

# GENDER INFLUENCES ON NEGOTIATION TACTICS IN WORKPLACE CONFLICTS

Leqele Manngope Maureen

*School of Business, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China*

## ABSTRACT

*In the present paper, the impact of gender relations in the working place is examined, as well as the methods of encouraging fair career development are discussed. Through the evaluation of the past and present gender concerns, it provides revelations on how gender preferences affect career advancement and professional growth. Based on the study, the systemic barriers that prevent gender equity are noted: these are discriminatory hiring, unequal access to mentorship, and biased performance evaluations. It also points out the achievements gathered by diversity programs but does not ignore the current issues, which include the stable gender pay gap and the interdependence of gender with race and socioeconomic prosperity. The study adopts a mixed-method design to negotiating styles and psychological obstacles that men and women encounter in the workplace. The results indicate that there are substantial gender disparities as regards to effective negotiation, self-efficacy, and outcome satisfaction. The conclusion of the paper contains practical recommendations that organizations can use to create inclusive cultures, establish equitable policies, and improve mentorship and sponsorship opportunities that would eventually lead to better organizational performance and job satisfaction by employees.*

**Keyword :** - Gender negotiations, Conflict styles, Workplace bias, Negotiation equity, Assertiveness penalty

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is meant to explore the gender aspect in the workplace and to establish the best ways of ensuring fair career growth. Through an examination of the past and present gender-related matters in the work place, the paper aims at providing a detailed insight into the role that gender plays in affecting career progression. In addition, it will offer effective suggestions which should be implemented in organizations in order to promote gender equity. It aims at analyzing gender relations, defining the existing approaches to the improvement of gender equity and estimating their efficacy. The exploration will also deepen the knowledge of the way organizations can establish inclusive cultures that support the professional development of every employee.

Gender dynamics professional development refers to how gender influences career opportunities, progress and the professional lives of people. Historically, workplace norms and expectations have been created through gender biases, which tend to disadvantage women and gender minorities [1]; [2]. Such biases may manifest in many ways, including discriminatory recruitment and hiring practices, reduced access to mentorship, and biased performance appraisals. As an example, research has pointed out that women are less likely to be offered leadership positions as compared to their male counterparts even in cases where both the women and men have been performing at similar levels. Moreover, women face the challenge of being unable to access equal professional development opportunities that men have, and it may hinder their career growth [3]. The current work places are becoming more aware of these problems and are devising measures to counteract them. Nevertheless, in spite of these efforts, gender equity discrepancies are still observed. These dynamics should be understood subtly considering past contexts and current practices. Another important aspect is to consider the intersectionality of gender with other dimensions including race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, which may additionally influence the possibility of professional development. Exploring these dynamics further, organizations will be better placed to address systemic barriers that limit gender equity and endeavor to build more supportive and inclusive workplaces to all workers [4]; [5];[6].

The last century has brought about considerable shifts in gender relationships in the working sphere,

following the changes in the society. This was the situation in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century when men were expected to be the breadwinners and occupy positions of leadership and professional work, whereas women were relegated to minor or clerical jobs [7]. This segregation was strengthened by the existing social norms and legal restrictions which reduced the chances of women progression and financial autonomy. Indicatively, most nations did not have legislation that guaranteed equal pay in relation to equal work until the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and women were in most cases blocked by legal and institutional barriers in relation to progressing with their careers [8].

However, the second part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was marked by vital alterations due to the rise of the feminist movement that promoted women rights and gender equality at the workplace. In the United States, historic laws, including the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and other countries, tried to solve the wage gap issues and pursue equity [9]. Also, affirmative action guidelines were implemented to increase the participation of women and minorities in different professional fields. Such legislative and social changes started to break down some of the boundaries that had traditionally limited the professional opportunities of women. Nevertheless, with all these developments, there was still an unequal distribution of progress, and gender imbalance in terms of leadership and career growth was still evident in many industries [10].

Hypothesis 1. Gender Differences in Negotiation Styles: Men will show a lot more assertive results of negotiation styles than women who will tend to use more collaborative and accommodating negotiation styles. This implies that societal expectations and gender norms influence the behavior of negotiation.

Hypothesis 2. Psychological Barriers to Negotiation: Women will be predicted to greater report low self-efficacy and stereotype threat situational reports in negotiation than men. All these psychological barriers are expected to reduce the effectiveness and confidence of women during negotiations.

Hypothesis 3. Conflict Outcomes by Gender: Men shall record greater satisfaction and feeling of fairness in the outcome of the negotiation than women, this means that gender will determine the perceived outcome of the negotiation efforts.

Hypothesis 4. Influence of Organizational Support: Greater estimates of organizational support of conflict management will be positively connected with negotiation satisfaction in both men and women, though the impact should be more notable in women, which could help to remove some of the psychological obstacles they face.

## 2. RELATED WORK

The gender relationships in the workplace in the 21st century are characterized both by improvements and by the remaining challenges. Many organizations are on the path of closing the gender equity gap by initiating diversity and inclusion programs, appointing women to top managerial roles, and establishing policies to discourage discrimination and harassment. These positive changes are marked by the increasing women participation in the workforce and the presence of more and more female leaders in different fields. As an example, females currently constitute a considerable portion of the professional labor market and tend to enter more and more spheres that used to be dominated by males, like tech and finance [11].

However, there are still a number of challenges. Gender pays gap remains one of the burning problems, as women tend to be underpaid in comparison with their male colleague who do similar job. This disparity can be explained by variations in occupations, industries, and levels of experience but systemic biases and discriminatory actions also contribute rather substantially to it. Moreover, women and gender minorities are likely to experience barriers on the way to high-level jobs and career development opportunities. Such obstacles can comprise unfair performance reviews, lacking access to mentorship and sponsorship, or organizational cultures that are insufficiently conducive to work-life balance or otherwise unsuccessful in handling discrimination [12]; [13].

Intersectionality further complicates the issue of gender relations in the workplace. The Gender identity does not live in a vacuum with the other identity determinants that include race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status. To give an example, women of color can face intersecting issues related to both gender and racial discrimination. Likewise, LGBTQ+ people may be confronted with peculiar challenges concerning their gender identity or sexual orientation. These intersectional issues require a complex solution that would consider and address the varied experiences of people in the labor force [14].

Gender dynamics within the professional sphere of influence have a serious impact on the process of professional growth and careerism. Gender biases may influence the process of hiring, performance evaluation, and promotion, usually causing an uneven career progression of women and gender minorities. Studies have shown that women have a lower propensity to be elevated into executive roles as compared to their male counterparts even in situations where both the qualifications and performance records are comparable. Such discrepancy could be

attributed to a range of aspects, such as unconscious biases, disparities in networking possibilities, and challenges of reconciling work and family demands [15].

Gender dynamic effects on career development also spread to job satisfaction and organization commitment. Research indicates that when employees feel that the working environment is fair and conducive, they will be more active and dedicated to their job. On the other hand, perceived bias and discrimination may create low job satisfaction, increased turnover, and poor productivity. In such a way, the discussion of gender dynamics and the promotion of equity are not merely ethical requirements, but also smart business thinking [16]; [17]; [18].

A gender-balanced working environment would require a policy and organizational structure that is strong enough to address the structural and cultural issues affecting career growth. Good policies ought to have numerous measures which would guarantee that gender equity is embedded in the organizational culture and ways of doing things. One of the most effective strategies is the adoption of elaborate diversity and inclusion policies that explicitly spell out the organizations desire and determination to achieve gender equity, together with targets, roles and measures. As an example, establishing goals regarding women representation among the leaders and reporting on this issue periodically can contribute to increasing accountability and creating meaningful change [19].

Besides formal policies, the organizational structures should include practices that embrace gender equity throughout the ranks. This will involve the introduction of equitable recruitment and promotion procedures that are not biased. Uniform job descriptions, guided interviewing and a varied hiring committee can minimize the unconscious biases during the hiring process. Furthermore, setting up transparent and clear standards of performance assessment and promotions means that every employee will be evaluated according to their qualifications and work input, as opposed to gender [15].

Organizational culture has a very critical role towards promoting gender equity. An inclusive environment needs to be supported by policies and a culture that appreciate diversity and are keen on removing discrimination. This should be done through supporting open communication, employee resource groups as well as by recognizing and embracing diversity through a number of initiatives and events. The most pivotal component is leadership commitment when leaders need to demonstrate inclusive behaviors, reinforce gender equity efforts, and promote the relevance of diversity in every organizational process [16]; [17]).

The programs of mentorship and sponsorship are vital to promote gender equity and facilitate professional development of women and gender minorities. Mentorship is a practice that involves assigning less experienced employees to experienced mentors, who guide, advise and assist them. Successful mentorship initiatives are able to help people in managing their careers, creating networks and attaining the skills they need to achieve promotions. Women and gender minorities may find it especially helpful to have access to mentors with a shared experience of the specific challenges they face, thereby overcoming the obstacles to career advancement [18]; [19].

Although it is similar to mentorship, sponsorship implies a more active type of advocacy. Sponsors are more senior individuals who use their power, and networks to advance the careers of their proteges. As opposed to mentors, sponsors vigorously promote the promotions, assignments, and professional opportunities of their protgs. Some studies have shown that women do not receive similar sponsorship to that of their male counterparts and this may limit women access to high profile projects and positions of leadership. This gap may be eliminated by formalizing sponsorship programs, which would provide women and gender minorities with the advocacy and visibility needed to progress in their careersp [20]; [21].

