, indicating there are two ways of speaking about moral problems and two modes of describing the relationship between other and self. While the feminine focus is more on the formulation of lasting relationships, the masculine is on individualization. The feminine focus is personal and the masculine is positional in nature (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Gilligan, 1982). The emphasis on forming a lasting relationship leads to a silencing of the feminine voice in an effort to ensure others are not hurt as well as a fear of not being heard. If a woman believes she will not be heard, she may not even attempt to negotiate for compensation.

Another behavior that can keep a woman from asking for more compensation is compliance. As girls grow, they are taught compliant behavior, becoming accustomed to doing what someone tells them to do rather than deciding for themselves what they will do. For boys, the more unstructured forms of play they undertake teaches them to assert themselves more and to make their own rules (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Gilligan, 1982). Because men have been taught from childhood to assert themselves, they tend to be more comfortable in asking for more compensation, while a woman may wait to be told when she will receive more.

Tannen (1990) supports the previously mentioned research on gender communication regarding feminine relationships and masculine individualization. She discusses gender differences in communication styles, indicating that women tend to
focus on connection while men tend to focus on status. The key for women in becoming
connected is intimacy, whereas men are more focused on independence in their quest for
status. In becoming connected, the key element is symmetry, with individuals feeling
they are equally close. In seeking status, asymmetry is an essential element. This results
in a hierarchy where individuals do not have equal status, much like the structure in
institutions of higher education.

These differences in communication styles lead to a lack of understanding
(Tannen, 1990). While women see being connected as important and display this quality
by consulting with others, discussing and coming to consensus, men may perceive this as
a lack of independence and associate it with incompetence and insecurity. If men make
decisions without consulting others or gaining consensus, thereby exhibiting their
independence, women feel slighted and left out of the communication process.

An important difference in gender communication that Tannen (1990) discusses is
the difference between what she refers to as “report-talk” and “rapport-talk.” Men’s
comfort level is higher in public speaking or non-personal types of communication
referred to as report-talk. Women are more comfortable with rapport-talk, which
involves private, more intimate conversation. In an effort to become connected and
develop relationships, women focus more on personal, intimate details and consider talk a
matter of interaction. During this conversation, an emphasis is placed on similarities and
matched experiences. Most men focus on maintaining status and, therefore, exhibit their
knowledge and skill to preserve their independence. Men tend to consider talk a matter
of gathering information. These differences in approaches to communication lead to the
inclination of women to downplay their work experience rather than display it, as they
are attempting to build rapport by equalizing status through the creation of symmetry. In seeking to establish independence and maintain or elevate their status, men seek opportunities to gather and distribute information.

In a study conducted on the voice and style, or rhetoric, of women’s leadership, Stephens (2000) interviewed 35 women from businesses, religious institutions, and higher education. The purpose of this research was to discover the implications for women in leadership as a result of their transition into formal positions of authority. The study also explored whether women’s rhetoric, or the way they spoke, altered the accepted and expected rhetoric of leadership in formal organizational contexts or if organizational leadership altered the rhetorical style of women leaders. The researcher referred to women’s use of the “mother tongue” in the way they spoke. The mother tongue is defined as one’s personal voice, which connects and elevates rather than distancing and reducing. The mother tongue invites people to practice vulnerability, to be real, take risks, and discover. In contrast, the research found that the “father tongue” is a language of social power. It is the language chosen for public discourse, the language of thought that seeks objectivity, and its essential gesture is to distance or make a gap. The mother tongue described in this study supports previously cited research regarding women’s desire to connect and build relationships. Women tend to use the mother tongue, negotiating room for their own voice in traditionally male-driven institutions, such as colleges and universities. Based upon these research findings, in order to negotiate for salary women would need to use the father tongue, which generates distance and makes a gap. This could damage relationships, so women tend not to use it, which puts them at a disadvantage in negotiating for compensation.
Another gender communication difference Tannen (1990) addresses is that while women encourage quieter members of a group to become involved, men usually do not encourage quiet members to speak up, expecting that anyone who has something to say will voluntarily share their information. In a management position, women’s inclusiveness can be advantageous. Because women are more inclined to consult others in the decision-making process, employees are more likely to have ownership in the decision and implement it more efficiently. However, because of women’s egalitarian ethic, being successful can appear to a woman to be a violation of maintaining equal status. If she feels she is damaging relationships by achieving success, this could stop a woman from pursuing promotions and keep her from moving up in the administrative ranks.

In summary, gender socialization plays a big role in the differences in gender communication styles. Because of the way boys and girls are socialized in childhood, with boys being taught to be independent and strive for status and girls being taught that connections and relationships are important, these learned behaviors have a profound affect on the way they communicate as adults. Women who learn to be compliant and wait to be told what they will receive for compensation are perpetuating the salary gap and increasing issues of gender equity.

Gender Equity Issues

A review of gender equity issues for this study begins with the number of females in administrative positions in both public and private sectors, focusing on higher education. Feminists have attempted to draw attention to the disproportionately large number of men in high-paying, high-prestige positions compared to the
disproportionately large number of women in low-paying, low-prestige positions (MacDonald, 2002; Ropers-Huilman, 2002). Feminists also bring attention to the disproportionately low number of women in upper levels of administration.

Statistics from 2002 show that women accounted for about half of managerial and professional positions in both public and private sectors but only 15.7 percent of corporate officers, 5.2 percent of top corporate earners and about 1.2 percent of Fortune 500 chief executive officers (Catalyst, 2002; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2003; U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002). Also, according to Babcock and Laschever (2003), only 14 percent of U.S. Senators and 13.5 percent of U.S. Representatives are women. In addition, a female has never been elected president or vice president in the United States and to date only two of the U.S. Supreme Court justices have been females since the country was founded in 1776. This shortage of women in political positions is occurring even when more than 50 percent of the population is female. This shows a trend that is evident in both public and private sectors.

In higher education the general trend is the higher the position, the fewer is the number of women holding those positions (Ropers-Huilman, 2002). The American Council on Education (2002) issued a report in 2000 indicating that the percentage of women college presidents nearly doubled over a 15-year period from 9.5 percent in 1986 to 19.3 percent in 1998. However, in 1998 only 2 percent of those women presidents lead a major research university, while 39 percent were presidents of two-year community colleges.
Another report issued in 2003 by the National Center for Education Statistics (2003) indicates that in 2001 there were 152,038 individuals in executive, administrative, and managerial positions in the 4,168 public and private two- and four-year colleges and universities in the U.S. Women held approximately 48 percent of these executive, administrative and management positions. However, women held 60 percent of the low-level administrative positions. This supports other findings in the literature that women are more highly represented in low-level positions and not well represented in high-level administrative positions.

While statistics show the inequality of women in leadership positions, Rhode (2003) brings up a disturbing issue, which she defines as a central problem for American women. There is a fundamental lack of consensus that various gender issues even pose a significant problem. For example, 25 chief executive officers were surveyed and a majority indicated that the glass ceiling was something that affected women in the past but no longer does (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). Another survey conducted by the American Bar Association found that over half of both male and female respondents felt that women were not treated differently than men (Samborn, 2000). However, Rhode (2003) disagrees with such findings, indicating that women still remain underrepresented at the top and over represented at the bottom in both public and private sectors.

Korn/Ferry International (2004), a leadership recruitment firm, indicates that the outlook for women in chief executive officer positions is not likely to change in the near future. In their survey of 75 senior executives from corporations around the world, half
of those surveyed expect little or no change in gender diversity in chief executive officer’s positions over the next ten years.

While some may believe that the solution to increasing the number of women in upper-level administrative positions is to put women in middle management positions, this does not necessarily advance deserving women into senior management positions (Swiss, 1996). There appears to be a disconnect with the idea that simply hiring women into middle management positions will allow or enable them to promote into higher level positions. Many of the individuals who are groomed and mentored for those top positions are often mirror images of people in those positions at the top, alike in both gender and style. Since males dominate these positions, females have a distinct disadvantage in moving into those positions. When women’s numbers are small, they are more likely to be devalued (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). This only adds to the problem of being able to increase the ranks of female administrators. It is a situation that perpetuates itself. Research has shown that some of the issues which keep women from increasing their numbers in administrative positions are the lack of a presumption of competence, a lack of mentors and collegial support, attitudes about gender equity in the workplace, a lack of information to do their jobs, occupational stereotyping, multiple roles women must handle and salary equity issues. The following subsections will deal with these issues and how they relate to gender equity in higher education.

Presumption of Competence

Female leaders often lack the presumption of competence accorded to male counterparts. Rhode (2003) contends that women face a greater challenge in establishing credibility and capability, stating that women are often held to a higher standard. The
more power and status involved in a position, the more masculine the job is perceived to be (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). These contentions are supported by research conducted by Johnsrud and Heck (1994) in which they studied the impact of gender on administrative promotion in a university. They used personnel records for 1,108 posted vacancies from a large, public research university over a three-year period and found that being female has a direct effect on attaining promotions. One effect is the initial impact that being female has on the status and responsibility attained, with women receiving lower returns in status and responsibility. They receive significantly lower salaries and significantly more classified jobs or jobs with less status and responsibility. This puts women at a distinct disadvantage when applying for promotions to administrative positions, as they have not achieved the same status as male counterparts. Because women are held to a different standard, women as a group progress more slowly through the ranks and earn less than men (Babcock & Laschever, 2003).

A contributing factor to the lack of a presumption of competence for women is that they often fail to make themselves competitive in the marketplace by failing to build on their curriculum vitae and list their accomplishments (Fassinger, 2002). This may be attributed to the fact that a woman’s beliefs about her own perceived value in the workplace may prevent her from being properly prepared to negotiate for salary and from incorporating negotiation skills. In a study on the differences in the nature of men’s and women’s beliefs about requesting a higher salary, Barron (2003) conducted 38 simulated salary negotiations between second-year masters in business administration students and human resource managers from local companies. There were 21 male and 17 female subjects. The purpose of her study was to investigate gender differences in a negotiator’s
initial requests for higher salary and explore the beliefs that affect those requests. She found that women were uncertain how to evaluate the value they brought to the organization and left it to the organization to decide their worth. The organization could perceive this as a lack of confidence, which could lead to a perceived lack of competence.

Mentoring

The lack of role models, mentors and collegial support is a barrier to women in their career advancement (Swiss, 1996). Without such support, women are often denied assistance in planning their career progression and in grooming themselves for leadership positions. Much of the literature regarding women in administrative positions addresses the need for mentoring (Bower, 1993; Fassinger, 2002; LeBlanc, 1993; MacDonald, 2002; Rhode, 2003; Swiss, 1996; Twombly & Rosser, 2002; White, 1992).

Astin and Leland (1991) conducted research on the personal and social issues pertinent to recognizing and developing women's leadership for the future, specifically within the context of education including colleges and universities. They interviewed 20 women over a two-day period and focused the discussion on leadership in the next decade. Their findings indicated that women found their mentors not only inspired them, they also guided them and played a significant role in shaping their vision, values and work. Some of the older women in the study indicated they did not have mentors, because there were simply no other females available to mentor them. They indicated in some cases that they simply mentored themselves. This lack of influential mentors is an obstacle to women in leadership positions. Because higher education is male-dominated, women find it difficult to obtain role models, putting them at a disadvantage in preparing for promotion into administrative positions.
Mentoring is also important at the institutional level. Women represent a substantial and growing share of the pool of leadership talent (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Institutions are not utilizing the talents and distinct perspectives offered by women to their best advantage (Bower, 1993; Swiss, 1996). Women who are in administrative positions need to actively promote and provide mentoring to younger, less experienced women whenever possible in order to help increase the number of female administrators (Bower, 1993).

Attitude

Attitude is a problem with achieving gender equity in the workplace, especially the attitude of male administrators. Smulders (1998) conducted research at a university with 11 academic staff members and career administrators. Five of the participants were male and six were female. The purpose of this study was to analyze the working conditions of women in relation to men in a university using gender as the key tool of analysis. Results of the study revealed that changes in attitude are necessary if gender equality in the workplace is to be achieved. Smulders (1998) indicated there is often not enough awareness of the problem with attitude to bring it to light and, therefore, misunderstandings exist. Findings revealed there is a relationship between gender blindness in organizational and management practices and the differences in career progress between men and women in an organization. When there is a lack of an open, caring environment, gender inequity exists. A positive, supportive climate in the workplace is essential to improving institutional results. This requires a change in attitude and an acknowledgement that gender equity issues exist in order to reduce and
ultimately eliminate them. This will allow equal opportunities for women to promote into higher education administrative positions.

*Lack of Information*

Another issue facing female administrators is that they are not given as much information to do their jobs as male administrators (Ropers-Huilman, 2002; Smulders, 1998). This relates to both formal and informal information. Additional findings from Smulder’s (1998) study indicated while men who are new to an institution are readily accepted into existing informal networks which serve to bond males, women feel or are excluded from informal groups. Where men have the possibilities of establishing informal contacts and attending committees, women are hampered in doing this because of expectations and role relationships linked to their gender.

Women are also given fewer opportunities for training and less follow-up after the training occurs. Smulder’s (1998) study indicated that even though training opportunities were extremely limited, men reported having had the opportunity to attend training or having been encouraged to take promotional tests while women indicated that requests for training were repeatedly turned down. This puts women at a disadvantage in performing their administrative tasks and in growing in their positions and beyond.

Tedrow (1999) conducted a study to investigate how senior-level women administrators at community colleges construct a leadership identity in a masculine-oriented institution. She interviewed 30 women to examine how each viewed herself as a leader within her community college. One conclusion was that women’s ways of knowing and leading can cause their opinions to be viewed as outsider perspectives by
senior administrators, setting up barriers to their career growth and advancement. The community college culture presented women with contradictory expectations, which created a double bind. If their responses were embedded in masculine styles, they were often not accepted by men or women. When they responded in predominately relational styles, their accomplishments were not recognized. This shows that because of women’s egalitarian or relational styles of leading in institutions of higher education, women’s positions on senior-level administrative teams can be marginalized (Tedrow & Rhoads, 1999), putting women at a disadvantage in both securing and maintaining administrative positions.

**Occupational Stereotyping**

In the research by Johnsrud and Heck (1994), which was previously discussed, they studied the impact of gender on administrative promotion in a university. They sought to find the cumulative effect of gender on the attainment of women as they move within an organization over time, indicating that men have an advantage in the promotion process. One disadvantage for women deals with job segregation and the notion that certain work is “women’s work” and other work is “men’s work.” This idea perpetuates the salary inequity issue, due to the overcrowding of women in a few positions. Women are discriminated against in a large number of men’s positions, while the supply of men’s positions exceeds the number of men applying for them, thereby inflating their salaries. Findings from this study revealed gender stratification within organizations is both pervasive and persistent, with women receiving lower returns in status and responsibility. This is detrimental to women and is additive in its impact, having a negative effect on a women’s career in regards to salary and position over time.
Occupational stereotyping has kept women from advancing in certain occupations and has perpetuated gender inequity by promoting men over women in some positions where women are either equally or more qualified than their male colleagues (Collins, 1998; Fassinger, 2002). Fassinger points out that gender bias and occupational discrimination has been widely documented, "... indicating that men advance faster, further and with greater compensation than do their female peers, and differential salary patterns have remained quite consistent over time" (p. 25). Evidence supporting this contention includes statistics that indicate women earn less than 80 cents on average for every dollar a man earns (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Institute for Women's Policy Research, 2004b; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2003). In addition, research such as that presented previously by Johnsrud and Heck (1994) shows that gender bias exists in the promotion process, with men having an advantage over women.

Women also tend to underestimate their own competencies, talents and capabilities, while men appear to have more self-confidence, especially in male-dominated occupations (Fassinger, 2002; LeBlanc, 1993). Because females are taught to hide their competence and intelligence through gender role socialization, their ability to exude confidence and increase their decision-making skills is inhibited.

Changes in affirmative action have eroded the progress that has been made in making the workplace a more equitable and hospitable environment for women (Fassinger, 2002). Collins (1998) suggests women are actually held to a higher standard than men when being considered for a position. It is important that leaders are not viewed by gender, but valued for their personal assets and the strengths they bring to a position (Harrow, 1993).
Multiple Roles

Another barrier to women in their career development is the issue of multiple roles. Women who have full-time positions as well as a family spend an average of 15 hours more per week than men on household and childcare duties. This limits their ability for travel and longer working hours, giving men the advantage in the workplace (Fassinger, 2002; Morrison et al., 1987).

The Center for Creative Leadership (Morrison et al., 1987) created the Executive Women Project in order to research women’s experiences and growth in executive ranks and to create tools so that women would not be excluded from channels that help them grow and ascend into executive positions. They interviewed 76 women and 22 higher-level executives, 16 of those men and 6 women, to determine the factors that made these women successful. One of the findings from this study revealed that women are still expected to take major responsibility for maintaining a household, raising children, and even nurturing an intimate relationship.

In a review of literature during the past decade, Phillips and Imhoff (1997) consider primary empirical literature and sample findings relative to women’s self-concept development, readiness for vocational choices, and a variety of other issues. Their findings showed that while women have taken on additional roles outside the home, their level of involvement with childcare and household responsibilities has not changed relative to their husbands. This puts women at a disadvantage in the amount of time they can spend on work-related issues in comparison to men.
Salary Equity

Salary equity is also part of the gender equity issue, with males, on average, earning more than females who have the same job title. Swiss (1996) contends that not only does salary inequity exist among men and women, the inequity grows larger over the course of a career, with men earning an even higher percentage over women in the same position for those with over ten years of experience. In a study conducted in two-year community colleges among 20 female deans, vice presidents and presidents, the top issues regarding gender bias identified by the participants were gender gaps in salary and lack of career advancement opportunities (Thompson-Stacy, 1996). Another interesting finding of this study was that the respondents indicated they felt uncomfortable in asking for something for themselves. While women are able to effectively advocate for others, they are constrained by gender-linked stereotypes, roles, and norms when it comes to advocating for themselves (Wade, 2001).

