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Executive Summary

The value of women’s work is not always recognized. Boston has one of highest gender wage gaps in the US. Women in Boston are paid 8% less than men are for the same jobs, and women of color have the greatest disparity in wages. On average, Latina women in Boston earn 45 cents for every dollar white men earn, and black women earn 49 cents.\(^1\) Women face unique barriers in career negotiations around pay, promotions, and schedule flexibility that contribute to the gender wage gap.

Negotiating skills can help women communicate the value of their contributions in the workplace. From negotiating the salary for a first job to arranging a return to work schedule after maternity leave, negotiation skills help women achieve their career goals. Women and girls around the world are learning how to negotiate staying in school longer, earning higher salaries, and self-advocating for promotion. While negotiation skills alone cannot close the gender wage gap, they can help women identify and take advantage of opportunities to achieve their goals.

Many women do not have access to quality negotiation training. While the City of Boston offers free negotiation training for women, the curriculum is focused narrowly on pay. More comprehensive trainings, which are more effective at helping women succeed in negotiations, are cost prohibitive for most women.

The goal of this policy analysis exercise is to understand whether increasing access to career negotiation training advances women’s economic empowerment. Economic empowerment is the “capacity of women to participate in, contribute to and benefit from growth processes in ways that recognize the value of their contributions.”\(^2\)

The Women’s Foundation of Boston is the client for this research. The Women’s Foundation of Boston is a nonprofit that creates and funds projects that support the economic empowerment of women in Boston.\(^3\) This research will help the Women’s Foundation of Boston determine if it will invest in negotiation training programs for women.

I conducted this project in two stages.

In Stage 1, I investigated how negotiation training helps women overcome barriers in career negotiations, asking the following questions:

1. What barriers do women face in career negotiations in Boston?
2. What type of negotiation training is the most effective for women?

In Stage 2, I piloted a negotiation training in Boston and measured the impact, asking:

3. Does negotiation training improve performance in career negotiations?
4. Does the impact of training vary based on personal characteristics (e.g., by industry, income level)?
5. How could negotiation training programs scale to other locations and demographics?
Key findings of this research are:

➢ **Women can face three main barriers in career negotiations:** lack of negotiation skills, fear of backlash, and uncertainty about what is negotiable.

➢ **Women are more successful in career negotiations when they are trained to:**
  ▪ Consider a broader scope of their career goals than pay,
  ▪ Seek mutually-beneficial agreements, and
  ▪ Know whether they are negotiating for something typical, a special exception, or an innovative change.  

➢ **Our negotiation training pilot improved women’s proficiency in negotiations.** The training also increased women’s confidence in negotiations, helped women achieve their career goals in negotiations, and spurred women to share what they learned with others in their networks.

➢ **The training was effective across a diverse group of women.** More research is needed to understand the impact of training on hourly workers and the intersectional barriers that women face.

➢ **Train-the-trainer’s programs are the most effective way to scale the impact of the training** to more women and girls in Boston.

The three main recommendations for the Women’s Foundation of Boston are:

➢ **Fund negotiation training** for women and girls who otherwise are not likely to have access (e.g., low-income women and those without college degrees)

➢ **Share career negotiations research** with other organizations supporting women and girls

➢ **Advocate for policies** that remove barriers to women in career negotiations and economic empowerment more broadly
Introduction

Negotiation training is an emerging tool to advance women’s economic empowerment around the world. The World Economic Forum found that negotiation is one of the top ten skills needed to succeed in the future workforce. Negotiation skills are helping women and girls stay in school longer in Zambia, get fairer investment contracts for small businesses in England, reach peace agreements in Afghanistan, and improve their lives in many other ways. From corporate leadership programs in the United Kingdom to school-based negotiations training for girls in Mali—women are bolstering their negotiation competencies to be more economically empowered.

Economic empowerment brings value to women, families, businesses, and society. Families benefit when women are fairly compensated for their work—as women are the primary earners in 40% of households with children. Drawing from a larger talent pool also improves performance and productivity in organizations. When women are well represented in leadership, company profits and share performance can be close to 50 percent higher. Furthermore, robust female participation in the labor force improves development outcomes and increases women’s representation in government and quality of policy making.

Massachusetts was the first state to provide free negotiation training to women. To increase access to negotiation training, the State of Massachusetts and the City of Boston partnered with the American Association of University Women (AAUW) to offer free negotiation training to women. In 2015, Boston set the ambitious goal of training half of the city’s working women—85,000 women—in negotiations by 2021. While Boston has trained nearly 10,000 women in training since 2015, the city is not on track to achieve its original goal.

Boston’s free negotiation training curriculum narrowly focuses on pay, and more comprehensive trainings are cost prohibitive for most. Women tend to perform best in negotiations when they consider their entire career goals (e.g., career trajectory), rather than pay alone. Unfortunately, the AAUW trainings focus on salary negotiations, rather than incorporating broader career goals like promotions. Professional negotiations programs that incorporate more comprehensive career negotiation topics are available online, but most are time intensive and cost thousands of dollars. See Table 1 in the appendix for a list of available negotiation trainings for women.

The Women’s Foundation of Boston wants to understand if expanding access and scope of negotiation training improves the economic mobility of women. To answer this question, I conducted research in two stages. First, I researched barriers that women face in negotiations, investigated if trainings can address those barriers, and then designed a curriculum using that research. Second, I piloted the training with women who may otherwise not have access to negotiation training and measured the impact.

This project measured how negotiation training impacts women’s economic empowerment and investigated how that effect might vary based on personal characteristics. This paper shares my
findings about what barriers women face in career negotiations and what type of negotiation training can help women reach their career goals. The paper concludes with recommendations for how the Women’s Foundation of Boston could use negotiation training to advance women’s economic empowerment.

Methodology

Stage 1: Investigate barriers women face in negotiations and design training to overcome them

I began this project by conducting a literature review on women’s career negotiations. I defined “career negotiations” as a problem-solving process that involves some trade-offs for purposes of achieving career advancement. The review covered the gender wage gap, gendered expectations and experiences in negotiations, and negotiation training designs for women. I referenced literature across different cities and countries and looked for evidence among workers with varying degrees of education and wealth.

Harvard Professor Hannah Riley Bowles guided this research, bringing her expertise on how gender influences career negotiations. At Harvard Kennedy School, Prof. Riley Bowles chairs the Management, Leadership, and Decision Sciences Area and co-directs the Women and Public Policy Program. Her current research focuses on women’s leadership advancement, examining situational barriers and individual strategies to see how negotiation is a micro-mechanism of inequality.

After conducting a literature review, I selected a host for the pilot negotiation training. I conducted interviews with leaders of the Women’s Foundation Boston and her partner organizations to gauge interest and fit for the pilot. The criteria I used for a good fit was that their members had access to remote learning, were likely to benefit from and participate in the training, and were not vulnerable to research during the pandemic.

I selected the Big Sisters Association of Greater Boston as our partner organization for the pilot—and included their employees and volunteers as participants. Big Sisters had already moved their operations online and their employees and volunteers were not considered vulnerable populations. A benefit of working with Big Sisters is that mentors could use information they gained in the pilot to train their Little Sisters on negotiation concepts.

Next, I interviewed interested participants about their experiences with career negotiations and goals for the training. I sent a survey to affiliates of Big Sisters to assess interest in participating, and invited women to an interview prior to the pilot. The objective of interviewing participants was to understand barriers they faced in career negotiations so that I could design the training to address those issues. I interviewed 22 women between November 2020 and January 2021. See appendix for a description of interviewee’s professions (inferences that this research can make for trans women and non-binary individuals).

---

a This paper refers to cisgender women (i.e., assigned women at birth), as available research primarily uses a binary sex categorization, limiting

b Including Project HOPE, Big Sister Association of Boston, EMMPath, and Dress for Success.
Table 2) and a list of interview questions (in Data Analysis Techniques). c

Using information from interviews and literature reviews, I designed a three-hour virtual negotiation training pilot for women. Interview responses informed which simulations I used in the pilot and which areas of the negotiation curriculum we focused on to ensure the pilot was most relevant and useful to the participants.

**Stage 2: Pilot negotiation training and measure impact**

We launched the negotiation training pilot on a Saturday in January 2021. I helped coached the session, along with Prof. Hannah Riley Bowles and experienced facilitator Florangel Suero. We offered the training for free to ensure access and conducted the training virtually for safety during the COVID-19 pandemic. The 30 women who participated in the training were employees and volunteers with the Big Sisters Association of Greater Boston, primarily under the age of 35 and early in their careers. Summary statistics on the participant demographics are included in the appendix.

I evaluated the negotiation training pilot in three ways: through feedback surveys, participant interviews, and negotiation simulations before and after the training.

**First, I gave participants time at the end of the training to submit a feedback survey.** Participants were asked whether they found the training relevant to their careers, if they would recommend the training to a colleague, whether the training was the right length, and to provide any other ideas they had for improvement.

**Second, I invited participants to be interviewed by the Women’s Foundation of Boston about their experience in the training.** The CEO of the Women’s Foundation of Boston interviewed five participants from February through March to assess whether they had applied or shared learnings from training. In addition, we will send participants a follow-up survey 6 months afterwards to ask if they have applied any skills gained in the workshop to advance their career goals.

**Third, I compared participants’ negotiation proficiency before and after the training through a pair of simulations.** At the beginning and end of the pilot, we gave participants a negotiation case and asked them how they would recommend the protagonist prepare for and approach the negotiation. Then evaluators scored their recommendations based on whether they included strategies that help women succeed in career negotiations—like reducing ambiguity and seeking mutually-beneficial agreements. A full description of the scoring methodology and examples of participant responses are in the appendix section on Data Analysis Techniques.

**For the last phase of the project, I analyzed options for recommendations.** I investigated how the Women’s Foundation of Boston and her partner organizations could fruitfully incorporate evidence from the negotiation training pilot into their existing work that promotes economic empowerment among women in Boston.

---

c I kept participants names anonymous for their privacy.
**Addressing bias and limitations in the research**

The biggest limitation of this research is in addressing intersectional barriers to negotiations (across class, ethnic, racial, socio-economic, and other dimensions) due to the small sample size of the researched population (n=30). In addition, since this is not a randomized control trial, we do not know how participants would have performed in a negotiation (or if they would have attempted to negotiate) in the absence of the training.

Since the pilot participants were self-selecting, participants may not be representative of the broader population. For example, participants may have a different level of commitment to learning negotiations or a unique type of experience in negotiations compared to other women in Boston. Pilot participants had much higher educational attainment compared to the general population of women in Boston. In Chart 1, you can see that in Boston, 21% of women have an advanced degree and 25% have a bachelor’s degree, compared to the pilot, where 55% had an advanced degree and 45% had a bachelor’s degree.

In addition, pilot participants likely started the training with a higher negotiation proficiency than the general population. 72% of the pilot participants reported to have some exposure to negotiations, and about half of the participants stated that they considered themselves to have an average level of experience in negotiations (only 1 participant believed she had an above average experience, the remaining considered themselves below average).

Similarly, interviewees were self-selecting and may not be representative of the entire pilot participant group. Since I interviewed almost all pilot participants prior to the training (22 of 30), the pre-pilot interviews were likely representative of the group. But this could have been an issue for the post-pilot feedback interviews, since only 5 of 30 volunteered to provide feedback through an interview. It is possible they may not represent the average experience in the training. However, this limitation is mitigated by the high completion rate of written feedback surveys (28 out of 30 participants submitted).
The design of the training may have also had limitations based on the gender of the coaches and the virtual format of the pilot. Because the pilot negotiation training coaches and participants were women, participants did not have the opportunity to simulate a negotiation with a male counterpart. This may limit the applicability of the training to settings where participants are negotiating with a male. Lastly, the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic required the training to take place remotely via Zoom. The remote environment has two implications. First, it is unclear whether practicing negotiations virtually will translate to in-person negotiations. Women that work remotely will also have career negotiations in a virtual setting, but this may not continue in the future. Some research shows that performance varies based on setting (e.g., in person, on the telephone, virtually). Second, the performance of the January 2021 pilot training may not be replicable in future negotiations trainings that use this curriculum in an in-person setting.