Mentorship and sponsorship programs should be designed in order to be effective, i.e. they have to be structured and inclusive. Companies ought to invest in training mentors and sponsors so that they are in the best position to guide their proteges. Moreover, initiatives are supposed to be tailored to ensure that all employees have fair access to the program, and they should address the needs and issues unique to underrepresented groups. Feedback and outcome measures can aid organizations to assess the thriving of these programs and revise their strategies to achieve their objectives of gender equity [22]. Training and development programs also play a significant role in facilitating gender equity in professional development by providing employees with desired skills and knowledge that are essential in career advancement. Such programs must consider both personal and firm-level requirements and target such areas as leadership training, skill-building, and knowledge of gender biases [23].

The leadership development programs play a crucial role in training women and gender minorities towards the senior jobs. Through these programs, specific leadership training, strategic thinking training, and executive

presence training should be provided. Moreover, they should consider giving assignments on high-profile initiatives and cross-functional assignments that would enable them to develop the skills and connections that they need to develop their careers. Even organizations can be recommended to adopt custom development initiatives that consider the distinct issues that women and gender minorities may encounter, which can include reconciling work and family life or overcoming male-dominated working environments [5]; [24]; [25].

In addition, companies ought to invest in their consistent learning opportunities that enable the consistent growth of the profession. The employee should be provided with access to the external training facilities, industry conferences, and professional certification to keep the employee abreast of the industry trends and improve skills. By facilitating a culture of lifelong learning and development, the career growth can be nurtured as well as assists employees to remain competitive in an ever-changing job market [26]; [27].

To sum up, promoting gender equity in professional development requires a complex solution that involves the adoption of effective policies and organizational structures, the development of mentorship and sponsorship opportunities, as well as providing extensive training and development programs. Organizations can build more inclusive cultures by removing the structural and cultural obstacles that affect gender equity, which will in turn facilitate the career advancement of every employee. Such measures do not only help in creating a more balanced work environment but also allow improving the performance of the entire organization by using the varied skills and viewpoints of the employed personnel.

Monitoring of the gender equity strategies is highly important in reviewing the effectiveness of the strategies and to make necessary changes to keep continuing with the progress. Towards this end, it is important that organizations put in place measurable and indicators of success that will shed light on the effectiveness of gender equity initiatives. Such metrics must cover many areas, such as representation, pay equity, career growth, and employee satisfaction.

One of the basic indicators that can be used is the presence of women and gender minorities at various levels of the organization and especially in managerial positions. The effectiveness of Promoting gender diversity at the top could be monitored by keeping the percentage of female staff in the senior management and executive positions. Also, organizations ought to monitor the gender distribution of groups and departments to ascertain that diversity is attained in every facet of the business [28].

Pay equity is an important indicator to organizations. I would recommend a frequent pay audit, in which salaries of similar jobs between genders are compared. It is also essential to identify and correct any pay gaps as a way of making sure that fair and equitable compensation practices occur. Besides the salary analysis, it is also necessary that organizations examine the promotion rates and the possibilities of career advancement between the various genders. The average number of years till promotion and the proportion of men/women who get promoted can indicate the presence of gender-related biases in advancing the careers [29]. Employee satisfaction and employee engagement surveys can become useful in evaluating gender equity program effectiveness. Such surveys must include questions on perception of unfairness, cases of discrimination and level of satisfaction concerning professional development opportunities. Results analysis may allow identifying areas where gender equity initiatives are prospering and those where they should be further directed [29]; [3].

Case studies and benchmarking provide practical information about the effectiveness of gender equity initiatives because they demonstrate how gender equity initiatives are carried out in the real world, and what their results are. An examination of the way that other organizations have engaged with strategies of gender equity can serve to illustrate some helpful lessons and identify practices that have been successful. As an illustration, such organizations as Salesforce and IBM have already achieved considerable success in eliminating gender pay gaps and advancing diversity by conducting extensive equity reviews and releasing clear reports.

An example is Salesforce that has conducted an annual pay audit to ascertain fair remuneration regardless of gender or race. The organization as well undertakes frequent changes to eliminate any disparity noted. Such a proactive approach demonstrates the desire to promote fairness and is an example to other companies that want to address pay equity issues. Likewise, IBM has also put up policies to increase the presence of women in senior roles and has invested in mentorship opportunities to facilitate career growth [30]; [31].

Comparing to the industry standards and best practices helps the organization to review the progress against the peers and define areas of improvement. Benchmarking the gender equity indicators against the indicators of the leading companies operating in the same sector or field will allow the companies to detect some insights into the best practices and develop realistic objectives of their own efforts. Reports and surveys in the industry can

usually give information on female and male representation, equal pay, and job satisfaction which can enable organizations to evaluate their performance and to determine what practices are working. Besides, participating in external analysis and certifications, e.g., the Gender Equality Index or Diversity and Inclusion Benchmarking, provides an objective perspective on gender equity actions. Such assessments offer a systematic approach to measuring improvement, and they may allow companies to pinpoint the gaps and areas of improvement [32]; [33];[34].

### 3. METHODOLOGY

Through mixed methods, scientists were looking into how gender affects how people respond and view situations at work that involve conflict. Both interviews and answers to surveys were part of the study to include a variety of trends and different people's personal experiences. The results of the study are both valid and reliable because a variety of methods were used to conduct research.

In order to obtain the information, a survey was given at a specific time to examine negotiation styles, how conflicts were seen by those involved, mental biases, self-belief, and the environment at their workplace. To learn more, semi-structured interviews were used to see how men and women deal with conflicts at work. After everyone received the right information and ethical clearance was granted, they decided to join the study.

#### Sample

214 employees who worked full-time (108 women and 106 men) in well-established companies in the healthcare, education, technology, and finance sectors were included in the study sample. People were invited to take part in the study through professional networks, forums at work, and LinkedIn. Every person who took part needed to be employed full-time for at least a year and report experiencing or witnessing a work conflict involving negotiation.

#### Populations

Of the population, 49.5% are men and the rest, 50.5% are women. Individuals' mean age was 37, with ages between 25 and 55 years (SD = 7.8) The average amount of work experience is 11.2 years.

Majority of jobs are non-managerial, and there are fewer managerial or supervisory jobs compared to others.

Among the people who took part in the main sample, thirty people (15 women and 15 men) were chosen for the follow-up interviews based on their industry, job rank, and negotiation method.

#### Procedure

Those taking part completed a Qualtrics survey that took no more than 25 minutes. It showed the following results:

- The demographics
- How many conflicts one faces and how serious they are
- These are just descriptions that people provide about their own negotiation style. Parts of negotiation related to the mind
- How fair and successful response to disputes is perceived

All the interviews were done on Zoom and each one took between forty-five and sixty minutes. among the topics discussed in the interviews were personal negotiation experience, ideas about gender, choices in negotiation strategy, and reflections on the results.

Every participant's interview was recorded, written down in full, and looked at using thematic analysis. The agreement of two independent coders was at 90% and thus proved inter-coder reliability.

#### Measurements

NSI measures five different negotiations styles with a consistent factor ( $\alpha$ ), which are aggressive, avoidant, accommodative, compromise, and collaborative.

We used the CROS measure to evaluate how satisfied people were, sense of fairness, and their long-term success in resolving the dispute ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ).

To fit the General Self-Efficacy Scale for negotiations, it was modified to come up with the Negotiation Self-Efficacy Scale, with an internal consistency score of 0.79.

Perceived stereotype threat was measured with a 4-item scale that had been taken from earlier studies ( $\alpha = 0.76$ ).

The Perceived Organizational Support for Conflict Management scale ( $\alpha = 0.83$ ) was applied to look at organizational support.

#### Qualitative Themes

Interview analysis identified key thematic codes:

- Strategy framing
- Backlash anticipation
- Emotional labor
- Organizational silence
- Adaptive behavior

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 4.1 Gender Differences in Negotiation Styles (Table 1)

Independent samples *t*-tests revealed significant gender differences across all three negotiation styles:

- Assertive Style: Men ( $M = 3.76, SD = 0.61$ ) scored significantly higher than women ( $M = 3.30, SD = 0.68$ ),  $t(212) = 5.19, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.29, 0.63]$ .
- Collaborative Style: Women ( $M = 3.72, SD = 0.65$ ) scored higher than men ( $M = 3.40, SD = 0.61$ ),  $t(212) = -3.81, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [-0.50, -0.16]$ .
- Accommodating Style: Women ( $M = 3.26, SD = 0.60$ ) scored higher than men ( $M = 2.84, SD = 0.57$ ),  $t(212) = -5.28, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [-0.58, -0.26]$ .

These findings support H1, confirming that men tend to adopt more assertive negotiation strategies, whereas women favor collaborative and accommodating approaches.

### 4.2 Gender Differences in Psychological Factors (Table 2)

Large and statistically significant gender disparities emerged in self-efficacy and stereotype threat:

- Self-Efficacy: Men ( $M = 4.21, SD = 0.50$ ) reported substantially higher self-efficacy than women ( $M = 3.16, SD = 0.50$ ),  $t(212) = 15.15, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.91, 1.18]$ .
- Stereotype Threat: Women ( $M = 3.79, SD = 0.51$ ) experienced significantly higher stereotype threat than men ( $M = 2.47, SD = 0.43$ ),  $t(212) = -20.38, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [-1.44, -1.19]$ .

These results support H2, indicating that women face greater psychological barriers in negotiation settings.

### 4.3 Conflict Outcomes by Gender (Table 3)

Gender differences were also observed in post-negotiation evaluations:

- Satisfaction: Men ( $M = 3.77, SD = 0.56$ ) reported higher satisfaction than women ( $M = 3.45, SD = 0.63$ ),  $t(212) = 3.95, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.16, 0.48]$ .
- Fairness Perceptions: Men ( $M = 3.93, SD = 0.44$ ) perceived greater fairness than women ( $M = 3.75, SD = 0.51$ ),  $t(212) = 2.72, p = 0.007, 95\% CI [0.05, 0.30]$ .