Despite the fact that women are very capable in administrative positions and have proven their capability through performance, women continue to experience serious salary inequities (Collins, 1998). A contributing factor to this salary equity issue is that many women wait to be rewarded, not knowing if they deserve something unless someone else tells them they do (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). This leads women to settle for less than they deserve and could otherwise obtain.

As indicated previously, women on average are paid less than 80 cents to every dollar a man makes (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Institute for Women's Policy Research, 2004b; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2003). In some states, such as Alabama,
Michigan, and Wyoming, the median income for women is less than 67 cents for every dollar earned by a man (Institute for Women's Policy Research, 2004a; Low, 2004).

Fortune Magazine asked Equilar, a data analysis firm, to analyze the total compensation of top-level executives at Standard and Poor's 500 companies. They compared pay for 2,120 male and 112 female executives for three years. The median compensation for women was 24 percent less than the median compensation for men (Sellers, 2003). This reveals that even at top-level positions in the private sector, women's salaries are still lagging behind men's.

A study of Middle Atlantic University Masters in Business Administration graduates from 1973 to 1982 found that males' starting salaries were higher than females. Women's starting salaries in this study were approximately $2,700 less than men's, with current salaries being about $3,000 less (Frieze et al., 1990). This emphasizes the compounding effect of a lower starting salary over the course of a women's career.

A recent survey conducted among purchasing professionals showed a gap of $21,500 between the average compensation earned by men and women (Avery, 2002). A study conducted among student affairs officers at both public and private institutions of higher education showed that gender was a significant predictor of salary. The study found that while females were well represented in administrative positions, the positions were on the extreme low end of the average mean pay scale of the 15 positions in the study. One conclusion of the study was that there is possibly a continued systematic bias against women, resulting in a negative impact on women's salary levels (Walker, Reason, & Robinson, 2003).
Other factors that contribute to differences between men's and women's wages include the development of job-related skills through education, on-the-job training, and work experience as well as the types of occupations in which they are employed (Caiazza, Shaw, & Werschkul, 2004). Women are grossly underrepresented in higher paying occupations in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and top business jobs.

In summary, gender equity issues must be understood and addressed in order to help eliminate the salary gender gap. Acknowledging that these inequities exist is necessary to deal with them and focus on how to improve women's status in the workplace. One way to address the salary gap issue is to review the negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education.

**Negotiation**

A review of negotiation will allow for a better understanding of the issues women are confronted with when negotiating for compensation. Negotiation is a special type of communication and form of exchange. Fisher, Ury and Patton (1991) describe negotiation as follows:

Negotiation is a basic means of getting what you want from others. It is back-and-forth communication designed to reach an agreement when you and the other side have some interests that are shared and others that are opposed. (p. xvii)

Putman and Kolb (2000) claim that exchange is a gendered activity in traditional negotiation models. This means that the attributes of a given activity are more closely related to one gender than the other, which means the attributes of the other gender are less valued. For example, in negotiation, qualities of effective bargaining that are valued
include independence, competition, forcefulness, analytic rationality, and aggressiveness. Yet these qualities are linked to masculinity. Feminine qualities such as sense of community, intuition, emotionality, sympathy, and compassion are less valued as effective negotiation qualities. Therefore, the value placed on these qualities puts women at a disadvantage in negotiations. And because women focus more on relationships than goals or outcomes, their style of negotiating is not valued in traditional methods. Table 1 (Arliss, 1991; Borisoff & Victor, 1998; Wood, 1997) contains a synthesized list of masculine and feminine gendered communication traits. Because patriarchal values are most often associated with traditional negotiation methods, men tend to have an advantage in this arena (Putnam & Kolb, 2000). This leads to another issue that needs to be explored, which is the likeliness of women to negotiate.

Likeliness to Negotiate

Babcock and Laschever (2003) indicate that women are much less likely to negotiate for what they want than men. Research conducted by Laschever looked at starting salaries of students graduating from Carnegie Mellon University with their master’s degrees and found that the starting salaries of men were 7.6 percent higher on average than those of women, representing almost a $4,000 difference. The research also showed that only 7 percent of the female students had negotiated for their beginning salary, whereas 57 percent of men had asked for more money. This lack of negotiation on the part of women contributes to salary inequities over the course of women’s careers. Additional findings from this same study showed that those who negotiated, mostly men, increased their starting salary by an average of 7.4 percent, about the same difference in starting pay between men and women.
### Table 1

Gendered Communication Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine Traits</th>
<th>Feminine Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive, Assertive</td>
<td>Submissive, Gentle, Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical, Intelligent, Logical, Rational</td>
<td>Frivolous, Intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-oriented</td>
<td>Relationship-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident, Decisive</td>
<td>Fickle, Indecisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Loud, Outspoken</td>
<td>Demure, Quiet, Refined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant, Forceful</td>
<td>Accommodating, Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dependent, Sense of Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Helpful, Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>Fearful, Timid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong, Tough</td>
<td>Enduring, Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td>Emotional, Sensitive, Sentimental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaman and Hartel (1994) conducted a study where they asked 238 students in upper-level business classes at a state university, 127 of whom were females, to indicate their pay expectations and anticipated negotiation strategies. They concluded that men have a higher likelihood of active negotiation than women. They also found that men, compared to women, indicated less likelihood of using traditional self-promotion strategies, more opportunity for legitimate negotiations and higher pay expectations. One
reason that women’s pay expectations are not as high as men’s could be their lack of aggressive goals when negotiating.

**Lack of Aggressive Goals**

A contention made by Babcock and Laschever (2003) is that even when women do negotiate, they often get less than a man in the same situation. One cause of this discrepancy can be attributed to women setting less aggressive goals. A study by Stevens, Bavetta and Gist (1993), exploring the effectiveness of training as a strategy for addressing differences in salary negotiation skills, showed a significant gender effect. Participants included 60 full-time Masters in Business Administration students, including 36 men and 24 women. Findings revealed that women negotiated significantly lower salaries than men and that women set lower goals than men, with men negotiating beginning salaries of $43,338 and women negotiating salaries of $41,989. The study also revealed that women used significantly fewer tactics during negotiation.

Women also expend less effort than men and set lower goals for themselves when negotiating for larger salaries because of a lower level of confidence (Stevens et al., 1993). Watson and Hoffman (1996) conducted a study that focused on whether there are gender differences in negotiating attitudes and behaviors of male and female managers. Participants included a sample of 40 male and 40 female managers from 18 firms in manufacturing, service, and educational fields. Findings revealed that women’s attitudes toward negotiation leave them feeling less confident in anticipation of negotiations and less satisfied with their performance.

Findings in the study by Kaman and Hartel (1994) mentioned previously showed a significant correlation between pay expectations and negotiation strategies, with men
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having higher pay expectations than women. Women expect to get paid less for the same work as men. Babcock and Laschever (2003) found that most women they interviewed in their study felt they were successful in getting what they wanted in salary compensation. Upon further questioning, they found that these women didn’t want very much, indicating that they were not very demanding or were “readily pleased.” Because their expectations were low, they were satisfied with what they received.

A study discussed previously, which was conducted by Barron (2003) with 38 masters-level students to investigate gender differences in a negotiator’s initial requests for higher salary, showed that men’s initial requests are significantly higher than women’s. In addition, initial salary requests were significantly correlated with final negotiated salaries. This same study showed that women are more oriented than men toward asking the same as others, but not more than others. Halpern and McLean-Parks (1996) conducted a study of 50 advanced undergraduate students from a bargaining class, with 24 females and 26 males participating. The purpose of the study was to consider whether there was a difference in negotiation outcomes and processes of groups of males and females. Study findings revealed that women take the feelings of others into consideration during their negotiations. Women’s desire to build and maintain relationships can keep them from asking for more money than they think someone else may get or more than the person they are negotiating with feels they deserve.

Low Offers

Another mitigating factor resulting in women’s lack of success in negotiating is that our society often takes a harder line against women who negotiate, offering women less and applying more pressure on them to concede (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). In
addition, women are significantly more cooperative than men during bargaining and are more likely than men to accept an offer given (Eckel & Grossman, 2001).

A study was conducted by Kray, Galinsky and Thompson (2002) with 122 masters of business administration students evenly divided between male and female participants. The purpose of the study was to determine how gender stereotypes affect performance in mixed gender negotiations. Findings revealed that women performed better in mixed-gender negotiations when stereotypically feminine traits were linked to successful negotiations but not when gender-neutral traits were linked to negotiation success. The study also showed that women outperformed men in mixed-gender negotiations when stereotypically masculine traits were linked to poor negotiation performance; however, men outperformed women when stereotypically feminine traits were linked to poor negotiation performance. This study shows that gender stereotyping has a powerful effect on negotiations.

In another experiment to find gender differences in bargaining behavior that could impact wage negotiations, systemic differences were found (Solnick, 2001). This study was conducted with 178 participants. Findings indicated that even though women were not content with less, they were expected to accept less salary. This led to substantial differences in salary outcomes. The study by Halpern and McLean-Parks (1996) presented previously showed that men are more likely than women to emphasize their perceived positions, responsibilities and viewpoints during negotiations. While men believe that part of doing their best is being aggressive in pursuing what they want, women expect that life will be fair and in the end they will be rewarded for their hard work and for doing a good job (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Tannen, 1995b). This leads
women to take a less aggressive stance on negotiating for their salary, believing they will catch up later. This strategy, however, has a chilling effect on a woman’s ability to obtain equitable compensation over her career.

Negotiation is a skill that may be necessary to obtain an equitable salary. Female administrators are challenged with barriers to negotiating for compensation including being less likely to negotiate, lacking aggressive goals, and being willing to accept low offers. In order to overcome these barriers, women must be skilled in negotiation by learning successful negotiation strategies.

Negotiating Strategies

Kolb and Williams (2003) offer several strategies for negotiating. The first strategy they suggest is to take stock in negotiation skills and experience. An inventory of resources helps to build confidence at the negotiating table and bring to light any skills that are lacking, which may require a plan to compensate. Learning as much as possible is the next strategy. Facts need to be gathered to support the case to be made, avoid creating anxiety, and help set an agenda. Developing alternatives is another strategy that increases flexibility by having options available. A decision can then be made to accept an option or walk away. The final strategy they offer is to get a fresh perspective by talking to others who are trusted to help see the situation in a new light. This can assist with obtaining a more positive or realistic orientation.

Additional negotiation strategies offered by Keltner (1994) include being persuasive by using personal, logical and emotional characteristics of persuasion. He also advises the use of interpersonal communication through listening, providing feedback and speaking effectively. Being persistent by sticking to the purpose and not
conceding is another strategy he shares as well as avoiding struggle and dispute by acknowledging differences of opinion and discussing them openly.

Humor can also be used as a negotiation strategy. Halpern and McLean-Parks (1996) found that men tend to use humor more than women during salary negotiations. Not only do they use humor, they use it strategically and confrontationally as a negotiation strategy. In addition, men are more prepared than women when going into negotiations (Kolb & Williams, 2003). Women need to have factual information before negotiating so they can be in a better position to negotiate a salary that is in line with realistic expectations. This contention is supported by previously mentioned studies by Stevens, Bavetta and Gist (1993) and Watson and Hoffman (1996), which found that women’s level of confidence in negotiating for salary is low. This may be due to their lack of preparation to negotiate. Table 2 (Keltner, 1994; Kolb & Williams, 2003) summarizes strategies, which can be utilized when negotiating for salary.

According to feminist theory, there are three areas in which women can give voice to negotiation (Kolb, 1992). One perspective is through a relational view of others. While men see negotiation as a contest or competition, women see it as an opportunity to build relationships. Another perspective is a contextual understanding of issues and interests. While men focus on individual achievement, women look at events in terms of the impact on relationships and are more attentive to needs of others. The third perspective is a communicative view of strategy. In the context of communication, men see it as a way to establish status and position, while women see it as an opportunity to create community and connection. Women tend to understand first then to be understood.
(Covey, 1989). While this is an important trait, women need to make sure they make themselves heard and understood when negotiating.

Table 2
Salary Negotiation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take stock</td>
<td>Inventory skills and expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn as much as possible</td>
<td>Gather facts to support position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop alternatives</td>
<td>Increase flexibility through options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get fresh perspectives</td>
<td>Consult with others to obtain different views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use humor</td>
<td>Strategically use skills to ease tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be persuasive</td>
<td>Use personal, logical and emotional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use interpersonal communication</td>
<td>Listen, provide feedback, speak effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be persistent</td>
<td>Stick to the purpose and do not concede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals</td>
<td>Be prepared to request desired salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid struggle and dispute</td>
<td>Acknowledge differences of opinion/discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate</td>
<td>Be willing to ask and discuss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Halpern and McLean-Parks (1996) found that men tend to mention monetary concerns earlier than women during negotiations, while women tend to bring up interpersonal concerns before men. The literature shows that men are prone to focus on individualism and tend to think about themselves first (Babcock & Laschever, 2003;
Gilligan, 1982; Tannen, 1995b). Women, on the other hand, are focused on maintaining relationships. Women tend to stress a "morality of responsibility" while men tend to stress a "morality of rights."

Gerhart and Rynes (1991) explored the determinants and consequences of salary negotiations by male and female masters of business administration graduates; 153 male and 52 female graduating students participated. While they found no difference between men's and women's propensity to negotiate, they did find significant differences in negotiation payoffs, with men having significantly higher payoffs than women. This theme has appeared in much of the literature and is an issue that must be addressed through a further examination of female negotiating strategies.

Summary and Conclusion

While women have made strides in increasing their numbers in higher education leadership positions, they have not achieved the same participation rates as their male counterparts. Because institutions of higher education were founded on a patriarchal premise and traditional views of leadership are associated with masculine traits, women have been challenged in securing leadership positions in these institutions. Women's salaries have also not kept pace, with women earning on average less than 80 cents for every dollar a man earns.

Feminists have attempted to promote an understanding of how women are affected by inequities and they propose strategies to improve the conditions under which women work. While they have been successful in bringing light to many of the inequitable conditions that face women, there is still much to be done. Leadership theories and gender communication theory have assisted in understanding the differences
in the way men and women lead and communicate, with women focusing on building and maintaining relationships and men focusing on individualization and status.

Women continue to face many gender equity issues in regards to obtaining administrative positions and receiving equitable salaries. Some of the problems facing women have been created from issues such as a presumption of lack of competence, the lack of mentors and collegial support, insensitive attitudes about gender equity issues, lack of information for women to do their jobs, occupational stereotyping, the multiple roles of women, as well as the continuation of the gender salary gap.

Since the salary gap is still prevalent, additional research must take place to work toward the achievement of gender equity. Additional research on women’s negotiating skills and the way they communicate during negotiations is required to determine the effect this may have on the salary gap. Johnson (1993) indicates that the key to success for women seeking jobs, promotions and recognition is utilizing their communication skills. Negotiating is a communication skill that needs to be practiced and developed. The salary gap continues to exist between men and women due, in part, to the unwillingness of many females to negotiate for salary (Thompson-Stacy & Pogue, 1996). The problem begins with the lack of or insufficient skills to negotiate for beginning salary and then perpetuates over the span of a woman’s career (Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999). This makes it difficult for a woman to catch up on salary, even if she is evaluated positively for job performance (Gerhart & Rynes, 1991). A salary deficit early in her career leads to the creation of a glass ceiling in the workplace as she becomes less effective in gaining access to positions of power in every stage of her career (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999).
Additional studies to determine the causes of gender inequity must be explored in an effort to address the salary gap. Further study is necessary to analyze negotiation strategies as well as how women perceive themselves as negotiators. Not enough is known about the negotiation strategies used by female administrators in higher education. While previous research indicates there are salary inequities and key reasons for this, it does not delve deeply into the specific negotiation strategies women can use to negotiate for salary and additional compensation. These studies have not focused on the conditions that must exist for women to feel confident in negotiating or when women stop negotiating for compensation. This study focused specifically on these issues as well as the perception women have of their negotiation strategies compared to men’s strategies, leading to a better understanding of how women negotiate for salary and additional compensation.
CHAPTER 3

Research Methodology

The purpose of this research was to explore the salary negotiation strategies of executive- and mid-level female administrators in higher education. Data collected from this study was used to evaluate how female administrators negotiate for salaries, what environment was necessary for successful negotiations, their perceptions of women's salary negotiation strategies, and what strategies they perceived to be effective. Previous findings were reviewed in an effort to explore similarities and possible differences in women's negotiation strategies. The benefit of conducting this research was to add to the knowledge base on gender equity issues, focusing on the salary gender gap and what role negotiations strategies play in that gap. By exploring the strategies female administrators use to negotiate, a better understanding of how they negotiate for salary and additional compensation was obtained. Strategies to improve negotiation skills were also explored in an effort to help reduce the salary equity gap.

Specific research questions included:

1. What, if any, negotiation strategies do female administrators use to negotiate for compensation:
   a. at the time they are hired; and
   b. when additional job duties are assigned to them?

