

**50** YEARS  
WOMEN | MBA

• Hannah Riley Bowles & Laura J. Kray  
• Negotiation is a Man's Game

• Research Symposium

# GENDER & WORK:

CHALLENGING CONVENTIONAL WISDOM

DIFFERENCE

GENDER & WORK

# NEGOTIATION IS A MAN'S GAME:

## Ultimate Truth or Enduring Myth?

Hannah Riley Bowles

· Kennedy School of Government  
· Harvard University

Laura J. Kray

· Haas School of Business  
· University of California, Berkeley

### Negotiation as a “Battle of the Sexes”

Over 15 years ago, researchers asked MBA students enrolled in a negotiation course, “Who has the distributive advantage in negotiations—men or women?” The overwhelming answer was “men.” The most commonly cited reason—that men do not want to lose to women—revealed a lay conceptualization of negotiation as a battle of the sexes, or at least a tug-of-war, with masculinity on the line. Other common responses reinforced the stereotypic link between masculinity and negotiation performance. Men’s presumed advantage was perceived to derive from their aggressiveness, strength, and ruthlessness. Some respondents argued that women might be at an advantage because they could leverage others’ underestimation of them and would be stereotypically better attuned to other parties.

This exploratory study by Kray, Thompson, and Galinsky (2001) marked an important shift in perspective from studying the difference that gender makes (i.e., being a man vs. a woman) to studying the difference that gendered beliefs (e.g., stereotypes) make to negotiation performance. For the past decade and a half, psychological research in negotiation has largely been devoted to understanding how the social construction of gender in negotiation affects men’s and women’s performance (Bowles, *in press*; Kray & Thompson, 2004). The aim has been to move the field beyond the treatment of gender as a trait to illuminate gender as a situational phenomenon in negotiation. However, as we reflect on the topic of “gender difference” and “the difference difference makes,” we question how far we have moved conceptualizations of gender in negotiation beyond the “battle of the sexes.”

At this juncture, we take stock of the research published over the past 15 years and see that the bulk of it is consistent, rather than inconsistent, with popular wisdom that negotiation is a man’s domain. Consistent with the meta-analyses that launched the reinvestigation of gender in negotiation (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999; Walters, Stuhlmacher & Meyer, 1998), research continues to show in broad brushstrokes that men tend to be more competitive negotiators than women and reap more negotiating rewards.

So, have we made any progress? Are we just feminists trying to fight biology with psychology? One might look at this scorecard and think this is just the way that men and women are made. Negotiators with higher testosterone will be more assertively competitive and dominate the negotiating table (Zak et al., 2009). Because women are higher in oxytocin, they are more yielding except when protecting their own (Zhong et al., 2012).

A more refined review of the research would not support this conclusion. Those of us intimately familiar with gender studies in negotiation have witnessed time and again how these gross patterns of male dominance flicker on and off across negotiating contexts in response to modest psychological and situational manipulations. Five examples follow:

- **Ambiguity.** Studies show that increasing ambiguity within the negotiating context increases the potential for gender effects in negotiation behavior and performance. When negotiators have a clear sense of what constitutes a good outcome or how they are expected to comport themselves, gendered norms are less influential and gender differences decline (Bowles, Babcock, & McGinn, 2005; Kray & Gelfand, 2009).
- **Stereotype Activation.** Implicit activation of gender stereotypes (i.e., subtle, below the level of conscious awareness) within the negotiation context elicits gender stereotype fulfillment (Kray et al., 2001). Explicit activation of gender stereotypes in contrast prompts psychological reactance and counter-stereotypical negotiation performance (Kray, Reb, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004; Kray et al., 2001).
- **Role Congruence.** For female negotiators, gender-role incongruence elicits social backlash, inhibits women’s negotiating behavior, and diminishes women’s negotiation performance (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Bear & Babcock, 2012; Bowles & Babcock, 2013; Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007)
- **Power.** Power derived both from the availability of alternatives (Kray, Reb, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004) and the increased psychological experience of power disinhibits women’s negotiating behavior (Small, Gelfand, Babcock, & Gettman, 2007).
- **Social Cues.** Gender stereotypic effects in negotiation are stronger in face-to-face than anonymous or text-based negotiations because women’s behavior is more gender stereotypic in face-to-face interaction (Stuhlmacher, Citera, & Willis, 2007; Walters, Stuhlmacher, & Meyer, 1998).

