

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

2020

Examining Gender Differences in Perceptions of Pay Negotiation and Remuneration Among Late-Adolescents

Meghan Borg
borg7410@mylaurier.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Developmental Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Borg, Meghan, "Examining Gender Differences in Perceptions of Pay Negotiation and Remuneration Among Late-Adolescents" (2020). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 2271.
<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/2271>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Running head: PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

EXAMINING GENDER DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF PAY NEGOTIATION AND
REMUNERATION AMONG LATE-ADOLESCENTS

by

Meghan E. Borg

Honours Bachelor of Arts, Wilfrid Laurier University, 2018

THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Psychology

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Arts in Psychology

Wilfrid Laurier University

Supervisor: Dr. Eileen Wood

© Meghan E. Borg, 2020

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Abstract

Documented gender differences exist between males and females in terms of preparedness for the workforce in financial knowledge obtained from both family and educational sources (e.g., Danes & Haberman, 2007; Saari, Wood, & Wood, 2017), and the ways in which they negotiate (or fail to negotiate) for higher pay (e.g., Babcock, Gelfand, Small, & Stayn, 2006; Kugler et al., 2018). The current study extends this literature by investigating factors associated with Canadian late-adolescents' preparedness for work by documenting work experiences (both casual and formal), remuneration experiences, and negotiation experiences as a function of gender. In total, 268 participants (137 females) aged 18-19 years ($M = 18.44$) completed a survey to assess gender differences in financial literacy, workforce readiness, and perceptions of and experiences with negotiating for higher pay. Key findings supported some patterns in gender disparities in financial knowledge, remuneration, and negotiation behaviours. Females reported learning significantly less financial knowledge in school compared to their male peers, and were also paid less for their casual jobs compared to males, suggesting that these gender differences may develop earlier in adolescence. While only a few of the late-adolescents in the present study reported having negotiation experience, success rate of a competitive negotiation was predicted by competence characteristics for male negotiators and by social characteristics for female negotiators, which indicates that existing gender norms affect the ways in which late-adolescents view negotiation as a function of gender (e.g., Kugler et al., 2018). Thus, the current study provides evidence of some gender differences in negotiation behaviour extant in adolescent populations, and supports the need for improvement in financial education and opportunities for practical applications in these domains.

Keywords: adolescence, gender, negotiation, work experience, financial education

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Acknowledgements

I am eternally grateful to everyone who has helped me complete this thesis. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Eileen Wood, for her immeasurable mentorship, guidance, and encouragement. Thank you for giving me the chance to learn and grow in a supportive environment, and for enriching me with your endless knowledge and contagious passion. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Nicky Newton, Dr. Serge Desmarais, and Dr. Carolyn FitzGerald for evaluating and editing my thesis document with great insight and precision.

I would like to thank all the research assistants who helped me create and revise measures, as well as collect data for this project. I couldn't have done it without all your help! I would also like to thank my lab-mates and friends, Fatma Arslantas, Constanza Uribe-Banda, Preet Chauhan, and Kaitlyn Butterfield for helping me with spontaneous stats questions, keeping me sane with late night chats (sometimes about academics!), and making me laugh when I needed it the most. Thank you also to my best friend Eva for being there whenever I needed it. You all have played a pivotal role in the completion of my thesis, and I am so lucky to have friends like you all.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family for all that you have done for me. Thank you for encouraging me to do my best even when I thought my best wasn't good enough, and for supporting me through all the challenges and triumphs. I could not have accomplished this without your love and support.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	vii
Introduction.....	1
Gender Pay Gap in Canada	2
Global Gender Disparity	4
Sources of Financial Literacy Across Development.....	6
Family socialization.....	7
Educational socialization.....	9
Effectiveness of financial socialization.....	11
Early Paid Work Experiences	11
Perceptions of and Experiences with Negotiation for Pay.....	12
Purpose of Current Study	15
Research Questions and Hypotheses	16
Method	17
Participants.....	17
Materials	19
Demographic information.....	19
Endorsement of feminine and masculine personality characteristics.....	19
Career studies knowledge.....	20
Paid work experience.....	22

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Formal and casual paid work experience.....	22
Comfort asking for money.....	24
Negotiation experience.....	24
Perceptions of negotiation.....	25
Gender and negotiation scenarios.....	26
Procedure.....	28
Results.....	29
Preparedness for the Workforce.....	29
Perceptions of readiness.....	29
Sources of information.....	31
Wage knowledge.....	32
Formal Work Experience.....	33
Remuneration for formal work.....	33
Casual Work Experience.....	34
Remuneration for casual work.....	34
Disposable income.....	35
Gender Typing of Jobs.....	35
Formal work.....	35
Casual work.....	36
Personal Attributions of Gender-Typed Personality Characteristics.....	36
Negotiating for Pay.....	37
Perception of Pay-for-Performance.....	38
Beliefs and Exposure to Negotiation for Pay.....	39

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Experience with Negotiating for a Higher Wage.....	40
Perceptions of Negotiation.....	41
Gender Differences in Perception of Success of Negotiation Strategies	42
Collaborative negotiation strategy.....	42
Gender-typing of the negotiator using a collaborative strategy	42
Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using a collaborative strategy	43
Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using a collaborative strategy	44
Competitive negotiation strategy.....	45
Gender-typing of the negotiator using a competitive strategy	45
Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using a competitive strategy	46
Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using a competitive strategy.....	47
Accommodating negotiation strategy.....	48
Gender-typing of the negotiator using an accommodating strategy	48
Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using an accommodating strategy	48
Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using an accommodating strategy	49
Compromising negotiation strategy.....	50
Gender-typing of the negotiator using a compromising strategy.....	50
Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using a compromising strategy.....	51
Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using a compromising strategy	51
Summarizing Patterns of Outcomes.....	53
Discussion.....	53
Sources of Information About and Preparedness for the Paid Workforce.....	53
Work Experiences and Remuneration for Paid Work.....	57

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Experience with and Perceptions of Negotiation	59
Limitations and Future Directions	64
Conclusions.....	66
Appendices.....	86
Appendix A – Supplementary Material	88
Appendix B – Personality Characteristics from the Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) and Competence Index and Social Skills Index (Rudman & Glick, 1999)	89
Appendix C – Modified Negotiation Strategy Scale (Marks & Harold, 2009)	91
Appendix D – Pay-for-Performance Perception Scale (Heneman et al., 1988; Kim et al., 2008)	92
Appendix E – Implicit Negotiation Belief Scale (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007)	93
Appendix F – Gendered Negotiation Scenarios.....	94
References	96