These findings partially support H3, suggesting that men derive more positive outcomes from negotiations.

#### 4.4 Regression Analysis of Conflict Satisfaction (Table 4)

A multiple regression examined predictors of conflict satisfaction ( $R^2 = 0.10$ ,  $F(9, 204) = 2.57$ ,  $*p* = 0.008$ ). Key findings include:

- Self-Efficacy was a significant positive predictor ( $\beta = 0.17$ ,  $*p* = 0.036$ ), supporting H4a.
- Stereotype Threat was not significant ( $\beta = -0.05$ ,  $*p* = 0.554$ ), failing to support H4b.
- Gender  $\times$  Assertiveness Interaction: A follow-up analysis (Table 5) revealed a significant negative interaction ( $\beta = -0.32$ ,  $*p* = 0.010$ ), indicating that the effect of assertiveness on satisfaction was weaker for women than men.

#### Discussion

There Are Various Forms of Negotiating.

The research shows that women cooperate and accept more than men, who tend to be more assertive, so gender roles in negotiations are proved here. These findings are also supported by studies that noticed that cultural standards affect people's negotiation styles based on their gender.

Areas that psychology covers:

Those who cannot effectively negotiate tend to be women due to the big gap in self-confidence and the threat from stereotypes. Having to deal with more gender-based expectations and believing less in their abilities may decrease women's confidence and achievement.

Theoretical Output:

- It uses skills borrowed from Expectancy Violation Theory and bridges the gap with Social Role Theory to explain the difference between the genders in negotiation. It is claimed by this theory that women should be both cooperative friends and good negotiators, which ends up creating a dilemma. As a result of this, they have to act differently and cannot negotiate as much as they could before.
- Showing what is different and why these things happen everywhere improves our understanding in this field.

In the area of practice:

- Workshops should be given that help staff deal with gender-based barriers in negotiation and show them how to change their approach if needed.
- Put formal, fair ways of handling disputes into place to address fewer issues through unofficial and prejudiced ones.
- Making confidence and multiple negotiation styles normal is possible if leaders build support systems among teammates and senior staff.
- Remind leaders about possible unconscious biases while they assess negotiations and employees' success in their reviews.

Restrictions:

The data can only show relations, not actual reasons for them. With continued experience or guidance, many styles like the aggressive style could enhance over a long period. Despite the variety within the industry and age, the sample is only made up of people who identify as men and women from the United States. In the future, researchers should examine the views of non-binary people and compare results from other countries.

In addition, researchers can carry out tasks in which individuals negotiate with 'experts,' allowing for the study of aspects such as backlash perception and how much power people have.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This paper emphasizes the importance of understanding gender relationships in career advancement and career growth at the work place. It affirms that women and gender minorities are still systematically underprivileged and this is reflected in numerous ways including unfair hiring, lack of mentorship opportunities, and discriminative performance reviews. Even with the progress made by diversity programs, there is still a long way to go, with such issues as a continuing gender pay-gap and the challenges posed by intersectionality.

The evidence suggests that women tend to have more cooperative negotiation approaches and have greater psychological obstacles, including less self-efficacy and more stereotype threat. These are some of the reasons that result in differences in satisfaction and perceived fairness of the negotiation results in comparison to their male counterparts.

#### Recommendations

1. **Policy Development:** The policymakers are supposed to enact and adopt the law which stipulates that equal work deserves equal pay and also conduct frequent audits to detect and correct the inconsistencies related to pay among different genders.
2. **Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives:** Organizations must have elaborate diversity and inclusion policies, which stipulate specific goals on gender representation especially in the management team, and require the management to report on the progress.
3. **Mentorship and Sponsorship Programs:** The stakeholders shall invest in formal mentorship and sponsorship programs explicit to women and gender minorities to get equal access to professional development opportunities and resources.
4. **Education on Unconscious Bias:** Conduct education sessions among all the employees and mostly the leaders to sensitize them about unconscious biases and how they affect the hiring, promotions, and performance appraisals.
5. **Enabling Organization Culture:** Promote an organizational culture that is inclusive, open communication, and appreciates diversity; it should also engage actively to stop discrimination so that the culture can support the success of all employees.

By implementing these suggestions, organizations would be able to establish a more equal and supporting environment that would allow to increase the level of career development of all the employees and better the overall organizational performance.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1]. Bird, Sharon R., and Laura A. Rhoton. "Seeing isn't always believing: Gender, academic STEM, and women scientists' perceptions of career opportunities." *Gender & Society* 35.3 (2021): 422-448.
- [2]. D'Agostino, Maria, et al. "Organizational practices and second-generation gender bias: A qualitative inquiry into the career progression of US state-level managers." *The American review of public administration* 52.5 (2022): 335-350.
- [3]. Hartman, Rosanne L., and Emily G. Barber. "Women in the workforce: The effect of gender on occupational self-efficacy, work engagement and career aspirations." *Gender in Management: An International Journal* 35.1 (2020): 92-118.
- [4]. Afolabi, S. "Perceived effect of insecurity on the performance of women entrepreneurs in nigeria." *FUW-International Journal of Management and Social Sciences* 9.2 (2024).
- [5]. Akpuokwe, Chidiogo Uzoamaka, Chidinma Favour Chikwe, and Nkechi Emmanuella Eneh. "Leveraging technology and financial literacy for women's empowerment in SMEs: A conceptual framework for sustainable development." *Global Journal of Engineering and Technology Advances* 18.3 (2024): 020-032.
- [6]. Chikwe, Chidinma Favour, Nkechi Emmanuella Eneh, and Chidiogo Uzoamaka Akpuokwe. "Navigating the double bind: Strategies for women leaders in overcoming stereotypes and leadership biases." *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews* 18.3 (2024): 159-172.
- [7]. Antico, Janet O. *RE-IMAGINING TRADITION: WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH*. Diss. Doctoral dissertation, Drew University, 2020.
- [8]. Gakpo, Ernestina Joyce. *Gender Equality: A Case Study on the Effect of Patriarchy on Women's Pastoral Leadership in the Presbyterian Church of Ghana, North America/Australia Presbytery*. Diss. Northeastern Seminary, 2022.
- [9]. Bailey, Martha J., Thomas Helgerman, and Bryan A. Stuart. "How the 1963 equal pay act and 1964 civil rights act shaped the gender gap in pay." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 139.3 (2024): 1827-1878.
- [10]. Afolabi, Salami, and C. T. Aghaunor. "Women leadership, financial literacy and performance of small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria." *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews* 22.2 (2024): 2239-2253.
- [11]. Offermann, Lynn R., and Kira Foley. "Is there a female leadership advantage?." *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management*. 2020.
- [12]. Blanchard, Anita K., and Janice C. Blanchard. "Isolation, lack of mentorship, sponsorship, and role models." *Burnout in Women Physicians: Prevention, Treatment, and Management* (2020): 193-216.
- [13]. Phelps, Lauren. "a literature review and qualitative exploration of the barrier to female career advancement and mitigating organizational characteristics." (2024).

- [14]. Keating, Julie A., et al. "Supporting midcareer women faculty in academic medicine through mentorship and sponsorship." *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions* 42.3 (2022): 197-203.
- [15]. Benson, Alan, Danielle Li, and Kelly Shue. "Potential and the gender promotions gap." *Available at SSRN* (2024).
- [16]. Koburtay, Tamer, Jawad Syed, and Radi Haloub. "Implications of religion, culture, and legislation for gender equality at work: Qualitative insights from Jordan." *Journal of Business Ethics* 164.3 (2020): 421-436.
- [17]. Lewellyn, Krista B., and Maureen I. Muller-Kahle. "The corporate board glass ceiling: The role of empowerment and culture in shaping board gender diversity." *Journal of Business Ethics* 165.2 (2020): 329-346.
- [18]. Hing, Leanne S. Son, et al. "Gender inequities in the workplace: A holistic review of organizational processes and practices." *Human Resource Management Review* 33.3 (2023): 100968.
- [19]. Mustapha, A. H., Y. C. Ojeleye, and S. Afolabi. "Workforce diversity and employee performance in telecommunication companies in nigeria: Can self efficacy accentuate the relationship." *FUW-International Journal of Management and Social Sciences* 9.1 (2024): 44-67.
- [20]. Cardenas, Alice. *The Effect of the Quality of Mentoring and Sponsorship on Career Advancement Among Women of Color*. Diss. The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, 2023.
- [21]. Griffeth, Lauren L., et al. "Sponsorship: An Intervention to Accelerate Women's Career Velocity." *IUP Journal of Soft Skills* 15.3 (2021): 7-22.
- [22]. Rasool, Samma Faiz, et al. "How toxic workplace environment effects the employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing." *International journal of environmental research and public health* 18.5 (2021): 2294.
- [23]. Johnson, W. Brad, et al. "Creating a mentoring culture in graduate training programs." *Training and Education in Professional Psychology* 17.1 (2023): 63.
- [24]. Ediae, Ayo Amen, Chidinma Favour Chikwe, and Kevin Namiro Kuteesa. "Empowering youth through sexuality and leadership education: Approaches and outcomes." *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews* 22.1 (2024): 1250-1265.
- [25]. Smith, Sonya G., and Jeanne C. Sinkford. "Gender equality in the 21st century: Overcoming barriers to women's leadership in global health." *Journal of Dental Education* 86.9 (2022): 1144-1173.
- [26]. Patel, Sunil. "Chapter-15 Learning and Development Strategies: Fostering Continuous Growth." *Human Resource Management in the Modern Workplace* 177 (2022).
- [27]. Uzorka, Afam, David Makumbi, and Kagezi Kalabuki. "Lifelong learning and skill development for project managers in the dynamic labor market landscape." *Human Resources Management and Services* 6.2 (2024): 3401-3401.
- [28]. Baker, Marzena, Erica French, and Muhammad Ali. "Insights into ineffectiveness of gender equality and diversity initiatives in project-based organizations." *Journal of Management in Engineering* 37.3 (2021): 04021013.
- [29]. Dong, Ting. "Gender salary gap in the auditing profession: Trend and explanations." *European Accounting Review* 33.2 (2024): 617-645.
- [30]. Calvin, Ojeleye Y., et al. "Abusive leadership, job stress and SMES employees' turnover intentions in Nigeria: Mediating effect of emotional exhaustion." *International Journal of Intellectual Discourse* 7.1 (2024): 146-166.
- [31]. Bersin, Josh, and Kathi Enderes. "Elevating equity: The real story of diversity and inclusion." (2021).
- [32]. Mirvis, Philip H. "From inequity to inclusive prosperity: The corporate role." *Organizational dynamics* (2020): 100773.
- [33]. Okeke, Nkem, et al. "Sustainable Approach to Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Through Better Quality Measurement." *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* 17.5 (2024): e010791.
- [34]. Velasco-Balmaseda, Eva, Izaskun Larrieta-Rubín de Celis, and Nagore Embeita Izaguirre. "Corporate social responsibility as a framework for gender equality: mapping of gender equality standards for sustainable development." *Corporate social responsibility and environmental management* 31.3 (2024): 1905-1920.