If gender effects in negotiation were deeply personality or biologically based, one would expect more consistency of effects across negotiating contexts. For instance, negotiating face-to-face or behind computers should not make a marked difference.

So, why does our research writ large continue to reinforce this battle-of-the-sexes perspective? In the following section, we propose that our research strategy may be in part responsible. The theoretical and empirical advances of this recent era of negotiation research are characterized by a common theme: under certain conditions the default male negotiating advantage can be made to turn off. Mentally anchored by a quest to explain women’s disadvantage as measured by traditional negotiation paradigms, we have not yet adequately questioned the assumptions underlying how we conceptualize negotiation itself.

### How We Study Gender in Negotiation

Why, if so much of our research has been dedicated to explaining gender as a social phenomenon in negotiation, does the research still largely reinforce the stereotype of male dominance? We propose two reasons:

**Emphasis on women’s deficiencies.** While most research on gender in negotiation has been focused on explaining how social-psychological—as opposed to personality or biological—factors contribute to gender effects in negotiation, the animating question motivating most research in this vein has been women’s underperformance (Kolb, *forthcoming-a*). Why don’t women ask? Why don’t women negotiate higher salaries? Why do women leave value on the table? We try hard not to “blame the women,” by showing, for instance, that it is the stereotypes more than individual differences that explain these effects. Still, our focus remains largely on explaining women’s deficiencies. This sends an implicit message that, for whatever complex academic reasons, negotiation remains a man’s game.

To the extent that we offer prescriptive advice, it is to level the negotiating playing field between the sexes, for instance by reducing ambiguity and helping women avoid the pitfalls of

negative stereotypes. To our knowledge, the only studies that reliably produced a female negotiating advantage involved inducing stereotype reactance by blatantly endorsing gender stereotypes (Kray et al., 2001) or manipulating the content of gender stereotypes to redefine feminine traits as predictive of negotiating success (Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002). Yet even these studies were motivated by the question of how to undo women's presumed disadvantage.

An unspoken contributor to our focus on women's disadvantage relative to men is that our research on "gender" is really about gender relations among predominately White, college-educated Americans. Little research has included experienced female negotiators in the sample. We also know little about the negotiating experiences of low-status men and how gender interacts with other status-linked social identities. The few studies that have tested the treatment of low-status men (e.g., racial minorities) in negotiation suggest that they experience similar constraints to those documented for "women" in our gender studies, such as lower outcome expectations (Ayres & Siegelman, 1995) and backlash for assertive negotiating behavior (Bowles & Al Dabbagh, 2011). Recent research on race as a moderator of gender-based backlash in the workplace indicates that, while White women face more backlash than White men for dominance behaviors at work (e.g., getting tough with an employee), Black men face more backlash for this same behavior than do Black women (Livingston, Rosette, & Washington, 2012). Absent a broader theoretical and empirical exploration of identity in negotiation, we don't really know the extent to which our "gender differences" in negotiation are about gender per se or about the role of status in negotiation more broadly.

**The negotiation paradigm.** A second reason that our scholarship depicts negotiation as a man's game is that we have relied too heavily on a narrow and now dated conception of negotiation. Mainstream negotiation research traces its roots back to labor management scholars and decision theorists, such as Dick Walton and Bob McKersie and Howard Raiffa, who quantified and elucidated fundamental negotiation concepts with elegant simplicity using point-based games (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Raiffa, 1982; Walton & McKersie, 1965). Their students and colleagues further elaborated negotiation theory in terms of "utility points" created and claimed by the parties (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Raiffa, 1982). The next generation of negotiation scholars elaborated this "negotiation analytic" perspective with new insights from the cognitive revolution sparked by Danny Kahneman and Amos Tversky. They employed the decision-analytic game paradigm to demonstrate negotiators' systematic deviations from the normative prescription of rational choice theory (Neale & Bazerman, 1991; Thompson, 1998).