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

List of Tables

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Preparedness for Workforce.....	69
Table 2. Frequency of Concepts Learned in Secondary School	70
Table 3. Frequency of Beneficial Concepts Learned in Secondary School.....	71
Table 4. Frequency of First Person as a Source of Information about Negotiation.....	73
Table 5. Frequency of First Resource as a Source of Information for Negotiation	74
Table 6. Frequency of Formal Paid Positions	75
Table 7. Frequency of Casual Paid Positions.....	76
Table 8. Frequency of People Witnessed Negotiating	77
Table 9. Frequency of Factors That Would Encourage a Negotiation for Pay	78
Table 10. Frequency of Factors That Would Discourage a Negotiation for Pay	79
Table 11. Means and Standard Deviations for Endorsement of Personality Scales and Gender of Negotiator	80
Table 12. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Male Participants of a Male Negotiator Using a Competitive Negotiation Strategy	81
Table 13. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Female Participants of a Female Negotiator Using a Competitive Negotiation Strategy	82
Table 14. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Male Participants of a Female Negotiator Using an Accommodating Negotiation Strategy	83
Table 15. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Male Participants of a Female Negotiator Using a Compromising Negotiation Strategy	84
Table 16. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Female Participants of a Female Negotiator Using a Compromising Negotiation Strategy	85

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 17. Summary of Research Questions and Hypothesis 86

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Examining Gender Differences in Perceptions of Pay Negotiation and Remuneration Among Late-Adolescents

Financial knowledge, skills, and behaviour begin within the home and continue to develop throughout the lifespan (Brenner, 1998; Danes, 1994; Danes & Haberman, 2007, Jorgensen & Salva, 2010). Opportunities to develop financial literacy throughout childhood and adolescence serve as an important foundation for future economic and psychological outcomes. For example, recent research indicates that most adults do not possess the necessary skills to make successful financial decisions such as managing a budget and paying off debts (Serido & Deenanath, 2016; Shim, Serido, Bosch, & Tang, 2013; Sinha, Tan, & Zhan, 2018; Terriquez & Gurantz, 2014). A study of Canadian adults ages 24-64 years reported that 42% of participants were able to correctly answer questions related to personal financial decisions; however, women, visible minorities, and those with low educational attainment scored lower on these measures (Boisclair, 2014). Those adults who experience financial difficulties often have a decreased quality of psychological well-being and higher stress levels related to their financial stability later in life (Dew 2008; Heckman, Lim, & Montalto, 2014; McCormick, 2009; Norvilitis & Santa Maria, 2002; Roberts & Jones, 2001; Trombitas, 2012).

Past literature has indicated that gender has a notable impact on the acquisition and practice of financial literacy, such that women typically demonstrate less knowledge about finances and earn less compared to men (e.g., Boisclair, 2014; Moyser, 2017). These gender differences in financial literacy and remuneration contribute to the gender pay gap, in which women earn less money than men in their occupations (e.g., Moyser, 2017; World Economic Forum, 2020). A recent report found that Canadian women performed worse than men on questions related to financial literacy and were more likely to indicate that they did not know the

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

answer when responding to these questions (Boisclair, 2014). Lack of financial literacy early in life can have lasting effects later in life. For example, retirement planning is highly correlated with financial literacy, and limitations in knowledge early and throughout the working years may present financial consequences for adult women later in life (Boisclair, 2014; Lusardi & Mitchell, 2008).

Limitations in financial literacy have been demonstrated early in development, particularly among youth and emerging adults. In a recent report, only a quarter of Canadian millennials (ages 15-34 years as of 2015) had a basic level of financial literacy, with an even smaller minority demonstrating a high level of financial literacy (BMO Wealth Management, 2017). With overall levels of education increasing and more millennials occupying the current labour force (BMO Wealth Management, 2017), there is increased potential for the lack of financial skills among this group to lead to personal economic challenges. For example, individuals may experience economic hardships such as accumulation of debt and loss of personal financial security (Chen & Volpe, 1998; Grable & Joo, 1998). The goal of the present research is to assess factors, such as gender, that impact preparedness for and experiences in the workforce in late-adolescence. Investigating sources of financial literacy during this time in adolescent development is important for understanding how early educational and work experiences contribute to gender differences in adulthood. Understanding the ways in which gender impacts early financial literacy may have significant ramifications for individuals and society in the coming years.

Gender Pay Gap in Canada

Understanding what constitutes fair remuneration for work performed is an important aspect of financial literacy. Previous literature is mixed (Danes & Hira, 1987; Jorgensen &

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Salva, 2010); however, much of the research has indicated that gender differences in remuneration begin in the home, long before the youth has gained formal employment (Borden, Lee, Serido, & Collins, 2008; Saari, Wood, & Wood, 2017; Volpe, Chen, & Pavlicko, 1996). Female mid-adolescents report less disposable income than their male counterparts (Lintonen, Wilska, Koivusilta, & Konu, 2007; Saari et al., 2017), which is mostly obtained through paid chores and odd jobs within the home (Furnham, 1999; Kerr & Cheadle, 1997; Saari et al., 2017), as well as from monetary gifts for special occasions (Furnham, 1999; Lintonen et al., 2007; Saari et al., 2017). Furthermore, females report having more chores than males; however, recent literature has not found a gender difference in payment received for completing chores (Saari et al., 2017). This finding is representative of trends found in adult literature where females are expected to hold more responsibility in terms of household chores and tasks (Saari et al., 2017; World Economic Forum, 2020). These factors, present across development, collectively contribute to what is commonly known as the “gender pay gap”.

Over 80% of women ages 25-54 years participated in the workforce in 2015 compared to 91% of men. Despite this substantial increase from previous years, there continues to be sizeable gender disparity between men’s and women’s workforce participation (Moyser, 2017). However, remuneration for women continues to fall below that of males. Women in Canada make 87% of every dollar that their male counterpart earns, which is problematic considering the growing number of women who have entered the workforce over previous decades (Moyser, 2017). Past research has identified many reasons for this difference in pay, and there continues to be much exploration of this topic.

One explanation for the gender pay gap is that female-dominated occupations, such as jobs within the “5 C’s” (caring, clerical, catering, cashiering, and cleaning), tend to earn less than

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

male-dominated occupations (Moyser, 2017). Furthermore, women are socially prescribed with the responsibility to commit to parenting, which can limit participation in the workforce (Charlesworth & Macdonald, 2014; Crofts & Coffey, 2017; Gatrell, 2013). In a longitudinal study conducted by Crofts and Coffey (2017), all female participants who were 23-24 years of age indicated that they were aware of gender inequalities in the workplace, including the gender pay gap. While some female participants in the previously mentioned study indicated that they felt the workplace was becoming more equal for women, they also recognized that the investment in education does not necessarily provide the same financial and employment benefits for women as they do men.