2. What gendered communication traits do female administrators exhibit if and when they negotiate for compensation:
   a. at the time they are hired; and
   b. when additional job duties are assigned to them?
3. If female administrators do not negotiate for compensation, what issues are defined as barriers to negotiating:
   a. at the time they are hired; and
   b. when additional job duties are assigned to them?

4. When female administrators do negotiate for compensation:
   a. what conditions must exist for female administrators to feel confident in negotiating; and
   b. at what point do female administrators cease to negotiate for compensation, and why?

5. How, if at all, do women perceive that their negotiation strategies are different than men's in reference to:
   a. types of strategies used; and
   b. any gender stereotypes implied?

6. What negotiation strategies do women perceive as most and least effective and what recommendations do they offer for other aspiring female administrators?

This chapter discusses the method of analysis, subjects of the research and how they were selected, instrumentation that was used to conduct the research, procedures employed, and data analysis methods used in this study.

Method of Analysis

This study was conducted using a qualitative method. Qualitative studies are chosen for a variety of purposes, including the need for rich description, interpretation, verification, and evaluation (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Because the research is not
constrained by predetermined categories of analysis in a qualitative study, there is an added richness of the data collected (Patton, 2002). Qualitative methods provide for depth, openness, and detail that would not have been obtainable in a quantitative study. Qualitative research allowed for a deeper understanding of the negotiation strategies used by female administrators.

Creswell (1998) delineated several criteria for selecting a qualitative research method. The first involved the nature of the research question, which determines the type of research that should be undertaken. Qualitative research questions often start with how or what. The main research question for this study focused on what strategies female administrators in higher education use to negotiate for compensation. The second criterion Creswell (1998) defined is that qualitative studies should be used for a topic which needs to be explored because variables are not easily identified. This study explored strategies that are used to negotiate as well as strategies that could be used to improve the salary negotiation skills of female administrators. Previous studies have not provided the depth needed to detail the strategies that women use to negotiate for compensation. In order to fully understand the perceptions female administrators have of their negotiation strategies and the strategies they perceive to be most or least effective, a detailed review of this topic was conducted.

Other criteria Creswell (1998) described are an interest in writing in a literary style and the existence of sufficient time and resources to spend on data collection. In reference to the presentation of this data, a literary format was appropriate, as this type of information is best presented in a richly descriptive style (Creswell, 1998). In addition,
this researcher was committed to rigorous research of the topic throughout the data collection, analysis, and presentation phases of this study.

Creswell (1998) further indicated that audiences must be receptive to qualitative research and the researcher must emphasize the role as an active learner who can tell the story from the participant's view. The audience will benefit from the use of a qualitative method for this study due to the richness of data that has been generated. Quantitative studies would simply provide data on negotiation strategies used, but would not provide an understanding of the complex process of communication and detailed descriptions of strategies women use to negotiate for compensation. Qualitative research allowed for a more thorough presentation of the negotiation strategies used by various female administrators. Because of an intense interest in this topic, the researcher was an active learner and shared the views of the participants in the study findings. In Creswell's (1998) definition of qualitative research, he indicated:

> Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting. (p. 15)

Based on Creswell's (1998) criteria for a qualitative study, this research lent itself well to this type of inquiry.

Phenomenology is the qualitative research method that was used to conduct this study. The term phenomenology refers to a person's perception of the meaning of an event (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). A phenomenological study seeks not only to understand perceptions, but also people's perspectives and understanding of a particular situation.
Moustakas (1994) described perception as the primary source of knowledge in phenomenology which cannot be doubted. Patton (2002) pointed out that phenomenology seeks out the meaning, structure and essence of the lived experience of a phenomenon for a person or group of people. It explores how people make sense of an experience and transform that experience into consciousness. In phenomenology, the researcher uncovers the meanings in text, which includes the life experiences of the researcher (Arminio & Hultgren, 2002). This requires that the researcher bring forward previous understandings connected to the phenomenon being studied.

Phenomenology returns to the traditional tasks of philosophy as a search for wisdom (Creswell, 1998). This is philosophy without presuppositions where all judgments are suspended about what is real, and it is referred to as epoche (Creswell, 1998; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002). The meaning of epoche is to refrain from judgment and to stay away from the everyday, ordinary way of perceiving things. Moustakas (1994) indicated that in phenomenological studies, the researcher must abstain from making suppositions. This requires a new way of looking at things, which requires the researcher to learn to see what is presented and what can be distinguished and described. Even though this researcher entered into the study with existing views based on lived experiences, biases were set aside and participation in epoche took place. An attempt was made to refrain from judgment regarding the topic of salary negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education.

The use of the phenomenological method of research for this study provided a logical, systematic, and coherent resource for carrying out the analysis and synthesis required to arrive at essential descriptions of experience (Moustakas, 1994).
important part of this qualitative research, which allowed for the richness of data through the sharing of lived experiences.

Subjects of the Research

The population for this study included executive- and mid-level female administrators in higher education. Executive-level positions included positions such as vice president, associate and assistant vice president, and deans. Mid-level administrators included directors and department chairs. Administrators in both of these categories included positions with different titles but similar responsibilities. At least ten participants in each category were selected. The female administrators were employed in various divisions within the universities.

Methods of data collection for a phenomenological study suggest a purposeful sampling of 5-25 individuals (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Creswell (1998) indicated that a criterion sample is well suited for research where the subjects have all experienced the phenomenon being studied. For this study, a total of 22 female administrators were selected and a purposeful sample was used based on criterion sampling. All participants in the study experienced the opportunity to negotiate for compensation.

A purposeful sample yielded the most information and best helped the researcher understand the problem and the research question (Creswell, 2003; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985):

The Naturalist is likely to eschew random or representative sampling in favor of purposive or theoretical sampling because he or she thereby increases the scope or range of data exposed (random or representative sampling is likely to suppress
more deviant cases) as well as the likelihood that the full array of multiple realities will be uncovered. (p. 40)

The researcher purposefully selected the participants for this study by viewing websites of the various universities to determine potential subjects. A sample of 22 female administrators enabled collection of data from at least ten participants from the executive-level category and eight from the mid-level category. This sample size also allowed for diversity in age, ethnicity, and work experience of the participants. A snowballing technique was also utilized (Patton, 2002). Upon securing the agreement of one or two individuals from each institution to take part in the study, the researcher solicited suggestions from these subjects for other potential participants.

Risk, Protection and Confidentiality

Risk associated with this study included the possibility of being identified. Subjects may not want to be identified due to continuing relationships with the institutions where they are employed, as some of the issues discussed in the interviewing process were sensitive in nature. Rubin and Rubin (1995) indicated that in some cases this could mean leaving out exciting material or slightly distorting the results to protect participants from being harmed. An effort was made to protect the identity of study participants. Fictitious names were assigned to subjects and the universities, positions and specific departments where subjects are or have been employed were presented generically. Every attempt was made to maintain confidentiality, including holding interviews in private offices. Participants may have also felt embarrassed about their possible lack of negotiating skills. The researcher engaged in casual conversation to begin each interview and attempted to make each subject feel as comfortable as possible.
A consent form was used to obtain agreement from subjects to participate in the study. A sample of this form is included in Appendix A.

Instrumentation

Phenomenology involves the use of in-depth interviews as the primary method of collecting information (Creswell, 1998). Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicated, "The structured interview is the mode of choice when the interviewer knows what he or she does not know and can therefore frame appropriate questions to find it out" (p. 269). Open-ended interviews of the subjects were conducted for this study using a general interview guide approach (Patton, 2002). This approach involved developing an outline prior to the interviews, which included a set of issues to be explored with each participant. The guide allowed for free conversation within a topic area while ensuring all questions were adequately covered in the interview process. The interview outline for this study was based on the research questions and is included as Appendix B.

Initial contacts were made via email to determine interest of potential participants for the study. A follow-up telephone contact was made within a week after the initial email contact to confirm receipt of the communication and interest or lack of interest in participating in the study. A sample of the email communication is included as Appendix C.

In addition to face-to-face interviews, a few contacts using written correspondence took place to obtain additional information or clarification after the initial interview. These contacts were made only when there was a need to clarify information that had been collected. Participants were made aware of the potential for additional contact prior to agreeing to participate in the study.
Data Collection Procedures

Moustakas (1994) suggested that phenomenological interviews begin with social conversation to create a relaxed and trusting atmosphere. He also indicated the interviewer is responsible for creating a climate where the participant will feel comfortable and will respond honestly and comprehensively. To ensure a comfortable atmosphere and convenience for the participants, interviews for this study took place in the town or city where the institution was located. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) pointed out that interviews will be more successful if they take place in a quiet location to minimize distractions and interruptions. A private office was secured at each university. The researcher worked with each of the interviewees to determine the best location to ensure privacy. In every instance, this ended up being the private office or conference room in each participant's area.

Scheduling of the interviews was based on the availability of the participants. The researcher scheduled as many interviews on the same day as was reasonable in each location, making more than one visit when necessary. Since all of the institutions were in the West Michigan area, this was not an issue for the researcher.

Each interview was audio taped and the researcher took notes at every session. Permission to tape the interviews was obtained from participants prior to agreeing to take part in the study. Interviews were each approximately one hour in length. Only one follow-up interview was required, as the interview was interrupted and had to be completed by telephone the following day.
Data Analysis and Verification

In phenomenological data analysis, the researcher followed a methodology of reduction, including an analysis of statements and themes and a search for meanings (Creswell, 1998). The researcher bracketed personal experiences by participating in epoche, setting aside all prejudgments. Personal biases were set aside in order to listen to and understand the lived experiences of the female administrators who participated in this study.

Patton (2002) laid out the reduction phase of data analysis, which the researcher followed for this study. This phase included locating key phrases, interpreting the meanings of these phrases, obtaining the subjects’ interpretations of the meanings, inspecting the meanings for what they revealed, and offering a tentative statement about the phenomenon. From this phase, the data was spread out for examination and irrelevant, repetitive, or overlapping data were eliminated. The researcher then looked for the textural portrayal of each theme, which provided content and illustration. A structural description containing the experience of the entire group was evaluated, looking beyond the experience for deeper meanings for the individuals who made up the group. Moustakas (1994) suggested the final step is “an integration of the composite textual and composite structural descriptions, providing a synthesis of the meanings and essences of the experience” (p. 144).

The audiotapes of the interviews were transcribed. The researcher transcribed about half of the tapes. However, additional assistance was necessary, as time was an issue. A transcriptionist was hired to complete the other half of the transcripts. Numbers were used to identify the audiotapes in order to protect the participants’ identity. The
researcher listened to every tape in order to become totally immersed in the data and fully analyze the transcripts.

Transcripts from the interviews were analyzed using the methodology described previously. The researcher read each transcript closely and made notes. Data was coded based on themes, identifying key words and phrases. This was accomplished by conducting a search for both words and phrases through reading the transcripts and highlighting themes. After deciding on the major themes, a delimitation process followed to eliminate irrelevant, repetitive or overlapping data. This led to a process of developing an expanded view of the themes and a textual portrayal of each theme. From there, a structural description was created and then an integration of composite textual and structural descriptions took place, which was accomplished by refining words and applying interpretations to each theme. The final analysis was a distillation of the essence of the salary negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education.

Member checks were an important part of this study. This involved the participant’s review of the material to verify its accuracy (Creswell, 1998). Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicated that member checks are important comprehensive checks to not only test for fact and accuracy of interpretation but also to provide credibility to the results. A summary of their interviews and results was shared with the participants to ensure accurate interpretation of the data prior to completing the findings.

Confidentiality was maintained by carefully storing the audiotapes in a secure, locked location. Transcripts were also stored in a confidential manner as was electronic material, which was saved on an external media storage device and will be stored with the transcripts and audiotapes for three years.
Creswell (1998) indicated that "phenomenologists view verification and standards as largely related to the researcher's interpretation" (p. 207). In addition to member checks, verification of the data also involved the review of findings by an individual well versed in gender communication theory and feminist research. Input from this individual ensured that interpretations are appropriate according to research through review of the transcripts and comparison to the findings.

Delimitations and Limitations

This study was confined to female administrators from four-year, public universities in West Michigan. While the framework for this study was based on feminist communication theory, the focus was specifically on female administrators. While every attempt was made to obtain the participation of women of color, the focus of the study was not specifically on that population.

The universities were confined to non-metropolitan areas, with three of the four being in rural locations. Administrative positions were confined to executive- and mid-level administrators, excluding presidents and chancellors. Because the study was a qualitative design and a purposeful sample was used, the results cannot be generalized to other populations.

Summary

Qualitative research is a rigorous endeavor, which produces rich description, interpretation, verification and evaluation (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Qualitative methods provide for depth and openness of the data because they are not constrained by predetermined categories of analysis (Patton, 2002). This study of the salary negotiation
strategies of female administrators in higher education met the criteria for a qualitative study.

Phenomenology seeks to understand perceptions, perspectives and people's understanding of a particular situation (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005) and seeks out the meaning, structure, and essence of the lived experience of a phenomenon for a person or group of people (Patton, 2002). A phenomenological method provided a logical, systematic, and coherent resource to carry out the analysis and synthesis required to arrive at essential descriptions of the lived experience (Moustakas, 1994).

Interviews of 22 female administrators were used to collect data and the researcher participated in epoche, suspending all judgments about what is real (Creswell, 1998; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002). The researcher set aside biases during the research process, so as not to interfere with the interviews or the interpretation of data. Interviewing to collect the data and explore the salary negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education resulted in findings that allowed for thick, rich descriptions. This provides female administrators in higher education additional information on salary negotiation strategies and may lead to a better understanding and reduction of the gender equity gap.
CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this research was to explore the salary negotiation strategies of executive- and mid-level female administrators in higher education. The methodology used to conduct this study included 22 open-ended interviews with women in administrative positions from four-year, public institutions of higher education in West Michigan. The interviews were conducted at the institutions where these women were employed. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. A general interview guide was utilized to conduct the interviews and ensure the research questions were adequately covered while allowing for free conversation within a topic area, as suggested by Patton (2002).

This inductive analysis was conducted in order to seek out the meaning, structure, and essence of the lived experience of the research participants (Patton, 2002). This phenomenological method provided a logical, systematic, and coherent resource to arrive at essential descriptions of the participants’ lived experiences (Moustakas, 1994) in reference to this study.

Participants

The research proposal indicated that 16 to 20 women would be interviewed for this study. However, in order to include as many women of color as possible, a request was made and approved to increase the pool to up to 26 potential participants. The snowballing technique was used to identify additional subjects (Patton, 2002). This involved asking participants who had already agreed to take part in the study if they could recommend any potential participants. Utilizing this technique added 3 additional
women of color to the study, bringing the total participants to 22, with 5 of those being women of color. This enhanced the pool of participants, producing more diverse results.

A purposeful sample was used in order to increase the range of data exposed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This sample resulted in 10 mid-level and 12 executive-level female administrative participants, yielding a fairly balanced pool. Member checks and peer reviews were employed to verify the data and thick, rich descriptions were used to report the results of the research.

Mid-level Participants

There were ten mid-level administrative participants in the study. For purposes of this study, mid-level administrators included positions such as directors, department chairs, assistant deans, and associate deans. The majority of the women in this category were in the middle-age range (40 or over but less than 65) with two in the 30’s-age range. The majority of these women were married, with three of the ten being single.

Executive-level Participants

Executive-level participants included positions such as vice presidents, associate vice presidents, assistant vice presidents and deans. Other positions with similar titles or high-level administrative authority were also included in this category. Twelve women were in this category, with the majority of these women being in the middle-age range and four being in the 65 or over category. Seven of these women were married and five of them were either single or widowed.

Table 3, Appendix D contains a listing and description of the participants by administrative category, age range, ethnicity, and marital status. The purpose of presenting this data is to show the diversity of the group of participants; however, there
were no significant findings or themes within a specific administrative, age, ethnic or marital category. Names of all the participants were changed, as were the names of any co-workers or supervisors mentioned. Specific position titles were not included in order to protect the identity of the participants.

Themes

Analysis of the data resulted in two major theme categories: (a) negotiation strategies and (b) salary and job expectations. Within those two categories, there were a total of eight major themes and several sub-themes. In the negotiation strategies category, the four major themes included (a) the perception that women don't ask, while men do; (b) negotiation has a negative connotation for women or "women don't like to haggle"; (c) positions of power are beneficial to successful negotiations, and (d) women who negotiate or describe effective negotiation strategies exhibit masculine traits. The second category was salary and job expectations. The four major themes in this category included (a) the job is more important than the compensation, (b) additional compensation for additional duties is not an issue, (c) salary expectations were met or exceeded, and (d) women are concerned about gender equity and race discrimination.

Negotiation Theme 1: Perception - Women Don't Ask, While Men Do

Every participant in the study spoke to this theme and/or one of its sub-themes. This theme focused on the perception of the participants that generally women do not negotiate and that men do. Kim, who is in her thirties and serves in a mid-level administrative position, shares her perceptions about the way women and men negotiate. She addresses masculine gendered traits such as confidence and being direct, indicating:
I don’t know if women feel like they have to be more persuasive or provide more rationale, but I think women are better at negotiating. I think one way that women lack is sort of the confidence to go out and actually engage in negotiation. Because a lot of people are just, females are like, well you know what, I need this job, this is good, I’m going to take this, and they don’t even try. Whereas I think men are much more apt to say I need more. Let’s talk about this.