Findings

Stage 1: Investigate barriers women face in negotiations and design a training to overcome them

Literature review

What barriers do women face in career negotiations?

Career negotiations serve three main purposes for women: navigating their career advancement, overcoming gendered barriers to their growth, and claiming leadership. However, most research on the gender dynamics of career negotiations focus on pay since it is the most easily measured outcome. Studies on pay negotiations show that women are less likely than men to negotiate their salaries and have a lower success rate in getting a pay increase even when they ask.

Gender disparities in pay negotiations begin with a woman’s first job offer, when she is less likely than her male counterparts to ask for a higher wage. By not negotiating her starting salary at her first job, a woman could make half a million dollars less in earnings over the course of her career. Women may negotiate the terms of their job offers less often because they are expected to be more accommodating and face a higher social cost for negotiating compared to men. “Social costs” means that people want to work with women less after seeing them negotiate. But emerging research on the gender dynamics of negotiation investigate women’s experience in negotiations beyond pay—to include non-standard working arrangements and growth opportunities.

In addition to pay, women also face barriers in negotiating their career growth. This is important because the difference in career trajectory between women and men is the biggest contribution in the gender pay gap. Women are 18 percent less likely than men to be promoted from an entry-level position to manager. Common myths that justify the discrepancy in promotions is that women are less capable candidates for leadership, do not want more responsibilities, or are less likely to advocate for themselves.

These myths about women’s slower career trajectories are not supported by evidence. First, women leaders are consistently ranked as more competent leaders than their male counterparts. Second, women
are just as interested in getting promoted as men are—in fact 90% of the women I interviewed said that they wanted to learn how to negotiate a promotion, but many were unsure how to do so. Lastly, multiple studies show that women are now asking for promotions as often as men.\textsuperscript{32,33}

**Work-family conflicts are a common barrier to women’s career advancement.** When women have children, they are likely to spend more time out of the workforce. In contrast, having children increases men’s time in the workforce.\textsuperscript{34} When women want to stay in the workforce after having a child, some women attempt to negotiate flexible working arrangements to accommodate childcare.\textsuperscript{35} On the flip side, men tend to be more hesitant to negotiate flexible work arrangements because childcare is considered “feminine.”\textsuperscript{36}

**Women also face more difficulty in advancing in male-dominated hierarchies when they have a non-traditional background.** When women have different qualifications than men who traditionally rise through the ranks (e.g., lack of combat experience in the military), evaluators may consider them to have “lack of fit” for a promotion.\textsuperscript{37} Similar to how men feel more hesitant to negotiate flexible work arrangements, both genders can face barriers in career negotiations when taking on counter-stereotypical roles.

**The uncertainty that women experience in career negotiations also contributes to lower rates of women’s promotions.** Uncertainty about what is negotiable, how to negotiate, or who to negotiate with can increase anxiety and lower leverage in a negotiation. Evidence shows that uncertainty inhibits women’s willingness to negotiate their pay\textsuperscript{38,39} and decreases likelihood of a successful salary negotiation.\textsuperscript{40,41} If women lack access to the same social support networks that men have—such as mentors and sponsors at work—they are more likely to face uncertainty in a negotiation. Access to social networks can vary by class, race, sexual orientation, and other factors—so not all women face the same barriers to social networks.

**Minority and low-income women are particularly disadvantaged in negotiations.** When someone is perceived to be “lower status,” they can face more backlash for attempting to negotiate. Women can mitigate this risk of backlash by signaling higher status when negotiating (e.g., by mentioning credentials and experience).\textsuperscript{42} But some women are systemically denied rights that would increase their perceived status. For example, women who work in domestic services in the US lack union organizing rights,\textsuperscript{43} but international research demonstrates that increases in collective bargaining gives domestic workers leverage (and can help close the gender wage gap).\textsuperscript{44} More research is needed to understand how negotiations skills can help women who have less power in a career negotiation—and mitigate the greater risk of backlash they experience.

What strategies help women succeed in career negotiations?

The good news is that women are just as likely as men to succeed in career negotiations under the right circumstances. One experiment showed that women achieved the same outcomes in negotiations as men did in a context where people were explicitly told that negotiation was expected.\textsuperscript{45} These findings imply that women are not bad negotiators
by nature, but they can face greater challenges when navigating different social expectations compared to men.

**Women achieve the most success in career negotiations when they:**

1. Consider a broader scope of their career goals than pay (to include role and schedule flexibility)
2. Seek mutually beneficial agreements
3. Know whether they are negotiating for something typical, a special exception, or an innovative change

**First, negotiation trainings that go beyond salary are more likely to help promote women's success and create systemic changes that remove gendered barriers.**

For example, negotiating the ability to manage staff or choose your team could enable women to hire more representative candidates that draw from a wider talent pool. Consider the benefit of negotiating inclusion riders into Hollywood contracts—if women filmmakers were not given the authority to choose their cast, it would be difficult to make a more inclusive show.

Negotiation trainings for women should take into consideration that negotiations often take place on multiple fronts. Women might have to negotiate with their partner or parents to manage domestic responsibilities while also negotiating for a new position at work. Research from economics and sociology on intrahousehold bargaining demonstrates that negotiations over the allocation of domestic labor at personal level influences labor force participation at the professional level. Negotiations experts Hannah Riley Bowles and Kathleen McGinn recommend taking a “two-level-game” perspective, where

**Second, women are more likely to achieve a positive outcome in a career negotiation when they can show how their request also benefits others.** People who approach negotiations seeking mutually beneficial agreements are less likely to experience retaliation—but this is especially important for women. “Relational accounts” can help women demonstrate that what they are asking for is in the best interest of the organization. For example, Sheryl Sandberg said during her salary negotiations at Facebook, “This is the only time you and I will ever be on opposite sides of the table” to indicate how she valued being part of the team and would use her negotiating skills to help the organization if hired.

To make mutually beneficial proposals, it is important for women to prepare for negotiations by learning their negotiating counterpart’s interests and positions.

**Third, it is important for women to know what type of request they are making.**

Hannah Riley Bowles recommends that women early in their careers know whether they are in an “asking, bending, or shaping” career negotiation. Each type of negotiation requires a different strategy to communicate the legitimacy of their request. When women request something that is standard for someone in their role at the organization (e.g., market rate salary for a new role), they are in an “asking” negotiation. When attempting to request an exception to the standard practices (e.g., work-from-home at an in-person company), women must adopt a “bending” negotiation strategy. Finally, a “shaping” negotiation is when women propose a creative new idea that would transform the organization (e.g., starting a new project). In bending and
shaping negotiations, it is particularly important for women to demonstrate how their requests are in the best interests of their employer. 

*Can training help women overcome barriers in career negotiations?*

**Negotiation training can increase women’s likelihood to ask and achieve her goals in a negotiation.** While negotiation training alone cannot close the gender pay gap, it can help women identify and take advantage of opportunities for raises, promotions, and greater flexibility in their work schedule. Negotiations researcher Eman Elshenawy has found that negotiation training can improve performance in negotiations, and proficiency increases with the length of the training.\(^{52}\) Leigh Thompson, a negotiations professor at Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University, says that negotiations best practices can give women at least a ten-percent improvement in negotiations.\(^{53}\)

**Negotiation training for women can increase confidence in self-advocating.** In the summer of 2020, Hannah Riley Bowles found that her negotiation training for under-represented women pursuing careers in technology and engineering gave women confidence that they can overcome challenges of pursuing counter-stereotypical career goals.\(^{54}\) The City of Boston’s negotiation training for women achieved a similar outcome: “*In addition, an important and unexpected finding is the degree to which the workshops resulted in an increased sense of confidence and self-esteem, making visible the importance of this factor in facilitating women’s actions to improve their pay and employment status.***\(^{55}\) An area for future research is how negotiation trainings impact cognitive and emotional mindsets beyond skill development.

**Women who have received negotiation trainings share their new skills and confidence with other women in their networks.** AAUW cites ripple effects after their trainings: “*The workshops also generated a sub-cohort of women interested in supporting other women in their own workplaces and beyond through their roles as co-workers, supervisors and mentors.***\(^{56}\) The impact of negotiation training can reach women beyond the initial cohort of women trained.

**It is important to note that training women to use the same strategies that work for men in career negotiations can backfire.** When women take on an assertive “masculine” style of negotiations, people may be less likely to hire them\(^{57}\) and evaluate them more harshly.\(^{58}\) Rather than training women to replicate the negotiation styles that work for men, trainings should incorporate research on the gender dynamics of negotiation to help women confront the unique challenges that women face in career negotiations.

**Future research is needed to understand whether women who are paid hourly or have less education would benefit from a negotiation training.** Research shows that women with higher status, or a perceived higher position of power, tend to perform better in negotiations. Conversely, when “*women of presumed low status behave as if their status is high, people are likely to react negatively and punish them.***\(^{59}\) A curriculum tailored to less educated and lower income women may need to teach women how to create a perception of higher status (e.g., by communicating
successes in previous employment), but there may be limitations for how much these skills will improve negotiation outcomes.

Qualitative research on barriers women in Boston face in negotiations

Women in Boston have a wide range of skill level and success in negotiation—ranging from no experience to considerable competence and success. I interviewed 22 pilot participants about their experiences with negotiations and their goals for the training. The women shared with me stories of negotiations that went well and ones that they wished had gone better. Although some women had gained negotiating skills in their first few jobs, almost everyone missed an opportunity to ask for a raise or promotion at some point early in their careers. Women shared a range of challenges that they faced in career negotiations—which mirrored the barriers that women faced in the academic literature. See Chart 2 for a summary of the three main barriers women faced in career negotiations.

First, about half of the women lacked essential negotiation skills and strategy. A few did not consider their negotiating counterpart’s point of view and instead appealed to personal reasons for a career goal (e.g., justified a request for a higher salary by noting an increased cost of living). Others went into negotiations without preparing or researching to better understand what was negotiable. When asked how she prepared for her most recent career negotiation, a medical student responded, “I didn’t necessarily go in prepared, knowing all the facts, I just assumed it will come to me when the time arose... and that put me at a disadvantage.”

Importantly, there were many instances when women did not compare their options in a negotiation to their alternative (e.g., competitive job offer at another company). However, many women did demonstrate proficiency in negotiations—about half of women prepared well for their negotiations or compared their options to an alternative.

Second, most women had experienced or feared the social cost of career negotiations. “Social costs” means that people want to work with women less after seeing them negotiate. Among the women that I interviewed, over half said they had worse relationships after a negotiation or did not negotiate because they worried about how it would be received. They had heard about or experienced gender discrimination in negotiations. Many worried that asking for a raise would defy the cultural values of their organizations where service is emphasized (e.g., non-profits, education, healthcare, and the service industry). A server at a restaurant said, “It is hard to talk about money in my industry because places don’t want someone who is worried about the money, because they say it is a labor of love and the experience is well worth it.”

A few women said they were uncomfortable negotiating because they felt a need to please others and avoid conflict. One woman had prepared extensively for a career negotiation but was unable to ask for a raise in her annual review. “It is really hard to say what I think is fair when the other person might not see it the same way,” said a chemical engineer I interviewed. Some said they let opportunities pass because they were
intimidated by older employees (both male and female) who were their negotiations counterparts. Another woman noticed she could only ask in an apologetic way and wanted to find the courage not to apologize for advocating for herself.