This game-based perspective on negotiation has had lasting influence at least in part because of its considerable practical advantages. Business schools and beyond have supported and disseminated negotiation research because of its popularity and pedagogical effectiveness. Centers of negotiation research have invested considerable resources in the development and sales of quantified negotiation simulations for both teaching and research purposes.

However, as Kolb and Putnam (2000) observed a long time ago, this game-based perspective on negotiation privileges stereotypically masculine conceptions of negotiation as individualistic, competitive, transactional, and normatively rational. Although negotiation scholars have argued persuasively for more relational perspectives on negotiation (e.g., Gelfand, Major, Raver, Nishii, & O'Brien, 2006; McGinn & Keros, 2002) and for studying social as well as material outcomes (Bowles et al., 2007; Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006), the money or points earned in the one-off negotiation game remain the predominant measure of performance.

Another gendered dimension of these negotiation games is the context in which we embed them. We tend to mask the analytic structure of our games in substantive areas in which men tend to dominate: compensation, deal financing, sports contracts, auto manufacturing, etc. Some recent studies have shown empirically that the contexts of our negotiation games can influence

whether gender differences emerge in negotiation behavior and results (Bear & Babcock, 2012; Miles & Lasalle, 2008). For instance, Bear and Babcock (2012) took a case of two manufacturing executives negotiating over motorcycle headlamps and changed it to a negotiation over beads holding constant the analytic structure. Men trounced women in the motorcycle headlamp negotiation, but not when bargaining over beads. (However, to the broader point about the inherent masculinity of negotiations, women did not beat men in the bead version of the game.)

Perhaps, the most vivid description of women's "lack of fit" (Heilman, 1983) with negotiation as we know it comes from a paper that is now close to 35 years old, in which psychology undergraduates were recruited to negotiate as retail and wholesale executives in an appliance market (Kimmel, Pruitt, Magenau, Konar-Goldband, & Carnevale, 1980). In a section on "Gender Differences," the authors observed:

*"Men and women behaved similarly and showed similar correlations on most measures. But a few interesting differences suggest that in comparison with men, women did not seem so comfortable with the task or so involved with the formal bargaining role: They spoke less...; they showed less interest in the experiment and more self-doubt; and they made fewer references to their companies and the hypothetical commercial world surrounding the negotiation. ...they made less use of positional commitments, threats, and derogatory put-downs. These are standard distributive tactics found in most formal negotiations. Women may have rejected them because the role of formal negotiator was ego alien..."*

Negotiation scholars stopped making these types of observations, perhaps because it would seem politically incorrect to imply that being a negotiator was alien to women. But, now with the benefit of theory and research on how masculine-stereotyped negotiations privilege men's performance, perhaps it is time to say, "yeah, that sounds about right." This task was more awkward for the women than for the men.

### Broadening the Scope of Gender and Negotiation Research

Negotiation is a process for allocating scarce resources between interdependent parties. If our larger objective is to understand problem solving in organizational settings in which parties' interests are only partially overlapping, we need to stretch beyond the games paradigm involving one-off interactions to incorporate richer contextual and moral considerations influencing strategic behaviors and outcomes (Kolb, forthcoming-a; Putnam & Kolb, 2000). In conclusion, we propose four avenues for gaining a fuller perspective on how men and women navigate their social worlds to allocate scarce resources and solve problems.

**Redirect attention from barriers to opportunities.** Scholars of gender in negotiation—and of gender in organizations more broadly—have mapped extensively the myriad obstacles hampering women's performance. Yet, a growing number of women are effective negotiators and leaders in the public and private sector. We propose to build upon our foundation of knowledge about how women fall behind with a concerted effort to study how women get ahead. Even within the constrained context of point-based negotiations, researchers have only begun to scratch the surface in understanding how distinctively feminine interaction styles might predict female advantages (Kray, Locke, & Van Zant, 2012). For instance, collective intelligence in groups is predicted by turn-taking, which is predicted by the proportion of women at the table (Woolley, Chabris, Pentland, Hashmi, & Malone, 2010). By facilitating social interactions, women raise the intelligence of collectives. With an expanded conception of how women negotiate in organizations, we can develop positive theory about women and negotiation.