## TABLE APPENDIX

**Table -1: Descriptive Statistics for All Variables (N = 214)**

Variable	Mean (SD)	Min	Max
Gender (0=Male, 1=Female)	0.49 (0.50)	0	1
Age	5.00 (0.00)	5	5
Work Experience (Years)	10.95 (4.15)	1.3	23.5
Job Level (0=Junior, 1=Senior)	0.37 (0.48)	0	1
Negotiation Styles (1–5 scale)			

Assertive	3.53 (0.69)	2.06	5
Collaborative	3.56 (0.65)	1.96	5
Accommodating	3.05 (0.62)	1.35	4.75
Psychological Factors (1–5 scale)			
Self-Efficacy	3.70 (0.72)	1.66	5
Stereotype Threat	3.12 (0.81)	1.34	5
Conflict Outcomes (1–5 scale)			
Satisfaction	3.61 (0.61)	1.88	5
Fairness	3.84 (0.48)	2.42	5
Organizational Support	3.41 (0.46)	2.2	4.85

**Table -2:** Gender Differences in Negotiation Styles (Independent Samples t-Tests)

Variable	Men (n=109)	Women (n=105)	Mean Diff. [95% CI]	*t*(212)	*p*
Assertive Style	3.76 (0.61)	3.30 (0.68)	0.46 [0.29, 0.63]	5.19	<0.001
Collaborative	3.40 (0.61)	3.72 (0.65)	-0.33 [-0.50, -0.16]	-3.81	<0.001
Accommodating	2.84 (0.57)	3.26 (0.60)	-0.42 [-0.58, -0.26]	-5.28	<0.001

**Table -3:** Gender Differences in Psychological and Conflict Outcomes

Variable	Men (n=109)	Women (n=105)	Mean Diff. [95% CI]	*t*(212)	*p*
Self-Efficacy	4.21 (0.50)	3.16 (0.50)	1.04 [0.91, 1.18]	15.15	<0.001
Stereotype Threat	2.47 (0.43)	3.79 (0.51)	-1.32 [-1.44, -1.19]	-20.38	<0.001
Conflict Satisfaction	3.77 (0.56)	3.45 (0.63)	0.32 [0.16, 0.48]	3.95	<0.001
Perceived Fairness	3.93 (0.44)	3.75 (0.51)	0.18 [0.05, 0.30]	2.72	0.007
Organizational Support	3.44 (0.47)	3.38 (0.46)	0.06 [-0.07, 0.18]	0.94	0.349

**Table -4:** Regression Predicting Conflict Satisfaction

Predictor	$\beta$ (SE)	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Gender (Female)	-0.06 (0.17)	-0.36	0.722	[-0.40, 0.28]
Self-Efficacy	0.17 (0.08)	2.11	0.036	[0.01, 0.34]
Stereotype Threat	-0.05 (0.09)	-0.59	0.554	[-0.22, 0.12]
Assertive Style	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.42	0.676	[-0.15, 0.10]
Collaborative	-0.07 (0.07)	-1.11	0.270	[-0.20, 0.06]
Accommodating	-0.02 (0.07)	-0.26	0.792	[-0.16, 0.12]
Org. Support	-0.14 (0.09)	-1.57	0.118	[-0.32, 0.04]
Experience	0.00 (0.01)	0.02	0.986	[-0.02, 0.02]
Job Level	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.25	0.802	[-0.19, 0.15]
Constant	4.05 (0.65)	6.24	<0.001	[2.77, 5.33]

Model Fit:  $R^2 = 0.10$ ,  $F(9, 204) = 2.57$ ,  $*p^* = 0.008$

**Table -5:** Interaction Between Gender and Assertiveness

Predictor	$\beta$ (SE)	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Gender (Female)	0.81 (0.45)	1.80	0.073	[-0.08, 1.70]
Assertive Style	0.15 (0.09)	1.62	0.106	[-0.03, 0.33]
Gender $\times$ Assertiveness	-0.32 (0.12)	-2.58	0.010	[-0.57, -0.08]
Constant	3.20 (0.35)	9.10	<0.001	[2.51, 3.90]

Model Fit:  $R^2 = 0.10$ ,  $F(3, 210) = 7.60$ ,  $*p^* < 0.001$

APPENDIX

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
id	gender	age	experience	job_level	style_assertive	style_collab	style_accom	self_efficacy	stereotype_threat	conflict_satisfaction	conflict_fairness	org_support	gender_assert	ext_stg2
1	1	0	5	19.8	0	2.2	3.03	3.23	4.79	2.05	4.22	3.38	2.2	0
2	2	1	5	8.1	1	3.28	3.57	2.62	3.46	3.42	3.54	4.26	3.4	3.29
3	3	1	5	14.7	0	4.58	3.43	3.26	3.8	3.59	3.97	3.7	3.52	4.08000001
4	4	1	5	11.9	0	3.13	2.25	2.4	2.72	4.57	3.57	3.7	3.5	3.13000001
5	5	0	5	20	1	4.4	2.25	2.54	3.49	2.40	3.43	3.84	4.12	0
6	6	0	5	8	1	3.11	3.78	3.09	4.95	1.68	4.02	4.08	2.96	0
7	7	0	5	7.8	0	3.58	3.77	1.94	4.04	2.80	3.11	4.41	3.84	0
8	8	1	5	8.8	1	4.44	3.98	3.40	2.97	3.47	3.47	3.27	3.9	4.44000001
9	9	1	5	2.7	0	2.76	3.12	3.19	3.76	4.74	3.58	3.57	2.41	2.76
10	10	1	5	9.1	1	4.47	3.07	3.55	3.38	4.54	3.28	3.55	3.46	4.48000001
11	11	0	5	8.2	0	4.1	3.3	3.03	4.43	2.18	3.72	3.55	3.25	0
12	12	1	5	11.8	0	2.81	3	4.02	4.18	4.44	2.27	3.29	3.28	2.80000001
13	13	1	5	12.6	1	3.04	4.6	3.28	2.78	3.65	3.07	3.48	3.47	3.64000001
14	14	0	5	18.7	0	4.28	3.83	2.84	4.66	2.85	3.90	4.44	3.26	0
15	15	0	5	25	0	4.04	3.17	2.97	4.23	2.84	3.9	4.25	3.18	0
16	16	0	5	8.8	1	2.5	3.32	3.23	4.35	1.98	3.18	4.1	3.52	0
17	17	0	5	7.6	1	3.08	3.43	2.93	4.96	2.08	4.56	4.45	2.96	0
18	18	1	5	18.2	1	3.03	2.47	3.22	3.35	4.51	2.88	3.69	3.78	3.03
19	19	0	5	5.9	1	3.55	3.15	2.48	4.47	2.23	4.38	4.1	3.84	0
20	20	0	5	18.5	0	4.08	2.89	2.5	4.74	2.2	4.06	3.95	2.99	0
21	21	1	5	15.9	0	3.32	3.1	2.86	2.92	3.52	3.01	3.89	3.69	3.31000001
22	22	0	5	9.3	0	2.67	3.13	3.95	3.78	2.41	4.87	3.71	3.73	0
23	23	0	5	4.3	0	3.87	4.38	2.15	3.68	3.43	3.08	2.78	2.64	0
24	24	0	5	16.6	1	4.08	3.68	2.48	3.21	1.87	4.39	3.99	3.18	0
25	25	0	5	10.7	0	3.99	2.96	2.47	5	2.41	4.1	4.71	4.1	0
26	26	1	5	16.2	0	3.96	4.04	3.74	2.55	4.51	3	4.16	3.81	3.96
27	27	0	5	4.8	0	4.18	4.14	2.72	4.08	2.36	4.64	4.48	3.27	0
28	28	1	5	6.6	1	3.52	4.25	3.95	2.96	4.03	3.25	4.32	3.59	3.52
29	29	1	5	11.2	0	3.15	3.74	2.8	3.25	3.27	3.74	3.69	3.15000001	0
30	30	0	5	11.4	0	2.44	2.91	3.07	4.41	2.61	3.95	4.1	3.07	0
31	31	1	5	9.4	0	3.5	4.12	2.7	3.53	3.71	3.92	3.38	3	3.5
32	32	0	5	13.7	1	3.75	3.54	4.18	3.91	2.89	4.28	3.84	4.21	0
33	33	0	5	6.8	0	3.79	3.84	3.19	4.12	2.90	4.24	4.31	4.37	0