Global Gender Disparity

Globally, a substantial gender pay gap still exists (World Economic Forum, 2020). North America, with a gender gap of approximately 27 percent, is one region that has made great strides toward gender equality in various areas such as Educational Attainment, Political Empowerment, and Economic Participation and Opportunity. As assessed by a report issued by the World Economic Forum in 2020, the latter area is made up of a sub-index which contains three concepts: the participation gap, which measures the difference between men and women in rates of participation in the labour force; the remuneration gap, which indicates the ratio of estimated female-to-male earned income and wage for equality of comparable work; and the advancement gap, which indicates the ratio of women to men among managers, senior officials, and legislators, as well as ratio of women to men among professional workers (World Economic Forum, 2020).

Out of 153 countries studied in this report, Canada is ranked 30th in the Economic Participation and Opportunity sub-index, indicating that Canada has closed approximately 75%

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

of its economic participation and opportunity pay gap (World Economic Forum, 2020).

Interestingly, Canada has a perfect score for Educational Attainment, indicating that there is no gender gap in this area. This implies that despite the equality of availability of education, there remains a gap between men's and women's participation in the economic field and the opportunity to engage in this area. For women, investment in education does not necessarily result in greater employment success to the same degree as it does for men (Crofts & Coffey, 2017; World Economic Forum, 2020).

The disparity in this level of gender parity can be explained through remuneration for similar work. The same report mentioned above indicates that there is a 30% wage gap between women and men for similar work (World Economic Forum, 2020). This finding represents an explicit gender inequality, but results also indicate that on average, women spend a higher proportion of time on unpaid work per day compared to men. This work includes tasks such as housework, caring for both household and non-household members, shopping and errands, and performing other household activities (World Economic Forum, 2020). It is possible that women are unable to participate as fully in the economic realm because they spend more time on unpaid tasks that are necessary for the function of family and social life. While these additional responsibilities stem from entrenched and continually perpetuated gender norms, these unpaid tasks are often unrecognized by employers as valuable experience that can be brought to a formal job (Crofts & Coffey, 2017). Of notable contribution to these maintained gender norms are the gender differences that exist in negotiation for higher pay.

Negotiation skills are an important aspect of financial literacy. In the adult literature, negotiating for pay has been shown to increase work benefits including salary (e.g., Kugler, Reif, Kaschner, & Brodbeck, 2018), and gender differences have been prominently documented (e.g.,

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Greig, 2008; Kugler et al., 2018). Despite previous literature on the development of financial literacy and early work experiences, little research has investigated whether late-adolescents practice negotiation strategies in early work experiences; specifically, little research has assessed early attitudes toward negotiation skills as an important aspect of financial development. Understanding the mechanisms of financial literacy development can provide insight into the origins of these gender differences as they relate to remuneration and negotiation.

Sources of Financial Literacy Across Development

Financial literacy in youth encompasses the knowledge and understanding of financial concepts necessary to make confident and effective decisions in financial contexts (e.g., OECD, 2014). Financial literacy extends from managing finances in the home, business, and work, and includes planning and awareness that is essential for future financial behaviours (e.g., OECD 2014). Financial socialization is the way in which adolescents and emerging adults acquire values, behaviours, and attitudes to develop their financial literacy throughout their transition into adulthood (Danes, 1994; Jorgensen & Salva, 2010; Kim & Chatterjee, 2013). Elements of this socialization include earning, saving, spending, borrowing, and sharing money (Danes, 1994; Schuchardt, Danes, Swanson, & Westbrook, 1991). These skills are gained during human development and are an important precursor for future financial success (Braunstein & Welch, 2002; Danes & Haberman, 2007). Exposure to concepts related to financial well-being and financial decision-making throughout early development have been found to influence increased financial behaviours in young adults (Jorgensen & Salva, 2010; Kim & Chatterjee, 2013). Learning these skills is important for future financial achievement, and thus, many previous studies have looked to uncover the precise sources of financial socialization.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Social constructivist models of learning identify the interactions that adolescents observe and experience as critical foundations for learning. Interactions between adults, such as parents in the home and teachers/educators at school, and among adolescents contribute to adolescents' understandings and expectations. Students engage in this social process by assimilating information from various environments to construct knowledge in a particular domain, such as financial literacy. As such, adolescents' knowledge of financial literacy occurs through interactions both inside and outside of the classroom (Lorber & Farrell, 1991). The constructivist nature of acquiring knowledge in this domain lends to the importance of having positive sources of financial literacy both inside and outside of the home.

Family socialization. Previous research has indicated that family is the primary socialization source for learning about finances (Danes, 1994; Danes & Haberman, 2007, Jorgensen & Salva, 2010). Children's first experiences happen within the household even before they are exposed to these concepts through formal education (Brenner, 1998; Danes, 1994). Though both are prevalent in familial contexts, implicit means of socialization (i.e., generic and nonspecific communication about finances) are more frequent than explicit methods (i.e., purposeful contact about financial skills; Danes, 1994; Gudmunson & Danes, 2011; John, 1999; Jorgensen & Salva, 2010). The parental socialization hypothesis indicates that both parental behaviours, such as monitoring of child behaviour, and parents' emotional responses to financial circumstances effectively predict financial attitudes, outcomes, and practices in their adult children (Conger, Cui, Bryant, & Elder, 2000; Kim & Chatterjee, 2013).

Past literature has indicated that financial socialization affects males and females differently. As youth are exposed to gendered financial role patterns in both home (such as women completing more unpaid work than men, such as household chores; Askari, Liss, Erchull, Staebell, &

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Axelson, 2010) and school environments (such as gender-typing of occupational roles; Moyser, 2017), these norms may be internalized and function as unconscious attitudes (Danes, 1994; Danes & Haberman, 2007). For example, early research suggests that females expect to delay financial and career success to fulfill familial roles, such as bearing and rearing children (e.g., Greene, 1990). This caretaking role has resulted in a long-standing wage gap within the workforce (Eagly & Wood, 2012). Despite the evolution of changing gender roles in society, these norms are still prevalent and influence the ways in which males and females are socialized (e.g., McClintock, 2018).

Since the majority of adolescents receive their financial education from their parents (Jorgensen & Salva, 2010), there is concern regarding whether parents effectively prepare their children for navigating future financial challenges. According to Shanks (2007) and Conger and Dogan (2007), parents who are more highly-educated and have more financial assets (such as owning stocks or having higher personal wealth) are better able to provide resources to assist their child's acquisition of financial knowledge (Kim & Chatterjee, 2013). Given that the parental socialization model includes modeling positive financial behaviours (Allen, 2008; Kim & Chatterjee, 2013; Kim, LaTaillade, & Kim, 2011), parents must be accomplished in these areas in order to successfully convey financial skills and information to their children so that their children are able to foster these positive financial practices later on in development.