**Investigate gender's intersections with other status-linked social identities.** Critical to understanding men's and women's social situations is investigating how gender intersects with other status-linked social identities, including race, ethnicity, and social class. To deepen our under-

standing of gender in negotiation beyond the experience of predominately White, young, middle class Americans, we should make a concerted effort to study a more diverse population of negotiators and explore other sources of variation within gender. Our theories of gender in negotiation and of negotiation more broadly would also benefit from a clearer understanding of the role of status in negotiation. Gender is a distinctive and especially persistent source of social status (Ridgeway, 2011). To explain what is truly gendered about negotiation, we need to explain how the influence of gender is distinct from the influence of other status-linked social identities.

**Recognize the moral implications of negotiations.** To date, negotiation has largely been conceptualized as an amoral activity in which parties make tradeoffs over economic resources to facilitate mutually beneficial agreements. Yet the very act of explicitly tallying relative payoffs in discrete transactions (“bean counting”) has moral implications. Specifically, the notion that all negotiation issues are translatable into a common and fungible utility assumes that negotiators are operating within a relational sphere wherein it is morally acceptable to weigh competing priorities against each other, conduct cost-benefit analyses, and pragmatically accept tradeoffs (Fiske 1991, 1992; Fiske & Tetlock, 1997).

Recent evidence suggests women and men differ in how they view the morality of negotiations. Female negotiators, relative to male negotiators, are more resistant to moral pragmatism (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2012), are less prone to morally disengage (Kennedy, Ku, & Kray, in prep), and experience more moral outrage in reaction to ethical compromises in pursuit of profit and status (Kennedy & Kray, 2013). The findings underscore the possibility that deep-seated moral frameworks dictate the rules of exchange, and men and women may approach negotiations from different rulebooks. Along similar lines, negotiation scholars would be wise to appreciate that negotiation is but one legitimate form of social exchange. Sociologists have long distinguished negotiated exchanges from reciprocal exchanges (Emerson, 1981; Molm, Peterson, & Takahashi, 1999), which involve loosely structured arrangements that are specifically non-negotiated, possibly involving debts that may never be called due or surpluses that may never be cashed in. Reciprocal exchange occurs when individuals make concessions to others without knowing whether, when, or to what degree they will be reciprocated. Theories of gender in negotiation will be enriched by incorporating alternative relational spheres and methods of social exchange into negotiation research.

**Broaden our investigative and theoretical conception of negotiation.** Finally, we recognize the need to complement experimental game-based research with broader investigations of the lived experience of negotiation in organizations and across work and family boundaries (Kolb, forthcoming-b). Negotiation scholars have begun to expand negotiation theory beyond what is measurable in the quantifiable value created and claimed within one sitting (e.g., Curhan et al., 2006 on social value; Lax & Sebenius, 2006 on 3D negotiation; McGinn & Keros, 2002 on relationships). It is time to stretch for a larger theory of the role of negotiation in how men and women navigate and shape their social worlds. More organizationally grounded research will enrich our understanding of the mutually constitutive interplay between the contextual and interpersonal in negotiation (Strauss, 1978).

## Conclusion

In sum, we are arguing for greater self-awareness among negotiation researchers of our role in the social construction of negotiation as a man’s game. We have gained important insights in the past 15 years into how contextual factors moderate the male advantage in negotiation. It is time now to critically reexamine how we conceptualize negotiation itself and to reach beyond games we know to learn from more diverse population of negotiators and negotiating contexts.