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
34	34	0	5	9.9	0	3.79	3.86	3.39	4.13	3.99	4.34	4.31	4.37	0	1
35	34	1	5	10.0	1	2.51	4.08	3.59	3.24	3	2.35	4.3	3.79	2.20000001	1
36	36	1	5	11.7	1	3.44	4.23	3.88	2.96	4.08	4.38	3.63	3.34	2.44000001	1
37	36	1	5	13.9	0	3.94	3.88	3.85	3.9	3.98	2.4	3.47	2.9	3.94000001	1
38	37	0	5	14	1	3.57	4.09	3.79	4.45	2.3	4.42	4	3.08	0	1
39	38	0	5	6.7	1	4.08	3.43	3.82	4.67	2.33	4.48	4.3	3.76	0	1
40	39	1	5	9.1	1	3.22	4.95	3.29	3.45	3.97	2.75	2.98	3.51	3.22	1
41	40	0	5	18.3	0	3.82	2.89	2.81	4.79	2.25	3.55	3.85	4.2	0	1
42	41	0	5	13.5	0	4.29	3.84	3.48	4.29	2.48	3.14	3.72	3.89	0	1
43	42	0	5	8.2	1	3.24	3.42	4.23	3.55	3.08	3.97	3.59	2.75	0	1
44	43	0	5	17.4	0	3.67	3.81	2.37	4.4	1.8	3.63	3.75	4.03	0	1
45	44	1	5	11.7	1	2.85	3.41	3.98	2.77	4.37	3.97	3.69	2.8	2.88000001	1
46	45	0	5	13.9	1	3.5	3.11	2.85	3.94	3.06	4.38	3.77	3.51	0	1
47	46	1	5	11.5	1	3.88	3.85	4.75	3.39	3.74	3.24	4.43	3.49	3.84	1
48	47	0	5	19.4	0	3.79	3.81	2.42	4.82	1.34	3.48	4.18	4.5	0	1
49	48	1	5	18.2	0	3.86	3.26	4.18	3.11	3.3	3.27	3.45	4.85	2.85000001	1
50	49	1	5	10.2	1	4.08	3.89	4.21	3.25	4.41	3.39	4.01	3.6	4.07000001	1
51	50	0	5	13.1	1	2.97	4.59	3.57	5	2.38	3.32	3.43	3.41	0	1
52	51	1	5	13.8	0	3.07	4.74	3.54	3.22	3.2	3.88	4.22	3.57	2.80000001	1
53	52	1	5	18.7	1	2.89	3.96	4.18	4.4	3.33	4.37	3.66	3.74	2.88000001	1
54	53	1	5	7.3	1	4.21	3.72	2.97	3.58	4.22	2.66	4.04	3.14	4.21	1
55	54	1	5	13.9	0	3.84	3.77	3.06	2.22	4.07	3.04	3.16	4.2	3.38000001	1
56	55	1	5	15.4	1	3.92	4.07	2.85	3.48	3.08	3.38	3.92	3.42	3.92000001	1
57	56	1	5	4.2	0	2.16	3.08	2.59	3.29	3.62	3.57	4.11	3.55	2.16000001	1
58	57	0	5	6.5	0	3.79	3.15	3.51	3.84	3.1	3.91	4.19	3.89	0	1
59	58	0	5	5	0	4.22	3.5	2.17	4.54	1.94	4.02	3.55	3.71	0	1
60	59	0	5	10.1	1	3.66	3.54	2.49	4.13	3.21	3.32	3.67	3.69	0	1
61	60	0	5	14.1	0	4.25	3.69	2.44	3.79	2.24	3.75	3.79	3.19	0	1
62	61	0	5	17.2	0	3.24	3.01	3.04	4.1	3.01	4.13	3.41	3.22	0	1
63	62	0	5	11.5	0	4.59	4.24	1.87	3.77	3.18	3.8	4.82	3.85	0	1
64	63	1	5	17.7	0	4.81	3.96	3.4	2.81	4.3	3.14	3.25	3.52	4.80000001	1
65	64	0	5	6.7	1	3.26	3.42	3.4	4.49	2.18	3.73	4.39	3.89	0	1
66	65	0	5	4.4	0	3.29	3.43	3.7	5	2.8	3.75	3.84	3.75	0	1
67	66	1	5	11	0	4.22	4.35	3.42	3.5	3.78	3.38	4	4.14	4.21000001	1

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
94	1	5	11	0	422	433	942	53	179	318	4	434	42199999	0	1
95	0	5	12.7	1	471	431	944	9.6	195	364	379	9.5	0	0	1
96	1	5	11.1	0	280	342	147	532	396	436	362	369	18299999	0	1
97	0	5	1.9	0	331	395	5.9	4.6	1.81	4.14	402	295	0	0	1
98	1	5	10.8	0	5	368	945	2.8	439	322	3.2	3.11	3	1	1
99	1	5	6	0	226	35	278	505	557	362	407	365	224	0	1
72	0	5	13.3	0	296	383	287	421	23	3.6	374	392	0	0	1
73	0	5	12.7	0	29	369	525	581	234	4.3	389	325	0	0	1
74	1	5	7.4	0	266	273	525	542	367	3.62	3.2	3.28	24699999	0	1
75	1	5	0.1	1	318	459	552	504	409	3.64	242	254	31899999	0	1
76	1	5	7	0	336	453	285	321	536	3.67	3.8	3.12	32599999	0	1
77	1	5	10.3	0	429	352	3.5	246	424	2.46	402	375	429	0	1
78	0	5	35	1	2.9	354	2.05	598	173	3.12	459	379	0	0	1
79	0	5	7.5	0	429	3.5	282	450	246	3.08	3.99	375	0	0	1
80	0	5	13.2	1	345	346	236	401	337	3.89	3.87	352	0	0	1
81	1	5	9.1	0	317	337	276	596	3.3	4.44	371	3.3	21799999	0	1
82	1	5	8	1	367	3.3	594	2.9	546	474	3.97	3.97	26799999	0	1
83	0	5	10.8	0	281	338	335	631	246	4.18	341	385	0	0	1
84	0	5	7.1	0	387	4	327	487	249	4.1	456	371	0	0	1
85	0	5	9	0	272	369	234	349	258	2.72	436	379	0	0	1
86	0	5	4.4	1	394	308	271	332	284	3.47	436	324	0	0	1
87	1	5	19.1	0	3.4	414	398	234	412	2.93	3.92	232	34099999	0	1
88	1	5	11.3	1	492	399	329	373	435	3.03	371	385	49299999	0	1
89	1	5	8.8	0	275	439	459	242	4	3.3	404	306	275	0	1
90	0	5	12.1	1	333	226	334	5	228	352	4.3	307	0	0	1
91	0	5	10.8	0	336	308	300	342	274	2.61	382	385	0	0	1
92	1	5	10.8	1	281	303	301	319	475	3.85	341	3.1	26999999	0	1
93	1	5	13.7	0	275	292	328	387	379	2.76	375	388	275	0	1
94	1	5	14.2	0	403	4.4	311	41	531	354	447	361	40399999	0	1
95	1	5	9.1	0	419	342	362	425	435	4.64	308	364	41999999	0	1
96	0	5	8.9	0	3.2	351	547	4.8	234	325	327	262	0	0	1
97	1	5	10.1	0	282	367	275	561	271	1.89	378	391	28299999	0	1
98	0	5	2	0	395	359	2.1	45	282	3.63	403	363	0	0	1
99	0	5	5.1	1	321	325	2.1	439	215	4.46	403	352	0	0	1

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
99	0	5	5.1	1	321	325	2.1	439	215	4.46	409	352	0	0	1
100	0	5	16.7	0	404	255	5.2	302	235	4.98	412	557	0	0	1
101	0	5	17.8	0	274	3.4	224	379	257	3.06	5.89	2.61	0	0	1
102	1	5	10.2	0	214	3.4	191	51	5.9	3.7	4.44	3.5	21499999	0	1
103	0	5	15.4	0	498	337	313	411	275	3.52	3.2	2.99	0	0	1
104	1	5	12.4	0	446	344	4.7	287	538	3.34	3.29	1.62	446	0	1
105	1	5	25.5	0	277	4.8	3.2	345	406	4.39	3.85	2.54	277	0	1
106	0	5	15.7	0	338	3.61	3.4	468	227	2.8	3.19	4.06	0	0	1
107	0	5	10.7	1	3.8	309	295	424	271	3.95	3.81	3.19	0	0	1
108	1	5	7.4	1	343	348	314	384	411	3.68	4.52	4.07	34399999	0	1
109	0	5	4.8	0	406	311	345	363	348	4.45	4.01	3.23	0	0	1
110	0	5	12	0	5	452	271	41	394	3.86	4.13	1.62	0	0	1
111	0	5	8.2	1	248	353	306	384	213	3.98	2.37	2.84	0	0	1
112	0	5	5.5	0	304	356	309	327	2.8	3.57	2.69	4.13	0	0	1
113	1	5	8.1	0	222	452	2.8	306	398	3.56	2.51	3.22	222	0	1
114	1	5	6.9	0	289	384	5.8	304	472	3.19	2.54	3.02	28999999	0	1
115	1	5	17.9	1	318	354	3.1	389	399	3.77	4.34	3.58	31899999	0	1
116	1	5	14.7	1	448	358	2.75	342	365	3.18	3.98	3.25	448	0	1
117	1	5	11.2	0	284	366	352	239	379	3.63	3.24	3.86	28499999	0	1
118	0	5	17.1	0	376	328	239	5	225	3.78	4.12	4.22	0	0	1
119	1	5	11.5	0	329	414	322	371	4.1	4.08	3.95	3.12	31999999	0	1
120	1	5	7.8	1	409	373	319	359	299	3.37	4.27	1.64	40999999	0	1
121	1	5	17.3	0	497	414	385	299	327	3.34	4.49	3.99	49799999	0	1
122	1	5	18.4	0	289	365	348	262	327	4.16	3.19	3.43	28999999	0	1
123	0	5	7.1	1	326	395	288	401	288	3.26	3.39	3.02	0	0	1
124	0	5	10.4	0	430	3.1	399	474	326	3.41	3.37	3.02	0	0	1
125	0	5	7.7	1	408	385	373	3	235	3.44	3.88	3.67	0	0	1
126	0	5	9.7	0	489	351	323	487	232	4.82	4.23	3.48	0	0	1
127	1	5	14.9	0	561	4.3	321	289	384	2.12	4.19	3.23	30999999	0	1
128	1	5	18.8	0	235	296	241	254	438	5	5.66	2.92	2.95	0	1
129	0	5	5.6	1	401	455	239	427	194	4.45	3.84	3.58	0	0	1
130	1	5	15.5	1	398	362	302	212	392	3.53	3.79	2.84	1.98	0	1
131	0	5	8.6	1	417	396	253	436	289	3.77	3.58	3.95	0	0	1
132	0	5	9.3	0	396	266	279	413	285	3.97	5	4.02	0	0	1