In reality, many parents are incapable of providing their children with ample financial knowledge, perhaps because they do not possess this knowledge themselves, or because they do not feel a personal responsibility to teach their children (Beverly & Clancy, 2001; Danes & Haberman, 2007; Jorgensen & Salva, 2010). In some cases, cultural beliefs may inhibit open discussion of money and finances between parents and their children (e.g., Sato, 2011). This has

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

prompted researchers and policy makers to identify alternative ways of providing financial socialization to adolescents outside of the home. Given the importance of financial socialization within the home, the current study assesses the impact of the home environment in the provision of financial literacy skills and knowledge for late-adolescents. The present study also includes casual work experiences as possible contributors to financial literacy development. The current study also examines factors beyond the home, such as school.

Educational socialization. Across North America, formal financial education was created as a means of providing an equitable opportunity for youth who have not been exposed to sufficient financial socialization from parents (Danes & Haberman, 2007). Educators have the ability to influence the financial knowledge and behaviours their students develop. For example, Brenner (1998) found that while students had prior knowledge about finances before entering the classroom, second-graders shared a substantial amount of similarities to their teacher's viewpoints about buying and spending compared to their own parents (Danes & Haberman, 2007). For youth who have not been effectively socialized within the home, learning about financial literacy in school can allow them to catch up to their peers.

One aim of financial education that is presented in a formal educational institution is to create an equitable playing field for students across gender, race, and socio-economic backgrounds. Previous literature indicates that at the high school and college level, males typically have more financial knowledge than females (Danes & Haberman, 2007). In a study conducted by Danes and Haberman (2007), male students maintained higher scores in financial planning (including credit costs and investments) compared to females after taking a course on financial education, indicating the persistent advantage from males receiving greater financial literacy socialization in the home compared to their female counterparts. However, despite having lower scores overall,

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

females demonstrated a larger increase in knowledge after taking the course. This finding indicates that females may benefit from formal financial education more than their male counterparts as they may not have received sufficient financial socialization within the home prior to entering secondary school. Thus, the present study explores potential differences across knowledge of financial skills and experiences in both the casual and formal workforces as a function of gender.

Formal financial education becomes particularly important as an adolescent develops and begins experiencing financial challenges, such as paying for and attending college/university, balancing budgets, or obtaining a full-time job in the workforce. The average college student in the United States of America enters college without ever developing responsibility for their personal finances (Mae, 2002; Maurer & Lee, 2011). As a result, many students report having issues with managing credit (Joo, Grable, & Bagwell, 2003; Maurer & Lee, 2011) and budgeting for expenses related to their personal finances (Henry, Weber, & Yarbrough, 2001; Maurer & Lee, 2011). Together, these concerns highlight the need to provide adolescents with sufficient financial skills to allow them to navigate financial responsibilities.

Educational programs in some parts of Canada have incorporated programming intended to provide children and adolescents with a common foundation in financial literacy. In Ontario, Canada, financial literacy is intended to be explicitly incorporated across curriculum of other subjects for elementary students in grades four through eight (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016). Once the Ontarian student has reached secondary school, they are required to complete a Career Studies course, most often when they are in grade 10 and 15-16 years of age. This half-credit course is designed to teach students how to develop goals, skills, and characteristics that will assist in economic and community settings. Most importantly, this course aims to prepare

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

students for future life transitions involving careers and work (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2006). This course is an example of formal financial education and was created to provide students with the necessary career preparation skills if they had not previously acquired them through family socialization. Little empirical research has investigated the extent to which the Career Studies course impacts students as they navigate transitions in employment. Thus, the current study explores the effects and benefits of this particular course on the development of financial literacy and preparedness for the workforce.

Effectiveness of financial socialization. Financial education is best provided in an integrated and relevant fashion over time (Jorgensen & Salva, 2010; Mandell & Klein, 2009; Maurer & Lee, 2011). Ideally, youth would receive a combination of socialization from parents and guardians in familial settings and through formal financial education to achieve successful financial skills as they enter adulthood. Much financial knowledge is experience-based, in that adolescents gain financial knowledge as they age, which may be due to applying education-based knowledge to practical situations, or through trial-and-error-type experiences (Jorgensen & Salva, 2010). Understanding what is taught, especially in educational contexts, and what adolescents say they have learned in educational contexts, may provide a fuller picture of content that is drawn upon in early work experiences. Overall, both parental and educational socialization are important sources of information. Therefore, the present study examines the impact of practical experiences and educational content in the work life of late-adolescents.

Early Paid Work Experiences

As adolescents age, they are provided with opportunities to earn money through occasional and casual work, such as babysitting or mowing the lawn. This provides adolescents with their first exposure to making and managing money, thereby allowing them to practice

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

financial skills they have previously learned. Between the ages of 14-16 years, adolescents in Ontario are legally able to enter the formal workforce and obtain a paid job outside of the home (Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act, 2016; Raby, Lehmann, Easterbrook, & Helleiner, 2018). Here, they are provided the opportunity to engage with formal financial behaviours such as managing a pay check, attending scheduled shifts, and setting and negotiating for a wage.

Whereas early paid work may be informal in nature, such as yard work for a neighbour or babysitting for another family (Raby et al., 2018), once the legal working age is reached, early paid working experiences can progress into more formal positions, such as working as a sales associate for a retail company or becoming a lifeguard at the local pool. These experiences allow adolescents to develop independence, both financially and socially (Raby et al., 2018). Early work experiences may differ for females and males, especially in terms of the types of work experiences available. For example, females reported having more experiences within the home and doing work such as babysitting, whereas males reported having more experiences outside the home, such as snow shoveling and mowing lawns (Saari, et al., 2017).

Indeed, research indicates that gender differences may be an important consideration when investigating financial literacy among youth populations. For example, gender differences are prominently highlighted in research on adults and work in terms of pay, equity (in roles and responsibilities), and promotion and advancement in which women are often disadvantaged (e.g., Greig, 2008; Kroska, 2003). One aim of this study is to address this gap within the literature by investigating the development of negotiation knowledge and skill in late-adolescents.

Perceptions of and Experiences with Negotiation for Pay

Negotiation is a fundamental skill for any individual who is looking to obtain a higher position within an organization (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999). Salary increases, pension and

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

benefit rates, and comparative salary at a future place of employment are all commonly awarded based on starting rate of pay within an organization (Gerhart & Rynes, 1991; Kugler et al., 2018; Rubin & Brown, 1975; Thompson, Wang, & Gunia, 2010). Negotiation is a self-driven act, in that an individual must initiate a negotiation in order to profit from it. Salary negotiations can have a drastic financial impact across a career. Assuming a five-percent wage increase over a 40-year career, an employee with a starting salary of \$55,000 can earn nearly \$635,000 more across their career compared to a counterpart with a starting salary of \$50,000 (Marks & Harold, 2009). Just a \$5,000 difference in starting salary can drastically affect the financial trajectory of a young employee.