Third, some women did not negotiate because they did not know their value or what was negotiable. As I saw in the research, when women lack access to the social networks that men have, they are more likely to face uncertainty about how and what to negotiate. Participants wondered whether getting a raise or a promotion was realistic and did not know how the negotiating process would work. One woman told me she questioned whether she would be worth receiving a higher wage.

Some women were unsure about the financial constraints of their employers, especially in non-profits and during the COVID-19. One woman reflected on her last negotiation, “It is hard to know whether I could have asked for more because of the pandemic.” A few women were unable to identify opportunities to negotiate and most waited for opportunities (e.g., an annual review) rather than seeking them proactively.

Chart 2: Barriers many women experience in career negotiations

- **Lack essential negotiation skills and strategy**
  - “I told my manager I needed a raise because I have student loans and some other responsibilities”
  - ~Entry-level non-profit employee

- **Experience or fear the social cost of career negotiations**
  - “I wish I would have thought a bit more about what I said in the negotiation first...I would avoid my manager in the future if I could.”
  - ~Scientist for biotech firm

- **Do not know their value or what is negotiable**
  - “I didn’t know if I could have negotiated my first job, I just took what they offered.”
  - ~Technology professional for a pharmaceutical company


Design of pilot training curriculum

I used evidence-based research on negotiation training and interview responses to design the pilot curriculum. The objective of the training was to help women overcome barriers they face in negotiations. I designed the curriculum to teach mutually beneficial self-advocacy from Hannah Riley Bowles’ negotiation framework. She uses strategies that she has found mitigate backlash against women for negotiating. Since most training participants were in their twenties (58%), we adapted the framework for women early in their careers.

Participants prepared for the pilot by reading a handout on the negotiation
framework. We modified the handout from the Career Negotiation Coaching Program Tips for Career Negotiations in the COVID-19 Crisis—which was written for students seeking employment in 2020—and incorporated examples that were relevant to the pilot population.66 See the appendix for a copy of the Negotiation Framework Handout.

The training utilized multiple formats to keep participants engaged throughout the three-hour virtual workshop. We used plenary lecture, breakout group discussions, polls, and multiple forms of negotiation simulations. See appendix for details on the Pilot Agenda and Teaching Guide.

The pilot began and ended with negotiation simulations. We gave participants the opportunity to advise a woman on how to prepare for and approach an upcoming career negotiation. These interactive simulations helped participants practice preparing for a negotiation. In addition, the pre- and post-training simulations helped us measure if the participants’ negotiating proficiency changed over the course of the training.

After the initial negotiation case, the participants simulated a three-way coalition game to practice finding a deal that would offer them the best deal. Hannah Riley Bowles adapted the game from The Art and Sciences of Negotiation, which teaches that “what you might demand from one coalition depends on what you can add to that coalition and what you potentially could obtain elsewhere.”67 The game illustrated the concepts of soft and hard power in negotiations and alternatives to an agreement. See the appendix section on “Three-Way Case: Negotiating Department Funding” for more details on the case.

In total, the interactive workshop included three negotiations simulations, as well as a “fishbowl” demonstration of a career negotiation between two course facilitators. I also offered individual office hours to participants after the training if they had questions about the curriculum or how to apply it in their personal careers.

Stage 2: Pilot negotiation training and measure impact

The pilot negotiation training had a positive impact along all three measures of impact: simulations, surveys, and interviews.

Participants increased their negotiation proficiency during the training. Comparing participant’s performance in simulations at the beginning and end of the workshop, independent evaluators measured an average increase in performance of 34%. (see appendix for more detail on Data Analysis Techniques). Participants took away lessons on how to strategically prepare for their next negotiation—by planning, building support, and leveraging relationships. See Chart 3 for a word cloud of lessons students highlighted at the end of the workshop.

Pilot participants are already applying and sharing the skills that they learned. Out of the 5 women that volunteered for a feedback interview with the Women’s Foundation of Boston, 3 had already applied the negotiation skills they learned in the training. 80% of the women had shared lessons from the training with their network, including their partners, sisters, and friends. I also spoke informally with two
women after the training, and one shared that she used the principles to secure a $10,000 salary increase.

All participants recommended the training. In an anonymous feedback survey following the training, 100% of participants said that they would recommend the workshop to a colleague or a friend. One participant said the training “definitely gave some perspective on where my personal weaknesses are, and also highlighted where I’m not alone in those weaknesses in negotiation.” The appendix includes a full list of comments from the participants on the training.

Participants felt the content was relevant to their career goals. 71% of participants said the training was very relevant to their careers, and the remaining participants said that the training was somewhat relevant. Two trainees recommended we provided more specific tips for strategies during the negotiation (e.g., best form of communication and language to use). Another participant wanted us to include negotiation strategies outside of career (e.g., rent, car buying).

The pilot was about the right length for most participants. 50% said that the workshop was the right length, while 21% said it could have been shorter and 29% wanted a longer training. Among the third of participants that wanted a longer session, participants recommended increasing time to read cases, respond to simulations, and ask the course coaches questions.

The pilot negotiation training increased confidence of some participants to self-advocate. The participant who was inspired by the training to ask for a higher wage said, “The most powerful element of the training was to be in a room of women encouraging each other to negotiate. It made me feel like it was standard.” This outcome mirrors findings in academic literature that negotiation training for women can increase confidence.

Initial results of the pilot indicate that negotiation training is relevant to women of all races, as 38% of the training participants were women of color (see appendix for full summary statistics on participant demographics). Unfortunately, we were unable to assess how the impacted varied across other dimensions—such as industry and position—because we did not have a large enough sample size. However, Hannah Riley Bowles has seen initial positive results in her recent work teaching negotiations skills to low-income college students in Boston.68

Chart 3: Participant responses on ingredients for success in a negotiation
Recommendations and Next Steps

Career negotiation training dovetails with the focus areas of the Women’s Foundation of Boston: promoting women and girls’ economic empowerment, education, and leadership. There are three potential strategies for how the Women’s Foundation of Boston could use the findings from this research project—listed from lowest to highest reach of impact. First, they could support expanding access to career negotiation training to lower-income women, younger girls, and those who work in the non-profit sector in Boston. Second, the Women’s Foundation of Boston could share these findings with other organizations interested in financing programs that advance women and girls’ economic empowerment—in Boston and other cities and countries. Third, they could work with targeted partner organizations to advocate for policies that remove barriers for women in career negotiations. This section will go into more detail about these three potential strategies for the Women’s Foundation of Boston.

I evaluated options based on evidence they increase the likelihood that women will succeed in career negotiations. I examined whether the policy options would help women overcome the barriers that I found women face in negotiations: lack of essential negotiating skills, fear of social cost in a negotiation, and lack of information about what is negotiable. I also considered how the interventions would increase access to women who otherwise might not be able to gain negotiation training.

Chart 4: Recommendations to the Women’s Foundation of Boston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase proficiency in negotiations skills</th>
<th>Reduce risk of social cost in a negotiation</th>
<th>Identify opportunities to negotiate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund grants for negotiation trainings at more partner organizations (reaching women without college degrees, working in the non-profit sector, and with low-income)</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share career negotiations research and curriculum with other organizations supporting women and girls</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share best practices for policies that remove barriers for women in career negotiations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 1: Fund grants to expand access to career negotiation training to more women and girls**

The Women’s Foundation of Boston could finance negotiation training with more partner organizations to reach women and girls with the biggest economic disadvantages—women without college degrees, girls from low-income households, and women working in non-profits. The most scalable method for financing trainings at partner organizations would be to fund a “train-the-trainers” program, where each organization could send a negotiation trainer to learn how to coach the curriculum.

The first option for funding grants is to target women without college degrees. Labor economists estimate that 30 million American workers without four-year college degrees have the skills to move into positions that pay 70% more than their current wages. The key is convincing employers to rethink how skills are measured—so negotiating skills are essential for this population. However, it is important to note that employers frequently require a four-year college degree for 74% of new jobs in the US—so institutional filters also need to change before candidates will have the opportunity to negotiate. The Women’s Foundation of Boston could start by financing career negotiation training at the following three partner organizations that serve low-income women in Boston:

**Organizations serving low-income women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Buddies</td>
<td>Pairs low-income women with personal financial coaches to support them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second option for funding trainings is to begin earlier, with low-income girls at schools and mentorship programs. The Women’s Foundation of Boston could work with some of the below existing partner organizations:

**Organizations for low-income girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Sister Association of Greater Boston</td>
<td>Mentorship program for women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza Academy</td>
<td>A free independent middle school for girls from low-income families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Inc. of Worcester</td>
<td>Programming that supports girls’ economic empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in Girls</td>
<td>Gives financial literacy programming to girls to make finance an accessible profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Caroline</td>
<td>Free private school for low-income girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third option for funding negotiation training is focusing on women who work in the non-profit sector. Negotiation training could be particularly useful in the non-profit sector because it can be more difficult to determine what is negotiable given financing constraints. Many of the pilot participants worked in the non-profit sector and had difficulty negotiating because they were not sure what was negotiable, and they felt negotiating was counter-cultural for service-oriented organizations. The Women’s Foundation of Boston could fund grants for negotiation training with its two established programs that train current and future leaders in non-profits:

**Recommendation 2: Share career negotiations research with other organizations supporting women and girls**

The Women’s Foundation of Boston could share this research with its existing foundation partners who might be interested in financing career negotiation training for more women in Boston. This option could increase access to negotiation training while incurring a lower cost to the Women’s Foundation of Boston. The Giving Circles Summit Venture is a good fit for negotiation training because they convene philanthropic organizations to raise awareness of opportunities to give to organizations that serve women and girls. The Red Sox Foundation—the official charity of the Boston Red Sox—has a track record or supporting similar work, as they helped establish WIN to increase the share of philanthropic giving directed to Boston women and girls.

The Women’s Foundation of Boston could also work with the City of Boston and AAUW to update its curriculum to include coaching negotiations centered on career and life goals—rather than just salary. The impact of this work would extend beyond Boston to other US cities where AAUW offers free online negotiation training to women, such as New York City. More directly, the Women’s Foundation of Boston could share the curriculum with other women’s foundations around the US—from Atlanta to Chicago and from NYC to California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women in Nonprofit Network (WIN)</td>
<td>Network for women CEOs and executive directors of local nonprofits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Women’s Leadership Program (YWLP)</td>
<td>Yearlong training program for women who are future nonprofit leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations for women at non-profits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Sisters’ School</td>
<td>Free private school for low-income middle schoolers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Women Strong Girls</td>
<td>Mentorship program for women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Recommendation 3: Advocate for policies that remove barriers for women in career negotiations and economic empowerment more broadly

Negotiation training for women is not a silver bullet that tears down all barriers to women’s economic empowerment in Boston. Achieving economic mobility should not solely be placed on women alone. The final section of this paper discusses policy options that would create more equitable organizations where women have the same chances as men for career advancement. The Women’s Foundation of Boston may want to consider working with partner organizations to advocate for systemic change in tandem with supporting women’s training. Negotiation training for women is one tool to help promote women’s economic empowerment, but there are many other tools that may have a higher return on investment.

The Women’s Foundation of Boston could work with partner organizations to advocate for system-level changes that increase women’s capacity to negotiate—through legislation (e.g., requiring employers to disclose gender pay gaps) and corporate policy changes (e.g., non-retaliation clauses for negotiating salary). Partner organizations that might be interested in negotiation policies include the Boston Girls’ Empowerment Network (BGEN), which advocates for public policy that supports girls’ development, and Project Hope, which advocates for just public policies which strengthen families.