Kendra, a middle-aged, executive-level administrator has impressions similar to Kim’s. She also highlights some masculine gendered traits, with men being forceful and confident, while women appear to be timid and reserved, stating:

I think men are more pushy, a little bit more pushy and more confident that they’re going to get what they want. Whereas women will, “Well, I kind of was thinking. I wondered if you would consider this.” Men will say, “That’s not what I was thinking. This is what I have to have. Can you do this?”

Kay, a middle-aged, mid-level administrator has similar comments regarding men’s and women’s negotiations. When asked who is better at negotiating, she said, “Oh, I think men. I guess I just think that men have a tendency to end up more often with what they ask for than women. They don’t acquiesce, where women tend to.” Kay also thinks that “women are more accommodating and men tend to be more demanding.”

Debbie, a mid-level, middle-aged administrator believes that there is an expectation that women won’t try to negotiate. She also indicated, “But I think that there’s an expectation that men will come in and will try to negotiate.” Sandy, a middle-aged, mid-level administrator, also shares her perception that men are more direct and women are somewhat timid when it comes to negotiating.
I think maybe, my personal opinion, and that’s all it is, is that men, it’s easier for them or they’re more likely just to put the facts on the table and say this is it. I need this much and take it or leave it or whatever, where a woman is more reluctant for whatever reason to do that. It’s harder for her to do that.

In self-identifying with this theme, Megan, a mid-level, middle-aged administrator, indicated, “That’s why these questions are so interesting, because I realize these are concepts I don’t use for myself.”

Denise’s impression is that women do not negotiate, but generally men do, which supports this theme. Denise, who is an African-American, middle-aged, mid-level administrator, shared:

I don’t think generally that women negotiate. That would be my assumption. It’s not based on anything except how I see women work in the workplace. Most of the women that I see in the academic workplace, even if they have…there are two kinds. There’s ones that are lucky to be there and they know they’re lucky to be there. And then the ones who have fought tooth and nail to get where they are. They’ve scratched eyes and … they’re ferocious because that’s what it took to get where they are. I don’t see many savvy people…women. I don’t see what looks like savvy women . . . I see a lot of men doing it [negotiating], but not all of them.”

Jackie, an executive-level administrator who is in the 65 or over age range, shares Denise’s belief regarding men and women negotiating. Her comments point out the confidence men have in their ability to negotiate. She indicated: “I have to say that the
men I’ve negotiated with are usually a little more savvy about it than women are. But they come better prepared. They’re not afraid to broach the issue.”

Darcy, a middle-aged, executive-level administrator, also agrees with this concept, indicating: “I don’t think they [men] would hesitate to, excuse my language, ‘play hard ball.’ I think women are not nearly as adept at this.” Darcy goes on to say, “I think women hesitate because we don’t want to come across demanding/bitchy/unappreciative. Men [say] pay me what I’m worth and if you’re not going to pay me what I think I’m worth, I’m moving on to somewhere else.” This description by Darcy points out the compliant trait that women exhibit and the egocentric trait exhibited by men in this situation.

Tina, a mid-level, middle-aged administrator, agrees, indicating, “I just think that they [men] take a risk and they do it. And more women don’t.” Tina’s statement supports Megan’s self-identification with the theme of not negotiating. Tina further stated, “I always think that I was raised to be confident in who I am, but it’s interesting and I don’t ask.”

Suzie, an executive-level, middle-aged administrator, concurs with the concept that men are better at negotiating than women, indicating:

I think my perception is that men are better at it than women. I think men maybe are better at selling themselves and women are just not as, I don’t know that they [men] come in with any more information, it’s an attitude that they have . . . I don’t think they’re afraid to ask as much as maybe women are. I think they are more assertive about it.
Terry, who is a mid-level administrator in her thirties, believes that men and women do negotiate differently.

I think men are expected to be more open and direct about their desires, wants, and needs and expectations as far as salaries and negotiation might be concerned. I think women are expected to be, this is my perception, I think women are expected to be more docile, passive, and accepting of what is offered to them because this should be good enough for you. But I think that it is not expected of women to be vocal of their wants and needs when it comes to salaries or careers or negotiating.

Terry's comments point out gendered traits exhibited in women when negotiating, such as being passive and accommodating while men are direct.

Two sub-themes emerged from the main theme that women don't ask, but men do. The sub-themes are (a) gender socialization affects negotiation strategies and (b) women lack experience, comfort, and education in negotiation, but confidence grew with experience.

Sub-theme 1: Gender socialization affects negotiation strategies. Several participants made observations regarding gender socialization and the affect it has on salary negotiation strategies. Darcy spoke about the patriarchal nature of society, specifically of white society, and points out such gendered traits as compliance and being quiet.

"It [patriarchy] manifests itself differently in the way women are socialized, but in general, I think white women are socialized to be quiet, be nice and say thank
you, yes ma’am, no sir and I’ll take what I can get and walk away and do my work.”

Lea, an executive-level administrator in the 65 or over age range, believes that men approach negotiations differently than women. Lea contends that men don’t personalize negotiation as much as women do, while women are more single-person focused and tend to be more comparative. She talked about how their approach is different, stating:

Guys might say I’m going in to see my boss to ask for a salary adjustment because of A and B. Women will sit around for weeks and moan and groan about the fact that they’re not being paid and they should do something about it. And they’re sort of getting the emotional support from others to go do something about it.

Lea’s observations point out the way women were socialized in reference to being relationship-oriented. Ginny, an executive-level administrator in the middle-age range, believes that gender socialization impacts negotiation strategies, indicating, “Well, nice girls don’t talk about money . . . I think we are all told not to be too much of a bother.” She also believes that men tend to overvalue themselves, while women tend to undervalue themselves. Regarding relationships, she indicated: “Women are pretty good at reading relationships, so that may be a plus . . . If you are traditionally socialized, you’ve been taught to know when your dad, brother, husband or whoever is mad or not.” She also feels that women tend to be apologetic, in reference to explaining their position on issues, for example:
I feel like I have to explain, not to you exactly, but to other people. I have to say, “Well it wasn’t fair the way it was.” I usually [feel defensive] or guilty or like I’m selfish. . . . I don’t think all women do but I think if you have any leftovers of traditional gender role conditioning, you probably do. I think it’s hard for me and I think it is hard for women to say I deserve that without either smiling or cushioning that statement or being mad enough to be able to say it. I think it’s harder for women and I think that comes very easily to successful men. . . . I think they [men] just assume they belong here and it’s totally logical that they are here, having power, going after more power, that it’s not at all unfamiliar territory, as opposed to maybe apologizing for it in some kind of non-verbal way.

Marge, an executive-level administrator in the middle-age range, believes that many women in her age group are affected by the way they were socialized.

I think it depends on the age and I think it depends on the individual. I think a lot of women my age aren’t independent enough to figure out what they want themselves. But I don’t feel like I am one of those women. But I see those women that are my friends who have never worked or have had to figure these things out for themselves. Women who are my age thought they were always going to be taken care of. And that goes back to not having that negotiation, [not] being able to negotiate.

Sandy agrees with Marge’s comments in reference to the fact that socialization affects women’s negotiation strategies in different ways. She also addresses other factors that come into play.
I think it’s just the whole socialization issue and I think that’s changing. I think now it depends on a lot of other things, the assertiveness of the person, the skills, the willingness to take a risk, how good they are at strategizing on their feet frankly.

In reference to assertiveness, Mandy, a mid-level, middle-aged administrator, discussed a negative connotation for women, stating, “I do believe that there is that philosophy that women who are assertive are considered aggressive and a ‘bitch.’ I think that exists. And I think men who are assertive are just assertive.”

Kim indicates that men have been socialized to be more confident in their negotiating.

I also think that just in terms of their [men’s] gender roles that they’re taught to be more confident and they’re taught to ask for things and they expect other people to take them seriously and to consider what they have to say. And that means it just pours out and I think that they don’t explain a lot.

Another topic that was voiced by some of the participants as part of this sub-theme was the existence of the “good old boys network.” In speaking about men, Debbie indicated, “For some reason I feel that because they have this little boys club, I think they keep each other informed on different things.” Jill, an executive-level administrator in the 65 or over age range, also shared her ideas about the old boy’s network:

I think it's the good old boys network and I think it's alive and well . . . if a man goes in with a man . . . they listen to each other because you're a guy and I'm a guy and we'll do this . . . the way guys do it. . . . It's just that women don't know
the good old boys network. Women have a network. It's not this, I'm privileged and you're privileged because we're both female.

Mandy agrees that the good old boys network still exists, but is not terribly concerned about it.

I think the good old boys system is still in place. I don’t worry about it. I don’t worry about my job security. I’m comfortable enough with the job that I’m doing and I’m also comfortable enough with the people who would be my advocates.

Sub-theme 2: Women lack experience, comfort, and education. This sub-theme also indicated that confidence grew with experience. Several of the participants indicated that they had a lack of experience in negotiating and did not have a comfort level to negotiate effectively. Participants indicated they lacked education in negotiation skills; however, in several cases, their confidence in negotiating has grown with experience.

Suzie indicates, “I haven’t had a lot of experience with negotiation. It’s not something that really has been covered to any great extent in my educational experience or workshops.” When speaking about negotiating, she further stated, “I probably didn’t feel comfortable asking for it [money]. It probably occurred to me, but I thought, well, probably the chance of that would be slim, so I didn’t.”

Millie, a middle-aged, executive-level administrator talks about women’s comfort with negotiating. “I don’t think it’s that they [women] don’t think about it. I think they think about it. It’s either because it doesn’t make that much difference or they don’t feel comfortable doing it.” Millie’s statement points out a lack of confidence for women regarding negotiation.

Terry discussed her lack of work experience and negotiation.
Well, when I initially came into the position, there wasn’t that much negotiation. I was fresh out of college, didn’t really know about higher education and what the going salary happened to be or what. I didn’t have anyone there to guide me quite honestly.

Terry goes on to say, “I didn’t have that much experience in higher education, so I didn’t know if negotiation was possible or even how to do that with a higher education position.”

As participants gained experience, both in their positions and in their negotiations, their confidence grew. Several of the participants discussed how experience impacted their confidence in negotiating. Tina indicated:

I’ve had a chance to do a little bit of reading, but I really think the other part of it is maturing. Just trying to look at it and saying what can I lose? If they really want me, I’m not demanding that they give me this, I’m asking for it . . . I really think for me it’s just maturing and recognizing that people can do whatever they want to do within certain mild constraints . . . now I’m to the point where I am going to ask. I have asked. I’m more knowledgeable and aware.

Jackie confirmed that her confidence has grown through experience when she talks about her negotiations.

I’ve gotten better. I do a lot of negotiating and not just about myself . . . And I think it's just been doing it. Although I have to say that there's been a couple of workshops that I have taken that have given me a few insights.

When Marge talks about how her skills have changed over the years she says, “I think I am more direct. I always come in with an agenda . . . what the points are going to
be and go through it ... I probably winged it when I first started.” She also talks about taking courses in negotiation, which helped her with her skills in that area.

In speaking about her current position, Megan indicated, “I was more confident. If you want me, you are going to have to pay to get me. If you want my experiences and my expertise, you are going to have to pay for it.” Sandy verbalized the same type of confidence. “I felt comfortable in negotiating when I knew that I could provide what the administration needed at that point in time and that I had the support of my co-workers to make the transition.” Millie also feels more comfortable in negotiating due to her work experience.

[I feel comfortable in negotiating] when I know I bring to the table at least the average of what they can get if not the best that they can get, where I know they need me and where I know I can do a great job. That makes me feel much more confident in my bargaining.

Lisa, a mid-level, middle-aged administrator talks about being more comfortable and confident due to experience, saying, “I think we're wiser ... I don't know if it's years in the business or just getting older and more confident, which as to do a lot with experiences ... But I just feel more confident in dealing with people.”

Suzie also feels her confidence has grown through experience. When asked what gave her the confidence to negotiate for her current position, she indicated, “I had moved up, I had more experience under my belt, more confidence.”

Part of this sub-theme also included career path. Several of the participants mentioned that their career paths were not planned. Monica, a middle-aged, executive level administrator indicated, “I didn’t exactly say when I was 21 years old that I was
going to be . . . [in this position].” Debbie shared her experience about the guidance she received at a young age.

Coming up in the 70’s as an African American, I didn’t have a lot of role models and choices that were available to me. Even though I graduated with honors in high school, my counselor directed me toward the secretarial field.

While Jill had a desire to plan her career, she was limited due to some constraints that were put in her way. She says, “I didn’t choose wisely. I really wanted to be a veterinarian and they wouldn’t take women.” Ginny did not plan her career path either.

I never said, if I go for that position . . . then someday I’ll be able to be . . . It was, I’ll do this a while, this would be interesting, I like seeing it from another side, I’ve been opened to some opportunities, but I never drew that path.

However, Darcy did plan her career. She spoke about how she planned her first position.

I said I wanted to be . . . [in a specific position] when I was a senior in college, so I was very plannful [sic] about the progression and plan for what I wanted to do.

So I had started looking for . . . [these types of positions] probably two and a half years before I accepted the one here.

**Negotiation Theme 2: Negotiation has a Negative Connotation**

This theme came out in the responses of the majority of the participants and could also be referred to as “Women Don’t Like to Haggle.” Many participants referred to negotiating as “haggling.” When asked about negotiating, Rose, an executive-level administrator in the middle-age range, indicated, “Well, negotiate sounds like you’re strategizing against somebody that isn’t there.” Debbie referred to negotiating as
haggling, saying, "I just want to say I'm not going to haggle too much because I know I'm not going anywhere right now . . . That was pretty much it. I told my husband I'm the worst negotiator. I got nothing.” She also added:

I'm not a haggler and I think at that last negotiation, I think it may have been more haggling. I'm just not a haggler and I know . . . And so when I think about negotiations, I think about it being about haggling. Megan also refers to negotiating as haggling, indicating, "I needed to be happier professionally, that was more important to me than haggling . . . Of course I think back now and that was pretty silly of me.” Jackie’s reference to negotiation includes a description of haggling as well. She says, “In terms of negotiating my salary, I have a hard time remembering when I really did at that point and time, but I was so green, I'm sure I didn't haggle too much.”

There were two sub-themes with this negotiation theme: (a) women believe they had little or no opportunity to negotiate and they don’t think they negotiate, even though they do and (b) respect and honesty in negotiating is important to women.

Sub-theme 1: Women had little/no opportunity to negotiate. In addition, women don’t think they negotiate, even though they do. The participants overwhelmingly felt that they had little or no opportunity to negotiate and several participants indicated they didn’t negotiate. While they did not always negotiate specifically for salary, two-thirds of these women talked about negotiating either for salary or other benefits related to their employment.

Melissa indicated that there was not a lot of opportunity to negotiate, specifically when she first came to her current institution. “There wasn’t [sic] a whole lot of
negotiations for salary because the salary ranges were set.” Megan describes reasons given for limiting her opportunity to negotiate as being related to monetary issues. She indicated that the employer at her current job declared, “I don’t have the money. I can’t pay you because I don’t have the budget.” Darcy also talks about not having the opportunity to negotiate, indicating, “When I came here, there was no negotiating my salary. It was a certain amount. I was told what it was going to be and that was it . . . there was no negotiating.”

Suzie shares a similar experience that shows compliance in working for an employer where she had limited ability to negotiate:

I guess I’ve always been the type of person that always does whatever I’m asked to do . . . I know that, at least with the civil service system [at a university], there are certain rules and regulations, certain ranges of salary, so it didn’t appear when I was in that classification that there was a huge amount of negotiation that was involved.

In discussing whether or not she negotiated, in addition to believing that there was little opportunity to negotiate, Tina indicated she was part of the problem when it came to negotiating.

I hate to say this, too, but probably I’ve been my own barrier . . . That I have not necessarily believed . . . I don’t know that it’s not that I didn’t believe in myself or feel like I had the confidence to ask for what I wanted. So it’s not that I even approached anyone to say can we talk about this to see if they would say yes or no. I just didn’t do it. But because I’ve always felt like, this is what the university says they pay and there’s nothing to be done about it.
Several of the participants felt they did not participate in negotiation. During the interviews, it became obvious that the majority of these women did indeed negotiate for some portion of their compensation at one time or another. Millie shares, “Actually after talking to you on the phone and saying you know we don’t really do that [negotiate]. But then I thought, yes we do.”

Jill indicated that she didn’t worry too much about salary and didn’t negotiate. However, she did negotiate for a substantial amount of moving expenses when she moved from the east coast back to the Midwest:

When I came out here, I really negotiated for moving. They paid $14,000 to move me out here. We’d been married for several years and had all this stuff. Plus I had a ton of antiques which had to be packed, had to be crated.

Mandy indicated that while she did not negotiate, she always received increases for any new position.

I never had a job that I didn’t have a salary increase and I don’t know that I would have taken a job if I couldn’t have gotten a salary increase. So I guess, in that respect, that was my only negotiating position . . . I would not take a new job without a salary increase and I eventually . . . because of my years of service . . . would work my way up in the base.

*Sub-theme 2: Respect and honesty are important to women.* Most of the participants spoke about respect or honesty or both when they talked about negotiations. Treating individuals with respect was important to them. Honesty was also important from the standpoint of them being honest with the individuals they were negotiating with as well as the individuals they are negotiating with being honest with them. Honesty is
very important to Mandy, who indicated, “I guess I am a firm believer in honesty. I am not a pushy person, but I’m not going to have people walk over me either.”

When asked about effective negotiation strategies in negotiating with others, Millie talked about honesty and respect.

I really need to listen to what the other person is saying . . . I’m honest . . . I think that’s why it’s worked is because they feel like they’re listened to and their issues are addressed. And I clearly treat them with respect.