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
133	0	5	9.3	0	396	266	279	413	285	3.97	5	4.02	0	0	1		
134	0	5	8.9	1	435	347	255	597	349	4.11	3.2	2.58	0	0	1		
135	0	5	2.7	0	442	247	322	3.4	2.9	4.19	4.09	3.94	0	0	1		
136	1	5	11.4	0	417	333	339	536	245	3.73	4.71	2.55	41799999	0	1		
137	136	0	7.9	1	401	443	319	389	174	3.85	4	3.17	0	0	1		
138	157	1	11.3	0	308	359	324	252	547	3.28	3.6	3.28	30799999	0	1		
139	158	1	11	0	3.3	383	201	166	288	3.31	3.52	2.58	1.5	1	1		
140	139	0	10.2	0	444	382	234	410	269	3.68	3.91	3.04	0	0	1		
141	140	1	7.6	0	2.93	4	311	299	4.69	4.08	4.28	2.8	36999999	0	1		
142	141	1	8.9	0	346	379	247	393	573	3.26	2.59	3.4	346	0	1		
143	142	0	14.2	0	332	352	328	297	289	2.04	4.72	3.32	0	0	1		
144	143	0	13.7	0	362	474	382	3.9	371	4.19	3.29	3.14	0	0	1		
145	144	0	7.3	1	449	327	368	448	3.06	3.92	3.87	3.59	0	0	1		
146	145	0	11.8	1	573	342	277	3.7	322	3.79	3.23	0	0	1			
147	146	0	14.2	0	363	388	379	435	177	3.57	4.29	3.38	0	0	1		
148	147	1	4.5	0	225	436	329	348	384	4.07	2.9	4.14	225	0	1		
149	148	1	13.4	0	372	441	3	371	3	3.97	3.93	3.97	132	0	1		
150	149	0	8.5	1	405	368	253	415	218	3.54	5	2.83	0	0	1		
151	150	0	13.5	0	5	243	372	4.1	1.98	4.04	3.32	3.91	0	0	1		
152	151	1	8.1	1	298	488	257	266	489	2.82	3.79	3.71	298	0	1		
153	152	0	4	0	373	241	3	379	231	2.97	3.67	3.83	0	0	1		
154	153	0	4.7	0	377	348	3	409	246	3.42	4.21	3.61	0	0	1		
155	154	0	11.4	0	47	225	2.9	438	268	4.32	4.01	4.37	0	0	1		
156	155	1	12.2	0	318	346	346	536	582	3.97	3.38	2.74	31899999	0	1		
157	156	0	7.8	1	3.8	3.3	381	2.8	325	4.11	4.24	3.04	0	0	1		

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
165	165	0	5	15.2	0	4.84	3.66	3.22	4.33	1.7	4.01	3.84	3.39	0	1	
167	166	1	5	8.9	0	2.13	4.12	5.86	3.56	3.76	4.04	3.7	3.28	2.1500001	1	
168	167	0	5	14.5	1	3.21	3.12	2.55	3.43	1.85	3.78	3.57	2.73	0	1	
169	168	0	5	6.7	0	3.86	4.13	1.35	3.84	2.78	3.27	4.3	3.76	0	1	
170	169	0	5	18.3	0	6.7	3.1	2.57	4.6	2.44	3.7	4.44	3.79	0	1	
171	170	1	5	17	1	3.15	3.78	5.44	2.47	5.07	2.95	3.47	3.17	5.1500001	1	
172	171	1	5	1.3	1	2.81	3.0	2.31	3.25	5.85	2.99	3.46	3.88	2.8099999	1	
173	172	0	5	8	0	4.92	3.31	3.01	3.32	2.02	3.71	4.13	3.33	0	1	
174	173	1	5	13.5	0	2.19	3.04	3.19	3.33	3.86	2.92	3.48	3.58	2.1900001	1	
175	174	0	5	10.4	0	2.06	2.44	5.25	4.18	3.07	3.82	3.97	2.99	0	1	
176	175	1	5	12.7	0	3.51	4.88	5.27	2.29	2.86	2.26	4.75	3.29	3.51	1	
177	176	0	5	8.8	1	3.25	2.79	2.32	4.78	2.46	3.93	3.88	3.61	0	1	
178	177	1	5	11.5	0	2.49	3.11	3.92	3.73	3.72	3.4	3.52	3.41	2.49	1	
179	178	0	5	10.6	0	4.1	2.01	2.8	3.79	2.74	3.31	3.68	3.32	0	1	
180	179	1	5	15.9	0	3.57	3.32	3.18	3.2	3.91	3.8	4.07	3.23	3.3899999	1	
181	180	0	5	12.2	0	3.21	2.51	2.34	4.77	2.02	4.36	3.01	3.01	0	1	
182	181	0	5	12.4	1	1.7	4.29	2.83	3.89	2.24	3.68	3.28	0	1		
183	182	0	5	9.8	1	4.21	3.91	2.37	4.13	2	3.34	4.66	2.7	0	1	
184	183	1	5	9.2	0	3.88	3.29	3.1	3.31	4.24	2.94	4.41	4.17	3.8400001	1	
185	184	1	5	9.5	0	3.13	3	4.25	3.45	3.81	2.84	3.4	3.99	3.1300001	1	
186	185	0	5	12.8	0	4.89	3.89	2.08	4.29	3.35	4.3	3.07	2.85	0	1	
187	186	1	5	8.5	1	2.45	3.51	2.28	2.92	3.77	3.28	4.2	3.64	2.45	1	
188	187	1	5	12.4	1	2.13	2.2	4.98	2.89	3.45	3.24	3.26	3.05	2.1500001	1	
189	188	1	5	10.5	1	2.72	3	3.07	3.14	3.04	2.2	4.1	3.43	2.72	1	
190	189	1	5	14.7	1	3.17	2.87	2.8	2.56	3.8	3.78	2.71	3.45	3.1700001	1	
191	190	0	5	9.9	1	3.77	2.31	3.52	2.74	1.61	3.06	4.45	3.38	0	1	
192	191	0	5	18	0	3.43	3.91	2.54	4.42	2.59	3.84	3.39	3.11	0	1	
193	192	1	5	9.8	1	3.49	3	4.3	3.58	4.05	3.57	4.07	2.95	3.45	1	
194	193	1	5	3	0	2.52	4.52	3.81	1.82	3.01	4.22	3.71	2.84	2.3199999	1	
195	194	1	5	7.2	0	4.21	4.04	2.91	3.6	4.25	2.61	3.23	2.88	4.21	1	
196	195	0	5	5.7	0	3.54	3.66	4.19	4.51	2.16	1.99	3.8	3.47	0	1	
197	196	0	5	9.8	0	4.38	3.81	2.34	3	2.47	3.91	4.54	3.14	0	1	
198	197	1	5	11.3	0	3.44	4.16	3.85	3.11	4.81	4.48	3.73	3.64	3.4400001	1	
199	198	1	5	17.9	1	3.52	3.87	3.38	2.74	4.25	4.14	3.98	4.04	3.52	1	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
181	180	0	5	12.2	0	3.21	2.51	2.34	4.77	2.02	4.36	3.01	3.01	0	1	
182	181	0	5	12.4	1	1.7	4.29	2.83	3.89	2.24	3.68	3.28	0	1		
183	182	0	5	9.6	1	4.21	3.91	2.37	4.13	2	3.34	4.66	2.7	0	1	
184	183	1	5	9.2	0	3.66	3.29	3.1	3.31	4.24	2.94	4.41	4.17	3.8400001	1	
185	184	1	5	9.5	0	3.13	3	4.25	3.45	3.81	2.84	3.4	3.99	3.1300001	1	
186	185	0	5	12.8	0	4.89	3.89	2.08	4.29	3.35	4.3	3.07	2.85	0	1	
187	186	1	5	8.5	1	2.45	3.51	2.28	2.92	3.77	3.28	4.2	3.64	2.45	1	
188	187	1	5	12.4	1	2.13	2.2	4.98	2.89	3.45	3.24	3.26	3.05	2.1500001	1	
189	188	1	5	10.5	1	2.72	3	3.07	3.14	3.04	2.2	4.1	3.43	2.72	1	
190	189	1	5	14.7	1	3.17	2.87	2.8	2.56	3.8	3.78	2.71	3.45	3.1700001	1	
191	190	0	5	9.9	1	3.77	2.31	3.52	2.74	1.61	3.06	4.45	3.38	0	1	
192	191	0	5	18	0	3.43	3.91	2.54	4.42	2.59	3.84	3.39	3.11	0	1	
193	192	1	5	9.8	1	3.49	3	4.3	3.58	4.05	3.57	4.07	2.95	3.45	1	
194	193	1	5	3	0	2.52	4.52	3.81	1.82	3.01	4.22	3.71	2.84	2.3199999	1	
195	194	1	5	7.2	0	4.21	4.04	2.91	3.6	4.25	2.61	3.23	2.88	4.21	1	
196	195	0	5	5.7	0	3.54	3.66	4.19	4.51	2.16	1.99	3.8	3.47	0	1	
197	196	0	5	9.8	0	4.38	3.81	2.34	3	2.47	3.91	4.54	3.14	0	1	
198	197	1	5	11.3	0	3.44	4.16	3.85	3.11	4.81	4.48	3.73	3.64	3.4400001	1	
199	198	1	5	17.9	1	3.52	3.87	3.38	2.74	4.25	4.14	3.98	4.04	3.52	1	