## References

- Amanatullah, Emily T., & Morris, Michael W. (2010). Negotiating gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women’s fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(2), 256-267. doi: 10.1037/a0017094
- Ayres, Ian, & Siegelman, Peter. (1995). Race and gender discrimination in bargaining for a new car. *American Economic Review, 85*(3), 304-321.
- Bear, Julia B., & Babcock, Linda. (2012). Negotiation topic as a moderator of gender differences in negotiation. *Psychological Science, 23*(7), 743–744.
- Bowles, Hannah Riley. (in press). Psychological perspectives on gender in negotiation. In M. K. Ryan & N. R. Branscombe (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Gender and Psychology*.
- Bowles, Hannah Riley, & Al Dabbagh, May. (2011). Status constraints in negotiation: A study of global-local biculturals in the Arab Gulf. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School.
- Bowles, Hannah Riley, & Babcock, Linda. (2013). How can women escape the compensation negotiation dilemma? Relational accounts are one answer. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*(1), 80-96. doi: 10.1177/0361684312455524
- Bowles, Hannah Riley, Babcock, Linda, & Lai, Lei. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 103*(1), 84-103.
- Bowles, Hannah Riley, Babcock, Linda, & McGinn, Kathleen L. (2005). Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*(6), 951-965.
- Curhan, Jared R., Elfenbein, Hillary A., & Xu, H. (2006). What do people care about when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(3), 493-512.
- Emerson, Richard (1981). Social exchange theory. In M. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives* (p. 30- 65).
- Fiske, Alan. P. (1991). *Structures of social life: The four elementary forms of human relations*. New York: Macmillan (Free Press).
- Fiske, Alan. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review, 99*, 689-723.
- Fiske, Alan. P., & Tetlock, P. E. (1997). Taboo tradeoffs: Reactions to transactions that transgress the spheres of justice. *Political Psychology, 18*, 255-297.
- Gelfand, Michele J., Major, Virginia Smith, Raver, Jana L., Nishii, Lisa H., & O’Brien, Karen. (2006). Negotiating relationally: The dynamics of the relational self in negotiations. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(2), 427-451.
- Heilman, Madeline E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. In B. M. Staw & L. I. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 269-298). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Kennedy, Jessica, & Kray, Laura J. (In press). Who is willing to sacrifice sacred values for money and social status? Gender differences in reactions to ethical compromises. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.
- Kennedy, Jessica, Ku, Gillian, & Kray, Laura J. (In prep). Gender differences in moral disengagement in negotiations. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.
- Kimmel, Melvin J., Pruitt, Dean G., Magenau, John M., Konar-Goldband, Ellen, & Carnevale, Peter J. D. (1980). Effects of trust, aspiration, and gender on negotiation tactics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(1), 9-22.
- Kolb, Deborah M. (forthcoming-a). Are we becoming part of the problem? Gender stereotypes in negotiation research. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*.
- Kolb, Deborah M. (Forthcoming-b). Negotiating in the shadow of organizations: Gender, negotiation, and change. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*.
- Kray, Laura J., Galinsky, Adam D., & Thompson, Leigh. (2002). Reversing the gender gap in negotiations: An exploration of stereotype regeneration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 87*(2), 386-410.
- Kray, Laura J., & Gelfand, Michele J. (2009). Relief versus regret: The effect of gender and negotiating norm ambiguity on reactions to having one’s first offer accepted. *Social Cognition, 27*(3), 418-436.
- Kray, Laura J., & Haselhuhn, M. P. (2012). Male pragmatism in negotiators’ ethical reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 1124-1131.

Kray, Laura J., Locke, Connson, & Van Zant, Alex (2012). Feminine charm: An experimental analysis of its costs and benefits in negotiations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1343-1357.

Kray, Laura J., Reb, Jochen, Galinsky, Adam D., & Thompson, Leigh. (2004). Stereotype reactance at the bargaining table: The effect of stereotype activation and power on claiming and creating value. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(4), 399-411. doi: 10.1177/0146167203261884

Kray, Laura J., & Thompson, Leigh. (2004). Gender stereotypes and negotiation performance: An examination of theory and research. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26, 103-182.