Kendra also values respect when speaking about negotiating, in reference to learning as much as possible about an institution:

I always really try to read up when I go interview somewhere, read up on the institution. I had read their goals so I could speak to those . . . I think even if you say, oh well I wasn’t looking for you, you were looking for me, you need to treat it with respect and say because I’m trying to do this, I’m treating this with respect. I’ve read up on the institution. I’m going to try to make sure that I know what all has happened here. I have questions I can ask.

Ginny agrees that respect is important. She described a situation in which she was negotiating for a salary that was offered and was lower than she expected. In working through the negotiation, she indicated, “I think I was just a-matter-of-fact. I was very respectful but also just, I wasn’t whiny and I wasn’t leaning across the table or pounding my fists or anything.” She goes on to say, “I think one of the most important things is just to be respectful. My style is we are all in this together. Nobody is trying to be creepy about this; give people a chance to act well.” She goes on to say:
It's probably as simple as I know that people respond well to me when I behave in this way. It's just that reinforcement for what works . . . If you stop and think about it, it's negotiation for a continuing relationship. They ought to want to be nice and they ought to see it as helpful.

In reference to honesty in negotiations and describing how women negotiate, one of the participants who bargains for the university indicated, “They’re [women] closer to the truth and there’s more, it’s more interest driven.”

**Negotiation Theme 3: Positions of Power are Beneficial**

Two-thirds of the study participants talked about situations that placed them in positions of power when negotiating. Several of these women talked about not needing to have a position for which they were negotiating. Some discussed being solicited for a position and pursued by the employer. Others indicated that their expertise put them in a position where the employer was eager to employ them. These types of situations put these women in an enviable bargaining position.

Kim indicated she has been fortunate to not have been in a position where she had to have a specific job. “Maybe I’ve structured my life so I’ve never been in a position, I’ve been lucky enough that I’ve absolutely had to - there has been no pressure for me to take a job.” She goes on to talk about the lack of pressure being advantageous to the negotiation process.

And I also think in line with the negotiation process, I think you’re more apt to really express what you want in a salary capacity when there isn’t that pressure that you have to take something. And I think that people perceive that in a positive and sort of strong way.
Suzie also speaks of the confidence she had when she did not have the pressure of having to have a specific job. “It wasn’t a situation where I had to have a job. So I felt like what’s the worst that can happen to me?” Kendra also felt confident in her position of power because of the fact that she did not need a specific position. She was able to get more out of the negotiation. She shared, “I didn’t have to have the job. There were going to be other opportunities. He called back and he said, okay the president took a big gulp and he said that’s fine. So we didn’t renegotiate. That was it.”

Rose’s comments were similar to Suzie’s and Kendra’s as she shared these same ideas about not having to have a specific job and how that puts you in a position of power.

Yes, this is what I’ve got, this is what I can do then if you can’t do it then I won’t do it. And I think part of that too is kind of having the attitude that I don’t have to have this. And I’ve always had the luxury of that. It’s like you know when I applied for this job – I didn’t have to have this job. I had another job and I was quite content doing it... So that puts you in a really interesting position of power really when you do that because it’s really like, I don’t have to have this, but if you want me and you think I’m worth it, this is the only thing I actually need.

Sandy described a situation where she was in the enviable position of knowing that the employer would be fortunate to have her. This put her in a power position to negotiate for her salary:

When I got to the point where I was offered [this] position, then I did negotiate a starting salary... I was offered a certain amount and I knew that the situation was such that they were kind of in a situation where they were lucky to get me at that
point and time. The previous [person] had died so it was rather sudden . . . I was the assistant and they wanted to do an internal search so they ended up doing an internal search. When they offered the position I knew that I could do the job. I knew that I had the support of the people here who were anxious to have the continuity and not have any more disruption than necessary and so I simply asked for a little bit more and much to my delight, they agreed

Kay shared her story about being sought after for a position. She was content in the position she was in and could have stayed there, but she was pursued for a new job, which put her in a position of power. “I didn’t want to apply and actually the deadline came and went and I hadn’t applied and they called me . . . and I finally applied, thinking I would just apply and get them off my back.” She was ultimately chosen for this position and was offered what she considered to be a very generous salary. She did try to negotiate for more and although she was in a position of power, she was not successful in getting more at that time. However, she did receive a very substantial bonus several months after being hired.

Marge was also solicited, on several occasions, for her current position. She shared, “He would have given me anything I wanted. I really had no reason to come here.” She indicated that she had been contacted on at least five different occasions to take her current position. And while salary was not on the top of her list of importance, she did very well with both salary and additional perks.

Ginny agrees that not having to have a job is an enviable position. “What makes for a good environment . . . for negotiating, not feeling like you have to have a job. It is a more powerful position . . . they want you and you’re not sure . . . it’s a lot nicer to be
courted than beg.” Ginny was also pursued for a position, placing her in a position of power. She described her circumstances, saying:

I didn’t want the job bad enough to want to do it for less money than I thought was right or to be put in an uncomfortable position. In fact I took the job to try out administration for three years and then go back to the faculty. But at any rate, I was in an enviable position.

Denise described a situation in which she was offered a job that she wasn’t even aware of nor had she been pursuing. This enhanced her ability to negotiate:

While I was on sabbatical I was invited here to do a series of lectures, which was really kind of out of the blue. I always considered it out of the hand of God. And I came here to do the lectures and the President offered me a job on the spot - this job.

Several participants indicated they had never or almost never had to apply for a position. This put them in a position of power throughout their career, as their ability to negotiate was stronger because they had been solicited for these positions and had the luxury of deciding if they wanted to pursue these positions or not. Jill indicated that in the majority of her positions, someone had called her and asked her to come, further stating that she never really had to go looking for a position. Lea reiterated the same kind of situation. “Almost every job I’ve gotten has been one I have not applied for.” Kay also indicated, “The only job I’ve ever really applied for is this one.”

Negotiation Theme 4: Women who Negotiate Exhibit Masculine Traits

The research results indicate that of the 22 participants, 14 of these participants exhibited primarily masculine traits either when negotiating or describing effective
negotiation strategies. Five of the participants were balanced between masculine and feminine traits and three of the participants exhibited primarily feminine traits when referring to negotiation.

As the participants spoke about negotiating for salary, many of them talked about being prepared [setting goals] and doing their homework [analytical, logical and business-oriented]. Some of them talked about presenting the things they had accomplished [competitive and confident]. Lea said, “I think you have to be firm about what’s reasonable and be specific about it and if you are serious, you have to be prepared for the consequences.” Toughness, directness and practical traits are exhibited in this statement, which are all masculine traits.

Ginny speaks to the issue of feminine and masculine roles in reference to how people think about authority:

It is interesting to find a balance with your comfort level with whatever femininity or masculinity roles are out there . . . people in my interview saying, you are such a nice person, are you sure you are going to be able to make the hard decisions?

And now they're saying - it's the velvet hammer. I'm the velvet hammer. It's just so funny that people are set in their minds about authority.

Rose talked about her perceptions of Betty and Sally, two female administrators she worked for previously, and compared them to the male administrator she works for currently. The gendered traits she described for the females are masculine traits [control, dominance] while she describes, Mitch, her current male boss, as generous [caring, nurturing], which are feminine traits. It is also interesting to note that Rose did not
negotiate her salary for her current position, as she was aware that Mitch does not negotiate [know the person].

Well for one thing, I think Betty and Sally were very controlling. They very much needed to be in charge of things and even though I think Mitch comes across publicly as being - he is so generous as far as saying I want you to do this, you can do this. Whatever you say is fine and I will go with whatever your recommendation is and very like you are a colleague, not an employee.

*Salary/Job Theme 1: The Job is More Important than the Compensation*

This theme was very prominent throughout the study, with 18 of the 22 women specifically indicating that it's not just about the money. The job that the women were performing was more important than the compensation they were receiving. What was important to them was the challenge of the position, the individual they work for, the kind of duties they perform, and the responsibility, authority, and autonomy of their position.

Suzie discussed her desire to ensure her future and build her career so that she could be independent:

And so it really wasn't just about money, it was really more about job security and building my future so that I could take care of myself and not have somebody else take care of me. I thought it was a good decision and the salary was obviously more than I was making and seemed to be pretty good for an entry-level. It was essentially an entry-level position.

Rose pointed out that she chose to pursue her current position for the experience and for fun.
And then I read this dumb book and then I’m thinking you don’t want to undersell yourself. And then I’m thinking okay, as far as I’m concerned, and I wasn’t going to ask [about the salary], I really wasn’t going to ask cause to tell the truth of the matter, I’m not doing this for money. I did this for the fun – for the experience to do this.

Darcy also said that salary was not the most important thing and shared her primary motivation, which was about taking the job for the experience.

Salary was very secondary . . . I didn’t go looking for a job for salary. If I was looking for a job based on salary, I wouldn’t be in this field. That was never a primary motivator . . . I wasn't looking at it for the money. I was going for the experience.

Lisa spoke about the importance of having a good relationship with her boss [relationship-oriented]. She said, “To me it is so important to have a good working relationship and a good honest relationship with my boss.” She also spoke about her staff being compensated appropriately [nurturing].

Now one thing I’d like to share with you is that salary wasn’t my primary criteria at all . . . I could probably ask for more right now. But it isn’t my primary concern in my job. My primary concern is that the rest of my staff is compensated according to these figures . . . We are losing some people because of the low salary.

Jill described how important it was to her to have her current job and how she really didn’t care about the money. Part of this had to do with the fact that “I never,
except for my first job, never worked as a single person, so my salary didn’t carry it.”

She also shared:

I got offered what I was satisfied with. Each job offered me more. This year . . .
I probably should have negotiated for a higher salary but I didn’t really care,
which isn’t doing a good service for whoever follows me . . . Probably not going
to be okay for a new person, because when they rehire, they’re going to have to
pay a lot . . . I don’t think it is [a fair salary] . . . I thought well, I’m not going to
fight this. I don’t care. I’m not jeopardizing being able to do what I want to do.

Millie places several others things above salary when it comes to her position.

She described being in a position of power because of making her decision about the type
of job she wanted to do and how much she would accept for salary before moving
forward.

I’ve never been in a position where salary was the deciding factor for whether I
was going to take a job or not. I pretty much decided where I wanted to be, what
I wanted to be doing, and then what salary could I live with. And I think that puts
you in a different bargaining position so I think that’s important to know from the
beginning. I was much more interested in who am I going to report to? What are
going to be my responsibilities? . . . There were other things more important than
salary for me.

Millie goes on to say:

I guess if we are ever going to get gender equity in salary, we need to make salary
more important for females. And I don’t know that I want to do that, because to
me that seems, again, maybe the female’s coming out in me, that’s not the most important thing.

Sandy was much more concerned about the service operation that she was directing than the salary. Although salary was not totally unimportant to her, the operation took priority.

I thought I would have done it anyway . . . now what do I do if he says no? Then I would have had to make a decision. Well do I want to do it anyway or do I want to look for something else or whatever. So fortunately I didn’t have to cross that bridge . . . The money really wasn’t the issue at that point. I really believed in what we were doing here and it was at a time when there were serious budget constraints in the State and there were real threats to these operations and I wanted to do whatever I could to make sure that the services stayed here.

Kay was very clear about the importance of salary, saying, “At the bottom . . . I guess it was never a consideration to be honest with you because it was always an offer of more.” In reference to what is most important, she goes on to say:

The responsibilities . . . just being more in control. Not more, but being as in control of my own destiny as I had been. Because when I was in the previous position, I went through four bosses and so pretty much I did what I wanted to do. That sounds really blunt, but for the most part I could decide what I wanted to initiate, follow through on it, do it, fund it, and I didn’t want to go to a position where I didn’t have any autonomy.
Lea was also very direct and confident about the lack of significance of salary for her. Because of her years of experience and the fact that she believes this will most likely be her last position, she indicated:

I couldn't have cared less. I think it's an obligation to provide service to the institution at a critical time and as long as I was paid relatively adequately I wouldn't have cared what my salary was. I still probably don't.

Lea also discussed her beliefs about the importance of getting the job versus getting the salary:

I think you're always trying to make the judgment about whether you want to do the work versus get the salary. I think you often make that choice between arguing for another $2000 versus having a job and making it into something, recognizing that when you do a superb job, you are going to be paid more. Sometimes it's a question of getting the work and getting the opportunity to demonstrate what you can do versus worrying about the entry-level salary . . . I'm very practical.

Jackie had an opportunity to take a very high-level position, which would have paid substantially more than the position she ultimately chose to take at one point in her career. She chose a position which she thought would be more fun. When asked how much salary played a part, she indicated:

Not at all; it was way down on the list. I would have gotten a much larger salary, but as far as I was concerned, I wanted to do things that were stimulating, exciting, and that enabled me to be creative.
While most of the women did not think salary was the most important, there were some exceptions. A few participants thought salary was at least as important as everything else. When asked if something else was more important than salary, Mandy shared:

Over salary? No. Most of it needs to be pretty much equal to me. It’s really interesting, and I’ve gone through a lot of these and I’m sure you have too, workshops on this is why people stay in their jobs and they’ll claim money is not the reason people leave their jobs or not job satisfaction. Well you know it is. I like to think that I can buy with my money . . . maybe I’m too materialistic, but it’s my only sense of reward in some respects.

Denise felt that salary was very important, indicating, “Salary [is the most important] certainly and that’s the hardest thing. Because they always tell you they can’t give you that salary even if they’re giving it to somebody else.”

Tina also felt that salary was important, indicating that she definitely considered salary when looking at a position:

To be honest, this is kind of contradictory, but I look at the money. I mean often times when I was looking at the position I was looking at the salary. But this position, I didn’t know what the salary was but anything around [a certain amount] that I thought I had the skill set to do, it may not have been my most desired position, then I would apply for those positions. It’s right here at the top.

Salary/Job Theme 2: Additional Compensation Not an Issue

The purpose of this study was to explore the negotiation strategies of female administrators at the time of initial hire and/or for additional job duties as well as the
gendered communication traits they exhibit if and when they negotiate for compensation. The overwhelming response to the question about additional compensation in this study was that it was not an issue. Most of the women could not even think of situations where they had been given additional job duties which were above and beyond their regular duties, and/or in some cases feeling that the duties they performed were part of the job. In a few cases when some of the participants had been given additional duties, they did ask for and receive additional compensation. A small percentage of the participants did, however, talk about some situations where they felt additional compensation may have been appropriate, but even then, the majority felt it was part of the job.

Suzie shared one experience where she questioned why she had not asked for additional compensation. Compliance is a feminine gendered trait that is exhibited in this example:

> When I was in the coordinator role, I remember . . . we didn’t have much student help and I was doing it all and taking home work in order to get it done all the time. And why I didn’t ask for more, I don’t know. I guess I just took it as part of the job.

In one situation, Lisa believed it was appropriate to ask for additional compensation for an interim position where she was filling in a director who was out on an extended leave. She approached the Human Resource Department about this issue and was told that it was in her job description. She indicated, “She and I reviewed it and she determined that it was in my job description to assume those duties . . . As I read it, she was right – it was in the job description.” In this situation, Lisa responded in a business-
oriented fashion and accepted the fact that it was part of her job and that additional compensation was not appropriate at that time.

Melissa spoke about getting additional compensation for some additional duties she had been given. She had already previously taken on additional duties in another capacity, so this was above and beyond her original position and the other duties she was performing. She shared, “I got another compensation for that . . . I was thinking about it yesterday because with a little bit here and a little bit there, it’s three people who I’m still being, right?” It was clear from speaking with Melissa that she exhibited a deep sense of community and was willing to take on these additional duties to assist the institution.

Lea was very committed to her belief in doing what needs to be done as part of the position and also possessed a strong sense of community. When asked about additional compensation, she indicated, “I think when you’re an administrator, you never know what’s going to happen. There’s no such thing at the senior level as a defined administrator job. You simply do what you’re asked.” She goes on to say:

I don’t think I’ve ever taken on additional work expecting I would be paid for it. I mean I think people that do that have a lot to learn about getting along and going along because if you’re going to count your time as a blue collar worker, you’re clearly not a professional and when you take these jobs, you don’t count your hours. You’re doing a job whatever it takes.

Darcy spoke about her reasons for not asking for additional compensation. She indicated it had to do with the way she was brought up.

I guess it has a lot to do with the way I was raised. It probably has something to do with the fact that I’m a woman but I was raised by a man who had a work ethic
like no one I've ever known before or since. And he had a philosophy, it was an incredible work ethic, and he always believed in putting everybody else ahead of yourself. So he was not a typical male in that way. That's how he lived. That was the role model that I had and so we do whatever needs to be done and you don't expect remuneration for it. You do it because it's the right thing to do.

Salary/Job Theme 3: Salary Expectations Were Met or Exceeded

Several of the participants shared that the salaries they were offered either met their salary expectations or were more than they had expected. This reduced or eliminated the need to negotiate for salary. Part of this theme also was the fact that fairness in salary was important to the participants.

Rose spoke about how she makes her decision about fairness, saying, "Well, I think rather than just making up my mind, once I decide I think something is fair, then I'm going to demand what's fair and if they're not going to be just about it, then you take the hit." When Rose was hired for her current position, she was prepared to discuss salary and ensure she would be paid a fair amount for the position. She shared, "But as it turned out, he had a letter all ready for me and he said [a certain amount of money] and I thought, well, that was more than I had wanted as a base and that was fine."