Local and state governments are already working to promote women’s economic equality in the area. Massachusetts implemented new equal pay legislation in 2018 that prohibits employers from asking employees about their current salary and protects employers who are working to increase transparency and close the gender wage gap. The law also prevents employers from prohibiting employees from talking about their wages and protects employees from retaliation. The city of Boston is also working with employers to collect wage data and assess company policies and tackle things like equity and unconscious bias in the workplace.

However, more policy reform is needed to promote women’s economic empowerment. Harvard economist Claudia Goldin argues that caregiving policies and extending the school day could have the greatest impact on women’s economic empowerment, since women are disproportionately caregivers. However, Goldin warns that some policies that seek to close the gender wage gap can backfire—such as requiring maternity leave (rather than parental leave) would make it more expensive for employers to hire women than men—so careful design of the program is needed.

Protecting organizing rights is also important to removing barriers for women-dominated professions like domestic workers to advocate for their interests. Removing the exemption of domestic workers from federal labor laws would enable more low-income women to self-advocate.

More organizations need to acknowledge women’s perspective on gender equity and recognize the business case for women in leadership. Men have different perceptions than women about gender equity in their workplaces. The majority of men (63 percent) believe that their company is
already doing enough to improve gender diversity, while only 49 percent of women hold that opinion. Given that disparity, men are less likely than women to prioritize new initiatives for achieving gender equality. Male leaders need to start paying attention to the women’s perception—that most companies could be doing more to advance gender equality—because organizations thrive when women can negotiate a position at the top.

There are at least three more steps employers should take to remove barriers to women in career negotiations:

Firstly, organizations should standardize how negotiations occur during the hiring and promotion process, by either explicitly stating that negotiations are or are not standard procedure. Some technology firms have removed the ability for anyone to negotiate a job offer to promote pay equity. Although eliminating salary negotiations does eliminate gender pay disparities, it could also make hiring more difficult for some employers. Another option for employers is to explicitly state in job offers that the contract is subject to negotiation.

Companies could also make consideration for a promotion a default. The structure of an opt-in system discourages women from participating in promotion review process. Research shows that moving to an opt-out policy does not result in negative consequences on performance, monetary payoffs, or well-being, as measured by reported anxiety. Organizations could increase transparency about the salary ranges for different positions, as some women are less connected than men are (particularly in male-dominated industries) and therefore lack access to the same information about what is negotiable. Employers could also offer negotiation training that is informed by research on the gender dynamics of negotiation.

Secondly, employers should change or eliminate their self-evaluation processes, as women are harsher on themselves than men in self-evaluations. Since women discount positive feedback about their abilities, managers could provide extra feedback to women employees, which can help bolster their confidence in contributing and advocating for themselves. Employers could also have women reflect on their prior performance rather than compare themselves to peers. One experiment showed that women and men are equally willing to compete against their own past performance, while women are less willing than men to compete against others.

However, changing the self-evaluation process to encourage women to self-promote at the same rate as men is unlikely to make substantial changes, as the gender gap in self-promotion persists even when men and women are fully informed with objective data on how well they performed. Alternatively, employers could eliminate the use of self-evaluations in consideration for promotion.

Thirdly, employers should work to close differences in pay caused by childcare responsibilities, which fall disproportionately on women. It is common for full-time employees to make more than double what a part-time worker is paid for half the amount of work. This “non-linearity” of salaries based on hours worked contributes to the gender pay gap. Economist Claudia Goldin found that professions with more interchangeable workforces (e.g., pharmacists) have more
linear wages across the number of hours worked.\textsuperscript{91} Employers could identify opportunities to workers more interchangeable—so that caregivers that want to work fewer hours can be paid proportionately for their work.

Companies could also promote changes in gendered social expectations through policies that encourage shared household and caregiving responsibilities (e.g., by offering paid or mandatory paternity leave). Offering flexible work schedules can also benefit both the employee (by enabling them to be with their family during critical times) and the organization (by increasing employee satisfaction and retention).\textsuperscript{92} Finally, organizations adopt policies that prohibit retaliation for employees who attempt to negotiate work arrangements to accommodate work-life balance.

Next steps

The Women’s Foundation of Boston should begin by asking its existing partner organizations if they want to host negotiation trainings for their members. For interested groups, the Foundation could fund a “train-the-trainers” program with negotiations coaches from Harvard Kennedy School to teach our pilot curriculum.

Meanwhile, I will follow up with pilot participants in June 2021 (6 months after the training) to assess the longer-term impact of the training on women’s negotiation proficiency and economic empowerment and share those findings with the Women’s Foundation of Boston.

In the summer of 2021, the Women’s Foundation of Boston could begin working with another second year policy students at Harvard Kennedy School to conduct further research on the impact of negotiation training on women who are paid hourly or have intersectional forms of marginalization (e.g., by nationality or sexual orientation).

This spring I will send a proposal to the Mayor’s Office for Women’s Advancement for sharing our negotiation training curriculum with more women in Boston. I will also send policy recommendations for employers to the Boston Women’s Workforce Council. If successful, both follow-on projects are an opportunity for the Women’s Foundation of Boston to spread its reach to new partners in the city.
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Ethics and Transparency Statement

This research is covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for the Career Negotiation Coaching Program (CNCP) with Hannah Riley Bowles, which gives Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. The program also covered funding to hire an additional coach for the workshop. The research is also funded by a stipend of $2,000 from Harvard’s Women and Public Policy Program (WAPPP).

We conducted our research remotely to eliminate risk of transmitting COVID-19. Interviews were conducted via Zoom or telephone calls. I de-identified data of interviewees and reported only anonymous quotations and summary statistics of aggregated data on pilot participants.

Before conducting interviews, I obtained consent using the following prompt:

“Thank you for volunteering to talk to me today about your goals and your background. I will be designing the curriculum for the Big Sisters Negotiation Workshop in January, and I am conducting these calls to inform the curriculum for the negotiation training to ensure that it is relevant and useful to you. Any information that you provide to me in this call will be anonymized and combined with other participants’ information. I will be taking notes during our conversation, do I have your permission to use information you share in this call to inform my research?”
Background

Existing negotiation training resources available to women in Boston

Negotiation training is one of Boston’s tools for reducing the gender pay gap. The other tools in the City’s multi-pronged approach are encouraging and supporting employers who commit to closing the gender wage gap and passing legislation that advances pay equity.93

The State of Massachusetts and the City of Boston partnered with AAUW to offer free negotiation training to women. The American Association of University Women (AAUW), a national nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing the empowerment of women in the workforce, plans to train 10 million women in the US in salary negotiations programs by 2022. Out of the 100,000 participants that AAUW trained in 2018, 60% successfully negotiated within six months after training.94

In 2018, Boston planned 150 workshops at 15 community colleges, aiming to reach 5,000 workers.95 Nearly half of the women studied after the training in the first year of the program said they used the skills they learned in the workshops to negotiate higher pay or a competitive starting salary at a new job.96 Following Massachusetts’ lead, New York City launched free salary negotiation training programming for women in 2019.97

Table 1: Organizations offering negotiation training to women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association of University Women (AAUW)</td>
<td>Boston98, other Massachusetts locations99, nationwide, and online100</td>
<td>Salary negotiation</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley University</td>
<td>Online101</td>
<td>Negotiation for self</td>
<td>~$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>In person—facilitated at organizations in groups102</td>
<td>Negotiation for self and organization</td>
<td>Payment required for training workshops (quotes available for organizations to train employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Ground Seminars</td>
<td>In person—facilitated at organizations in groups103</td>
<td>Negotiation for self</td>
<td>Payment required for training workshops (quotes available for organizations to train employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Online104</td>
<td>Negotiation for self</td>
<td>~$3,600 - $7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating Women Inc.105</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Career negotiation</td>
<td>Free tips; payment required for training (quotes available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International examples of how negotiation skills advance women’s economic empowerment

International organizations are already sharing negotiations skills to empower women and girls inside and outside career organizations. For example, some private sector companies in the United Kingdom teach negotiation skills in leadership track programs for women. Negotiations can also empower women outside of professional contexts—especially those in environments that have strong cultural traditions of obedience and reciprocity—by increasing their agency.

Particularly important—negotiations skills can help girls advocate for themselves to stay in school and increase their educational attainment. Negotiation training for teen girls in Zambia improved educational outcomes. This is particularly critical in the context of COVID-19, which disrupted education for 1.5 billion students in the spring of 2020 and could push 20 million more secondary school-aged girls out of school after the pandemic. Suadela, a negotiations skills training program based in Mali, is now teaching girls self-advocacy skills for education and health rights. In patriarchal settings where the scope of women’s power is very limited, there could be narrower but significant applications of negotiation (e.g., advocating for partner’s use of contraception).

International applications for negotiations extend to many arenas and areas for women. The Land Policy Initiative—a collaboration between the United Nations, African Development Bank, and the African Union Commission—is training smallholder farmers in negotiation skills to ensure that investment deals are sustainable and beneficial to African communities including women. Women entrepreneurs are seeking out professional growth trainings on negotiations to run small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in East England. After the passage of new minority rights legislation in Croatia, Romani women negotiated their new status in society. The inclusion of women in peace negotiations in Afghanistan is critical to achieving long-lasting peace in the region. In Norway, negotiations help skilled migrants to get their education and experienced recognized by prospective employers.
Summary Statistics on Negotiation Training Participants

Table 2: Interview participant job description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant #</th>
<th>Job description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development associate at a non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Experienced social services worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher education administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Entry-level non-profit employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cyber security engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Team leader at a non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Computer engineer for technology firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sales worker for an insurance company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Server in the restaurant industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Management consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Marketing professional in real estate industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Director at a non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Public health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Technology professional for a pharmaceutical company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Scientist for biotech firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Human resources professional in a non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Program manager for healthcare provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chemical engineer for a manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Account manager for retailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Manager at a non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Administrator at a non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Medical student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Training registration responses, N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current employment status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employed for pay</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employed for pay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for paid employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29 years old</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44 years old</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of career-related negotiation topics of interest</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay (e.g., salary, benefits, bonus, equity)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role (e.g., promotion, authority and responsibilities, developmental opportunities)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload (e.g., hours, location, travel)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., work and family, mentoring others in negotiations)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Pre-training survey responses, N=29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-reported level of experience as a negotiator (1 = no experience, 3 = average, 5 = very experienced)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of experience in negotiation participants had</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial or ethnic identity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or with long-term partner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caregiving responsibility for one or more children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanswered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of educational attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I-We” Self-Advocacy: Negotiating in Early Career

Many people early in their careers find self-advocacy awkward or may even perceive it as impossible. They don’t know what is reasonable for them to request or propose, they are unsure how to go about it, who their negotiating counterparts should be, or what they care about. Often for good reason, they hold back out of fear that speaking up will undermine important relationships.

However, there are meaningful downsides to letting opportunities to self-advocate pass, even if only to learn more about what is possible. Negotiation attempts can backfire, but there are ways to prepare strategically to reduce that risk. This note was crafted to help people in early career or junior positions to analyze potential negotiation opportunities and to prepare for those opportunities in ways that make a clear case that what you are proposing makes good sense for others, as well as for yourself.

Step 1. Start with Your Career Goals

First, think about your “career” as including both paid work and quality-of-life considerations (e.g., family or other personal passions and aspirations). Start with your longer-term goals: Where would you like to see yourself in five or ten years? Then map backward from that vision to define your more immediate objectives.

