

Rose, S. M. & Danner, M. (2010) Money matters: the art of negotiating the academic contract for women. In M. E. Lenning, Brightman, S., & S. Caringella (Eds.), *A guide to surviving a career in academia: Navigating the rites of passage* (pp. 33-56). NY: Routledge.

3 Money matters

The art of negotiation for women faculty

Suzanna M. Rose and Mona J. E. Danner

If “location, location, location” is the single most important consideration in real estate, the likely parallel motto for career success in academe is “Negotiate, negotiate, negotiate.” Negotiation is the use of information and power to affect behavior; more specifically, it is an endeavor that focuses on gaining the favor of people from whom we want things (Cohen 1980). For women faculty, the idea of developing their negotiation skills may run counter to a well-ingrained belief that academe is a meritocracy in which rewards presumably are given to those possessing the greatest talent. In reality, few are recognized based on their expertise alone; success usually requires both job competence and the ability to negotiate. In other words, in academe as in business, “you don’t get what you deserve, you get what you negotiate” (Karrass 1992).

Knowledge about how to negotiate has been shown to have a significant impact on one’s likelihood of success. Those who know that negotiation requires tactical skill, as well as distinct types of information such as knowing deadlines and the other party’s reputation, are generally more successful at bargaining than those who have little awareness of the task-specific components of negotiating (Stevens et al. 1993; Weingart et al. 1996). Elements of the task environment also play a role in negotiating, including the behavior of the other party, the success of attempted strategies, and the content of the task itself (Weingart et al. 1996). The other negotiator’s possible gender bias has been identified as an aspect of the task environment that may significantly affect women’s success as well (e.g., Gerhart and Rynes 1991). Nevertheless, actively preparing oneself for the negotiating process may help women achieve better outcomes even when the task environment is uncontrollable or unfavorable.

One of the most crucial negotiations from the standpoint of academic careers is the salary negotiation. In general, women faculty fare less well than men in this process. Research indicates that women faculty are paid lower salaries than are men – about 20 percent less, on average. Translated into dollars, colleges and universities pay women nearly \$10,000 a year less than men. Gender differences remain greatest at the full professor rank, where women earn 80 percent of men’s salary, but are still present at the associate and assistant professor levels, where women earn 93 percent of men’s earnings. The salary

gap persists across academic disciplines and types of institutions (NCES 1993, 1996; Sax et al. 1996).

Despite the importance of negotiating salary and other conditions of employment in academe, how to proceed is seldom discussed. For example, *Career Guide for Women Scholars* (Rose 1986), *The Academic Job Search Handbook* (Heiberger and Vick 1996), *Lifting a Ton of Feathers: A Woman's Guide to Surviving in the Academic World* (Caplan 1993), *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe* (Tierney and Bensimon 1996), *Rhythms of Academic Life* (Frost and Taylor 1996), and *Black Women in the Academy* (Benjamin 1997) contain much information pertinent to the academic job search and how to establish and maintain a successful career, but mention little about salary or contract negotiations. The graduate school experience is similarly lacking in instruction concerning negotiation for most, although informal networks may convey relevant information from senior to junior men (e.g., Dreher and Cox 1996). As a result, new women PhDs may enter the job market with little experience or knowledge about how to position themselves for the first job. In addition, subsequent opportunities for significant salary negotiations may be infrequent in an academic career. Thus, women could be quite senior, and the wage gap with senior men quite large, before they could benefit from trial-and-error learning.

In the present chapter, our intent is to illustrate why women faculty should acquire the art of negotiating, as well as to provide practical advice concerning how to negotiate. Although faculty jobs involve numerous types of bargaining, the primary focus will be on negotiating the academic contract, with a particular emphasis on salary negotiation.

Money matters

Negotiation is important because money matters in academe. Your salary is a sign of your worth to the institution, as well as a source of self-esteem. Your economic security or that of your family also depends on your income. Moreover, your earning power affects not only your current living conditions but also your retirement benefits, which are generally calculated partly as a percentage of your base salary in the years before retirement. Thus, the most important negotiation you are likely to make during the first phase of your career is the entry-level salary negotiation. Opportunities to increase your salary throughout your career are similarly crucial for you to negotiate successfully.

The long-term financial and career implications of entry-level salary may be best illustrated with an example. Suppose a woman assistant professor, Linda, is newly hired at \$42,000, and earns 93 percent (i.e., the average wage gap) of a newly hired male assistant professor, Bob, who is hired at \$45,150. Now suppose both Linda and Bob get average merit raises of 5 percent for the next five years. At this juncture, when they are likely to be undergoing tenure review, the institution will have invested \$17,400 more in Bob than in Linda (enough for a down payment on a house or relaxing vacations every year!). Bob also

may be more enthusiastic about his job because he has been more amply rewarded and may even be seen as more valuable to the department simply because the institution has invested more in him, even though their performance has been similar. Even if the salary differential is only \$1,000, the difference calculated over forty years, given 3.5 percent yearly raises, is a loss to the woman of \$84,550 (Haignere 1996).

Research indicates that gender plays a role at each stage of the negotiation process that is detrimental to women. The extent and success of negotiating academic salaries depend on four steps:

- The applicant's pay expectations.
- The initial salary offered by the institution.
- Whether or not a counteroffer is made by the applicant.
- The final salary agreed upon by the applicant and the institution.

First, women tend to have lower pay expectations than do men, regardless of occupational field (Jackson et al. 1992; Major and Konar 1984). Lower salaries emerge as one consequence of lower salary expectations. For instance, applicants who conveyed lower pay expectations in one laboratory study were offered less pay than equally qualified applicants who had higher pay expectations (Major et al. 1984a). Thus, women's lower pay expectations may partly influence the second step of the negotiation, the initial salary offer.

Second, research shows that the initial salary offer given by the institution's representative (usually a White man) has a strong impact on the final outcome of negotiation (i.e., higher initial offers are associated with higher final offers). The evidence is also clear that men (particularly White men) receive better initial offers for both commercial negotiations and salary discussions than do women. In a study of car sales, Ayers (1991) found significant differences in the initial offers made by sales associates based on the buyer's gender and race. White men received lower initial price quotes than did White women and minority women and men. Experimental simulations of various retail buyer-seller interactions confirm that men procure lower prices and higher profits than do women (Neu et al. 1988). Similarly, men obtain better initial salary offers in both laboratory and field studies. Male prospects who were hypothetical job applicants were assigned higher starting salaries by research participants than were female prospects, even when they had the same qualifications and pay expectations (Major et al. 1984b). The finding of higher initial salary offers to men also held true in an investigation of the actual experiences of recent MBA graduates, who were surveyed about the outcomes of their wage discussions with employers (Gerhart and Rynes 1991).