If past research has indicated that people who negotiate generally increase their salaries, why do people choose not to negotiate? This question has been partially answered in previous literature by exploring the gender wage gap that exists within negotiation practices and outcomes. Overall, women are less likely to initiate and participate in negotiations compared to men (Babcock, Gelfand, Small, & Stayn, 2006; Gerhart & Rynes, 1991; Hernandez-Arenaz & Iriberry, 2019; Kugler et al., 2018; O'Shea & Bush, 2002). Individual differences in the type of strategy used also account for who is likely to initiate and receive a negotiation increase (Marks & Harold, 2009).

The existence of social gender roles (beliefs about the roles that men and women should assume) also influences who initiates and who receives in negotiation scenarios. Social role theory explains that beliefs about assumed gender roles guide the perceptions of men's and women's social roles within society, such as women assuming caregiver-type positions (Eagly & Wood, 2012). One social role that impacts negotiation strategies is the assignment of gender-specific attitudes to both men and women, resulting in gender-specific behaviours (Kugler et al.,

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

2018). That is, men tend to behave in a more agentic manner through being assertive, dominant, and competitive, whereas women exhibit more communal attributes such as emotional expression, friendliness, and concern for others (Eagly & Wood, 2012; Kugler et al., 2018). Agentic attributes are often related to successful negotiation experiences; specifically, strategies that employ concern for one's own outcomes (i.e., competitive strategies) versus other's outcomes (i.e., collaborative strategies) are most successful (Hernandez-Arenaz et al., 2019; Marks & Harold, 2009; Nelson, Bronstein, Shacham, & Ben-Ari, 2015). Negotiation strategies that focus on the concern for others' outcomes or communal outcomes endorse female gender roles and are typically less successful. Even in varying levels of power, women typically adhere to gendered behaviour when engaging in negotiation and therefore are less dominating and more accommodating (Nelson et al., 2015).

Though women have the ability to attain agentic attributes in a negotiation experience, they often face what is known as the backlash effect: retaliation for violating gender roles and norms (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013; Kugler et al., 2018; Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman & Glick, 1999; Williams & Tiedens, 2016). Because of this reaction, women tend to negotiate in ways that favour communal benefits rather than personal gain (Nelson et al., 2015; Saari et al., 2017). Women also tend to demonstrate social skills such as friendliness, cheerfulness, and warmth, rather than exhibiting competence driven characteristics (e.g., assertiveness, forcefulness, and self-reliance) during a negotiation to compensate for the backlash effect (Rudman & Glick, 1999). Interestingly, negotiation strategies can be moderated and even improved when women are negotiating on another person's behalf in a role-congruent context (Mazei et al., 2015; Saari et al., 2017), or when they are attempting to disprove the stereotype that women cannot negotiate as well as men (Curhan & Overbeck, 2008;

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2001; Kray, Reb, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004; Saari et al., 2017). While these social aspects of negotiation depend heavily on established gender roles, it is unclear as to when in development these norms become ingrained in both men and women. Thus, the current study examines the relationship of gender role attitudes and attitudes toward negotiation among late-adolescents.

Purpose of Current Study

The overarching goal of this research is to examine factors that impact late-adolescents' preparedness for work. Little is known regarding how early work experiences (paid and unpaid) or educational experiences contribute to the development of financial literacy, which encompasses a broad variety of factors including remuneration, education, and negotiation. The adult literature encompassing this topic is broad and deep, however, our understanding of important experiences during late-adolescent development remains sparse. Specific consideration of the role of gender in late-adolescents' experiences with work, remuneration, and negotiation is a key concern in the present research, especially in light of the well-documented gender differences within adult populations. A secondary goal of this study is to document late-adolescents' experiences across a wider array of elements relating to financial literacy. This secondary goal permits a clearer picture of knowledge and needs regarding financial literacy in general, and negotiation in particular during the years preceding adult life.

Due to current limitations that exist in the developmental literature in the area of negotiation and remuneration, adult literature and theory will be used as a guide to explore further research questions. In order to successfully research attitudes and experiences with pay negotiation, it is necessary to explore financial literacy as a whole, including the socialization process and work experiences. Together, this information will provide a context for

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

understanding how early work experience and knowledge about work influences expectations about the workplace and negotiation skills in particular among late-adolescents.

Given the relatively sparse extant research involving late-adolescents in the domains to be examined, this study uses an exploratory approach to examine experiences with work (formal and casual), remuneration, and negotiation as a function of gender among late-adolescents. The study also explored some family and educational contributors through which late-adolescents can gain exposure, experiences, and information about work, remuneration, and negotiation knowledge and skills.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

One of the key contributions of the current study was to document work experiences (casual/formal), remuneration experiences, and negotiation experiences in late-adolescent Canadian youth. Early perceptions regarding negotiation styles were also examined as a function of gender. In addition to documenting these experiences in late-adolescents, the exploratory nature of the current study will allow for the following research questions to be examined:

1) Will late-adolescents' sources of information about financial skills indicate equal or different levels of input from the home or school environments? Will these sources of information differ across gender?

2) Will late-adolescents schooled in Ontario report having learned about financial information through the Career Studies course that is taken in secondary school? If so, what concepts will they report having learned and benefitted from? Will these differ by gender?

3) Will remuneration for casual and formal jobs differ as a function of gender in late-adolescents?

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

A second key interest of the present study was to explore late-adolescents' perceptions and preferences for different negotiation strategies as a function of gender. Specifically, the study assessed perceptions of negotiators utilizing various strategies, potential gender differences in negotiation experience (i.e., frequency, successful outcomes, and types of strategies used) in late-adolescents, attributions of personality characteristics to both male and female negotiators, and whether the gendered characterization is related to the perceived success of the negotiator. Based on previous adult and child literature, the following hypothesis will be tested:

1) It was hypothesized that experiences with negotiation and perceptions of a negotiator would differ as a function of gender.

Method

Participants

A total of 268 late-adolescents (131 males and 137 females) volunteered to participate in this study ($M_{Age} = 18.44$, $SD = 0.50$). There were no significant differences between males and females as a function of age, $\chi^2(1, N = 268) = 0.01$, $p = .937$. Overall, the sample included 150 18-year olds ($n_{Male} = 73$, $n_{Female} = 77$) and 118 19-year olds ($n_{Male} = 58$, $n_{Female} = 60$).