Particularly early in one’s career, this can be hard to do. Many people spend their early career figuring out what they want to do. Sometimes they feel like the options before them are their only choices. Even if your long-term goal is simply to figure out what you like to do or are good at, that’s informative in itself and can help you make choices or identify the types of opportunities you would like to try out. If your long-term aims don’t match up with the options before you, how might you change that? Thinking about your options in the long, as well as short, term, can help you evaluate trade-offs, for instance, between earning more money or gaining new developmental opportunities, as illustrated in the case of Sam.
Step 2. Understand What You’re Negotiating For

Before self-advocating, you need to understand what you are requesting or proposing from your counterparts’ perspectives. For instance, consider the following three types of negotiation approaches. Which one describes best what you want to negotiate?

- **Asking**: I am pursuing an opportunity, resource, or reward that is typical for people in my position or that others in my position have received.
- **Bending**: I am seeking privileges or a special arrangement that others in my position have not or typically do not receive.
- **Shaping**: I am proposing to lead my group or organization in a new strategic direction or change the way we work.

Research suggests that these three types of negotiations call for distinct types of arguments to be persuasive and different configurations of negotiating counterparts to achieve a successful agreement.¹

If you are **asking**, then you need to think about what norms or precedents demonstrate that you are making a standard request. Research suggests that asking negotiations are typically fairly short two-party negotiation, for instance, with an immediate supervisor or hiring manager.

If you are **bending**, you will need to explain why an exception is justified in your case. To do something that breaks organizational norms will likely require the agreement of multiple parties.

If you are **shaping**, you need to persuade others that what you are proposing is in the best interests of the group or organization. This is likely to require gaining buy-in from numerous stakeholders.

**Asking.** Monique wanted to use her summer to explore two different career directions, ideally spending half her summer with a management consulting firm and half with an educational non-profit. The non-profit offered flexible summer arrangements, but the consulting firm was offering a twelve-week internship. Monica inquired whether the consulting firm ever granted shorter internships. Learning that they did, she asked whether she could work for them for six weeks instead of twelve.

**Bending.** Jonathan wanted to use his tech skills to support social entrepreneurs. He was excited to do a three-month summer internship with a Ghanaian start-up, but worried about making ends meet with the $700 per month they were offering. The flight alone was $1,500! Expatriates living in Accra estimated housing would cost $500 per month. They also explained that bargaining for higher pay could be insulting, because $700 monthly is likely what the start-up paid its full-time workers. Jonathan was eligible to apply for summer funding if his internship was unpaid. Instead of paying him $700 per month, Jonathan asked the start-up to cover his travel and housing expenses pending approval of summer funding.

**Shaping.** Maya wanted to work in early education with underserved English language learners. When the COVID-19 pandemic hit, her summer internship with an urban school district fell through. Maya had been following the news and other reports on the challenges of remote learning for English language learners. Maya contacted the manager who had originally offered her the internship and expressed her interest in helping the school district work on this problem. She proposed a remote working arrangement in which she would research and develop strategies for serving English language learners as pandemic uncertainty persisted and the new school year approached.
Step 3. Reduce Ambiguity About What, How, and With Whom to Negotiate

As you prepare to negotiate, you are likely to find that you have many questions: What is potentially negotiable? How should I negotiate? Who will be my counterparts during the negotiation and what do they care about?

As illustrated by the case examples on the previous page, information is power. Reducing ambiguity about “what” is potentially negotiable helps you avoid leaving value on the table. Had Maya not investigated whether the consulting firm offered six-week internships, she might have mistakenly decided she needed to choose between her two opportunities and lose out on learning from both.

Reducing ambiguity about “how” to negotiate helps you reduce the fear and risk of an awkward interaction. Jonathan could have jeopardized his opportunity to work in Accra if he had tried to solve his funding problem by bargaining for more pay. Understanding more about the local context and norms helped him to develop a solution that met his and the start-up’s financial constraints.

Reducing ambiguity about “who” your counterparts are helps you to avoid making false assumptions (e.g., mistakenly assuming someone will be agreeable or combative) and better enables you to propose mutually beneficial solutions (i.e., appeal to their values and interests). Reducing ambiguity about “who” you are (e.g., high-performer, technically skilled, or team leader) could also reduce the likelihood that your counterparts make biased or inaccurate assumptions about you or your aspirations. To work on educational programming for English language learners, Maya had to persuade her prospective employer why hiring her would benefit them more than it would cost amidst all the pandemic-related challenges.

As discussed in the next section, some of these questions are ones that you can answer by reaching out to people in your personal or organizational networks. However, don’t forget to search for information available from public or organizational sources. Your counterparts might assume that you know what is potentially negotiable because it is posted on their website. For instance, one young scientist almost missed some critical information just before accepting a post-doctoral position. In academia, it is common to be paid on a nine-month salary and to cover the summer months with research grants or other work. Shortly before accepting the post-doc, the scientist happened upon a posting indicating that post-doctoral fellows were eligible for two months of summer salary. Recognizing it was appropriate to negotiate for summer pay, she was able to increase her compensation by 22% before accepting the position.

Step 4. Enhance Your Negotiations through Relationships and Your Relationships through Negotiation

What do we mean by “Enhance Your Negotiation through Relationships”?

As you embark on step 3, reducing ambiguity, consider who might assist you. Ask yourself:

- Who could help you out by providing information (e.g., What is potentially negotiable? On what norms or standards should I rely?)
- Who could give you advice (e.g., How to negotiate? Who are your counterparts and what is important to them?)
- Who could give you social support (e.g., encouragement or honest feedback?)
- Who might provide advocacy on your behalf (e.g., put in a good word or inquiry for you?)
Seek out contacts among your work or alumni networks or among family and friends. Try to reach beyond those closest to you so that you get the best information and advice possible. Be open to people who offer constructive criticism, as well as to those who cheer you on. If you believe someone could be an advocate for you, inquire about whether they might put in a good word or inquiry on your behalf.

**What do we mean by “Enhance Your Relationships through Negotiation”?**

This final principle is at the heart of “I-We” Self-Advocacy. It’s about staying attuned to the interests of others as well as your own so that you can reach mutually beneficial agreements. All the steps up to this point help get you to this place.

As an illustration, take this example of asking for a letter of reference. In the “I” Version, the person asks politely for a letter of reference and expresses regret for asking on short notice. In the “I-We” version, the person takes two additional steps:

1. Explains why the **request is legitimate** (i.e., clarifies that the purpose is to pursue an opportunity that the recommender would see as worthwhile and provides reason for the short notice.)

2. Explains how the **requester is taking the other person’s interests into account** (i.e., by making an effort to reduce the inconvenience to the recommender.)

Research suggests that doing both of these things helps you to be more persuasive and attend to maintaining positive relationships. Follow Steps 1-4 to be prepared to craft an effective “I/We” argument: be clear about your goals, understand what you are negotiating for, reduce ambiguity, and enhance your negotiations through relationships.

If you can’t reach agreement, try to depart with at least one of the two things: (1) learn something new (e.g., what might be possible if not what you proposed?) and; (2) keep the conversation going (e.g., “If I do x, y, and z, could I come back to you to discuss this?”) If you have done your homework and attempted sincerely to explain why you think your counterpart will recognize your request or proposal as legitimate and you have shown that you have taken their interests into account, there is likely to be more upside than downside to your having tried to “I/We” self-advocate.
Pilot Curriculum

Hannah Riley Bowles’ four-step framework for career negotiations:

1) Consider your career goals.
2) Understand what you are negotiating for.
3) Reduce ambiguity. Understand you and your negotiating counterpart’s interests and alternatives. Other researchers on the best practices for negotiations for women include reducing ambiguity about how to negotiate (Leigh Thompson recommends women “find the script or write the script and make it work for you”).
4) Enhance your negotiations through relationships and your relationships through negotiations.

Table 5: Pilot agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
<th>TEACHING GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:00am-9:10am | Welcome and introductions; share purpose and agenda for workshop | Slides on: purpose, coaches, and agenda | - Bringing people to present and mindful  
- Creating community; Give people a sense of shared purpose (enhancing the women’s agency in self-directing their career and life aspirations; equipping you with tools for problems-solving to achieve life goals) |
| 9:10am-9:35am | Career Negotiation Prep and Debrief – Part I | Case A/C | - Pre-baseline measure  
- Practice building a strategy |
| 9:35am-10:20am | Workplace Negotiation Exercise | Case B | - Teach negotiation basics, including power and persuasion in negotiation  
- Practice negotiations |
| 10:20am-10:25am | BREAK | | |
| 10:25am-10:40am | Introduction to negotiations framework | Framework summary | - Introduce “I-We” Self-advocacy negotiation framework |
| 10:40am-11:20am | “Fishbowl”- Observe negotiation | Angel Case | - Observe examples of creating mutually-beneficial agreements |
| 11:10am-11:15am | BREAK | | |
| 11:15am-11:40am | Career Negotiation Prep and Debrief – Part II | Case C/A | - Post-performance  
- Practice building a strategy |
| 11:40am-12:00pm | Q&A, goal setting, closing, and feedback | Worksheet | - Answer outstanding questions; summarize learnings |

1. Introductions.
**Time:** 10 minutes // Start 9:00am

**Objective:** Build community among training participants and coaches. Bring people to be present/ mindful. Give people a sense of shared purpose (enhancing the women’s agency in self-directing their career and life aspirations; equipping you with tools for problem-solving to achieve life goals).

**Description:** Course coaches will introduce themselves and explain the agenda and goals of the negotiation training. Share the importance of learning negotiations skills—World Economic Forum calls it a top 10 skill needed to succeed in the future workforce. Facilitators will ask questions to participants: What is one word to describe how you are feeling today? Type into the chat.

**Logistics:** Zoe will present pages

**Suggested script (Zoe):**

*Good morning, all! Thank you so much for joining us early on a Saturday morning for this negotiation training. It is our pleasure to bring you some insights that we hope will be beneficial to you in your careers and perhaps in other areas of your life as well. The World Economic forum has called negotiation one of the top 10 skills needed to succeed in the future workforce, so we hope the lessons that we share in this workshop will be useful as you build your careers.*

*I invite everyone to type into the chat one word that describes how you’re feeling today.***

****WAIT FOR RESPONSES****

****Point out patterns, make small talk****

*My name is Zoe Williams, and I am a master’s student at Harvard Kennedy School, studying how negotiations training can promote women’s economic empowerment. Prior to enrolling in graduate school, I worked for five years in the healthcare industry—working as a consultant at McKinsey for 2 years and an analyst for the Congressional Budget Office for 3 years. I am passionate about women’s equality, and I hope to run for political office one day and increase women’s representation in leadership in the government. My interest in negotiations began when my older sister invited me to a webinar training from her college for women in career negotiations. I took notes and later used those concepts in my job offers working for Congress and then multiple times at McKinsey. I have now taken a couple of courses on negotiations training, and I am excited to share my experience and pass along some pointers that I found so useful when I was first starting out in my career.*

---

This workshop is organized by the Women’s Foundation of Boston, who seeks to promote women’s economic empowerment in Boston -- for affiliates of their partner organization the Big Sister Association of greater Boston. Joining me in facilitating today are Hannah and Angel, who have experience facilitating negotiations trainings through Harvard.

Now I will invite Angel and Hannah to introduce themselves.

[Hannah and Angel provide bios.]

The goal of today’s session is to enhance your potential to self-advocate for your career and life aspirations. We will share a step-by-step guide for using “I-We” Self-Advocacy in your career negotiations. Those steps are: 1. Start with your career goals, 2. Understand what you’re negotiating for, 3. Reduce ambiguity about what, how, and with whom to negotiate, and 4. Enhance your negotiations through relationships and your relationships through negotiations.