An applicant's gender may also affect whether she or he makes one or more counteroffers during the third step of a salary negotiation and what tactics are used to negotiate. Women may have less knowledge or skill at negotiation than men. In a hypothetical salary negotiation, men college students were found to use significantly more active tactics (e.g., ask for a larger salary than

that offered), whereas women were significantly more indirect in their self-promotion tactics (e.g., emphasize their motivation to work hard; Kaman and Hartel 1990). When confronted with a competitive negotiator, women MBAs in a simulated salary negotiation were less likely than men either to match this style or to use diverse negotiation tactics (Renard 1992). In one of the few studies to examine salary negotiation directly, Gerhart and Rynes (1991) found that 56 percent of the MBA students who negotiated for larger salaries received increases from \$1,000 to \$7,000. Although men and women showed the same proclivity to initiate salary negotiations, men received \$742 more, on average, for their efforts. Propensity to negotiate also depends on the attractiveness of the offer and other options available to the applicant. If women are offered less initially, the offer may be viewed as less attractive and they may be less likely to bargain (Bacharach and Lawler 1981; Chamberlain 1955). In addition, applicants who have alternative job offers will have more bargaining power and will be more likely to negotiate (Mannix et al. 1989). Thus, a woman's skill at negotiating is not the only determinant of whether she will bargain or obtain outcomes equal to men.

The persistent wage gap between women and men in academic salaries indicates that men obtain better final salary offers at the last stage of negotiation. This difference cannot be explained solely by individual differences in ability, education, or training. Academic women's salaries lag significantly behind men's even when academic rank, type of institution, and experience are taken into account (NCES 1993). Gender stereotyping also results in the differential valuation of women and men by male supervisors with respect to vocationally relevant characteristics (Rosen and Jerdee 1978). Beliefs that women are willing to work for less pay or deserve less pay than men also remain common among administrators and supervisors (Rynes et al. 1985). Possible negotiator bias as expressed in the form of final salary offers, then, is one of the likely barriers to successful salary negotiation for women.

The first empirical study of negotiation in academe (Danner 1996) illustrates how the four steps just described operated for a national faculty sample of sociology PhDs in their first academic job. Women expected significantly lower salaries than men, initially were offered less, and were given final offers lower than those reported by men, congruent with previous research. Contrary to earlier findings, women were significantly more likely to initiate negotiations than were men. When women did not bargain, it was usually because they had been told that a higher salary simply was not possible. The major reason men did not initiate negotiations was because they were offered a salary equal to or exceeding their expectations. Despite the disparity in salary offers, it paid for both women and men to negotiate. About 92 percent of those who made a specific salary counteroffer won a salary higher than that offered initially.

In sum, the evidence concerning gender and salary negotiation indicates that women are underbenefited in terms of salary in a variety of occupations, including academe. It appears that women have little control over some aspects

of the salary negotiation, such as negotiator bias with regard to the initial and final salary offer, but that high pay expectations and the use of diverse negotiating tactics translate into higher salaries for women. These results suggest that, even in adverse circumstances, women faculty may be able to improve salary negotiation outcomes by pursuing two goals: (1) developing high pay expectations and (2) planning a negotiation strategy.

Pay expectations

It is problematic enough for women faculty that administrators may give them lower initial and final salary offers than they do men, but research on gender and perceived pay entitlement indicates that women may also undervalue themselves. It has been shown that women pay themselves less than men do when asked to determine their own pay for work done in an experimental task. In one study, women and men undergraduates worked alone on a task for about an hour and were told to compensate themselves. On average, women took \$2 for their work, whereas men took \$3 (Major et al. 1984). Even in situations where women have outperformed a coworker, they have been found to allocate less pay to themselves (e.g., Major 1994). Research done on actual full-time workers confirms the laboratory findings, with women reporting that they deserve less pay for the jobs they held than did men (Desmarais and Curtis 1997). In addition, women have been found to work more efficiently and longer than men when paid the same amount for performing a task. For example, when women and men undergraduates were given an equal wage and told to work as long as they wished on a routine task, women accomplished more in the same time period, made fewer errors, and worked 30 percent longer than men who performed the same task (Major et al. 1984).

Part of the explanation for gender differences in pay expectations pertains to lack of information about or gender differences in available social comparison standards. At least three types of social comparisons may operate, including comparing one's current salary with male peers, female peers, or with one's own recent pay experience. First, research indicates that when women lack knowledge about male peers' earnings, they tend to have lower pay expectations (Bylsma and Major 1992). Conversely, when women receive comparison information about men's earnings, they expect to be paid equally. The first author's experience as a career consultant to women faculty at several universities suggests that many women scholars are not aware of what male peers earn. Junior women faculty typically assume that their salaries are comparable to men peers and not seek verification. Senior women faculty may not want to know peers' wages because they fear being demoralized if inequities are discovered. Not every woman knows where to look for information, either. Some are not aware that public colleges and universities make all salaries available to the public, usually through a listing obtainable at the reference desk of the campus library. Others are unfamiliar with salary scales that are regularly published by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the AAUP.

Comparative salary information and career support may also be lacking for women who are excluded from mentoring relationships and networks with senior men. For instance, Dreher and Cox (1996) reported that MBA graduates who had established a mentoring relationship with White men earned an average of \$16,840 more than those with other mentors. However, White women and African-American and Hispanic MBAs of both genders were significantly less likely than White men to form such relationships. Thus, women may not have or seek enough information concerning male peers' salaries to allow them to negotiate effectively.

Social comparisons with female peers' salaries may be another source of women's low pay expectations. Women may be more familiar with women colleagues' salaries via informal same-sex networks. If women colleagues are also underpaid, this comparison will not reveal the top of the scale for salaries at a similar rank. Furthermore, women's pay expectations have been shown in at least one study to depend upon whether a female or male comparison group was chosen. Women in high prestige jobs were asked by Zanna et al. (1987) to indicate what they earned and to name what peers they used when making salary comparisons. Results indicated that women whose comparison group was predominantly men earned more than women whose comparison group was mixed gender or predominantly women.

One's previous pay experience has also been shown to affect pay expectations. For instance, using undergraduate students, Desmarais and Curtis (1997) demonstrated that both women and men who had higher previous income levels for their most recent job paid themselves more for completing an experimental task than did others. These results suggest that the more one earns, the more one will expect to earn. Conversely, being lower on the pay scale, as is the case for most women faculty, is likely to reduce one's initial pay expectations.

How might women faculty raise their pay expectations, then, given that low salary expectations may be internalized? We propose four strategies. First, women need to seek comparative salary information quite assiduously; in other words, you need to "do your homework." Fortunately, doing research represents an important component of our training as academics. If you are a graduate student, start preparing for the job search by learning as much as you can about the salaries of faculty at your own and comparable institutions. If you are already in a faculty position at a public institution, check regularly on peers' salaries in the library. Research indicates that the wage gap between women and men faculty is largest at private, elite institutions, where it is also most difficult to obtain information about salaries (e.g., Szafran 1984). Therefore, if you are at a private institution, you may have to rely on salary norms published annually in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* or talk about salary to peers at other universities or in similarly ranked departments at your institution. Evaluate where you stand in terms of these markers.