The screenshot shows the Stata command window with a list of commands and a help window for the 'wastres' dataset. The command history includes:

```

14: use org_support_by(gender)
15: graph box style_assertive style_collab s...
16: graph box self_efficacy stereotype_thre...
17: reg conflict_satisfaction gender self_eff...
18: gen gender_assertive = gender * style_...
19: reg conflict_satisfaction gender style_a...
20: save "gender_negotiation_conflict.dta"...
21: graph export "style_assertive_box.png"...
22: log using "appendix_output.txt", text r...
23: log close
24: set install estout
25: estout clear
26: eststo: reg conflict_satisfaction gender ...
27: esttab using "regression_results.rtf", re...
28: log using "full_analysis.smf", replace
29: translate "full_analysis.smf" "full_analy... 111
30: save "gender_negotiation_conflict.dta"...
31: save "gender_negotiation_conflict.dta"...
32: save "C:\Users\manning\OneDrive\Docu...
33: log using "appendix_output.txt", text r... 604
34: log close
35: file open myfile using "appendix_outp...
    
```

The help window for 'wastres' provides the following information:

**Statistics**  
6903 Lakewood Drive  
College Station, Texas 77843-1333  
800-STATIA-PC http://www.statia.com  
979-698-1800 statia@statia.com

**Class license:** authorized user 61 user network personal  
**Serial number:** 10480306  
**License to:** KEAN HIGER  
KEAN HIGER

**Notes:**

1. Includes no expanded; see help website advice.
2. More than 2 billion observations are allowed; see help site advice.
3. Maximum number of variables is set to 5,000; see help site message.
4. New updates available; type update all.

**File:** "C:\Users\manning\OneDrive\Documents\apps\Wastres\_2004-2023\gender\_negotiation\_conflict.dta"

**. describe**

Contains data from C:\Users\manning\OneDrive\Documents\apps\Wastres\_2004-2023\gender\_negotiation\_conflict.dta

Observations: 218  
Variables: 15 10 Jun 2025 09:26

Variable name	Storage type	Display format	Value label	Variable label
id	long	%12.0g		
gender	long	%12.0g		
age	double	%10.0g		
experience	double	%10.0g		
job_level	long	%12.0g		
style_assertive	double	%10.0g		
style_collab	double	%10.0g		
style_self	double	%10.0g		
self_efficacy	double	%10.0g		
stereotype_181	double	%10.0g		
conflict_self	double	%10.0g		
conflict_fair	double	%10.0g		
org_support	double	%10.0g		

**Sorted by:**

```

Jow Help
X Sorted by:
i summarize
Variable      Obs      Mean      Std. dev.      Min      Max
-----
id             214      107.5      61.92065       1      214
gender        214      4906542    .5010848       0      1
age           214       5         0             5      5
experience     214     10.95047    4.150058      1.3     23.5
job_level     214     .3691589    .4837085       0      1

style_asse`e  214     3.531449    .6859805       2.06    5
style_collab  214     3.555047    .6453523       1.96    5
style_accom   214     3.046168    .620241        1.35    4.75
self_effic`y  214     3.695047    .7234157       1.66    5
stereotype`t  214     3.118925    .8112728       1.34    5

conflict_s`m  214     3.608738    .6130113       1.88    5
conflict_f`a  214     3.843738    .481541        2.42    5
org_support   214     3.414579    .4642633       2.2     4.85

. ttest style_assertive, by(gender)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Group | Obs  | Mean  | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| 0     | 109  | 3.757156 | .0584696 | .6104402 | 3.641259 3.873053 |
| 1     | 105  | 3.292145 | .0667599 | .6840852 | 3.164756 3.42953 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Combined | 214 | 3.531449 | .0468927 | .6859805 | 3.439015 3.623882 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff  |      | .4650131 | .0885536 |           | .2854508 .6345754 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)          t = 5.1946
HD: diff = 0                      Degrees of freedom = 212

Ha: diff < 0                      Ha: diff != 0                      Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 1.0000                Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000                Pr(T > t) = 0.0000

. ttest style_collab, by(gender)
    
```



```

Ha: diff < 0          Ha: diff != 0          Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T < t) = 1.0000    Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000          Pr(T > t) = 0.0000
-
- ttest style_collab, by(gender)
Two-sample t test with equal variances
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Group | Obs | Mean | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| 0      | 109 | 3.395138 | .0380774 | .6003155 | 3.280018 3.510267 |
| 1      | 105 | 3.721048 | .0629864 | .6454187 | 3.596143 3.845962 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Combined | 214 | 3.555047 | .0441154 | .6453523 | 3.460008 3.649005 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff   |      | -.32591 | .085761  |          | -.494597 -.157223 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) |          |          |          |          |          | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H0: diff = 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Ha: diff < 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Pr(T < t) = 0.0001 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Ha: diff != 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0002 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Ha: diff > 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Pr(T > t) = 0.0000 |          |          |          |          |          |
-
- ttest style_accou, by(gender)
Two-sample t test with equal variances
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Group | Obs | Mean | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| 0      | 109 | 2.888991 | .0349333 | .5735206 | 2.730103 2.987878 |
| 1      | 105 | 3.261238 | .0681157 | .6965083 | 3.115993 3.376484 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Combined | 214 | 3.046168 | .0423988 | .620241 | 2.962593 3.129743 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff   |      | -.3722473 | .0799129 |          | -.5797229 -.1647216 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) |          |          |          |          |          | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H0: diff = 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Ha: diff < 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Pr(T < t) = 0.0000 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Ha: diff != 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Ha: diff > 0 |          |          |          |          |          |
| Pr(T > t) = 1.0000 |          |          |          |          |          |
-
- reg style_assertive gender age experience job_level
note: age omitted because of collinearity.
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 214 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | 11.9523973 | 3 | 3.9841324 | F(3, 210) = 9.48 |
| Residual | 88.2788334 | 210 | .42037592 | Prob > F = 0.0000 |
| Total | 100.2312307 | 213 | .47069223 | R-squared = 0.1192 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | | | Adj R-squared = 0.1067 |
| | | | | Root MSE = .64836 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
style_assertive | Coefficient | Std. err. | z | P>|z| | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| gender | -.4866805 | .0688707 | -8.28 | 0.000 | -.618535 -.3548257 | |
| age | 0 (omitted) | | | | | |
| experience | .0100092 | .0107336 | 0.93 | 0.352 | -.011502 .0314666 |
| job_level | -.071191 | .0918877 | -0.77 | 0.439 | -.252315 .1099496 |
| _cons | 3.477093 | .1366345 | 27.11 | 0.000 | 3.199713 3.954473 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
-
- reg style_collab gender age experience job_level
note: age omitted because of collinearity.
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs = 214 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | 6.30127539 | 3 | 2.10042513 | F(3, 210) = 3.39 |
| Residual | 82.4082241 | 210 | .392420148 | Prob > F = 0.0314 |
| Total | 88.7110145 | 213 | .416479575 | R-squared = 0.0710 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | | | Adj R-squared = 0.0578 |
| | | | | Root MSE = .62644 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
style_collab | Coefficient | Std. err. | z | P>|z| | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| gender | .3330604 | .0868653 | 3.88 | 0.000 | .1637921 .5023288 | |
| age | 0 (omitted) | | | | | |
| experience | -.0118015 | .0103706 | -1.18 | 0.273 | -.0318653 .0082623 |
| job_level | .0514893 | .0837803 | 0.38 | 0.363 | -.1235257 .226504 |
| _cons | 3.497474 | .1310476 | 26.69 | 0.000 | 3.239136 3.755811 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