I know that some of you are managers or mentors for younger women, and that we have a range of experience levels in the Zoom room with regards to negotiation. We hope that as we go through these concepts, you will consider how to apply them for yourself, and when you are on the opposite side of the negotiating table. It is our hope that we can extend the impact of this training beyond this Zoom room -- and that you will share tips and tricks that you learn here with other women in your networks and lives -- maybe your Little Sisters!

We know that Zoom can be tiring, so we are going to make this training as interactive as possible! You will get hands-on negotiations practice that will give you more experience and confidence as you go into your next career negotiation. We will cover a variety of situations -- informed by my conversations with some of you about what types of negotiations you are facing in your lives.

Before we get started, I wanted to cover the scheduling logistics:

- As you can see from this agenda, we plan to end our workshop today at 12:00 PM, but the facilitators will stick around in the Zoom meeting for a few minutes if you have any further questions.
- You may note that we have tweaked the agenda slightly since last week so that we can accommodate more time for discussion.
- Our workshop today is divided into three parts: first, we will be getting to know each other and practicing negotiation; during the second section we will cover the foundational concepts on negotiations, and you will observe two negotiations of different styles. To wrap up our workshop, you will reflect back on what you learned, and we will open the floor for Q&A.
- We have two scheduled breaks: the first one is at 10:20 AM, and the second one is at 11:10 AM. These will be five-minute breaks, but if at any point today, you need to get up to use the restroom or get something to drink, we encourage you to go during lectures rather than during one of the negotiation simulations that you will be participating in.
• We ask that everyone hold their questions until Hannah, Angel, or I create the space for them. If you want to make sure that you don’t forget it, you can send Angel a private chat message, by clicking on the blue bar above the text box in the chat and clicking on her name.

• Lastly, I wanted to ask you to please keep yourself muted, unless you are in a breakout group or have been called on to ask a question. Please also keep your video on so that we can make this as close of a proxy to an in-person experience as possible.

• Can everyone practice raising your hands in Zoom to make sure you can do that later when you have a question?[wait]. Great! You can now lower your hand.

Alright, with those logistics out of the way, let’s get started! I will pass things off to Angel, who will give us instructions for our first practice preparing for a career negotiation.

[Should wrap up around ~9:10am ET]

2. Building a Negotiations Strategy – Part I

Time: 25 minutes // Start ~9:10am

Objective: Measure performance pre-training and give participants practice in negotiations.

Description: Coaches will send participants into two breakout rooms –one for Case A and one for Case C. Coaches will send participants a link to a Google form – which they can open on their phone or computer. The form will include a couple paragraphs of instructions for the negotiation and space to write what they would recommend saying in the negotiation.

Suggested script (Angel in plenary / Zoe and Angel in breakout groups):

To kick us off, we want to give you a little taste of what preparing for a negotiation feels like and learn about your negotiation approach. Shortly, we will send you to break out rooms where you will read a negotiation case and answer some questions about how you would approach it. We will break the class into two rooms and the two rooms will cover a different simulation--later on, you’ll get a chance to do the other simulation. You will have 15 minutes to do the simulation, and then once everyone is done, we will debrief in our groups for about 10 minutes before coming back together as a group. See you soon--sending you into groups now!

— — — — —

ONCE INSIDE THE BREAKOUT ROOMS

[share pages with power point instructions]

Hi, do we have everyone? Perfect! I’ll start sharing my screen with instructions for this simulation and share the link to the GoogleForm in the chat. If you click on the link in the chat,
you will be directed to a Google Form that describes the case scenario and then asks you two questions about how you would recommend approaching the case. If anyone has any tech difficulties or any questions, don’t hesitate to ping me on the chat!

You have 15 minutes to read the case and answer the questions. Remember that we are all here to learn so it doesn’t have to be perfect, just try your best.

Send link to Google Form:

Case A “Maria and DoGood” (Zoe):

Case C / “Jane at my health” (Angel):
https://bit.ly/3qH1YWP

[After 5 minutes] You should start answering the first question if you haven’t already.

[After 10 minutes] You should be starting to answer the second question if you haven’t already.

[After 15 minutes] Please submit your Google form. Google will send you an email with a copy of your responses in case you want to reference that while we are debriefing.

DEBRIEF QUESTIONS

I think we’re all back and ready to go now, perfect!

- What are some ideas that people had?
- Fill in the chat box: what do you think she should negotiate?
- What do you think is the hardest part?
- Do you think that she had enough information?

[Sample responses for Case A / Maria and DoGood:]
- Maria doesn’t know whether or not her salary is negotiable but thinks she should be getting maybe 5-10% more than her offer.
- Maria doesn’t have an alternative job offer yet, and we don’t know if the other job that she is interviewing for has the same social mission that Maria cares about
- Maria doesn’t know whether DoGood has an alternative candidate to her.
- Maria has non-monetary interests as well--to do more creative work - might she bring that up in a negotiation about her job offer?

[Sample responses for Case C / Jane at MyHealth]
● Jane knows that someone else in her position with the same work experience is making 11% more than she is.
● Jane has been valuable to the company in the past year helping with COVID, but we don’t know whether that skill is unique to her.
● Jane doesn’t want to make things awkward with her supervisor, who she considers a friend. Jane might take the approach of asking for her advice, “I have done some research on the market value of an administrator with my skills and level of work experience, and I think that I should be making $50,000. Do you have advice for how I could work towards increasing my pay to be aligned with the market rate?”
● Jane has an alternative job offer where she would make $50K a year.

Great work starting to practice strategizing for a negotiation. We will now rejoin the plenary session and get instructions for a negotiation simulation, where you will get to practice negotiating yourself.

[Should wrap up around 9:35am ; Angel will bring everyone back to the plenary session]

3. Simulation of a negotiation

Time: 30 minutes // Begin around 9:35am

Objective: Give participants practice in negotiations. Teach concepts of negotiation basics and about power and persuasion in negotiation.

Description: Participants will be given a negotiation situation and answer questions about what they would recommend doing in the scenario.

Logistics: Coaches will send participants a link to a Google form – which they can open on their phone or computer – and send participants into groups of three in breakout rooms. The form will include a couple paragraphs of instructions for the negotiation, simple questions about their goals, and a place to record the agreement reached (all three participants will fill out this form).

Suggested script (Hannah):

Now that you all have gotten some experience preparing and strategizing a negotiation, we are going to give you the opportunity to practice a negotiation. We will send you into breakout rooms in groups of three, where you will have the opportunity to negotiate. The three of you will simulate a negotiation among representatives from three programs deciding how to split up funding for a cross-department project. On these power point page, you can see a description of the instructions. I am also sending a link in the chat to the Google form-- where one member of your group will need to submit the agreement that you reached. The Google form also has a full description of the scenario, which you can reference while you are negotiating.
[Hannah will read from her slides on the three-way case]

You will have 15 minutes to negotiate and record your agreement in the Google form. Then we will come together as a group and debrief the negotiation for 10 minutes. If anyone has any tech difficulties or any questions, you can ping Angel in the chat!

Send link to Google Form:
Case B: http://bit.ly/3sMXTlQ

[Angel and Zoe to float through the rooms to answer questions]

DEBRIEF QUESTIONS

Welcome back! You ready to debrief?

- **Which department color had the most power/leverage in the negotiation?**
  - Blue. In a two-party agreement, both Green and Yellow would be better off partnering with Blue than with one another.
- **How did your group determine what was “fair”?**
  - Equal distribution? Many groups will split evenly 8/8/8 out of a conception that sharing equally is fair. But if blue brings more resources to the table, it could also be considered “fair” for the blue department to get a higher share of the resources if they are willing to join the three-party coalition. For example, green and yellow would be better off giving blue $10M in a three party collaboration (and then each getting $7M), than they would be if they joined a two-party collaboration without blue and each got $6M.
- **Which standards seemed more persuasive?**

[Hannah shares lesson on power in a negotiations and concept of a ZOPA for 20 minutes]

Great work today practicing negotiations! We will now take a break for 5 minutes -- please be back and ready to go by 10:25am ET. You are welcome to stay and ask questions.

[Should wrap around 10:20am]

4. Break

- **Time:** 5 minutes
- **Objective:** Keep people’s attention.
- **Description:** Ask people if they have questions, and if not then play music.

5. Introductions to Negotiation Framework
Time: 15 minutes // should start around 10:25am

Objective: Teach overall framework of negotiations, including informed by gender dynamics of negotiations.

Description: Hannah will present her four-step framework for career negotiations.

Logistics: Zoe to screen share Hannah’s power point pages and record the session.

Suggested script: Hannah

--We wanted to give you a heads up that this plenary session is going to be recorded to help us improve our negotiations training materials.—

[Hannah presents from her slides on the four-step negotiation framework]

[Wrap around 10:40am ET]

6. Observe negotiation.

Time: 30 minutes // Start around 10:40am [5 minutes for simulation + 10 to debrief x 2]

Objective: Enhance student’s understanding of what a successful negotiation looks like and how to coach others on self-advocacy. Compare I vs. I-We Self-advocacy; introduce concept of creating mutually-beneficial agreements.

Description: “Fishbowl” will show coaches negotiating with one another, following by a coaching session on their performance.

Logistics: Hannah will present her own framework pages

Suggested script (Angel and Zoe simulating // Hannah facilitating)

Now we are going to move into a “Fishbowl” exercise where we will observe Angel and Zoe simulating a negotiation to the Angel Caselet. You should have received this case in an email ahead of the training—but in case you haven’t had a chance to read the case—the shared screen provides a summary. Angel is an intern, and she is meeting with her manager Zoe to make a few requests about changes that she would like to make in her remaining summer internship. A lot of negotiation trainings encourage women to just ask for what they want, so we’re going to start with one round of the negotiation with Angel using an assertive style. Then we will debrief the simulation and they will try a different strategy.

Send link to The Case of Angel:
[Negotiation for ~5 minutes]

[Instructions for Angel:
- Be professional and assertive.
- Focus on personal interests, such as how you need to help care for your uncle.
- Be direct and specific about what you want (i.e., pay increase, schedule flexibility, and more interesting work)]

[Debrief for ~10 minutes]

[Zoe to send reminder of the 4 steps in the chat:
1. Start with Your Career Goals
2. Understand What you are Negotiating for
3. Reduce Ambiguity
4. Enhance Your Negotiations through Relationships and Your Relationships through Negotiations]

DEBRIEF QUESTIONS
- What advice do you have using these four steps if you were advising her?
- What are Angel’s career goals?
- Was this an asking/bending/shaping negotiation?
  - Schedule change - asking / bending
  - Compensation - asking
  - Creative work - bending
- Has anyone thought about this step “Reducing ambiguity”? Does Angel know whether what she is asking for is standard? What more information might she want to get?

[Show new Angel B case summary slide]
- What were Angel and Zoe’s interests?
- What arguments did Angel use? What was Zoe’s strategy?
- Were these arguments persuasive? How could you tell? What could Angel have done better next time?
- What was each person’s alternative? Did you think one was stronger than the others? What could each side have done to improve their alternatives?

Ok great, thank you for your input. What you saw here was an example of an assertive “I” self-advocacy strategy. Angel did not appeal to the values or interests of Zoe in this negotiation. Now we are going to have them do another quick round, to provide an example of what an “I-We” Self-advocacy strategy might look like?

[Negotiation for ~5 minutes]
[Instructions for Angel]

- Show gratitude for the summer experience (e.g., start by saying that you’re having a great experience, being grateful and courteous)
- Demonstrate how your requests could help the company
- Acknowledge limitations for the pay rate
- Mention the idea of your pitch and ask to spend time working on it]

--------

[Debrief for ~10 minutes]

DEBRIEF QUESTIONS

- What was different about Angel’s strategy this go around?
- Do you think that these arguments were more persuasive?
- What could Angel have done even better next time?