Second, seek multiple opinions concerning what is possible in salary negotiations as well as what is likely or usual. Do not trust any one person's opinion. The person with whom you typically negotiate (e.g., your department

chair or dean) may not always be the most reliable source of information concerning what you deserve or what is possible. If he or she has offered your peers a higher entry level salary or a larger raise, he or she may justify having given you a poor bargain by impugning your performance. Because it is widely believed that academe is a meritocracy, you may also regard a below-scale salary or raise as objectively reflecting poorer quality work on your part. Verify any information concerning your salary and performance using several independent sources. Develop a network outside of your department to corroborate opinions. Women's Studies programs are often a critical source of comparative data for women faculty. It is important not to rely solely on departmental colleagues as your knowledge base because myths about what is possible sometimes get solidified within departments. For example, one of us was told by colleagues, including the department chair, that no raise was likely to accompany a promotion but was able to obtain one when negotiating directly with the dean.

Third, develop connections that will help you raise your pay expectations and improve your negotiating skill. Seek out colleagues whom you trust who have also been effective at building their careers in ways you find commendable. A colleague who is a good strategist is one who is able to answer the question "Under what conditions have exceptions to this rule, policy, or practice been made?" Conversely, a colleague who insists that "nothing can be done" to improve your salary or job conditions will not be that helpful to you. Select individuals who have high pay expectations for women, and be aware that even very high-achieving women sometimes underrate themselves or other women. For example, one of our colleagues, an extremely able woman negotiator, who had recently achieved an objective very much desired by the university, had also received another job offer at a prestigious university. She was at a point where her current dean was going to make a counteroffer. She called a friend to discuss the salary figure that would be needed to keep her, one she perceived to be extremely high. Others had told her the amount was more than she could realistically expect to get. Her friend suggested that she raise her target by at least \$5,000, based on what she knew men faculty more senior to but with less responsibility than the woman were earning, even though the figure sounded high to her, as well. The woman got the money she requested as well as many other concessions, and the university got her to stay. This example demonstrates that women faculty need to learn what is "outlandish" in terms of salary, due to internalized low pay expectations, as opposed to being truly beyond market price.

In summary, women faculty with low pay expectations may need to counteract them strongly by using several strategies to raise their aspirations. By educating yourself about faculty salaries, you will develop more confidence in what you might be able to achieve.

Planning a negotiation strategy

Part of planning a specific negotiation strategy requires that you know your personal wants and professional needs, as well as how congruent these are with

the mission of the institution you hope to join or are at already. This means that you should make an honest assessment of your skills, accomplishments, and potential. Every negotiator must be able to give something that is wanted by the other party. Faculty either must be able to do the job the institution perceives it needs done, or convince the other negotiator that the skills the faculty member offers are what the institution wants.

Your personal goals will help guide you in making choices about what to negotiate for and how to pursue an appropriate strategy. If you are at the job search stage, identify your personal preferences regarding the type of institution you hope to join. Teaching or research? Small or large? Geographic location? City size? Type of student body? In combination with a realistic assessment of your skills, accomplishments, and potential, the answers to these questions reveal a realistic indication of your power in negotiating during the hiring process. For example, limitations on moving due to personal or partner preference or family responsibilities will restrict one's personal job market. However, casting a narrow net and applying for positions in specific geographic regions mean that a woman will not get or be able to use another job offer to increase her bargaining power at her first-choice institution.

Assessing your situation differs to some extent for graduate students who are going on the job market versus established faculty. A tight academic job market exists in nearly every discipline. Many institutions replace retiring faculty with part-time or temporary hires, and tenure is under attack in many states. In addition to acquiring a thorough understanding of their discipline, graduate students must prepare early to position themselves as viable candidates. Job ads increasingly request some teaching experience and at least one research publication for even entry-level positions. Do your very best to get these while a student. Also, make certain that you attend professional association meetings, present your research there, meet students and faculty at other institutions, investigate the employment exchange room, and volunteer to serve on a committee. Your goal in these activities is to begin to earn recognition for yourself and develop relationships that can provide valuable information and contacts. Be aware that as a woman you may need more credentials than a man to compete effectively for the same job.

Planning for tenured senior faculty also necessitates an assessment of how one's talents fit the institution's mission, how one is progressing toward promotion to full professor or toward other professional goals, and one's likely marketability. Because senior faculty cost more to hire, few jobs are advertised at the senior level, and the competition for them is quite stiff. The average tenured faculty may not have much chance of getting a job elsewhere, and this will limit her bargaining power with administrators. A woman's personal life (e.g., spouse employed, children in school) more so than a man's may be seen by administrators as reducing the likelihood that she would seriously consider leaving. Senior women who seek to negotiate a better contract at their current institution must confront the assumption that they will not really leave if their requests are not met. If you are tenured and not marketable or not planning on

moving, one of the most effective ways to increase your salary is to assume administrative responsibilities (e.g., Lewis 1975). On the other hand, if you are a highly successful scholar who wishes to promote her research career, seriously applying for jobs may help you to find a better one or use a job offer at another institution to improve your current situation.

Knowing what to negotiate for is equally important. We emphasize base salary because salary is forever. However, there are numerous things you may need – not want, but need – to do the job the institution wants you to do. These will be discussed more fully in the next section on the negotiation process.

Thus, planning a negotiation strategy begins first with knowing what you want and need and knowing the institution with which you're dealing. Both require thoughtful consideration and extensive research before any initial offer is received or sought. Once you have identified your goals as described above, you are ready to move on to planning the actual negotiation strategy.

Planning the negotiation strategy itself requires that you carefully analyze the total situation and the goals on which you have decided in light of three tightly interrelated variables: power, information, and time (Cohen 1980). It is also important to realize that a negotiation is a process, not a single event, that involves all three in concert.

Power

Power is defined as the capacity or ability to get things done; to influence others to think or do what you would like them to do; or to exercise control over people, events, situations, or oneself. The concept of power sometimes has a negative connotation to women, particularly the notion of having coercive power over someone. However, power also has many positive aspects that are important to keep in mind (e.g., power is required to implement one's goals and facilitate one's own and others' development). Several types of power that are relevant to negotiating will be discussed below, including self-confidence and persistence; expert power; and the power of investment, identification, and formal procedures.