Maternal education was used as a proxy for socio-economic status (Elardo, Bradley, & Caldwell, 1977). Overall, the sample reflected a middle-to-high socio-economic status level. Specifically, 31% of participants indicated having a mother with a Bachelor's degree ($n_{Male} = 42$, $n_{Female} = 41$), 26.9% with a high school degree or equivalent ($n_{Male} = 36$, $n_{Female} = 36$), and 20.9% with some college/university but no degree ($n_{Male} = 23$, $n_{Female} = 33$). A smaller number of participants reported having a mother with a graduate degree, professional degree, or less than a high school diploma (for full descriptive statistics, see Appendix A for Supplementary Material)

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Participants were asked to indicate on what continent they were born, and on what continent they had spent the majority of their life. These questions were framed in this way because cultural environment is often more indicative of individual differences in constructs such as work experience, remuneration, and exposure to negotiation experiences compared to self-identified ethnicity or race (e.g., Hernandez-Arenaz & Iriberry, 2019). Overall, 79.9% of participants indicated that they were born in North America ($n_{\text{Male}} = 98$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 116$) along with 90.3% of participants who indicated that they spent most of their life in North America ($n_{\text{Male}} = 113$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 129$). A smaller number of participants were born in Asia (12.3% overall; $n_{\text{Male}} = 16$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 17$) or Africa (4.5% overall; $n_{\text{Male}} = 10$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 2$) and/or spent the majority of their life in Asia (5.6% overall; $n_{\text{Male}} = 8$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 7$) or Africa (1.9%; $n_{\text{Male}} = 5$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 0$).

Overall, 39.2% of participants reported living with two parents (mothers/fathers) most of the time ($n_{\text{Male}} = 57$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 48$), followed by 23.1% living with roommates in on-campus residence most of the time ($n_{\text{Male}} = 26$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 36$). 21.6% reported living with roommates in off-campus housing ($n_{\text{Male}} = 30$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 28$). A smaller number of participants reported living with a single father or mother, living alone, living with an adult guardian, or living with a romantic partner (for full descriptive statistics, see Appendix A for Supplementary Material).

The majority of participants were recruited through a research experience program at Wilfrid Laurier University ($n = 254$). Participants received 0.75 credits toward their course grade for their participation. Other participants were recruited through one secondary school in Waterloo, Ontario and community organizations ($n = 14$). Participants who were recruited through the community or through snowball sampling were entered into a draw to win one of four \$10 gift cards from Tim Hortons or Chapters.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

There were no significant differences between participants recruited through the university and participants recruited through secondary school or the community as a function of gender, $\chi^2(1, N = 268) = 1.40, p = .236$. Comparisons of responses between the university and community samples across each key variable were not conducted given the very small sample of community participants. However, the proportion of males and females were compared with the number of participants reporting negotiation strategies, and there were no differences in representation. Recruitment procedures did not differ in terms of invitation and protocols between the university and community sample.

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Board at Wilfrid Laurier University (REB #5867), and participants were treated in accordance with the American Psychological Association and the Canadian Psychological Association's ethical expectations.

Materials

Materials included one online survey delivered using Qualtrics software. The survey was comprised of six subsections: Demographic Information, Endorsement of Feminine and Masculine Personality Characteristics, Career Studies Education, Paid Work Experience, Negotiation Experience and Perceptions of Negotiation, and Perceptions of Gendered Negotiation Scenarios.

Demographic information. Demographic information was gathered through five questions assessing: age, gender, socio-economic status (using maternal education as a proxy for income; Elardo et al., 1977), ethnicity, and family composition.

Endorsement of feminine and masculine personality characteristics. Assessment of participants' endorsement of feminine and masculine personality characteristics was conducted through the use of two measures: the Masculine and Feminine Items from the Bem Sex-Role

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Inventory (Bem, 1974; Cronbach's alpha levels of the original scales range from .70 to .86) and from the Competence Index ($\alpha = .89$) and Social Skills Index ($\alpha = .88$) developed by Rudman & Glick (1999). The items from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory comprises of 40 adjectives from which participants select all those that apply to them to create a numeric score for each subscale. The Competence Index and Social Skills Index comprises of 19 adjectives from which participants select those that apply to them. Together, these measures yielded 59 adjectives with 6 adjectives that overlapped. Redundant items were deleted, leaving a total of 53 adjectives in the final measure (see Appendix B). The original scales are usually measured on a Likert-type scale; however, for the purpose of this study, each adjective was coded as either yes/no based on perceived applicability to the participant. The adjectives were presented to participants in a constant random order, and participants selected only characteristics that they felt described themselves best and left all others blank. Cronbach's alpha levels were acceptable for the modified personal masculine characteristics scale ($\alpha = .80$), feminine characteristics scale ($\alpha = .77$), competence characteristics scale ($\alpha = .68$), and social characteristics scale ($\alpha = .70$).

Career studies knowledge. In total, seven components were measured in this section. Using two yes/no forced-choice questions, all participants were asked to indicate whether they had taken a general career studies course as part of their secondary education. All participants were asked to indicate whether or not they attended high school in Ontario, Canada. If participants indicated yes to this latter question, they were asked whether they completed the Grade 10 Career Studies course that is required by all high school students in the province. All participants responded to two additional questions; participants were asked to select all factors that they learned about in high school from a list of 11 items including: minimum wage, completing a job application, what to expect in a job interview, determining the wage you will be paid, negotiating for pay, creating

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

a resumé, researching employment opportunities, personal-management skills, using assessment tools to provide a personal profile that describes interests/skills/accomplishments/characteristics/competencies, understanding the importance of safety in the workplace, and understanding employee/employer rights and responsibilities.

Of the factors they previously selected, participants were asked to rate which factors they found to be most beneficial to them as they entered the workforce on a scale of 1 (*not at all beneficial*) to 3 (*very beneficial*). These factors were drawn from the learning objectives documented in the Ontario Curriculum, Grades 9 and 10: Guidance and Career Education (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2006). These learning objectives are standardized across the province and should be applicable to any student who has previously completed this course; however, they may also have been taught in an alternative high school course. Participants were asked to share their perceptions regarding knowledge and preparation for future careers. Participants read seven questions employing a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). This section assessed participant's experience with learning about financial and career studies knowledge in both formal education institutions ("I have learned enough about finances in school to prepare me for a future job"; "I have learned enough about career preparation in school to prepare me for a future job"; "I have learned most of what I know about finances and career studies through school"; $\alpha = .71$) and in familial contexts ("I have learned enough about finances through my family to prepare me for a future job"; "I have learned enough about career preparation through my family to prepare me for a future job"; "I have learned most of what I know about finances and career studies through my family"; $\alpha = .81$).