Monica was also surprised by the amount she was offered and shared the experience when she received more than expected:

And so when that happened, she wrote it down and I said oh, yea. I had in my mind what Samantha made, because I was thinking that she would take 10% off and I'd put the 10% back on and even a couple more thousand. She offered me a
little bit more than the 10% and the couple thousand. So I didn’t know what to say. So I said oh yes right away because it was more than I had planned.

Jill spoke about how she never really developed negotiating skills because she was always offered good salaries due to the field in which she works, saying, “We’re a rare commodity, so they offer us very good salaries . . . I never developed good negotiating skills because I never really needed to.”

Millie explained that while salary was important, she felt she was always able to obtain a salary in the range she felt was appropriate. She indicated, “Salary was a factor. Now I think I can honestly say going into every position I had a range. Fortunately I never got faced with the ‘what if they went below my range’.”

Mandy spoke about how she had consulted with a friend [confer with others] who was in an administrative position and asked him what she should accept as a salary for a position she was being offered. She explained:

He said I don’t think they’ll give you more than a 10% salary increase. But he said you need to ask for more. I said, well I’ll at least ask for 12%. Before I had an opportunity to ask, I was offered 18%. I was happy. I was going to ask for 12% and I never got the chance because they offered 18% and I took it.

Terry was also offered more than she had expected when she accepted her first position at the university where she is currently employed. She had decided to accept the position if she was offered $5,000 more than she was currently making. She was offered considerable more than that, so she felt obligated to take it. She also spoke about fairness, indicating:
One of the reasons I applied for the position in the first place was because of the way my boss was handling salaries and payment and that sort of thing while I was at [the other university]. So I felt that I was not being treated fairly.

Sandy talked about her experience with negotiating for her current position. She looked at other salaries of individuals in similar positions at other institutions and decided on what she thought was fair and she received an offer that was actually higher than she had expected:

Typically they would hire in at about the mid-point and of course I’ve been looking for a number of years. Based on the experience that I had and the salary that I was already receiving, it was a fair offer. I was satisfied with it . . . it was more than I expected.

Ginny also felt she had been offered a fair salary for her current position. She had done quite a bit of investigating to see what others in this type of position were making, so she was prepared when the salary was offered:

When I came here, I had gone through the same thing, looking around at what I should expect for salary and so on . . . I knew what the past [person in this position] made, but he’d been here 30 years so it’s not comparable . . . I remember thinking, if I made [this much] . . . that was the right amount for me, which was still a nice raise from what I was making. And I was offered [substantially more]. So I went, thank you; that will be just fine . . . That’s very generous. I just did that.
Lea has a philosophy on compensation that relates to productivity. She believes the emphasis should lie with productivity and not with salary. She also believes that there are choices when it comes to equitable pay:

I wish we could get away from the emphasis of salary and more on the emphasis of productivity. Because my theory is, born out by some success, that if you’re productive, you will be equitably paid, and if you’re not, you have two choices. You can make your request up to two times and then you should move on and go into an environment that will be more receptive and you should not continue to blame the environment. You have to take some responsibility for fixing your own situation. It’s not the institution or the organization’s responsibility.

Lea believes she has always been compensated appropriately, indicating that she has always been paid well due to her high productivity. She shares, “I’m very well paid. I’ve always been well paid . . . I’ve been very productive so my salary has always been high.” She further indicates, “I think you do what you’re capable of doing when you’re asked and if you’re good at it, you’ll be rewarded.” She also believes that for the most part, people are fair and will do the right thing, saying, “I think that people want to do the right thing. I get up every day believing that, and my life experience tells me that most people will treat you fairly.” However, she did have one incident where fairness was an issue. Using her direct approach, she addressed this:

One of them appointed me [to a new position] . . . he was succeeded by a guy . . . who nickel and dimed me for a year and a half. So finally I threatened to quit . . . then he finally said he’d take it under advisement. So three weeks later I went
into [his supervisor] and told her I was going to quit and I wasn’t going to work with him [persistence]. My situation was obviously then corrected.

Jackie shares a situation where she was treated in a very fair manner by a female administrator in reference to obtaining an increase in salary to bring her in line with other administrators in the same position:

I didn’t have to do much. I went in prepared. We got a new [boss]. I went in to lay out a list of things and I told her what I was going to do. I had an agenda and there were a number of other things . . . I needed to talk to her about. But the final thing on the list was I needed a salary adjustment . . . we went through the first part of my agenda. Now my last item, and [she] said to me . . . don’t even say it. I’ve looked at your salary and it’s awful. I’m totally embarrassed. She said . . . you’re going to get [a substantial increase].

Darcy describes a similar experience with her new female boss. She did not go to her boss asking for a raise, but her boss brought it up to her:

I didn’t say anything to her about salary. I went into one of my individual meetings with her and she said . . . I want you to know that I’ve done a salary study because I have some concerns about inequities between the men and the women that are reporting to me. I have asked the Human Resource Director to pull [together a salary comparison] and I believe your salary needs to be adjusted and she just did it. I never asked. She gave me [a significant] raise. So I was just amazed by that.
It is interesting to note that in both Jackie’s case and Darcy’s case the boss was a female administrator. These women had noted inequities and acted upon them before they were brought to their attention.

Two sub-themes emerged from this theme of salary expectations having been met or exceeded: (a) women felt fortunate to have the job and/or the salary and (b) family issues impact the importance of salary.

Sub-theme 1: Women felt fortunate to have the job or salary. This sub-theme appeared many times throughout the study. This was most prevalent when the participants described their experiences with obtaining their first positions, in some cases just having graduated from college, although this sub-theme also emerged at other times as well. Kay spoke about her first fill-time position, having been looking for a position for quite some time. She shared, “They offered me a job and I jumped at it. . . . The salary was fair.” Marge also discussed the fairness regarding the salary she received for her current position, saying, “I knew I wanted excellent health benefits and I looked at what others [in this position] were making at that time and I was hired in at right about what they were doing, and I thought it was fair.”

Kim talked about obtaining her first job right out of graduate school, saying she was happy to have it and indicating, “They always tell you when you are in graduate school, just be happy that you get a job and that kind of thing.”

Suzie also felt fortunate to have her first position at a university. “I guess when I first started, I was just fortunate to land a job in [this field] in higher education and have the benefits as part of that. And of course it was more money than I had been making.”
Rose was happy to obtain her first position as well and spoke about the small amount of money she had been making in grad school versus what she was offered for her first position. “That was the same thing my father was making as he was retiring from the public school. To me, that was a huge amount of money.” She also spoke about graduating and wanting to make sure she even had a position:

Well the stress of finishing your dissertation, you’re hoping to get a job. And there’s also a certain amount of ego involved. I didn’t want to be one of those people who where still hanging around because I couldn’t find a job. I really wanted to go out and get a job and then hang around.

Sandy also talked about her first position in her area of expertise and how she was happy just to have the position:

When I first started “150” years ago [in this field], I think the salary was a whopping $2.25 an hour and I thought that was just great. So I never even thought about . . . At that time, who cares? I was so young. It didn’t matter.

Tina shared a similar situation to the one Sandy had, in that she felt the amount of money she was offered for a certain position was substantial, having just finished her master’s degree.

Let me start back at the position . . . in Indiana and I remember that it was $18,000 and I had just finished my master’s . . . It was a whole lot of money; at least it seemed to be. But there was no thought about negotiating.

Melissa described one job that she obtained and, while there was no negotiating for salary, she was happy to have a job and be able to eat. She explained, “I was
seasoned and I never got a negotiation for salary. This is the job and this is what it pays. But you know, once again I was just happy to be able to eat.”

Kendra reflected on the opportunity that one particular job offered her and that she was happy to have the position, so she did not negotiate for salary, saying, “It really did turn out to be a good opportunity and in going there, the salary was higher. I really didn’t negotiate for that because I was really pleased to get it.”

Sub-theme 2: Family issues impact the importance of salary. This sub-theme emerged under a couple of different circumstances. Some participants spoke about how being single affected their negotiation strategies and salary, either in a negative or positive way. Others spoke about being married and the impact that had on the importance they placed on salary.

Kim spoke about the difference between men’s and women’s negotiation strategies and how being single impacted her salary negotiations.

But I do think that as a female you have to be more prepared. I think your reasons have to be more well thought out and backed up by solid research because, you know, I’m a single person. I don’t have any dependents and I think there’s still that, oh she could leave at any time, she doesn’t have any ties, what does she need money for, those kinds of things.

Sandy talked about the fact that she is in a different place in her life now in relation to the importance of having a job and how that impacts her confidence in negotiating for a position and for a salary.

I think probably because I’m at the point in my career where if I had this job tomorrow or not isn’t going to matter in terms of my life. You don’t have to
worry about... I absolutely have to have that job tomorrow because I have to make that house payment or whatever. That gives you a freedom that you don’t have when you’re raising a family and coming up through the ranks and so on. It’s kind of nice to be at that point in your career where you can be able to be a little more daring. I think that gives you a lot of freedom that you wouldn’t otherwise have.

Kendra finds herself in a more powerful position being single when it comes to obtaining new positions, indicating, “I can just move.”

*Salary/Job Theme 4: Concern for Gender Equity/Race Discrimination*

One theme that emerged from several of the interviews was that participants are concerned about gender equity and race discrimination issues. These concerns stemmed from first-hand experience in some cases to observations and perceptions in other cases.

Kim talked about gender equity issues, saying, “Men are generally offered higher salaries for similar qualifications. It’s not as necessary for them to be first or even in the negotiation situation because a lot of times their salary needs are going to be met right away.” She went on to share a case of salary inequity she had in a previous position. She had brought the issue to the Human Resource Department.

We were hiring another research analyst in our office who had just gotten his Ph.D. who didn’t have as much experience as I had when I hired in. And they immediately offered him the job at the top of the pay band, which wasn’t very different from my salary, even with my bonus.
Taking the issue to Human Resources produced no results. So Kim took it to upper administration and even though she was leaving the institution, she received additional compensation as part of her severance package.

Suzie acknowledges the fact that men still make more money than women, although women are catching up:

You know from my reading and things looking at salary surveys and such, it appears overall in my mind that the nation as a whole, that women are catching up with men in terms of salaries for similar positions of my own. Men are still higher, better paid than the women are.

Mandy noted that she had done salary comparisons among individuals in her position at other universities in the same conference. She noted that of all the individuals in these positions, the three lowest paid were all women, with her being one of them. Her perception overall is that women are paid less than men.

Well, you know, [this university is] not any different than most organizations. I think that women were being paid less than the men. They still are. Although I don’t have any information in front of me and I don’t bother to look at it because it makes me mad. It just isn’t worth my time.

Mandy did mention that she was aware that the women deans at the university did not make as much as the male deans, as the salaries get published in the school paper. This appears to be an issue with at least one of the other universities, where the women deans are making less than the male deans, as indicated by another participant.

Monica shared a story of blatant discrimination that she experienced in a previous position.
They said you just finished your master’s and your husband just finished his master’s, aren’t you going to have babies? I mean that was the kind of stuff then, see. And they asked me if he was the primary job wage earner – they asked me that. Since your husband is the primary wage earner and yours is secondary – I said, wait a minute . . . But I remember telling him that my income was primary to me and my income has never been secondary to me. My husband may have made more but I didn’t view it as secondary.

Millie had a situation at a previous position where she had taken over as acting director. The administrator told her she would be made director on a full-time basis. Then he came and told her they had decided to hire a director to negotiate with the union instead.

They wanted a man to come in and do the bargaining . . . I have witnesses . . . he said we need a man to come in and deal with the union . . . so he put a blind ad in the Free Press and I met the qualifications so I applied. So he came over and he threw my resume at me and he said, ‘I’m not playing games with you. We told you we wanted a man for this position . . . I said, “I’m qualified for that position. I’ve done it. I deserve it.”’

They ended up hiring a man who had been unemployed for six years at more money than they were paying her and she was to report to him, knowing that she would carry the department. She ended up leaving and taking another position elsewhere.

Ginny expressed concern about the assumptions that are made about men and women based on gender stereotyping.
So anyway, he said, "You know that the other faculty member is a full professor" and I said, "Oh no he is not." I knew. And I found that interesting that the vice president thought he was an administrator, he was a man, he must be a full professor without even checking it out. And so when I told him, he went to the directory and looked it up and said, "Oh you are right, he is an associate professor." It was an assumption I don't think would have been made about a woman.

A few of the participants indicated they had not experienced any gender equity issues. There was no association with a specific age group, as one of these participants was in the middle age range and the other in the 65 and over range. Lisa indicated:

As far as gender is concerned, I never think about that much... I haven't experienced obvious issues with that, but maybe I have blinders on sometimes. I'm not really sure, but I always feel, I never feel intimidated. For example I couldn't even think if there were any other women in our professional group. I don’t think about that maybe I'm the only woman.

Lea expressed similar sentiments regarding equity, specifically focusing in on equity in salary.

I don't have the sense that women are mistreated and that men are treated more fairly in terms of salary. I’ve never seen that and I’ve worked in a lot of environments where I was the only woman or the second woman or the third woman and I have never had any sense and even for the women that came after me, that there was anything other than equity at work.
Jill spoke about an experience she had with age discrimination at one point in her career.

I went down to [the university] to apply for their master’s program in physical therapy . . . the woman who I interviewed with was the director of teaching and she told me that I was too old. And I was probably in my early 30’s, and I really wasn’t a professional because I wouldn’t have worked in the suburbs and I wouldn’t have children.

In reference to race discrimination issues, Debbie, who is African American, spoke about her experience at one university where she faced both race and gender issues. She said, “I was there for three years, difficult, very difficult. My race had issues, my gender had issues, the fact that I wasn’t from that area had some issues.”

Melissa, who is also African American, spoke of similar concerns in one of her positions, saying, “It was the old boy network. I wasn’t only not an old boy, but I was a species of another color and that was really hard for them to deal with.”

Another African American participant, Denise, is also concerned about issues of race discrimination.

Most white people believe that all black people are poor . . . So when you go to negotiate or even in a meeting, it doesn’t even have to be negotiating, the general consensus when I come into a room is I should feel lucky to be there. I am fourth generation professional grade. I deserve to be here . . . I don’t say that to say I have a sense of superiority. I have a sense that I’m already at the table and I get what comes from the table. I’m not lucky. I’m strategic.
Summary

Two major theme categories emerged from this study: (a) negotiation strategies and (b) salary and job expectations. In reference to the negotiation strategies category, the theme that emerged most often in this study was the perception that women don’t ask, while men do. Every participant spoke to this theme and/or sub-themes of this theme. Participants believed that gender socialization affects negotiation strategies and that women lack experience, comfort, and education in negotiation, but their confidence grew with experience. In addition, several of the participants spoke to the fact that their career paths were not planned.

It was also evident that negotiation has a negative connotation for women, with many of the participants referring to negotiating as “haggling.” These women also believed that they had little or no opportunity to negotiate and they think they don’t negotiate, even though they may have negotiated for salary at some point or at least for some facet of their compensation. Respect and honesty in negotiating was also important to these women. Being in a position of power was found to be beneficial to successful negotiations, and women who negotiated or describe good negotiation strategies exhibited masculine traits.

In the salary and job expectations theme category, the theme that emerged most often, being discussed by 18 of the 22 participants, was that the job is more important than the compensation. These women were more concerned about things such as the challenge, responsibilities, authority, and duties related to the job than the amount of money they would earn. The results of the study also showed that additional compensation was not an issue, as most participants felt any additional duties were part
of the job. There was also an overwhelming belief on the part of the participants that in most instances their salary expectations were met or exceeded and they were being treated fairly. Many of these women indicated they felt fortunate to have the job and/or the salary. In addition, family issues impact the importance of salary. And finally, women are concerned about gender equity and race discrimination issues, with some participants having experienced equity and/or discrimination issues first hand. A few participants did not express or perceive concerns in this area.

Tables 4 and 5 in Appendix E include a list of the participants with the key emergent themes. These tables list each of the themes and which participants spoke to each theme.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Recommendations for Research, and Conclusions

The basic premise for this research is based on feminist communication theory. Feminist theory adds to the understanding of how women are affected by circumstances in their lives, inequities they face and how to improve those conditions (Kolmar & Bartkowski, 2000). The research included a review of gender socialization as well as feminine and masculine communication traits, which were key to the development of this study. The premise of gender socialization is based on gender as a social construct, indicating that the way gender is displayed is viewed as a learned behavior through family, friends, acquaintances, and societal influences. The gender socialization research conducted by Tannen (1995a), Gilligan (1982), Kolb (1992) Babcock and Laschever (2003), Belenky, Clinchy and Goldberger (1986), Arliss (1991), Borisoff and Victor (1998), and Wood (1997) were seminal works that contributed to this study. Their research was used to help define masculine and feminine gendered communication traits to interpret the data (refer to Table 1, Chapter 2).

Research by Kolb and Williams (2003), Halpern and McLean-Parks (1996), and Keltner (1994) on negotiations were key to synthesizing the negotiation strategies which emerged from this research. Theories and research on leadership utilized for the study included works by Rhode (2003), Twombly and Rosser (2002), Babcock and Laschever (2003), Kolb (1992), and Tannen (1990). While the research findings of others were also cited, these were the primary works used to evaluate the data regarding leadership.

A summary of this research as it relates to current literature is presented in this chapter. This summary focuses on the research questions and how they relate to the
results of the study. Recommendations for future study as well as conclusions are also presented in this chapter.