Self-confidence, or the perception of one's own power, will enhance your power in any negotiation. Granted, it is not easy to perceive yourself as personally powerful if you have been discriminated against, disregarded, or otherwise treated badly. The cumulative effect of a hostile environment cannot be ignored as a factor that affects the self-esteem and career confidence of women graduate students and faculty. If you feel demoralized or inadequate in your role as a professional, you may need to obtain a considerable amount of support in order to present yourself in a positive and self-confident manner. Women have reported finding this kind of support through role playing, creative visualization, feminist support networks and professional organizations, and therapy. Presenting yourself in a positive way requires that you honestly appraise how you come across to others through a process of self-examination,

seeking feedback from supportive others, and getting the help you need to build self-confidence.

A self-defeating self-presentation that has been observed among some women job candidates by one of the authors is when the candidate's first move is to enumerate her weakness for the current position. The strategy was used by a candidate who had numerous recent publications and a considerable amount of federal funding for her work. Early in her interview with various individual faculty, the candidate stated that she knew she hadn't published as much as she should have in the past few years. By framing her performance in a negative light, the candidate provided a "lens" for the review of her work that was to her detriment. It is a much better idea to focus on your strengths in any negotiation and leave the responsibility for finding your supposed weaknesses to the other side.

It is also wise in terms of projecting self-confidence to review your probable limitations for the position for which you are applying and consider ways they may be either deemphasized or turned into a source of power and strength. Do not leave it solely to your interviewers or colleagues to determine your contribution. You are a major player in influencing how your work is viewed. For instance, perhaps your publication record is not up to competitive standards in terms of quantity. It is important, then, to provide information about the high quality of your work, such as including rejection rates of journals in which you publish, the ranking of journals or presses in which your work appears, or citation counts or favorable reviews of your publications. Or perhaps you have published less because you do time-consuming field research instead of laboratory studies. You may want to point out that recent trends in your area indicate that field research is the "cutting edge." Always be prepared to educate your colleagues about your contribution. Few faculty have time to read much outside their own area, so it is important not to assume they know a lot more about what you're doing than what you tell them.

An aspect of power that is related to self-confidence is persistence. According to Cohen (1980: 83), "Most people aren't persistent enough when negotiating." This may apply especially to women. For instance, some of the women faculty in Danner's (1996) research did not bargain because they were told that the offer they had been given was nonnegotiable. However, other research has shown that individuals who bargained for salary increases in response to a nonnegotiable offer generally obtained a higher final offer (Gerhart and Rynes 1991). Persistence also refers to holding one's position over time. Be prepared to make a case on your own behalf more than once, perhaps even over a period of years. The "squeaky wheel" strategy works. Most people who may find it easy to say No once or even several times may find it difficult to do so continually and may eventually grant some concessions.

A second type of power that is highly valued in academe is expert power. Presumably, an outstanding or solid scholarly reputation will be justly rewarded by your institution. Expert power is likely to provide one of your strongest power bases; however, it does not automatically translate into better job

conditions for women faculty, who often work harder and longer than men to get the salary and recognition they deserve for comparable work. For instance, Wenneras and Wold (1997) found that reviewers for postdoctoral fellowships in biomedicine in Sweden had consistently given female applicants lower scores than equally productive men. The researchers reported that, in some cases, the women applicants would have had to publish three extra papers in top-tier journals or twenty extra papers in less prestigious journals to be ranked the same as the male applicants. Likewise, research on admissions to the National Academy of Sciences indicated that, on average, women were admitted nine years later than men, even though the research that led to their election did not appear to be done any later (Zuckerman and Cole 1975).

With these caveats in mind, expert power as reflected by your competitive standing in the job market still provides one of the major bargaining points in an academic salary negotiation. Having other institutions interested in hiring you provides verification of your credentials. Although you are in the strongest position to negotiate when you have another job offer in hand, some faculty have used the job application process effectively to negotiate at earlier stages. For example, one woman, Jane, had received a job offer at one university and was deliberating over whether to accept it. In the meantime, she had been called for an interview by another institution. She used the second institution's interest in her to raise her counteroffer to the first school, and successfully negotiated a higher salary and better terms of employment than had been offered.

The investment that the institution and specific individuals have made in you is another source of power. In any hiring situation, the department and university will have spent a considerable amount of time and money to consider you for a position before offering you the job. After such an investment, most of the people running the job search may prefer not to start over with a new candidate and will probably try quite hard to meet reasonable requests (e.g., extend the deadline for considering the contract, provide additional resources). If you are a senior faculty member, administrators will be looking for evidence that they have gotten a good return on their investment from you before being willing to invest more. Develop ways to educate relevant administrators about what you have accomplished. For example, you might send a note to your department chair, dean, or chair of the funding committee about an article or book you wrote or got published during a leave or summer fellowship funded by your institution. Keeping a few key people informed of your successes will also make it easier to approach them later if you need allies when seeking a promotion, raise, grant, sabbatical, or whatever. The more familiar they are with your work, the more effectively they will be able to advocate for you.

Others' identification with you is yet another source of power that influences the negotiation process. This power base may be less available for women faculty to use than men with regard to superiors, who also are likely to be male. Research indicates that women are often excluded from informal networks and protégé relationships in the professions (e.g., Clark and Corcoran 1986; Dreher and Cox 1996; Zuckerman et al. 1991). Dreher and Cox (1996)

have pointed out that individual characteristics such as race and gender are of considerable importance in understanding how existing opportunity structures work. Sexual orientation and class background might be added to this list, as well. Opportunity structures are influenced by these characteristics because influential decision makers (who are mostly White men) are more likely to form close relationships with individuals who are similar to themselves (other White men; Dreher and Cox 1996). Thus, White men will have more access to and benefit more from relationships with powerful White men in academe than will White women, women or men of color, lesbians, women faculty from poor or working-class economic backgrounds, or someone with a combination of these identities (e.g., Gregory 1995; Tokarczyk and Fay 1993).

The way the power of identification with similar others may work to the detriment of women faculty may be illustrated with two actual case examples. The first case pertained to two women faculty hired by the same department in the same year, one White and one African-American. The older White men in the department identified more strongly with the White woman than with the African-American woman, who intimidated them by her outspokenness. The White woman was labeled the "star" of the two, even though both had graduated from prestigious institutions and had similar records. The department chair gave the White woman her preferred courses to teach, which were in her research area and involved little course preparation. Against department policy, the African-American woman was given an above-average course load and numerous new courses to prepare, none of which was in her research area. This problem was not corrected until higher administration became aware of it. Besides demonstrating race discrimination, this example shows that the identification of the White woman as "like us" worked in her favor, whereas the social distance between the African-American woman and the White male faculty made it easier for them to disregard her concerns. In a second case, a department chair (a White man) went to the dean (also a White man) to advocate successfully for a higher salary for a younger White male faculty member with whom he played golf. The younger man said he needed a raise because his wife had just had a baby. The department chair refused to advocate for a raise for the young man's similarly accomplished female colleague, who was the sole supporter of her husband and child at the time. In order to get a raise, she had to go on to the job market, obtain an invitation to interview, and bargain with the dean herself. It is reasonable to conclude that the older man's identification with the younger man's role as a provider played a part in his advocacy for the man, but was not a motivator in the woman's case.