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Participants were also asked to indicate the time period when it would be best to provide formal instruction in school regarding negotiation skill. Participants indicated their preference by selecting one of five alternatives (Elementary school [grades 6 and under; 11 years of age and under], middle school [grades 7-9; 12-14 years of age], high school [grades 10-12, 15-17 years of age], early college/university [18-20 years of age], after 20 years of age). Participants were also provided the option of selecting that they do not believe instruction about negotiating should be provided through school.

Paid work experience. Paid work experience was assessed through 28 questions. A total of 18 questions across both formal paid work experience and casual paid work experience were optional as participants only completed questions that were applicable to them. This section was divided into two sub sections: formal and casual paid work experience and comfort asking for money in these domains.

Formal and casual paid work experience. Using a forced choice yes/no format, all participants were asked to indicate whether they currently held a formal paid job(s) or have held a formal paid job(s) in the past (i.e., have signed a formal contract or completed a formal application). All participants were asked to indicate whether they currently held a casual paid job(s) and whether they had held a casual paid job(s) in the past (i.e., have not signed a formal contract or completed a formal application). If participants indicated that they did not have experience in either the formal or casual job categories, they skipped subsequent questions pertaining to work experience. If participants indicated that they did have experience in either or both of the formal or casual categories, they were asked to identify the position title of the job(s). They were also asked to think of one job that they have had in the past or currently have in each category that was most important to them. Participants provided a label for the referent formal

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

and/or casual job(s) and used the position for the purposes of answering five questions about formal work and five questions about casual work.

The referent job(s) were coded as male-typical (e.g., labour, stocker, landscaping, and other outdoor work), female-typical (e.g., office work, receptionist, cashier, child care, food preparation, and retail work), or neutral (e.g., tutor, life guard, coach, counter clerk, and activity coordinator) based on the percentage of males and females who obtain them (e.g., Hirschman & Voloshin, 2007). Male-typical job positions were defined as those having less than 35% of females occupying the position, whereas female-typical jobs were defined as those having more than 65% of females occupying the position. Neutral jobs were defined as those with 36- 64% of females occupying the position. Any positions identified by participants in the current study that were ambiguous (e.g., not enough information was provided by the participant to categorize the position), or positions that did not fit within a category were not coded. In total, six formal job positions and three casual job positions could not be coded for these reasons. All participant responses were coded by two researchers using a nominal scale to create the Coded Gender Typicality of Jobs and inter-rater reliability was calculated for both formal, $\kappa = .75$ (95% CI, 0.66 to 0.84), $p < .001$ and casual jobs, $\kappa = .98$ (95% CI, 0.94 to 1.00), $p < .001$.

Using a yes/no/I don't know format, participants were asked two questions to determine if each of their formal and/or casual job(s) were representative of a career they would wish to have in the future, and if they enjoyed this job. Participants were asked how important advancement was to them in each job using a separate 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*very unimportant to me*) to 5 (*very important to me*). Participants were asked to report their wage for each job in dollars and cents, and were asked to indicate how satisfied they felt with this wage

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

using one 5-point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 (*very unsatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*).

Comfort asking for money. Using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*very uncomfortable*) to 5 (*very comfortable*), participants were asked to indicate their comfort with asking for money from three sources: a family member, from a boss or employer in an informal setting (i.e., *a person/neighbour(s) you do casual tasks for such as babysitting or snow shoveling*), and from a boss or employer in a formal setting (i.e., *in a formal organization/company*). Using open-ended question formats, participants were also asked to provide both the current minimum wage and the current student wage in Ontario, Canada.

Negotiation experience. Experience with negotiation strategies/techniques for pay increases was assessed using seven measures. All participants indicated whether or not they had observed any of 14 listed individuals negotiate for an increase in pay. The list included: mother, father, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, grandfather, grandmother, cousin, friend, character in a television show or movie, co-worker, boss, and teacher. For participants who indicated having witnessed a financial negotiation in the past, they were then asked to think of one negotiation, in particular, they had observed. Participants also indicated on a 3-point scale 1 (*I would definitely not use this negotiation strategy*) to 3 (*I would definitely use this negotiation strategy*) whether they would consider using this same negotiation strategy themselves. One forced yes/no question was used to determine whether participants had ever negotiated for a higher wage. If a participant indicated that they have never negotiated for a higher wage, they skipped the rest of this subsection. If a participant indicated that they had previously negotiated for a higher wage, they were asked two additional questions. First, they were asked how many times they had been able to successfully negotiate on a 5-point fixed-alternatives type scale (*1 time, 2-4 times, more*

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

than 4 times, I have never negotiated for a wage increase and been successful, I have never negotiated for a wage increase). Second, they were asked to indicate how much money they got after negotiating on a 5-point Likert type scale with options ranging from 1 (*a lot less than what I asked for*) and 5 (*a lot more than what I asked for*).

Participants completed a modified version of the Negotiation Strategy Scale (Marks & Harold, 2009) which was extracted from a total of 20 items across four strategy scales. One item from each scale was used and modified to be applicable to an adolescent population; therefore, four items were created that measured four negotiation strategies: competing, collaborating, compromising, and accommodating. These four items were measured on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) Likert-type scale (see Appendix C for the full modified scale).

Perceptions of negotiation. Participants' perceptions toward negotiating for wage increases were assessed through eight items developed for this study. For the first two items, participants were asked to what degree they believe negotiating has a positive impact on their rate of pay, and to what degree they believe negotiating has a negative impact on their rate of pay. Both items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*very little positive/negative impact*) to 5 (*a lot of positive/negative impact*). Using one question, participants were asked to indicate factors that would encourage them to initiate a negotiation for a higher wage. Participants were provided with eight possible factors and asked to select all factors that apply. Examples of these eight factors include: "Need to support myself or someone else", and "to gain experience for my resumé/CV". In a separate question, participants were then provided with seven possible factors that would discourage them from initiating a negotiation for a higher wage and were asked to select all that apply. Examples of these seven discouraging factors include: "Fear of being seen as rude or aggressive by my boss or co-workers", and "because my

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

parents/family would discourage me from doing that”. An “other” category was also provided for both questions.

Sources of information and guidance regarding negotiating were assessed through two questions. Participants were provided with 12 alternative sources including: father, mother, sibling, grandfather/grandmother, uncle, aunt, cousin, friend, co-worker, boss, teacher/professor, or other. Participants were asked to identify the first person they would contact as a source of information if they wanted to develop their negotiation skills. Participants were then provided with six alternative sources including: Internet, school/class notes or activities, YouTube videos, research articles, books, or other. Participants were asked to identify the first resource they would use as a source of information for developing negotiation skill. Both questions also had an option for participants to indicate that they would not contact anyone/any resource for information about developing negotiation skill.