Nice work debriefing this simulation. We will now take a break for 5 minutes -- please be back and ready to go by 11:15am ET. You are welcome to stay and ask questions.

[Wrap up around 11:10am]

7. Break

Time: 5 minutes // Begin around 11:10am

Objective: Keep participants engaged.

Description: Answer questions or play music.

[Resume around 11:15am]

Recording of Angel Case Fishbowl

8. Building a Negotiations Strategy – Part II

Time: 25 minutes // begin around 11:15am

Objective: Measure performance pre-training and give participants practice in negotiations.

Description: Participants will be given a negotiation situation and answer questions about what they would recommend doing in the scenario.

Logistics: Coaches will send participants into two breakout rooms – one for Case A and one for Case C. Coaches will send participants a link to a Google form – which they can open on their phone or computer. The form will include a couple paragraphs of instructions for the negotiation and space to write what they would recommend saying in the negotiation.
Suggested script (Angel in plenary / Zoe and Angel in breakout rooms):

The time has come for y’all to try another negotiation simulation. Please don’t fret if you cannot remember all of the exact Hannah has taught you today, just remember to try your best and do apply what you have learned. Now we will send you into the same groups that you were in for the first round but give you a different negotiation.

———

ONCE INSIDE THE BREAKOUT ROOMS

I’ll start sharing my screen with instructions for this simulation and share the link to the GoogleForm in the chat. If you click on the link in the chat, you will be directed to a Google Form that describes the case scenario and then asks you two questions about how you would recommend approaching the case. If anyone has any tech difficulties or any questions, don’t hesitate to ping me on the chat!

You have 15 minutes to read the case and answer the questions. Remember that we are all here to learn so it doesn’t have to be perfect, just try your best.

Send link to Google Form:

Case A / Maria and DoGood (Zoe): https://bit.ly/2LNdnWt

Case C / Jane at MyHealth(Angel): https://bit.ly/3qH1YWP

[After 5 minutes] You should start answering the first question if you haven’t already.

[After 10 minutes] You should be starting to answer the second question if you haven’t already.

[After 15 minutes] Please submit your Google form. Google will send you an email with a copy of your responses in case you want to reference that while we are debriefing.

DEBRIEF QUESTIONS

I think we’re all back and ready to go now, perfect!

- Compared to the first simulation you completed, did you change your strategy?
- If you did, how do you think this will affect your outcomes?

[Sample responses for Case A / Maria and Do Good :]

- What are Rashida’s interests? If she had trouble filling the role, she might be willing to increase the salary by 10%
• Maria could mention that she is also waiting to hear back from another future employer to strengthen the perception of her alternatives

[Sample responses for Case C / Jane and MyHealth]
• What are Kindra’s interests?
• Jane could appeal to the values of the company that allowing her to spend more time learning the new technology platform would help both clients and other MyHealth employees
• Jane could mention that she has an alternative job offer where she would make $50K a year

[Wrap around 11:35am]

10. Conclusion
Time: 25 minutes // Begin around 11:35

Objective: To build community among training participants and coaches.

Description: Course coaches will facilitate a goodbye.

Logistics: Zoe to share PPT page of final take-aways.

Suggested script (Zoe presenting / Hannah answering questions):

We are coming near the end of our time together, so we are going to spend some time reviewing what you have learned this morning-- and then field your questions and save time for feedback at the end.

Before we conclude I want to tell a story that illustrates the framework that Hannah shared today as it applies to my career.

As a reminder, the steps that Hannah has shared for negotiating includes:

1. Start with Your Career Goals
2. Understand What you are Negotiating For
3. Reduce Ambiguity
4. Enhance Your Negotiations through Relationships and Your Relationships through Negotiations

[Share personal experience with a career negotiation.]

Could everyone enter into the chat one thing they learned today?

[wait for responses, make observations]

Thank you all for your participation and for staying with us during this Zoom session! We also want to thank the Big Sisters association and the Women’s foundation of Boston for making this possible.
Let’s conclude our negotiations training by discussing what you think is one ingredient for a successful negotiation? You can answer in a PollEverywhere, where we can see everyone’s answer automatically populate this word cloud.

Switch screens from slides to PollEv.
Share link in chat:
PollEv.com/zoewilliams947

**** WAIT FOR RESPONSES****

****Point out patterns, make small talk****

We hope that you will share these lessons that you learned today with another woman that you know. With that, we will field your questions now, and then save five minutes for feedback at the end.

[Angel will start by reading any questions that she received in the chat]

Ok, we will stay for a few minutes after noon to answer any further questions, but right now we would like to do two things -- first, take a picture of all the participants and second, save 5 minutes for you to fill out the feedback survey. Please click this link in the chat -- we value your input so we can continue to improve these sessions in the future.

Share link in chat:

[Wrap at 12pm]
Case A: Negotiating Offer Package for New Job

Over the past few weeks, Maria had a few rounds of interviewing with DoGood, one of the largest non-profits in Boston. Maria just got a call from DoGood offering her a position as a web developer after she graduates from college. Maria was relieved to have her first job offer, plus she was excited to help the organization’s public mission.

When Maria’s human resources contact Rashida called her to tell her that she was being offered the job, the salary that she offered was less than what Maria had expected. (In the fall, Maria’s career services at her college had said the lower range of salaries for a similar entry-level job in Boston was about 10% more than her offer was). Maria thanked Rashida for the offer and asked if she could have a couple days to think about the offer.

Maria wanted to be paid the fair market rate for her skills, but she also thought, “I should just be grateful to have a job, especially when the pandemic has cost so many people their jobs.” Maria wanted to become financially independent from her parents, and she could make ends meet at the offered salary. But Maria would not be able to achieve her goal of saving 5% of her salary for a car if she didn’t get a 5-10% increase in her salary offer.

Maria looked at DoGood’s website and saw they were meeting their fundraising goals, which made her think DoGood is in a secure financial position. But Maria is not sure what budget they would have for a salary increase. Rashida told her that DoGood had been looking for a new web developer for a few months and were eager for her to start as soon as she graduated, so Maria thought that there might not be a lot of qualified candidates interested in the web developer position.

Maria also knows that this job with DoGood on her resume would help her future career in web developing. She particularly hoped to get experience launching a new online giving platform that the organization was pursuing in response to COVID-19. In her interview, Maria learned that a web designer at DoGood was interested in hearing ideas for the platform. But Maria was not sure yet how much she would be able to contribute to the design of the website or whether she would be primarily taking the web designers’ layout and making them functional. She knew that contributing to the creative design of a website would help her develop professionally and was hoping for that experience at DoGood. Maria didn’t know whether she would get a better job offer for another web developer position that she had interviewed for last week.

Maria has a phone call this afternoon with Rashida to talk about the offer package.
Angel Torres was ecstatic to receive the email offer of a summer internship from Spring 4ward, a trendy, five-year-old startup in downtown Boston. Angel was proud to have received the offer, given the buzz around Spring 4ward and the competitive application process. Spring 4ward was run by two brothers, who founded the startup in the garage of their fraternity house at Springfield Polytechnic Institute (SPI). The company was known for the work-hard, play-hard culture they had instilled. As a sophomore studying computer science at SPI, Angel hoped the internship might lead to a full-time job after graduation.

On the first day, Angel walked in and scanned the open floor plan to see a smattering of casually dressed employees laughing and chatting. Angel had been told during the interview that many employees worked largely from home, but Angel would be expected to work from the company’s office.

Just above them, Angel saw the brothers’ offices on the second floor, overlooking the main workspace. In the lobby hung pictures of past cohorts of interns, including the teaching assistant of a computer science class that Angel had taken during the previous semester.

One of the brothers came out of the office and called down, “First day? Let’s put you to work!” Angel was directed to a conference table. The intern supervisor gave Angel a first work assignment updating static websites. “Is this really all they trust me to do?” Angel wondered but quickly shrugged off the thought and got to work.

Three weeks later, Angel was still updating static websites and the excitement of interning at Spring 4ward was wearing off. Angel had an idea to improve the user interface of their primary app to make it more appealing to high school and college students. But Angel’s supervisor seemed too busy to chat. Angel considered pitching the idea to the founding brothers but never had the opportunity to interact with them directly, other than in online team meetings. Meeting conversations stuck closely to an agenda and the only non-agenda conversations happened in the few minutes before the meeting started, as people arrived in the online meeting room. The attendees knew each other well and shared inside jokes that left Angel confused.

Adding to Angel’s frustration was a suspicion that another intern was making more money. Angel heard the student make an off-hand comment about the pay at Spring 4ward “beating work-study rates.” Angel had accepted the job at Spring 4ward though it offers less than a typical work-study position on campus. Why is another intern getting paid more than me? Does the low pay and boring work say something about what they think about me? Are other interns getting more interesting projects than I am?

Angel didn’t want to raise any of these concerns at home. Angel’s Mom had so much pressure on her and seemed to take great pleasure in the idea of Angel having found this “great opportunity.” Angel’s Mom’s work schedule kept shifting and she worried openly about how she would get Angel’s uncle to his dialysis appointments. Angel wanted to help but was scheduled to be in the office at the same time as the dialysis appointments. “I’m going to see about changing my work schedule,” Angel told her. “No, sweetheart,” she said. “I don’t want you to jeopardize your internship. It’s too important. But maybe you could drive your uncle to his appointment and work on your laptop in the waiting room?”
Angel explained that the tools needed to complete the work—high-speed Internet connection and access to more advanced technology—were only available at the office.

The professional opportunity that Angel had envisioned was turning into a professional disappointment.

**Round II**

As the summer progressed, Angel wondered whether there might be ways to change aspects of the internship. To start, Angel wanted to explore whether it might be possible to work on more creative projects and wanted to pitch the concept for an upgrade to the Spring4ward app interface. Angel also wanted to see if it would be possible to negotiate a schedule that made time to help with the uncle’s dialysis appointments. Finally, Angel wondered why other interns would be paid more and whether there was something to be said or done about that.

Before attempting to negotiate, Angel reached out to some folks for information, advice, and support.

Angel spoke to a former Spring4ward intern (a teaching assistant from a class last year) who said that she met with one of the founders and had a great conversation. She encouraged Angel to ask for a meeting but warned that it might take a while to schedule.

Angel approached the internship supervisor to inquire about whether there was any flexibility in the schedule. He said he didn’t care on what days Angel worked but did note that the scheduling was complicated. He said ideal would be if Angel could swap office times with another intern.

With an adviser at school, Angel shared the idea of updating Spring4ward’s app interface. The adviser liked the idea and made some useful suggestions for Angel on how to pitch the idea. When Angel revealed concerns about being undervalued—in terms of work and pay—the adviser said the work and pay were typical for a sophomore and first-time intern. Juniors and seniors tended to make more money and get more responsibility because they had more experience and better outside options.

Angel pondered how the use this information and advice to improve the internship experience and help out with the driving dialysis appointments. *Where to begin?*
Three-Way Case: Negotiating Department Funding

A non-profit foundation in Boston wants to promote cross-department collaboration on a new development project. The non-profit has chosen three of its divisions that it would like to fund to collaborate on the project, which they refer to as the Blue, Green, and Yellow departments.

The non-profit will give more funds if all three departments can work together, but it will also fund two-way collaborations. Because the non-profit leadership wants to fund cross-department solutions to its development project, it will not give any funding if the departments do not reach an agreement on how to work together. The below table shows the total level of funding that the non-profit will give in different scenarios of collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration Options</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Blue, Green, and Yellow</td>
<td>$24M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Blue and Green</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blue and Yellow</td>
<td>$18M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Green and Yellow</td>
<td>$12M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No Collaboration</td>
<td>$0M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will be paired into groups of three in Zoom breakout rooms. Quickly decide amongst yourselves which department you will represent: Blue, Green, or Yellow (you each will represent a different color). Your task is to meet with representatives of the two other departments to try to work out a mutually agreeable division of the fund. Only those departments that agree to collaborate will receive funds.