Given that women faculty may have difficulty becoming "one of the boys," they may have to rely on power bases other than identification. Those who are ineligible for recruitment into the elite based on gender, race, sexual orientation, or class are in a position similar to that of a dissenting male scholar who has been judged not to fit in. According to Lewis (1975), such individuals will be left to make their own career; it is only in this case that the rule of publish or perish will be operative. Otherwise, there is little evidence that one's

publication record is tied to faculty rank or salaries (e.g., Doering 1972; Lewis 1975; Szafran 1984). The four possible outcomes for the dissenting scholar, then, are:

First, he [*sic*] may voluntarily leave the department. Second, if he fails to engage in any scholarly activity, he may be asked to leave, regardless of his skill in the classroom. Third, he may become an industrious scholar, put a minimum amount of effort into his teaching and other departmental responsibilities, and be harassed, or treated unfairly; eventually he may leave to maintain his self-respect. Fourth, he may become a productive scholar and a skilled teacher, and since his senior colleagues would be flagrantly violating academic norms by denying promotion or tenure, he can expect eventually to receive either or both.

(Lewis 1975: 41)

Although it has been more than twenty years since Lewis described these outcomes, they describe the options for many women faculty today very well. They also suggest that, because they lack identification power with the gatekeepers, women would do well to enhance their expert power as much as possible to achieve the fourth outcome.

Formal procedures constitute a last power base for women that will be discussed here. At times, women faculty have been forced to use grievances and legal remedies to maintain their rights. Because of the emotional and financial cost of such actions, it is preferable to negotiate using other strategies, if possible. It is also best to forgo using the threat of initiating a formal procedure when bargaining; to do so is likely to shut down the negotiation. However, to indicate that you are concerned about the "equity" or "fairness" of salary or contract decisions suggests that you see your rights as being violated and implies that you may pursue the matter further if not satisfied. Providing clear evidence of your performance in comparison with that of better-paid male (or White) colleagues could demonstrate that you have a strong case for a grievance or other action. Most savvy administrators will realize that it would be better to take care of your situation at this point rather than later. Grievance panels in faculty-administration disputes at most universities tend toward compromise, so if you go to the effort to conduct a grievance, there is a good chance you will get something you request. Due to the high personal cost of this strategy and possible (illegal) retaliation, it is recommended only as a last resort. It is also wise, when pursuing this option, to seek legal advice.

Time

Most people tend to think of the time frame of a negotiation as that period in which the actual bargaining takes place. In fact, the negotiation often involves a much longer process. If you are looking for a job, you may already have laid a series of connections by using your network to locate openings or influence

perceptions of your application. Once you are hired, you will have an ongoing relationship with many people with whom you will negotiate. This means that you and the other party may have considerable information about each other and a history with which you will have to contend. Your strategy should take this longer timeline into account. You also will need to know or should learn the formal and informal deadlines for making requests, so as to time your actions appropriately. Asking for a raise after all the funds have been distributed is not likely to yield the outcome you desire and will make you appear naive. Keep in mind that you may need to develop a strategy that involves repeated contacts over several years to get your desired goals. Finally, recognize that time may require you to change your strategy, because circumstances change with time. Keep an open mind and be flexible.

Information

The information you gather before the formal negotiation itself will be crucial to the outcome you achieve. Most of the information you will need will have to be obtained by word of mouth from your network. Thus, the benefits of developing a university-wide and national network cannot be overestimated. Several types of information you will need to be a successful negotiator have already been described in the earlier discussion on pay expectations, including learning peers' salaries at your own and comparable institutions, what exceptions there have been, and under what circumstances they were granted. Two types of information that have been useful to the authors in addition to those described earlier include information about precedence and about the other party's or institution's needs. First, finding there has been a precedent for a specific action has helped a number of women known to one author to obtain maternity leaves or have the tenure clock stopped. In one instance, a woman was told by her department chair that, because there was no official maternity leave policy, she would have to teach that semester. When the woman learned that someone else in another department had been granted an unofficial maternity leave by the chair, she went to the dean to negotiate a similar leave for herself. In another case, a woman who had two children in the years before the tenure decision (and no maternity leave) was given a negative tenure vote by her department. When she established that a precedent had been set for other women in some departments to stop the tenure clock during a maternity leave, she was able retroactively to receive a two-year stop in the tenure clock. Two years later, she obtained tenure.

Second, having information about the other party's needs may be invaluable in a negotiation. For example, one woman colleague who was negotiating with a chancellor to retain funding for an endowed professorship had heard immediately prior to the meeting that the chancellor had endorsed a new research initiative for the university aimed at getting more federal funding. The woman was able to argue successfully with the chancellor to keep the endowed professorship funding at a high level based on the argument that cuts would make

it difficult to attract faculty who had federal funding for the position, subsequently jeopardizing the chancellor's goals.

In summary, planning the negotiation requires that you identify your personal and professional goals and incorporate them into a strategy that uses your strongest power bases and the information you have gathered over a period of time to achieve your goals. In the next section, the tactics that can be used to implement your strategy will be explained.

The negotiation process

The process of coming to agreement about salary and other terms of the academic contract is often correctly described as a game. Some tactics that may be used in playing the negotiating game will be described below using: (1) case studies, (2) examples of items that have been negotiated successfully by women faculty, and (3) a step-by-step description of the negotiation process.

Case studies

The two case studies in Box 3.1 provide a more in-depth picture of how the actual bargaining session is conducted. The two cases chosen show how the process occurred for actual women faculty, one at the hiring stage of her career, and one negotiating for a raise at the senior level. In case study 1, Susan was able to achieve a successful negotiation by using several strategies. First, because the offer was given late in the season, the timing of the negotiation was in her favor. Other candidates for the position might have taken other offers, making her bargaining position more favorable. Second, the institution had already shown its willingness to make an investment in her, so it was only a small step for the dean to take to make increases in the investment in order to secure a top-ranked candidate. Third, the example illustrates that the dean was prepared to negotiate even though he described the offer as nonnegotiable. Lastly, Susan's enthusiasm conveyed that she was likely to accept the position if her offer was met.