Overall Summary

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to determine what strategies, if any, female administrators at institutions of higher education use to negotiate for compensation at the time of initial hire and/or for additional duties. In addition, the study explored the gendered communication traits women exhibit if and when they negotiate for compensation. This study was conducted in an effort to explore issues of gender equity in conjunction with salary negotiations and address the salary gap. The study focused on whether or not women negotiate, why they may not negotiate, women’s perceptions of how their negotiation strategies differ from men’s, and what women perceive to be effective negotiation strategies.

The theme that emerged most often in this study was that the job is more important than the compensation. A review of the literature helps explain why the focus is not on salary but on other variables such as the challenge of the position, the individual they work for, the kind of duties they perform, the responsibility, authority, and autonomy of their positions. Since women lean toward transformational leadership, which is problem-oriented and focuses on developing self and others (Burns, 1978), women are more concerned about issues that relate to developing their subordinates and themselves, making connections, building relationships, sharing information, and leading change.
Review of Research Questions

*Research Question 1*

What, if any, negotiation strategies do female administrators use to negotiate for compensation: (a) at the time they are hired, and (b) when additional job duties are assigned to them?

Kolb and Williams (2003) identified several strategies for negotiating: taking stock in individual skills and experiences, learning as much as possible about the position, developing alternatives to increase flexibility, talking to others, and being prepared with factual information. Keltner (1994) offered strategies such as being persuasive and persistent as well as using interpersonal communication, while Halpern and McLean-Parks (1996) indicated that humor can also be utilized strategically during negotiations.

Participants in this study perceived that women do not negotiate for compensation. However, while many participants did not negotiate specifically for their base salary, most of the participants did negotiate for other forms of compensation. Indeed, results of this research indicated that these women at one time or another utilized most of the negotiation strategies brought forth in the review of literature as well as other negotiation strategies, such as those listed in Table 7, Appendix G. Participants sometimes utilized alternatives, negotiating for options such as moving expenses, professional development, travel, and other alternatives. Yet most of these women had not really thought of these strategies as negotiating.

Part ‘b’ of this research question probed the strategies used when assigned additional duties. This study revealed that additional compensation for additional duties
was not an issue, as participants felt these duties were part of the job; however, they still utilized negotiation strategies in some instances to obtain additional compensation.

It is not surprising to find that women perceive they do not negotiate, as Babcock and Laschever (2003) found in their research that women are much less likely to negotiate for salary. This may in fact lead to one reason why women’s pay is not as high as men’s, as their expectations and perceptions are that women do not negotiate. Fassinger (2002) also points out that gender bias has been widely documented and that men advance faster and achieve greater compensation than women, thus adding to the salary equity gap. This gap may be perpetuated by women’s own perceptions of their ability to negotiate. This also coincides with Twombly and Rosser’s (2002) contention that women leaders face preconceived ideas on which they are evaluated and promoted and that institutional policies and practices can perpetuate male and female leadership differences.

Even though the participants perceived differences in men’s and women’s negotiating styles as well as perceiving that men negotiate while women do not, they utilized negotiation strategies such as persistence/persuasion, conferring with others, developing alternatives, knowing the person, taking stock in their abilities, setting goals, using interpersonal communication, asking for more, and actually negotiating. Women also used positions of power to their advantage when negotiating for compensation. A position of power occurred when women did not need a position and/or had been sought after to accept a position.

Although these women perceived they did not negotiate, they engaged in negotiation at various times. While they did not always negotiate specifically for salary,
they may have negotiated for alternative forms of compensation, which ultimately impacted their entire compensation, and they utilized negotiation strategies to achieve these successes. Refer to Table 7, Appendix G for a complete listing of negotiation strategies used and/or described by women in this study.

Research Question 2

What gendered communication traits do female administrators exhibit if and when they negotiate for compensation: (a) at the time they are hired, and (b) when additional job duties are assigned to them?

Women perceived men were better at negotiating, citing such masculine traits as being demanding, forceful, egocentric, assertive, confident, and direct. The perception of women’s negotiating strategies included gendered traits such as being timid, reserved, accommodating, compliant, passive, quiet, apologetic, and docile. Yet when these women actually negotiated for compensation, they exhibited masculine traits, such as being confident, direct, assertive, analytical, logical, business-oriented, competitive, tough, and practical.

The idea that women use masculine traits when they do negotiate supports the research by Putman and Kolb (2000) that exchange is a gendered activity in traditional negotiation models. Since masculine traits are more valued in traditional negotiation, women achieve more success in their negotiations when they exhibit masculine traits. Table 8, Appendix H contains a synthesized list of masculine and feminine gendered communication traits (Arliss, 1991; Borisoff & Victor, 1998; Compton, 2005; Wood, 1997).
This research supports the fact that women would be better served in utilizing masculine traits during negotiation. Women are hesitant to utilize these traits, however, due to the gender stereotypes that go along with the use of masculine and feminine traits. Tannen (1990) points out that while male leaders who are forceful, logical, direct, masterful and powerful, which are all masculine traits, are viewed in a positive manner, female leaders who are referred to in the same way may be putting themselves at risk of being devalued as women. This leads to women shying away from utilizing these traits and, therefore, not being as successful in traditional negotiations where masculine traits are more highly valued. Women in this study used masculine traits when they negotiated for salary or other forms of compensation and/or described masculine traits when they talked about effective negotiation strategies. Refer to Table 6, Appendix F for the primary gendered trait category exhibited by participants when negotiating or describing effective negotiating strategies.

Another contributing factor to women not achieving salary equity has to do with the gendered trait of compliance that women exhibit, where women wait to be rewarded, not knowing if they deserve something unless someone else tells them they do (Babcock & Laschever, 2003). In addition, the feminine focus is on lasting relationships while the masculine focus is on individualization (Gilligan, 1982), therefore, women will tend to avoid masculine traits, which do not lend themselves to building lasting relationships. This is supported by Tannen (1990), who indicates that men are more focused on status, where women are inclined to downplay their work experience and attempt to build rapport by equalizing status through the creation of symmetry. This does not necessarily lead to an increase in salary but sustains a relationship.
Women in this study exhibited the feminine traits of compliance and being relationship-oriented on several occasions when they described situations when they did not negotiate for salary. One indicated that she pretty much does what she is asked to do, complying with her employer’s wishes and not negotiating for salary. While compliance and being relationship-oriented was a very strong factor in not asking for additional compensation, it was also a factor when negotiating for initial salary. If there was chance a relationship could be damaged, participants would not move forward with negotiations.

Research Question 3

If female administrators do not negotiate for compensation, what issues are defined as barriers to negotiating: (a) at the time they are hired and (b) when additional job duties are assigned to them?

There were several barriers which were defined by the participants as obstacles to negotiating. The main barriers that emerged from this research included issues such as (a) little or no opportunity to negotiate, (b) a lack of experience in negotiating, (c) lack of career path planning, (d) compliance with the salary that was offered or not taking the initiative to negotiate, and (e) a negative connotation for negotiation or women don’t like to haggle.

Feminist communication theory (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004) points out that because differences are practiced hierarchically, certain privileges are afforded to some groups but not others, which could include groups divided by gender and race. Excluding these groups from opportunities to obtain positions or from discussions regarding salary would lead to little or no opportunity to negotiate and, therefore, a lack of experience in negotiating. One participant spoke of her experience in being told that they needed a man
for a position she was applying for, thereby excluding her from even having the opportunity to negotiate.

Feminists assert that women have not been allowed the same access to knowledge and knowing as men (Ropers-Huilman, 2002). This lack of knowledge required to negotiate for salary creates a barrier for women to negotiate and certainly puts them at a disadvantage. Smulder's (1998) findings support the contention that women are excluded, when she discusses results from her study that indicate men who are new to an institution are readily accepted into existing informal networks which serve to bond males, while women feel or are excluded from informal groups. Many participants in this study spoke about the good old boys network, supporting the previous literature on this topic. Rhode (2003) also contends that women face a greater challenge in establishing credibility and capability because they are held to a higher standard, creating yet another barrier for women during negotiating.

The lack of career path planning for women may relate to traditional views on leadership. Several participants spoke about not planning their career paths. In addition, Nidiffer (2001b) points out that because traditional views on leadership are associated with masculine traits, the skills and attributes valued as a part of a man's masculinity become the qualities sought in a leader. Because cultural metaphors such as boss, hero, titan, quarterback, and others have been used to describe leaders, females are challenged to achieve positions of leadership and may not think about being a leader or take the time to plan a career in that direction.

In reference to complying with the salary offered or not taking the initiative to negotiate, Stevens, Bavetta, and Gist (1993) indicate that women expend less effort than
men and set lower goals for themselves when negotiating for larger salaries because of a lower level of confidence. Many participants did not negotiate for their salaries, believing that there was no opportunity to negotiate or that the salary offered met their expectations. Babcock and Laschever (2003) indicate that even when women do negotiate, they often get less than a man in the same situation. Kaman and Hartel's (1994) research showed that because women’s expectations were low, they were easy to please during negotiations, which would help explain women’s compliance with the salary offered, as in this study.

The negative connotation of negotiation was voiced by several of the women, indicating they didn’t like to “haggle.” This may be explained by women’s attempt to downplay their accomplishments due to their childhood gender socialization (Gilligan, 1982; Kolb, 1992; Tannen, 1995a). In addition, because relationships mean so much to women, they may choose to be silent instead of damaging a relationship (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Gilligan, 1982), leading them not to negotiate or haggle. Another factor that may affect women’s reluctance to negotiate is that because women are taught compliant behavior since childhood, they may choose to wait to be told when it is appropriate to receive more (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Gilligan, 1982). This reluctance to negotiate ultimately has a chilling effect on a woman’s ability to obtain equitable compensation over her career.

Research Question 4

When female administrators do negotiate for compensation: (a) what conditions must exist for female administrators to feel confident in negotiating, and (b) at what point do female administrators cease to negotiate for compensation, and why?
The emergent response to this question was that in order for female administrators to feel confident in negotiating, they needed experience, both in negotiating and in their field of expertise. The barriers to negotiating described under question three would be contributing factors to the lack of experience women may have in negotiating and in their field of expertise. Because women have traditionally been excluded from positions of leadership (Rhode, 2003) and traditional negotiation models have been more closely associated with masculine traits (Arliss, 1991; Borisoff & Victor, 1998; Wood, 1997), women who do not utilize masculine traits to negotiate are at a disadvantage and would not have as much experience at negotiating.

Respect and honesty were also important aspects of feeling confident in negotiating. Kouzes and Posner (2002) discuss qualities that people look for and admire in their leaders. One of the most important attributes emerging from their research was that people want a leader who is honest. This study supported those findings, showing that women want a leader who is honest and that they can respect.

In addition, women who were in positions of power also felt very confident and often achieved success in their negotiations. A position of power usually resulted when women did not need a position or were solicited for a position. This included participants in both the mid-level and executive-level categories. These research findings related to specific situations participants found themselves in regarding issues such as their field of expertise, timing, and availability. In some cases it was related to the fact that a woman was single and not tied to family issues that could keep her from moving. In at least one case, a participant indicated that the opposite was true, with administration believing that
because she was single, she would not need as much money as someone who had a family to support.

The most significant finding of the study was that the job is more important to women than the compensation. Some participants in the study indicated they would stop negotiating when they wanted the job more than they wanted the salary or when they felt fortunate to have a position. Some mentioned just having graduated from college in some instances and the fact that the money they were offered was much more than they had been making. Almost every participant indicated that the job was more important than the salary. They were concerned about issues such as the challenge of the position, the individual they work for, the kind of duties they perform, and the responsibility, authority, or autonomy of the position.

A review of the literature helps to explain why this may be true, at least for the majority of these women. Women tend to exhibit transformational leadership in their styles. This type of leadership is problem-oriented and focuses on developing self and others (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders seek to satisfy higher needs, engage in the full person of the follower and look for potential motives in followers. This is a very relationship-oriented type of leadership. In addition, leading from a human resource frame includes needs, skills, and relationships (Bolman & Deal, 2003). From a gendered viewpoint, the feminist conceptual model assumes that leadership manifests itself when there is an action to bring about change to make a positive difference in people’s lives (Astin & Leland, 1991). Acting from this perspective, women leaders position themselves at the center of a communication web and at the heart of the activity instead.
of at the top, believing their strength is in connection and in sharing of information (Fine & Buzzanell, 2000).

This research validates the premise that women are not focused on salary but rather on developing their subordinates and themselves, making connections, building relationships, sharing information, and leading change. These issues are more important to them than “haggling” over the amount of money they will make in a position that they truly want. While the amount of money they make is not unimportant to them, it is less significant than these other issues.

Another reason why women would stop negotiating for salary had to do with the possibility of damaging a relationship if negotiations continued. They wanted to avoid any struggle or dispute that would injure an ongoing relationship. Gilligan (1982), Kolb (1992), and Tannen (1995a) contend that women are socialized to downplay their accomplishments in order to be rewarded by their peers. If they were to negotiate to the point where it damaged a relationship, women would cease negotiating in an effort to maintain a lasting relationship. Because women take the feelings of others into consideration during their negotiations (Halpern & McLean-Parks, 1996), they may not ask for more compensation and may cease negotiations.

Women in this study would also tend to stop negotiating when they felt the salary they had been offered either met or exceeded their expectations. In addition, participants were also not concerned about additional compensation for additional duties. They would not negotiate when they felt any additional duties they were given were part of their job. A contributing factor to these issues may be tied into lower pay expectations (Kaman & Hartel, 1994) and the lack of a presumption of competence for women.
(Fassinger, 2002). This causes women to fail to make themselves competitive in the marketplace by failing to build on their accomplishments. Therefore, a woman's own perceived value in the workplace may prevent her from being properly prepared to negotiate for salary and from utilizing negotiation strategies.

*Research Question 5*

How, if at all, do women perceive that their negotiation strategies are different than men’s in reference to: (a) types of strategies used, and (b) any gender stereotypes implied?

Women’s perceptions of differences in their negotiation strategies from men’s strategies included the perception that men negotiate and women don’t. The participants believe that gender socialization has an affect on negotiation strategies. These women perceive that negotiating is easier for men, men are more confident, more effective, men negotiate more, and men are expected to negotiate, while women are not expected to negotiate. The participants also believe the old boy network is alive and well.

The literature review validates the perception by the women in this study that men negotiate and women do not. Liberal feminism concludes that gender behavior is mainly the result of childhood socialization (MacDonald, 2002). Lessons learned in childhood regarding socialization carry over into adulthood and into the workplace (Gilligan, 1982; Kolb, 1992; Tannen, 1995a). Because men are more likely to behave in ways to get recognition, while women take a low-key approach, men are more likely to negotiate than women.

Women’s style of leadership tends to be more participatory and democratic, which leans toward transformational leadership (Nidiffer, 2002). While Bolman and
Deal (2003) contend that research gives little to support the notion that there are significant gender differences in leadership styles, many studies have shown that the leadership styles of men and women do differ (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Gilligan, 1982; Kolb, 1992; Tannen, 1990). Women place more emphasis on team and community, while men place emphasis on outcomes or results of change (Diamond & Spuches, 2002).

Women's ways of knowing impacts the way they communicate (Belenky et al., 1986). The first category of women's perspectives to knowing is silence. In a position of silence, a woman finds she has no voice and is controlled by an external authority, seeing authority as being all-powerful and thus feeling powerless to stand up to it. The second category is received knowledge, where women believe they can receive and reproduce knowledge they have received from external authorities but cannot create knowledge themselves. While the women in the study who indicated they did not negotiate may not have been operating from a position of silence, they exhibited the second category of received knowledge whereby they knew the information but could not create the knowledge themselves and had little confidence in their ability to negotiate for salary. In order to have been more successful, they would need to strive for procedural or constructed knowledge where they are vested in learning and applying objective procedures for obtaining and communicating knowledge through the use of reasoned reflection and, beyond that, by becoming creators of knowledge through the development of their own voice. Since many common negotiation strategies are viewed as more masculine, women may need to develop their own strategies for negotiating in order to develop their own voice and comfort level.
Women also tend to undersell themselves. They underestimate their own competencies, talents and capabilities, while men appear to have more self-confidence, especially in male-dominated occupations (Fassinger, 2002; LeBlanc, 1993).

Women are also concerned about and have encountered gender equity and race discrimination issues. Concerns included such issues as salary equity, gender discrimination, gender stereotyping, age discrimination, and race discrimination. This concept is brought to light by feminist communication theory, which points out that groups can be excluded from certain privileges afforded to some other groups. These groups could include individuals with differences in sexuality, gender, race, culture, nationality, ability and class (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004). One participant cited an incident where she was told by administration that they wanted a man for the position. Another indicated that a supervisor assumed a male candidate for a position was a full-professor when that same assumption may not have been made about a female candidate. Yet another was asked when she was going to have babies. A single woman indicated assumptions had been made about her that she could leave her job at any time because she didn’t have any ties. At least three of the African-American participants indicated they had experienced race discrimination issues at least once in their careers.

Issues of gender equity and race discrimination are still issues that are prevalent and must be dealt with, even though there are those who may not have experienced these issues. Statistics show that women average less than 80 cents to every dollar a man makes (Babcock & Laschever, 2003; Institute for Women’s Policy Research, 2004a; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2003), despite the fact that women are very capable in administrative positions and have proven their capability through performance.
Research Question 6

What negotiation strategies do women perceive as most and least effective, and what recommendations do they offer for other aspiring female administrators? Women cited several strategies for effective negotiation. In addition to the strategies they utilized that were reported under question one, they also mentioned strategies that were not specifically referred to in the review of literature, such as knowing your worth, playing the game, knowing the importance of timing, setting the stage, and knowing when to walk away. Avoiding struggle and dispute and using humor were a couple of the other strategies utilized by participants that were referred to in the literature. Please see to Table 7, Appendix G for a complete list of negotiation strategies.