Kray, Laura J., Thompson, Leigh, & Galinsky, Adam. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 942-958. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.942

Lax, David A., & Sebenius, James K. (1986). *The manager as negotiator: Bargaining for cooperation and competitive gain*. New York: Free Press.

Lax, David A., & Sebenius, James K. (2006). *3D negotiation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Livingston, Robert W., Rosette, Ashleigh Shelby, & Washington, Ella F. (2012). Can an agentic Black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science*, 23(4), 354-358.

McGinn, Kathleen, & Keros, Angela. (2002). Improvisation and the logic of exchange in socially embedded transactions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(3), 442-473.

Miles, Edward W., & Lasalle, Margaret M. (2008). Asymmetrical contextual ambiguity, negotiation self-efficacy, and negotiation performance. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 19(1), 36-56.

Molm, Linda D., Peterson, Gretchen, & Takahishi, Nobuyuki (1999). Power in negotiated and reciprocal exchange. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 876-890.

Neale, Margaret A. , & Bazerman, Max H. (1991). *Cognition and rationality in negotiation*. New York: The Free Press.

Putnam, Linda L., & Kolb, Deborah M. (2000). Rethinking negotiation: Feminist views of communication and exchange. In P. M. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 1-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Raiffa, Howard. (1982). *The art and science of negotiation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Small, Deborah A., Gelfand, Michele, Babcock, Linda, & Gettman, Hilary. (2007). Who goes to the bargaining table? The influence of gender and framing on the initiation of negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 600-613. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.600

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

Stuhlmacher, Alice F., Citera, Maryalice, & Willis, Toni. (2007). Gender differences in virtual negotiation: Theory and research. *Sex Roles*, 57(5/6), 329-339. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9252-y

Thompson, Leigh. (1998). *The mind and heart of the negotiator*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

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

Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Woolley, A. W., Chabris, C. F., Pentland, A., Hashmi, N., & Malone, T. W. (2010). Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. *Science*, 330, 686-688.

## Hannah Riley Bowles

Visiting Associate Professor  
Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law



Hannah Riley Bowles is a Visiting Associate Professor at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and a Senior Lecturer at the Harvard Kennedy School. She conducts research on gender in negotiation and women's attainment of leadership positions. Her research appears in academic publications, such as the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, and *Psychological Science*. She is the faculty director of Women & Power, the Kennedy School's executive program for women leaders from the public, private and non-profit sectors. She won the Kennedy School's 2003 Manuel Carballo Award for Excellence in Teaching. Earlier in her career, she was a research associate at the Conflict Management Group and Harvard Business School. She was a technical advisor to the Minister of Natural Resources, Energy & Mines of Costa Rica and has been a fellow at the Argentinean National Institute of Public Administration, the West German Parliament, and Oxford University's Forestry Institute. She has a DBA from the Harvard Business School, an MPP from the Kennedy School, and a BA from Smith College.

## Laura J. Kray

Warren E. and Carol Spieker Professor  
of Leadership  
University of California



Laura Kray is Professor and Warren E. and Carol Spieker Chair in Leadership at the Walter A. Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley. Kray holds a doctorate in social psychology and she applies this lens to her research on gender, negotiations, and problem solving. She has published over 40 articles in a range of top psychology and management outlets. Her work has received numerous "Best Paper" awards from the Academy of Management and the International Association of Conflict Management and received multiple awards from the National Science Foundation. In 2008, her work on gender and negotiations was recognized with the "Most Influential Paper" award from the Conflict Management Division of the Academy of Management. She is on the Editorial Board of two leading social psychology journals, *Social Psychological and Personality Science* and *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. Her research exploring women's leadership experiences has received numerous prestigious awards and has been featured in a wide range of media outlets (*New York Times*, *Business Week*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Scientific American*, *Financial Times*). Kray is the founder and faculty director of the Center for Executive Education at UC Berkeley's Women's Executive Leadership Program. She provides leadership training to both for-profit and non-profit organizations.



**HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL**  
**SOLDIERS FIELD**  
**BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02163**  
[WWW.HBS.EDU](http://WWW.HBS.EDU)