Box 3.1 The bargaining process: two case studies

Case study 1

Susan was offered a tenure-track assistant professor position following her interview at a nationally recognized PhD program. The dean told Susan that the \$35,000 salary was at the high end of the range and that it, and the \$500 moving expenses allowance, were nonnegotiable. She was given ten days to think about it. Although she wanted the job very much and thought that the offer was a fair one, Susan's mentor encouraged her to make a counteroffer. He explained to her that it would cost

her nothing, that the hiring institution had very few women faculty in the program, and that it was already mid-March. He also reminded her that she was a good candidate with some teaching and research experience. (During graduate school, Susan had worked on her mentor's grant, which had produced two minor coauthored publications, and had taught two introductory courses. Although "all but dissertation," or "ABD," she would finish the dissertation before starting the faculty job.)

Susan took her mentor's advice and, after ten days, asked for a salary of \$37,000 and moving expenses of \$1,500. Also, for the first time, she requested specific computer hardware and software, graduate faculty status, and guaranteed summer teaching. In making the requests, Susan followed her mentor's advice and emphasized her experience, her research agenda, and her excitement at coming to the program and working with graduate students. The dean countered with a salary of \$36,500 and moving expenses of \$1,000, all the computer equipment requested, and graduate faculty status. He said Susan would probably be able to teach in the summer but was unable to guarantee it. The dean was cordial throughout the negotiations and never reminded Susan that he had earlier said that his offer was not negotiable. Susan accepted the offer.

Case study 2

Ruth had been at her institution for about fifteen years and had just been promoted to full professor. As is typical in the case of many senior faculty, salary inversion had resulted in her salary being close to the level of that of many newly hired faculty. This occurs when merit raises for established faculty fail to keep pace with the salaries for new hires, which must be at market level in order to be competitive. Ruth's reputation as a feminist activist had also done little to endear her to the department chair. Thus, even though Ruth's publication record was similar to male peers', her salary had fallen well below theirs. Ruth planned to request a "salary adjustment" from the dean once she obtained final confirmation of her promotion. If she did not receive her requested increase, she planned to file a grievance.

Ruth first approached her chair with a list of faculty salaries (obtained from the library) for faculty at similar rank in the social sciences to demonstrate that a considerable increase would be required to bring her salary into line. Ruth named \$58,000 as her target figure for the following year, an amount \$2,000 over what her most immediate male peer would earn. The chair sent her to the dean to negotiate, but did not offer to accompany her. The dean said he would not discuss salary until the following month. Ruth made her points concerning her performance and the issue of equity anyway. She also gave the salary data to the director of another program on campus of which she was a faculty member, and

asked that person to advocate for her as well. In the meantime, the chair told Ruth that she would "never get" the figure she had requested.

A month later, Ruth again met with the dean. She reviewed her performance, using her recent promotion to indicate that her work was nationally recognized. She also let the dean know that she was aware that a faculty grievance by a colleague who was less productive than herself had been settled in the colleague's favor. The dean offered to increase her salary over a three-year period. Ruth had calculated an amount three years hence that would place her \$2,000 ahead of her most immediate peer and named that as her target figure. Several offers and counteroffers were made, and Ruth accepted as the final offer a salary that would place her \$1,000 above her target goal.

The situation for Ruth as a senior faculty in case study 2 was quite different. Ruth had a considerable amount of information about how the dean had operated in the past and what other faculty earned. She planned her raise strategy to correspond with a promotion and linked her request to a pay equity issue rather than using a strictly merit raise approach. Knowing that she had little support from the department chair, Ruth found another ally for her cause in the director of another program on campus of which she was a faculty member. Ruth also refused to let the chair's pessimism about an increase affect her target salary figure. The fact that the dean met twice with Ruth and once with both the chair and director about Ruth's salary may have worked in her favor by increasing the time investment the dean had made in her. Ruth was also able to convey the seriousness of her intent by mentioning her peer's salary grievance, thereby implying she might consider other avenues if her request was not met. However, throughout the negotiation, Ruth maintained an upbeat, professional attitude about herself and the university that seemed to be appreciated by the dean.

The two case studies demonstrate that each negotiation is unique and may involve quite different goals and tactics. No one formula may be applied to every negotiation.

Negotiable items in an academic contract

Once you have identified your personal and professional goals, you must translate these into specific requests in the negotiation. Although base salary is the most important negotiation, there are many hidden expenses involved in living the academic life that may become part of the negotiation process. Other forms of financial compensation and personal satisfaction may come in the form of other benefits you may be able to negotiate. Ask yourself what you need from the institution in order to fulfill your professional goals, and then consider what you need to fulfill the institution's goals for you. Laboratory

space? Few service requirements? Computer equipment? We have compiled a list of things below that you may be able to negotiate for in addition to base salary. The negotiation for these items should occur after you have been offered the job. Everything you request above the initial offer made to you should be justified in terms of getting the job done that the institution wants you to do. All of the items listed below were obtained by assistant professors in actual negotiations, though not all for the same job.

- Base salary increases (most important).
- Moving expenses.
- Higher rank.
- Office specifications (e.g., window, central location, size).
- Startup money for research (e.g., cost of laboratory or equipment).
- Research space.
- Graduate or undergraduate student assistants.
- Summer supplements for teaching or research.
- Computer equipment, including software and printer.
- Conference and/or research travel expenses.
- Reduced teaching load, at least during first or second year.
- Agreement to repeat courses annually to reduce number of new course preparations.
- Two-day-per-week teaching schedule.
- Reduced service expectations (but be cautious).
- Spousal or partner hire.
- Time toward tenure reduced.

If it is your first job, realistically appraise the contradictions inherent in the items above, especially those surrounding teaching and service. Although your institution may privilege solitary research, remember that first impressions matter. For example, new faculty who are frequently in the office are seen by faculty and students and able to develop relationships and reputations. Likewise, service on committees demonstrates one's competence and citizenship.

At the senior level, negotiations can be quite complex. If you are being considered for another job or have been offered another job, and your current institution is eager to keep you, you may be able to bargain for a number of additional benefits that may be limited only by your creativity. Some actual benefits that have been obtained by various senior faculty in this situation are listed below:

- A considerable salary increase.
- Promotion from associate to full professor.
- Ample funding for startup of research program or laboratory.
- Funds to build a program(s), including other faculty positions.
- Postdoctoral fellow positions for research program.
- Funding or fellowships for graduate students.
- Funding for colloquium series.

- Space for self and research staff.
- Resources for journal editorship role.
- New building or reconfiguration of current space.
- Journal subscriptions or other library resources.

Once you have decided on what possible items you might want, prioritize your list into two or three categories, including what items are essential to you, which are moderately important, and which are your “dream list.” Now you are prepared to negotiate using the steps below.