```

```

    _cons      3.497474   -1310476   26.69   0.000   3.239136   3.755811

. reg style_accow gender age experience job_level
note: age omitted because of collinearity.

Source      |      SS      |    df    |     MS     | Number of obs |      F(3, 210) |      Prob > F |      R-squared |      Adj R-squared |      Root MSE |
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Model      | 9.88061106   |         3 | 3.29353702 |              |              | 0.0000       | 0.1206        | 0.1080        | 0.58378      |
Residual   | 72.0602469  |        210 | .343144033 |              |              |              | 0.8794        | 0.8920        |              |
Total      | 81.9408579  |        213 | .384698864 |              |              |              |              |              |              |

style_accow | Coefficient | Std. err. | t    | P>|t| | [95% conf. interval] |
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
gender      | -.4207448   | .0802931   | 5.24 | 0.000 | -.262461   -.5790285   |
age         | 0 (omitted) |             |      |      |              |
experience  | .0045577    | .0096976   | 0.47 | 0.639 | -.0145594   .0236748   |
job_level   | -.0746187   | .0830189   | 0.90 | 0.370 | -.0890386   -.2382759   |
_cons      | 2.762273    | .1225434   | 22.54 | 0.000 | 2.5207     3.003846   |

. ttest self_efficacy, by(gender)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

Group      | Obs   | Mean   | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
0          | 109   | 4.20578 | .0482733   | .5039883   | 4.110094   4.301466   |
1          | 105   | 3.164857 | .0488783   | .5008533   | 3.06793    3.261785   |
Combined   | 214   | 3.695047 | .0494517   | .7234157   | 3.597569   3.792524   |
diff       |       | 1.040923 | .0687059   |             | .9054883    1.176357   |

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
t = 15.1504
H0: diff = 0
Degrees of freedom = 212

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 1.0000

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.0000

. ttest stereotype_threat, by(gender)

ttest stereotype_threat, by(gender)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

Group      | Obs   | Mean   | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
0          | 109   | 2.472569 | .0413063   | .4312501   | 2.390693   2.554445   |
1          | 105   | 3.789905 | .0499939   | .5122847   | 3.690765   3.889044   |
Combined   | 214   | 3.118925 | .0554575   | .8112728   | 3.009609   3.228241   |
diff       |       | -1.317336 | .0646432   |             | -1.444762   -1.18991   |

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
t = -20.3786
H0: diff = 0
Degrees of freedom = 212

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.0000

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 1.0000

. ttest conflict_satisfaction, by(gender)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

Group      | Obs   | Mean   | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
0          | 109   | 3.76578  | .0534211   | .5577323   | 3.65989    3.87167   |
1          | 105   | 3.445714 | .0612507   | .6276327   | 3.324252   3.567177   |
Combined   | 214   | 3.608738 | .0419046   | .6130113   | 3.526137   3.691339   |
diff       |       | .3200655 | .0810948   |             | .1602101    .4799209   |

diff = mean(0) - mean(1)
t = 3.9468
H0: diff = 0
Degrees of freedom = 212

Ha: diff < 0
Pr(T < t) = 0.9999

Ha: diff != 0
Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0001

Ha: diff > 0
Pr(T > t) = 0.0001

. ttest conflict_fairness, by(gender)

Two-sample t test with equal variances
    
```

```

- ttest conflict_fairness, by(gender)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Group | Obs  | Mean  | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| 0     | 109  | 3.930459 | .0421527 | .4400871 | 3.846905 4.014013 |
| 1     | 105  | 3.753714 | .0495428 | .5076629 | 3.655469 3.85196 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Combined | 214 | 3.843738 | .0329175 | .481541 | 3.778853 3.908624 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff   |      | -.1767444 | .0648757 |           | .0488604 -.3046285 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) |           |           |           |           |           | |
| H0: diff = 0 |           |           |           |           |           |
|           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Ha: diff < 0 |           | Ha: diff != 0 |           | Ha: diff > 0 |
| Pr(T < t) = 0.9965 | Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0070 | Pr(T > t) = 0.0035 |
|           |           |           |           |           |           |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

- ttest org_support, by(gender)

Two-sample t test with equal variances

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Group | Obs  | Mean  | Std. err. | Std. dev. | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| 0     | 109  | 3.443853 | .0452568 | .4724952 | 3.354146 3.53356 |
| 1     | 105  | 3.38419 | .0444838 | .455823 | 3.295977 3.472403 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Combined | 214 | 3.414579 | .0317364 | .4642633 | 3.352022 3.477137 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff   |      | .0596627 | .0635013 |           | -.0655122 .1848377 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| diff = mean(0) - mean(1) |           |           |           |           |           | |
| H0: diff = 0 |           |           |           |           |           |
|           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Ha: diff < 0 |           | Ha: diff != 0 |           | Ha: diff > 0 |
| Pr(T < t) = 0.8257 | Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.3485 | Pr(T > t) = 0.1743 |
|           |           |           |           |           |           |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

- graph box style_assertive style_collab style_accom, over(gender)

- graph box self_efficacy stereotype_threat, over(gender)

- reg conflict_satisfaction gender self_efficacy stereotype_threat style_assertive style_collab style_accom org_support age exper
> ience job_level
note: age omitted because of collinearity.

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Source | SS      | df  | MS      | Number of obs | F(9, 204) | Prob > F | R-squared | Adj R-squared | Root MSE |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Model  | 8.15647292 | 9   | .906274769 | -             | 2.57      | 0.0080   | 0.1019   | 0.0623       | .59362   |
| Residual | 71.8852864 | 204 | .352378855 | -             | -         | -        | -         | -            | -        |
| Total  | 80.0417593 | 213 | .375782908 | -             | -         | -        | -         | -            | -        |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

conflict_satisf~n | Coefficient | Std. err. | t | P>|t| | [95% conf. interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| gender           | -.0605981 | .1703042 | -0.36 | 0.722 | -.3963802 .275184 |
| self_efficacy    | .1738866 | .0823644 | 2.11 | 0.036 | .011492 .3362813 |
| stereotype_threat | -.0515798 | .08709   | -0.59 | 0.554 | -.2232917 .120132 |
| style_assertive  | -.0264557 | .0632633 | -0.42 | 0.676 | -.1511894 .0982781 |
| style_collab     | -.072651 | .0656622 | -1.11 | 0.270 | -.2021145 .0668126 |
| style_accom      | -.0185499 | .0704044 | -0.26 | 0.792 | -.1573635 .1202637 |
| org_support      | -.1412061 | .0900161 | -1.57 | 0.118 | -.3186874 .0362751 |
| age              | 0 (omitted) |           |           |           |           |
| experience       | .0001708 | .0099158 | 0.02 | 0.986 | -.0193798 .0197213 |
| job_level        | -.0212449 | .0848081 | -0.25 | 0.802 | -.1884576 .1459679 |
| _cons           | 4.053168 | .6491837 | 6.24 | 0.000 | 2.773198 5.333138 |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

- gen gender_assertive = gender * style_assertive

- reg conflict_satisfaction gender style_assertive gender_assertive

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Source | SS      | df  | MS      | Number of obs | F(3, 210) | Prob > F | R-squared | Adj R-squared | Root MSE |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| Model  | 7.83719099 | 3   | 2.612397 | -             | 7.60      | 0.0001   | 0.0979   | 0.0850       | .58637   |
| Residual | 72.2045684 | 210 | .343831278 | -             | -         | -        | -         | -            | -        |
| Total  | 80.0417593 | 213 | .375782908 | -             | -         | -        | -         | -            | -        |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

```

```

Source | SS      df      MS      Number of obs =      214
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Model   | 7.83719099  3      2.612397  F(3, 210) =      7.60
Residual| 72.2045684 210     .343831278  Prob > F =      0.0001
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Total   | 80.0417593 213     .375782908  R-squared =      0.0979
                                           Adj R-squared =      0.0850
                                           Root MSE =      .58637

conflict_satisf^m | Coefficient Std. err.   t   P>|t|   [95% conf. interval]
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
gender          | .8133772   .4515774    1.80  0.073   -.0766315   1.703386
style_assertive | .1501309   .092431    1.62  0.106   -.0320806   .3323424
gender_assertive | -.3238191  .1249326   -2.58  0.010   -.5691018   -.0785363
._cons         | 3.201715   .35179     9.10  0.000   2.508222    3.895207

. save "gender_negotiation_conflict.dta", replace
(file gender_negotiation_conflict.dta not found)
file gender_negotiation_conflict.dta saved

. graph export "style_assertive_box.png", replace
(file style_assertive_box.png not found)
file style_assertive_box.png saved as PNG format

. log using "appendix_output.txt", text replace
(file C:\Users\manng\Documents\appendix_output.txt not found)

name: (unnamed)
log: C:\Users\manng\Documents\appendix_output.txt
log type: text
opened on: 10 Jun 2025, 17:41:59

. log close
name: (unnamed)
log: C:\Users\manng\Documents\appendix_output.txt
log type: text
closed on: 10 Jun 2025, 17:42:14

. ssc install estout
checking estout consistency and verifying not already installed...
all files already exist and are up to date.

. eststo clear

```

```

. ssc install estout
checking estout consistency and verifying not already installed...
all files already exist and are up to date.

. eststo clear

. eststo: reg conflict_satisfaction gender self_efficacy stereotype_threat

Source | SS      df      MS      Number of obs =      214
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Model   | 6.85268399  3      2.284228  F(3, 210) =      8.55
Residual| 73.1890764 210     .348519406  Prob > F =      0.0003
-----|-----|-----|-----|
Total   | 80.0417593 213     .375782908  R-squared =      0.0856
                                           Adj R-squared =      0.0726
                                           Root MSE =      .59036

conflict_satisf^m | Coefficient Std. err.   t   P>|t|   [95% conf. interval]
-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
gender          | -.1074074   .161834   -0.66  0.508   -.4264741   .2116394
self_efficacy   | .1538521   .0806979   1.93  0.055   -.0032297   .314934
stereotype_threat | -.0382804  .0857697   -0.45  0.656   -.2073803   .1307995
._cons         | 3.204951   .4055129   7.90  0.000   2.405553    4.004349

(est1 stored)

. outtab using "regression_results.rif", replace label se star(* 0.05 ** 0.01 *** 0.001)
(file regression_results.rif not found)
(output written to regression_results.rif)

. log using "full_analysis.smcl", replace
(file C:\Users\manng\Documents\full_analysis.smcl not found)

name: (unnamed)
log: C:\Users\manng\Documents\full_analysis.smcl
log type: smcl
opened on: 10 Jun 2025, 17:43:41

```