Please use the following guidelines to make your decisions.

1. Try to reach an agreement that maximizes your own department’s share of the fund. There is no benefit to helping or hurting other departments (assume that they will look out for their own interests).
2. You do not have to include all three departments in your agreement. The excluded department will simply not receive a share of the fund.
3. If you do plan to have a two-way partnership, give the excluded department a chance to make a counterproposal.
4. The fund may only be divided in millions of dollars.

FINAL DECISION

What is your name?

What was your breakout room number?

Which organization did you represent?

Which partnership option did you choose? (circle one) BGY BG BY GY none

How did you divide the funds? Blue _______ Green _______ Yellow _______
Case C: Negotiating a Raise

Jane has been an administrator at MyHealth for three years. This past year Jane volunteered to lead the company’s initiative to transition all internal meetings online. Jane’s expertise in online meetings was crucial to the transition, and she spent countless hours training other administrators on how to facilitate online meetings in their departments.

Recently, Jane went to a Zoom social event for administrators at MyHealth. In one breakout group, another administrator named John shared that he was frustrated that his salary had been frozen during COVID, saying “How can I save any money when I’m only making $50,000 a year and living in Boston?” Jane was surprised to hear this because her salary had been frozen at $45,000. Jane and John were at the same level in the company and had the same years of work experience.

MyHealth announced at the end of December 2020 that they would lift the salary freeze in 2021 and that performance reviews would take place in January. Given all the extra work that Jane did for the company in the past year, she thinks that it would be reasonable to receive a ~5% raise. Jane is thinking about asking for a raise in her performance review with her manager, named Kindra. Jane and Kindra got to know each other well when they played in the company softball league together (before COVID started). Jane doesn’t want things to become awkward with Kindra if she tries to negotiate her salary, but she thinks that she should be fairly compensated for the work that she does.

Jane also applied to a couple other companies for administrator roles, and she was offered a job at a small company that offered her a $50,000 salary. Jane was excited for the offer, but she would prefer to stay at the larger company MyHealth.

Jane had recently started helping with a new project that would help MyHealth employees and clients securely access data from home computers—a feature that everyone had been asking for since the pandemic began. Jane knew that companies were looking for tech savvy administrators and was hoping to use this project to develop her technology skills. But in order to finish launching the project, Jane needed to get Kindra’s approval for her to spend 10% of her time in the next month learning a new technology platform.

Jane has a performance review call scheduled with Kindra next week. She thought about whether and how to talk to Kindra about what was on her mind.
Feedback Survey Responses

I would recommend this workshop to a friend or colleague.
28 responses

How relevant was the material to advancing your career aspirations? (1 being not relevant, 3 being somewhat relevant, and 5 being very relevant)
28 responses

How did you feel about the length of the negotiations training? (1 being too short, 3 being about right, 5 being too long)
28 responses

Feedback Comments

- Great session! I like that it focused on more than just salary.
- I wouldn’t mind having another hour. Maybe just for a Q&A
• I appreciated the scenarios and the blue, green, yellow game. It put me on the spot and made me think about negotiations in a different way. All the insight from Zoe, Hannah, and Angel were incredible. Thank you for sharing all of this with us.

• Thank you so much! I would have loved a 2nd roleplay that utilized the feedback from the group.

• Thank you for this opportunity! It was really interesting, and I felt like it was helpful to people at all levels of their careers. I really enjoyed learning about the "I-We" framework and talking through the case studies.

• Let people know they can turn off their cameras when answering questions, like Angel did.

• Read the question/paragraph to everyone and then give people the time to answer.

• Pay more attention to your knowledge and share what you know is correct, rather than allow everyone else to answer, which could confuse people because their advice was not necessarily the best way to go about it.

• Focus more on showing examples of great interviews rather than not so great ones so that we can see what we’re supposed to do, rather than not do. It's much easier for people to remember what not to do which could cause more stress. If you show them what to do instead, it will relieve that stress and finally make them feel like they know what to do. Humans are very good imitators, if we keep seeing bad examples, we’re going to only display those bad examples.

• Give an example of someone who feels is not doing great at their job and then show how in reality they are doing a better job than they think they are (show examples of how they can tell that they are doing a good job). And then show them stepping up feeling confident and asking for what they want and getting it, even if the previous week/months have felt a little turbulent, they still deserve the raise, should ask for it, and should get the raise.

• Great job with participation opportunities and exercises.

• I loved this training and definitely gave some perspective on where my personal weaknesses are, and also highlighted where I’m not alone in those weaknesses in negotiation. I think it could have maybe dove more into what other places we negotiate in our lives, but also respect that the most important for all of us is within our careers.

• There was a lot of information for the session so having more time to review the framework discussed (go over it more than once) either by shortening the agenda for the time or adding a bit of time to the session would be a good adjustment.

• More time to read the scenarios and answer the questions. Other than that, this was really great!!

• Would like a list of all the negotiation strategies to try.

• Love the fact that we jumped right into an activity. Set the tone well.

• Thought the Angel case and discussion was gold. I felt this section was more effective than the beginning and ending cases, which were helpful but a little more straightforward. I think the complexity of Angel's situation was more realistic, and the steps of seeing it play out (great acting! :) ) and then having the chance to give alternative ways of approaching the convo were somewhat more ‘sticky’ in my mind than the beginning and ending cases. I wonder if there’s a way to split the difference with the other 2 cases, or maybe simplify them even more so that they are not ‘weaker’ versions of Angel, but instead are their own, separate thing - quick exercises that only take 15 minutes or so.
• Also really enjoyed Hannah's mini lecture - super informative and engaging.
• Overall, great workshop, and I really appreciate the opportunity to participate!
• This was helpful! I think some more specifics would have been helpful to add as well- just kinda nitty gritty stuff on what to say in a negotiation, when to negotiate, how best to do so (email, phone, in-person), % salary that's negotiable, etc.
• I really enjoyed the part where we got to negotiate ourselves in small groups. Sometimes the hardest part is putting it into practice.
• I really liked the breakout sessions and discussing the case studies. It may have been useful to actually revisit the same case study in the second session to see how our approaches may have changed after the training/framework presentation.
• I appreciated the holistic nature of this framework; it reminded me not to think of advancement/opportunity/salary/career growth as a one-time thing but as steps along a greater trajectory. It can be so easy to get lost in the "now" that I forget the picture. Additionally, I benefited from the specific examples provided -- from the case studies to the B/Y/G exercise to Zoe's personal story. And perhaps most importantly, I learned a lot about how other people think! It was wonderful to hear how other woman would approach the case studies and I learned what is important to them, where they get stuck/need insight, how they'd approach something. This really expanded my thinking and for that I am extraordinarily grateful!
• One point that continually surprises me in trainings such as these is the "who". Somehow, no one ever mentions the importance of those surrounding the leaders/managers/people with power. As an executive assistant to someone perceived as an important figure within Boston's healthcare landscape, I am always shocked that no one mentions the importance of getting on the good side of she who controls the schedule and communicates regularly with every other executive assistant to important people within the city ;) Just sharing more from my personal experience and what appears to be an unknown thing that I think all woman should know about!
• Not enough time to read cases. I love the participation and interaction
• This was fantastic! Thank you so much for creating a safe space to discuss difficult professional topics and giving me tools to feel empowered when I have always felt like I have not had any leverage throughout any negotiation conversation within my career.
Data Analysis Techniques

Big Sister affiliates received an invitation to participate in a negotiation training and were asked if they would be willing to be interviewed for 15-30 minutes about their experience in career negotiations and what they are looking for in a negotiation training.

Questions for participant interviews before the training:

- Tell me about why you are interested in taking a negotiation training.
- What are your goals for the session?
- Tell me about the last time that you remember having a negotiation. How did you prepare? How did it turn out?
- Tell me about your current job.
  - Is there anything that you would like to change about your job?
  - Who decides whether those changes can be made?
  - What opportunities do you see in being able to negotiate those changes?
- What worries you the most about negotiations? What do you want help with in your negotiations?

Questions for participant interviews following the training:

- Was the Big Sisters Negotiations Training relevant to advancing your career aspirations?
- Can you give a specific example of something that was relevant and useful that you learned in the training (e.g., a strategy, tactic)?
- What is one way you have used the information since the training (or plan to use the information)?
- Did you share anything you learned in the training with someone else (e.g., a colleague, friend, mentee)? If so, what did you share, and was it useful to them?
- Do you have any suggestions for how the Negotiations Training could be improved?

Methodology for measuring performance in pre- and post- negotiation simulations

Half of the participants were given “Case A” at the beginning of the training and “Case C” at the end. The other half were given “Case C” at the beginning and “Case A” at the end. This methodology reduces concern that changes in participant’s performance in the negotiation simulations could be caused by a difference in difficulty between Cases A and C. Instead, changes in performance should be attributable to the training.

Hannah Riley Bowles and I developed a framework for evaluating performance in the negotiation simulation using the principles that we covered in the training. See Table 6 for the measures that we used to measure proficiency in negotiation simulations. For each dimension, evaluators scored responses with “0” if the participant failed to address that dimension in their response and a score of “1” if their response did include that dimension. A wider range of point system was not used to avoid false precision (as the participants had a limited amount of time to respond, they did not have enough detail to create a wide range of performance).

I recruited independent coders with experience in negotiation coaching to evaluate participant responses following the training—Blanka Soulava and Javier Munoz. I trained coders using the Angel Case to score sample responses into the framework in Table 6, selecting a binary score of 0 or 1 for
whether or not the response mentioned those dimensions. Before proceeding with data from the training, I measured whether the independent coders performed 90%+ correctly on the training data.

After training two independent coders, I shared de-identified data with coders to score participant responses to Cases A and C. Responses to the cases were anonymized and reordered, so evaluators did not know whether the respondent had responded to a case with or without training. I then aggregated and averaged their scores, which ranged from an average performance improvement of 24% to 43%.

Table 6: Coding Responses—Description and Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the participant’s response, was there….</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example of Yes (=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of positions and underlying interests?</td>
<td>Considering the motivations of the protagonist (e.g., non-monetary gains, such as work experience; both long-term and short-term goals) and the negotiating counterpart</td>
<td>“She really cares about getting work experience, so prioritize building good relationships over getting a raise in the summer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of alternatives to agreement or zone of possible agreement (ZOPA)?</td>
<td>Considering what other options the protagonist and her negotiating counterpart have; trying to shape the counterpart’s perception of her alternatives</td>
<td>“Tell her manager that she has another job offer” “Ask your employer if there are other candidates for the position”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion about understanding what the protagonist is negotiating for?</td>
<td>How is what she negotiating for related to existing standards (e.g., typical, special exception, innovative change)?</td>
<td>“Look up the market rate of salaries for the position in that geographic area”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of sources of ambiguity?</td>
<td>Seeking knowledge or clarity about negotiating counterpart, how to negotiate, or what is negotiable; attempting to reduce that ambiguity</td>
<td>“Research the company’s public financial statements to understand whether a raise is feasible”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of enhancing the negotiation through relationships?</td>
<td>Seeking information, advice, support, or advocacy from others</td>
<td>“Talk to the prior intern about her salary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of how to find mutually beneficial solutions?</td>
<td>Considering others’ perspectives, particularly how they will recognize negotiation attempts as legitimate and in their interest</td>
<td>“Explain how your skills relate the job description”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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