Steps in the negotiation process

After you have done the preparation described in this chapter, you should be ready to proceed with implementing your strategy in the actual bargaining session. Below, we suggest some general rules and steps in the negotiation process, and we provide a cautionary note to accompany them. Every situation is different. You may break nearly every rule and still be very successful, though that would be the exceptional case. Perhaps the most important rules are to be reasonably flexible and most gracious. Flexibility demonstrates your interest in serving the institution as well as yourself. A professional attitude assures that good feelings about you will persist despite the outcome. Academe is a very small community and one in which you need to maintain an excellent reputation. Unfortunately, many women (and men) encounter negotiators who are neither flexible nor gracious. In those cases, if you are in the hiring process, we suggest viewing this as an important insight into the nature of the administrator and institution and the likely conditions of work.

- *Set goals.* Set a high explicit goal for the negotiation based on your homework. Be sure this goal is high enough; do not underestimate yourself. The goal should be higher than the minimum you are prepared to accept.
- *Conduct the negotiation in person,* if possible. In the hiring process, telephone negotiations are common, but it is generally recommended that negotiations be conducted in person even if they involve more expense (Cohen 1980). Face-to-face interactions are less likely to result in misunderstandings, are more informal, more collaborative, longer, and make it harder to say No. If the negotiation must take place over the telephone, you are in the best position if you plan the call carefully beforehand and are the caller, not the one called.
- *Let the other party name the first figure.* The first dollar amount mentioned sets either the floor or the ceiling for future negotiations. In hiring situations, the institution sets a salary range for a particular position, and it behoves the candidate to find out what the range is early on. This should be done as discreetly as possible. Some shrewd negotiators may attempt to pressure the candidate to name “what it will take to get you here” during the interview process before even offering her the job, especially if they

perceive the candidate to be uncomfortable with negotiating. Immediate agreement with your named salary is likely to indicate that the administrator was playing a game and has won. We have heard many stories like this. Indeed, one of the authors had this experience. She politely refused to name a figure by asking about the salary range and stated that she had not yet learned the local cost of living, tax structure, or other benefits. The administrator persisted in asking her. After four rounds of this, and clearly exasperated, he named the figure that was her actual expected salary. She feigned disappointment and stated that it was below her expectations.

Resist the pressure to name a figure first, particularly in a hiring situation where you may have little knowledge about the salary structure. Instead, wait to begin negotiations until you are offered a specific job at a stated salary. Then counter the offer with a higher one, a full justification for why you are worth the extra money, and other items you need in order to do your job. The only exception to this rule generally occurs among more senior job candidates or current faculty who know exactly what it will take to get or keep them, know that the institution has paid comparable wages to peers, can justify their worth, and are prepared to stand firm.

- *Remember that almost everything is negotiable.* Nonnegotiable final offers, deadlines, and a host of other rules that have been legitimized by being put in writing or strongly asserted may nevertheless be negotiated under the “right” circumstances (Cohen 1980; Nierenberg 1981). For instance, one of the authors received a grant from her institution that specified in bold type that if the same proposal was funded elsewhere the funds must be returned to the institution. When she received funding from another source, she casually mentioned to a colleague that she was going to return the first grant award. She then learned that it was possible to negotiate to keep funds from the first grant if she had a “good reason,” despite the rule, and was successful in keeping part of the funding.
- *Be self-confident.* Convey the message that you will not back down on your negotiation position. Be confident that you are worth what you are requesting. Flexibility should only come into play when the negotiation seems to require it in order to keep it moving. At this point, be certain that the institution offers the same degree of flexibility as it requests of you.
- *Use persuasive arguments.* Use substantive arguments to persuade the other person to change her or his mind about an issue. For instance, perhaps you have not been the top-ranked faculty member in your department in terms of publications over the past few years, but you have consistently been publishing above the department mean for a number of years. You might argue that a greater than average raise is warranted in your case as recognition for “sustained superior contribution.” Emphasize all the skills you bring to the institution.
- *Exchange information.* Get information about the other person’s preferences on a specific issue, either by asking directly what issue is most important (“What consideration have you given to my two years’ postdoctoral

experience in your salary offer?" "To what extent have you taken my record of federal funding into account?") or by indirectly judging the other's reactions to your offers.

- *Approach the negotiation as a win-win event.* Assume that your gain will be beneficial to the other person, and, if possible, make this reasoning part of the negotiation process. For example, you might argue that it is advantageous for the university hiring you to pay you at the upper end of the assistant professor scale because you are already a seasoned teacher and researcher who will be able to pull her weight in the department immediately.
- *Tradeoff issues.* Be prepared to trade off issues that are lower in value to you for issues that have higher value. For instance, it may be wise to negotiate for a reduced teaching load rather than a guaranteed summer teaching appointment to increase your income, in order to provide more time for research in your schedule. Likewise, a higher salary is preferable to a better computer when the extant one will do.
- *Attention to time.* Two aspects of time are important. First, a new faculty's starting salary may well affect her for the rest of her career, especially once she is "tenured in" or otherwise place-bound. Indeed, this may be the most opportune time of one's career to negotiate salary, because new salaries frequently come from the university's budget line, whereas adjustments for current faculty often come from within departmental resources. In addition, the hiring institution may be willing to offer a good beginning salary in order to compete successfully with other universities. Moreover, recent graduates enter their first jobs with many positives; their graduate school success lies behind them and their potential before them. Current faculty have established and often complex reputations within their institutions and disciplines. Few people negotiate the terrain of academe, indeed of life itself, without ruffling a few feathers, including some that belong to influential administrators or scholars. Thus, current faculty may need to initiate salary negotiation in concert with some significant milestone, such as a promotion, a recent grant award or other type of scholarly recognition, and possibly even news of a salary grievance that has been settled in favor of someone in a position similar to yours.

Second, knowing the employer's timetable in a hiring situation and gracefully stretching it to its limits increases the institution's investment in a job candidate. Generally, faculty and administrators make job offers only to people they want and need, a decision they have come to following a lengthy and painstaking process that may not be completed until near the end of the academic year. Thus, ask for time to make your decisions regarding a job offer, and remember that even time can be negotiated.

In summary, successful negotiation requires that you utilize power, time, and information effectively within the context of the actual negotiating session, as described above.

Conclusion

It is important to realize that the effectiveness of your negotiation skill cannot be judged solely by the dollar outcome or additional benefits of the bargain you obtain. Women faculty experience serious salary inequities in academe, regardless of their performance. Research consistently indicates that discrimination is more severe at the later stages of women professors' careers than at the recruitment stage (i.e., recruitment equity is easier to obtain than rank or salary equity for women; Szafran 1984). These findings suggest that women faculty have their best chance to achieve equity during the hiring process and should carefully plan their negotiation strategy before the job search. They also indicate that senior women will be required to do some hard negotiating at later stages of their careers if they hope to reduce the gender salary gap by a significant amount. In other words, negotiation may not necessarily result in a "win" with you earning more than others; it may just keep you from falling as far behind as you might.