Knowing your worth came up in reference to knowing how much experience you have and how much you should ask for. One participant indicated that men tend to overvalue themselves while women tend to undervalue themselves. Playing the game referred to knowing how to go about negotiating. Women’s perceptions were that men know how to play the game and like to play the game, while women may not know how and/or don’t want to play the game. Knowing the importance of timing had to do with when to ask for more money. Several participants mentioned this strategy and indicated it comes with experience but that it is an effective negotiation strategy.

Setting the stage was also mentioned by several of the participants. This strategy is used to prepare for negotiations. Participants indicated they would share information prior to negotiations which would be beneficial when actually negotiating, such as significant accomplishments and salaries of other colleagues in their area of expertise.
Participants discussed knowing when it was time to stop talking and to wait for a response from others. This sometimes involved walking away from the negotiation and waiting for a response. This supports the premise of women being relationship-oriented and that they would stop negotiating to avoid damaging a relationship. In other instances, walking away meant that they needed to come to a realization that perhaps a specific position was not meant for them and they needed to move on to another option.

Avoiding struggle and dispute (Keltner, 1994) is similar to walking away. This strategy was only mentioned by a few participants, but inferred by others. Although the description of this strategy in the review of literature was to acknowledge differences of opinion and discuss them, findings in this study showed this strategy was typically used to stop negotiations.

Using humor was mentioned by only a few of the participants. One participant talked about asking for a boat during her negotiations. She said it felt good to joke with the interviewers and really be herself with them. This strategy was also mentioned in the review of literature as an effective strategy (Halpern & McLean-Parks, 1996).

The review of literature pointed out several effective negotiation strategies, as indicated in the responses to question one. The literature refers to the need for mentors for women (Bower, 1993; Fassinger, 2002; LeBlanc, 1993; MacDonald, 2002; Rhode, 2003; Swiss, 1996; Twombly & Rosser, 2002; White, 1992). Participants did refer to conferring with others as one of the negotiation strategies they utilized and actually referred to some of those individuals as mentors.
Least effective strategies that were cited included ultimatums or threats, lack of preparation, whining, emotional or hostile appeals, yelling and swearing, irrational/unreasonable/unrealistic demands, and silence (not negotiating).

In reference to being silent, in addition to the work on women’s ways of knowing by Belenky, Clinchy and Goldberger (1986) cited previously under the response to question four, Babcock & Laschever (2003) and Tannen (1995b) indicate that women expect that life will be fair and in the end they will be rewarded for their hard work and for doing a good job. This strategy has a negative affect on the salary equity gap.

Recommendations for Future Research

This phenomenological study was conducted to explore whether female administrators in higher education negotiated for their compensation and, if so, what strategies and gendered communication traits they used. Although the study revealed that women perceive they do not negotiate, while men do, additional research should be conducted to determine the perceptions of male administrators in higher education, if they actually do negotiate, and what strategies and gendered skills they use when negotiating. This study only included female administrators and their perceptions of their negotiation strategies and those of men. A study with both men and women could be conducted in order to do a thorough comparison of the strategies used to negotiate, and what barriers men may face when they negotiate for salary. A quantitative survey could also be conducted to follow up on the findings of a qualitative study.

Results of the study indicated that additional compensation for additional duties was not an issue, as the participants felt the duties were part of the job. It was difficult to determine if they actually had additional duties given to them that were indeed above and
beyond the scope of their positions or if it was their perception that the duties were part of the expectations of the positions. Further study could be done in this area to determine if additional compensation would be appropriate and that women simply accept what they are given or if, indeed, the duties assigned are within the scope of the various positions.

This study was restricted to four-year universities within West Michigan. The study could be expanded to more universities and more states. The study could also include private universities in order to do a comparison to see if there are significant differences between public and private institutions of higher education.

This study did include women of color; however, it was limited to five women of color, all who were of African American descent. This was due to the limited pool of potential minority candidates to draw upon from within this sample of universities. A study could be conducted to include additional women of color, including more diverse ethnicities in order to do a comparison of the strategies utilized among ethnic backgrounds to determine if there are significant differences.

Conclusions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine the salary negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education and ascertain what gendered communication traits they use during negotiations. This study was conducted to better understand women's negotiation strategies by focusing on the salary equity gap in an effort to work toward gender equity.

This research added to the knowledge base on gender equity, specifically salary equity, by exploring the negotiation strategies women leaders in higher education use to negotiate for salary, if they negotiate for salary, and if so, what gendered communication
traits they use. Other studies did not focus specifically on the negotiation strategies used or delve into the gendered traits women use when negotiating for salary. This study revealed the perception that women believe they do not negotiate, while men do. The study also showed that when women do negotiate, they utilize masculine traits. Findings show that women place more importance on the job they perform than they do on the compensation. While compensation is not totally unimportant to them, it is not as important as issues such as the challenge of the position, the individual they work for, the kind of duties they perform, and the responsibility, authority, and autonomy of their position.

This leads to the conclusion that women's focus is not on money but on the relationships they build in their jobs, the ability to grow their followers, the challenges they have to grow themselves, as well as other relationship-oriented issues. Women want to share information, be inclusive, work hard for their employer and hope to get paid for it. While this worked out well for many of these women, the lack of importance on salary for women has most likely enabled the salary equity gap to continue.

The perception of many of the women in this study was that salary meant much more to men than it did to women. Knowing that men make over 20 percent more on average than a woman in the same position, this is not a difficult conclusion to make. Because of gender socialization and the fact men have been raised to believe power and status is important, the importance of salary becomes very significant. While women are more concerned about maintaining and nurturing relationships, men are more concerned about achieving status and power.
Another significant finding was in reference to the participants’ perception that women don’t ask, while men do. Again, because power and status are important to men, achieving a high-paying salary would increase their status and power. In order to obtain a high-paying salary or a salary they believe is appropriate, men may have to negotiate for it. Having been conditioned since childhood to be assertive and speak out for what they want, this would be easier for men than women, as women were conditioned to be compliant and to wait for someone else to tell them when they deserve to receive more. This would also lead women to give a negative connotation to negotiating, considering it haggling.

A result that is somewhat troubling is the fact that the majority of the women in the study indicated that in at least one or more cases, their salary expectations were met or exceeded. Yet the salary equity gap still exists. This may be due to lower expectations that women have when negotiating for a salary and certainly pertains to the premise that salary is not the most important issue for women when negotiating for a position.

Many of the participants talked about effective negotiation skills and all of them used at least some of these skills at one time or another to obtain either a higher salary or other forms of compensation. An interesting finding was the fact that when women did negotiate for salary, they exhibited masculine traits. So while these women know how to negotiate, many are avoiding negotiating for salary possibly because the strategies used are linked with masculine traits. If they were to utilize masculine traits, they may jeopardize relationships that are important to them.
Gender equity and race discrimination issues are still a concern. Half of the participants spoke specifically about incidents that had happened to them. While this theme did not emerge as often as some of the others, equity is the underlying reason for conducting this study.

In order to overcome issues such as salary equity and reduce the salary gap, women must employ salary negotiation strategies. They possess the ability to negotiate, but have not fully employed the strategies. Women’s negative perception of negotiation as well as their low priority on salary versus other facets of a position may negatively affect their ability to obtain increases in salary needed to decrease the salary equity gap. To counter this, women need to develop their negotiation strategies, setting aside any preconceived ideas they have about masculine and feminine strategies and using whatever strategies work best for them. The compiled lists found in Appendix G and H represent a first step in this process by identifying strategies and traits used by the women in this study. By creating their own voice, women can develop a style of negotiating needed to help close the salary gap, but to also maintain relationships and other issues often key to women.
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APPENDIX A

Consent to Participate in Study
Consent Document

Western Michigan University
Department of: Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
Principal Investigator: Louann Bierlein-Palmer
Student Investigator: Suzette Compton

You have been invited to participate in a research project entitled Salary Negotiation Strategies of Female Administrators in Higher Education. This research is intended to study how female administrators in institutions of higher education negotiate for compensation. This study is being completed as Suzette Compton’s dissertation project.

You will be asked to attend a one- to two-hour private session with Suzette Compton. You will be asked to meet Suzette for this session at your private office or in the university library or an off-campus location, if desired. The session will involve an interview regarding your work history and experiences in negotiating for salary and additional compensation. You will also be asked to provide general information about yourself, such as age, level of education, and ethnicity. These sessions will be audio taped. By signing this document, you are agreeing to allow the audio taping of your interview. If clarification regarding interview responses is deemed necessary, you may be asked to attend a second interview session or to participate in a follow-up telephone interview. Email communications may also be used to contact you; however, clarification of responses and verification of accuracy in reporting responses will be addressed by phone, unless you have a private email address you are willing to use for this purpose.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. For example, one potential risk of participation in this project is that you may be uncomfortable responding to information about your salary or in sharing experiences that could be sensitive in nature. However, Suzette will take great care in keeping your identity confidential in the reporting of data collected in this study. Fictitious names will be used and positions and places of employment will be reported in a generic manner.

All of the information collected from you is confidential. That means that your name will not appear on any papers on which this information is recorded. The forms will all be coded, and Suzette will keep a separate master list with the names of participants and the corresponding code numbers. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the master list will be destroyed. All other forms will be retained for at least three years in a locked file in the principal investigator’s office.
While there may be no direct benefit to you by participating in this study, you will have an opportunity to talk about your experience in negotiating for compensation. Other female administrators who negotiate for compensation may benefit from the knowledge that is gained from this research and it may help in understanding and reducing the salary gender gap.

You may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. If you do participate in the study, you may choose to skip any questions you would rather not answer. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact either Suzette Compton at 231-591-3901, comptons@ferris.edu or Dr. Louann Bierlein-Palmer at 269-387-3596, l.bierleinpalmer@wmich.edu. You may also contact the chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the vice president for research at 269-387-8298 with any concerns that you have.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is more than one year old.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and/or had explained to you the purpose and requirements of the study and that you agree to participate.

______________________________
Signature  ______________________
Date

Consent obtained by: __________________________
Initials of Researcher  ______________________
Date
APPENDIX B

Interview Guide
I. Background information
   a. Explanation of research and assurance of protection of identification as described in the proposal
   b. Demographics (age & ethnicity) (age will be reported generically, i.e. middle aged or age range)
   c. Educational background
   d. Work experience

II. Salary negotiation strategies used and gendered communication traits exhibited
   a. Explore experience with negotiating for salary
   b. Explore experience with negotiating for additional compensation
   c. Identify strategies used to negotiate for salary
   d. Identify strategies used to negotiate for additional compensation

III. Reasons for not negotiating
   a. Identify reasons for not negotiating for salary
   b. Identify reasons for not negotiating for additional compensation

IV. Characteristics of confidence in ability to negotiate
   a. Identify characteristics that must be present in order to negotiate for salary
   b. Identify characteristics that must be present in order to negotiate for additional compensation
   c. Identify conditions present when negotiations cease

V. Perceptions of negotiation strategies
   a. Identify participants’ perceptions of differences in the types of negotiation strategies used by men and women
   b. Identify participants’ perceptions of stereotypes of men’s and women’s negotiation strategies
   c. Identify participants’ perceptions of most effective negotiation strategies
   d. Identify participants’ perceptions of least effective negotiation strategies
APPENDIX C

Email Correspondence to Potential Participants
Dear ________:

My name is Suzette Compton and I am inviting you to participate in a study on the salary negotiation strategies of female administrators in higher education. This study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership through Western Michigan University. I am the investigator in this study (231-591-3901, comptons@ferris.edu). The supervising professor is Dr. Louann Bierlein-Palmer (231-387-3596, l.bierleinpalmer@wmich.edu).

You are being invited to volunteer as a participant because you are in an executive- or mid-level administrative position at your institution. If you choose to participate in this study, you will attend a one- to two-hour interview session at your institution or an off-campus site where you will be asked questions regarding your work history, age, ethnicity and experience in negotiating for salary and additional compensation. You may also be asked to attend an additional session or to participate in follow-up telephone conversations, if clarification of your interview response is necessary. Email correspondence may be used to contact you throughout the study, however clarification of information will be done by phone, unless you have a private email account that you are willing to use for this purpose.

This study will be restricted to universities in the Western Michigan area. However, your interview responses are strictly confidential. This means that your name will not appear on any papers on which information is recorded. Fictitious names will be used and your position and place of employment will be described generically.

I will be contacting you via phone within the next week to discuss your possible voluntary participation in this study. If you decide you are interested in learning more about the study, please feel free to respond to this email. I will follow up with a phone call and will send you a consent form for your review. An appointment will be scheduled, where I will review the form with you. After obtaining your signature, the interview will begin. You will also receive an interview guide in advance, so you can be fully prepared to respond to the interview questions, should you decide to participate.

If you have any questions, you may contact either me or Dr. Bierlein-Palmer, as indicated above. Thank you for considering possible participation in this study. The results of this study may be of interest to female administrators in higher education and may be beneficial in assisting others in negotiating for compensation and ultimately reducing the salary gender gap.

Sincerely,

Suzette Compton
APPENDIX D

Demographics of Participants
**Demographics of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Administrative Level</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>65 or over</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>65 or over</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>65 or over</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>65 or over</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Single/Widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginny</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy</td>
<td>Executive-Level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>Middle Aged</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Themes and Sub- Themes and Distribution of Themes
Themes and Sub-Themes

Themes

NS1. Perception - women don't ask, while men do
   a. Gender socialization
   b. Lack of experience, comfort and education

NS2. Negative connotation for negotiation
   a. Little or no opportunity to negotiate
   b. Respect and honesty important

NS3. Positions of power beneficial to negotiations

NS4. Women exhibit masculine traits when negotiating

SJ1. Job more important than compensation

SJ2. Additional compensation not an issue

SJ3. Salary expectations met or exceeded
   a. Felt fortunate to have job or salary
   b. Family issues impact importance of salary

SJ4. Gender equity and race discrimination

Note. NS = Negotiation Strategy; SJ = Salary and Job Expectation
**Distribution of Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adm Lvl</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>NS1</th>
<th>NS2</th>
<th>NS3</th>
<th>NS4</th>
<th>SJ1</th>
<th>SJ2</th>
<th>SJ3</th>
<th>SJ4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginny</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* NS = Negotiation Strategy; SJ = Salary and Job Expectation. See Table 4 for Themes.
APPENDIX F

Primary Gendered Traits Exhibited
### Primary Gendered Traits Exhibited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Adm Lvl</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine/Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginny</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine/Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine/Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine/Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Masculine/Feminine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Comparison of Compton Research on Salary Negotiation Strategies with Previous Research


Comparison of Compton Research on Salary Negotiation Strategies with Previous Research (e.g., Keltner, 1994; Kolb & Williams, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies from Previous Research</th>
<th>Strategies from Compton (2005) Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid struggle/dispute</td>
<td>Avoid struggle/dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be persistent/persuasive</td>
<td>Be persistent/persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confer with others/mentors</td>
<td>Confer with others/mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop alternatives</td>
<td>Develop alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate</td>
<td>Negotiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Goals/be prepared/ learn as much as possible</td>
<td>Set Goals/be prepared/ learn as much as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take stock/inventory skills/ know your limits</td>
<td>Take stock/inventory skills/ know your limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use humor</td>
<td>Use humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use interpersonal communication</td>
<td>Use interpersonal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask for more*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be aware of timing*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be willing to walk away*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know the person (trust)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know your worth*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play the game*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strategies not found via the literature review of previous research.
APPENDIX H

Comparison of Compton Research on Gendered Traits with Previous Research
Comparison of Compton Research on Gendered Traits with Previous Research (e.g., Arliss, 1991; Borisoff & Victor, 1998; Wood, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine (M) Traits Previous Research</th>
<th>Feminine (F) Traits Previous Research</th>
<th>Gendered Traits - Previous Research and Compton (2005) Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive, Assertive</td>
<td>Gentle, Reserved, Submissive</td>
<td>(M): Aggressive, Assertive, Hostile*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Gentle, Reserved, Passive*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical, Intelligent, Logical, Rational</td>
<td>Frivolous, Intuitive</td>
<td>(M): Analytical, Logical, Rational, Practical*, Factual*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-oriented</td>
<td>Relationship-oriented</td>
<td>(M): Business-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Relationship-oriented, Committed*, Loyal*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>(M): Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident, Decisive</td>
<td>Fickle, Indecisive</td>
<td>(M): Confident, Decisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Indecisive, Lack of Confidence*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Loud, Outspoken</td>
<td>Demure, Quiet, Refined</td>
<td>(M): Direct, Outspoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Refined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant, Forceful</td>
<td>Accommodating, Compliant</td>
<td>(M): Dominant, Forceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Accommodating, Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>(M): Egocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Caring*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dependent, Sense of Community</td>
<td>(M): Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Dependent, Sense of Community, Sense of Duty*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Helpful, Nurturing</td>
<td>(F): Nurturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>Fearful, Timid</td>
<td>(F): Timid, Apologetic*, Self-Judgmental*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong, Tough</td>
<td>Enduring, Sympathetic</td>
<td>(M): Strong, Tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td>Emotional, Sensitive, Sentimental</td>
<td>(M): Unemotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F): Emotional, Sensitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Traits not found via the literature review of previous research.
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