The positive aspects of negotiation for women extend far beyond the actual outcome of the deal, and it is these we wish to emphasize in this chapter. By accepting responsibility for what you can do to advance yourself, you are likely to feel more self-confident and satisfied with your job, as well as to obtain better outcomes for yourself. In addition, self-blame is likely to be reduced by the realization that your negotiating skill alone may not be sufficient to counteract sex discrimination. Finally, as women faculty become more aware that, as a group, they are disadvantaged in the salary process, we hope there will be a collaborative response to improve the situation for women as a whole on their campuses. One strategy is for women faculty to conduct their own faculty salary study. Lois Haignere (1996) successfully implemented such a strategy with twenty-nine New York State universities using a procedure described in *Pay Checks: A Guide to Achieving Salary Equity in Higher Education*. The result was a \$2 million settlement for women and minority faculty. Similar individual and collective efforts to challenge pay inequity should eventually strengthen women's position at the negotiating table.

Note

Reprinted with permission from *Arming Athena: Career Strategies for Women Academics*, edited by Lynn Collins, Kathryn Quina, and Joan Chrisler (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998).

References

- Ayers, I. (1991) "Fair driving: Gender and race discrimination in retail car negotiations," *Harvard Law Review*, 104: 817-72.
- Bacharach, S. B., and Lawler, E. J. (1981) *Bargaining*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Benjamin, L. (ed.) (1997) *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.

- Bylsma, W. H., and Major, B. (1992) "Two routes to eliminating gender differences in personal entitlement," *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16: 193-200.
- Caplan, P. (1993) *Lifting a Ton of Feathers: A Woman's Guide to Surviving in the Academic World*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press.
- Chamberlain, N. W. (1955) *A General Theory of Economic Progress*. New York: Harper.
- Clark, S. M., and Corcoran, M. (1986) "Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage?" *Journal of Higher Education*, 57: 20-43.
- Cohen, H. (1980) *You Can Negotiate Anything*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Danner, Mona J. E. (1996) Gender and the Process of Negotiating the Academic Contract. Unpublished research.
- Desmarais, S., and Curtis, J. (1997) "Gender and perceived pay entitlement: Testing for effects of experience with income," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72: 141-50.
- Doering, R. (1972) "Publish or perish: Book productivity and academic rank at twenty-six elite universities," *American Sociologist*, 7: 11-13.
- Dreher, G. F., and Cox, T. H., Jr. (1996) "Race, gender, and opportunity: A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 287-308.
- Frost, P. J., and Taylor, M. S. (1996) *Rhythms of Academic Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gerhart, B., and Rynes, S. (1991) "Determinants and consequences of salary negotiations by graduating male and female MBAs," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 256-62.
- Gregory, S. T. (1995) *Black Women in the Academy: The Secrets to Success*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Haignere, L. (1996) *Pay Checks: A Guide to Achieving Salary Equity in Higher Education*. Albany, NY: United University Professions, Local 2190.
- Heiberger, M. and Vick, J. M. (1996) *The Academic Job Search Handbook*, 2nd edn. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Jackson, L. A., Gardner, P. D., and Sullivan, L. A. (1992) "Explaining gender differences in self-pay expectations: Social comparison standards and perceptions of fair pay," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77: 651-63.
- Kaman, B. D., and Hartel, C. E. J. (1990) "Anticipating pay negotiation strategies and pay outcomes during recruitment: An exploration of gender differences." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, August.
- Karrass, C. L. (1992) *The Negotiating Game*. New York: Harper.
- Lewis, L. (1975) *Scaling the Ivory Tower*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Major, B. (1994) "From disadvantage to deserving: Comparisons, justifications and the psychology of entitlement," in M. P. Zanna (ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 26. New York: Academic Press, 293-355.
- Major, B., and Konar, E. (1984) "An investigation of sex differences in pay expectations and their possible causes," *Academy of Management Journal*, 27: 777-92.
- Major, B., McFarlin, D., and Gagnon, D. (1984a) "Overworked and underpaid: On the nature of gender differences in personal entitlement," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47: 1399-412.

- Major, B., Vanderslice, B., and McFarlin, D. B. (1984b) "Effects of pay expected on pay received: The confirmatory nature of initial expectations," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 14: 399-412.
- Mannix, E. A., Thompson, L. L., and Bazerman, M. H. (1989) "Negotiation in small groups," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 508-17.
- NCES (1993) *Salaries of Full-time Instructional Faculty on Nine- and Ten-month Contracts in Institutions of Higher Education, 1982-1983 through 1992-1993*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- NCES (National Center for Education Statistics) (1996) *Salaries of Full-time Instructional Faculty, 1994-1995*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Neu, J., Graham, J., and Gilly, M. (1988) "The influence of gender on behaviors and outcomes in a retail buyer-seller negotiation simulation," *Journal of Retailing*, 64: 427-51.
- Nierenberg, G. I. (1981) *The Art of Negotiating*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Renard, M. K. (1992) *Salary Negotiations and the Male-Female Wage Gap*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Rose, S. (ed.) (1986) *Career Guide for Women Scholars*. New York: Springer.
- Rosen, B., and Jerdee, T. H. (1978) "Perceived sex differences in managerially relevant characteristics," *Sex Roles*, 4: 837-43.
- Rynes, S. L., Rosen, B., and Mahoney, T. A. (1985) "Evaluating comparable worth: Three perspectives," *Business Horizons*, 28: 82-86.
- Sax, L., Astin, A. W., Arrendondo, M., and Korn, W. S. (1996) *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1996-1996 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Stevens, C. K., Bavetta, A. G., and Gist, M. E. (1993) "Gender differences in the acquisition of salary negotiation skills: The role of goals, self-efficacy, and perceived control," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78: 723-35.
- Szafran, R. F. (1984) *Universities and Women Faculty: Why some Organizations Discriminate more than Others*. New York: Praeger.
- Tierney, W. G., and Bensimon, E. M. (1996) *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tokarczyk, M. M., and Fay, E. A. (eds) (1993) *Working Class Women in the Academy: Laborers in the Knowledge Factory*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Weingart, L., Hyder, E. B., and Prietula, M. J. (1996) "Knowledge matters: The effect of tactical descriptions on negotiation behavior and outcome," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70: 1205-17.
- Wenneras, C., and Wold, A. (1997) "Nepotism and sexism in peer-review," *Nature*, 387 (6631), 341-43, May 22.
- Zanna, M. P., Crosby, F., and Lowenstein, G. (1987) "Male reference groups and discontent among female professionals," in B. Gutek and L. Larwood (eds) *Women's Career Development*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 28-41.
- Zuckerman, H., and Cole, J. R. (1975) "Women in American science," *Minerva*, 13: 82-102.
- Zuckerman, H., Cole, J. R., and Bruer, J. T. (eds) (1991) *The Outer Circle: Women in the Scientific Community*. New York: Norton.