Participants completed the Pay-for-Performance Perception Scale (Heneman, Greenberger, & Strasser, 1988; $\alpha = .71$; Kim, Mone, & Kim, 2008) to assess connections between work performance and financial benefit (see Appendix D). Participants indicated their level of agreement with each of the four statements on a 5- point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Participants then completed the Implicit Negotiation Belief Scale (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007; $\alpha = .87$; See Appendix E). This scale used a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 5 (*strongly agree*) to assess embedded attitudes about the malleable nature of negotiation.

Gender and negotiation scenarios. A total of eight scenarios were created for this study to assess the impact of gender on perception of negotiation strategies (see Appendix F). Scenarios were created based on four negotiation strategies: collaborating, competing,

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

accommodating, and compromising (Marks & Harold, 2009). A female or male character was reflected in each version of each scenario. Both the female and male scenarios were worded similarly with only names distinguishing the gender of the scenario subject. Female and male gender-specific names were chosen for the scenarios to reinforce the gender of the subject. The scenarios differed with respect to outcome goals and concern for the other party involved in the negotiation, but all began with the same introduction: “[The negotiator] would like to ask their boss for a wage increase. They have been doing this job for a while and believe that they have a skill set that is of high value to the company”. Each participant read four randomly generated scenarios in total with one scenario from each strategy category.

The collaborating strategy involved a person who maintained high concern for receiving their desired outcome as well as the anticipated outcome for the other person involved in the negotiation (“...James/Jennifer wants to make sure that their boss is happy with the negotiation outcome and feels that James/Jennifer deserves the wage increase. James/Jennifer also wants to ensure that they personally feel the negotiation outcome is fair and that they obtain the desired outcome”).

The competing strategy involved a person who maintained higher concern for their own desired outcome and used persuasive and assertive language to achieve this outcome over the other party’s desired outcome (“...Patrick/Penelope approaches their boss and threatens to leave the job if their wage is not increased. They continue to persuade their boss to get the outcome that they desire”).

The accommodating scenario involved a person with more interest in the other party obtaining their desired outcome rather than their own desired outcome (“...Adam/Abigail approaches their boss and implies that they want a wage increase but does not want to upset their

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

boss with their request. Through the process, Adam/Abigail makes sure that their boss is completely satisfied with the desired outcome, even if it is not exactly what Adam/Abigail wanted”).

The compromising strategy involved a person showing concern for both their own desired outcome as well as the other party’s outcome and used a give-and-take approach to obtain an acceptable consensus (“...Kyle/Kyla gives their opening request, and their boss counters with an alternative request. They go back and forth until they both reach what Kyle/Kyla deems as an acceptable middle ground”).

After reading each scenario, participants answered one question on a 5-point Likert- type scale from 1 (*definitely not*) to 5 (*definitely yes*) to indicate how successful they believed the scenario subject would be in their negotiation attempt. Participants then read a list of 53 adjectives from the Masculine and Feminine items from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Bem, 1974), the Competence Index, and the Social Skills Index (Rudman & Glick, 1999). Participants were instructed to select all adjectives that they would use to describe the person in the scenario who negotiated for a wage increase. For each item selected, participants received a score of 1. Items were then used to construct scales to represent scores in endorsement of masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics for each participant. Participants then indicated whether or not they would use the same negotiation strategy as the person in the scenario if they were in a similar situation using one yes/no forced response question.

Procedure

Upon arrival, participants were greeted by a trained research assistant and either brought to a classroom setting for those participants tested in a university ($n = 254$), or to a classroom or

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

quiet place for those tested in schools or in the community ($n = 14$). Participants were asked ahead of time to bring a laptop or mobile device with Wi-Fi capability to complete the survey. If participants did not have a device available, one was provided to them. Participants were thanked for their attendance and told about the compensation (if applicable) for their participation. The research assistant was present to ensure that participants were able to access the survey and to provide clarification if participants did not understand a word or phrase, an instruction, or other aspect of the survey content.

Participants completed surveys individually, but most were tested in small groups ranging from two to 10 individuals. A link to the survey (created in Qualtrics) was posted on a board that was visible to all participants or was provided on a sheet of paper if no projection equipment or board was available. Participants reviewed the consent form online and indicated their consent before beginning the survey. Participants took approximately 15-45 minutes to complete the survey. Once participants were finished completing the survey, they were thanked for their participation.

Results

Preparedness for the Workforce

Perceptions of readiness. When asked about preparedness for employment on a 5-point Likert scale, mean scores indicated that participants reported being “somewhat” prepared to get a job in the workforce ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 0.92$). There were no differences in preparedness as a function of gender $t(266) = 0.53$, $p = .596$ (see Table 1 for complete summary of means). In total, 248 participants reported attending high school in Ontario, Canada ($n_{\text{Male}} = 120$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 128$). Of these students, 238 indicated that they completed the Grade 10 Ontario Career Studies course in high school ($n_{\text{Male}} = 114$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 124$).

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

In terms of content relevant for work, students endorsed eight of the listed topics highly (65% or more); however, two topics were endorsed by very few students. Specifically, 90.7% of participants indicated learning about creating a resumé ($n_{\text{Male}} = 115$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 128$), 82.1% learned about completing a job application ($n_{\text{Male}} = 102$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 118$), 81.3% learned about personal management skills ($n_{\text{Male}} = 101$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 117$), 76.1% learned about what to expect in a job interview ($n_{\text{Male}} = 95$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 109$), 73.5% learned about minimum wage ($n_{\text{Male}} = 105$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 92$), 69.8% learned about safety in the workplace ($n_{\text{Male}} = 95$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 92$), 68.7% learned how to research employment opportunities ($n_{\text{Male}} = 84$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 100$), 67.2% learned how to use assessment tools to develop a personal skills profile ($n_{\text{Male}} = 79$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 101$), and 64.6% learned about employee/employer rights and responsibilities ($n_{\text{Male}} = 84$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 89$). Fewer participants indicated learning about the following concepts: 30.2% learned about determining a wage to be paid ($n_{\text{Male}} = 44$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 37$) and only 10.4% learned about negotiating for pay ($n_{\text{Male}} = 18$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 10$). Overall, there was an association between learning about minimum wage in high school and gender, $\chi^2(2) = 7.77$, $p = .021$. The pattern of endorsement for all other topics did not differ as a function of gender (see Table 2).

When asked to rate these topics learned in high school in terms of how beneficial they were to them as they enter the workforce on a 3-point scale from 1 (*not at all beneficial*) to 3 (*very beneficial*), participants' mean scores indicated that three of the top reported concepts learned were "very beneficial" to them, including creating a resumé ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.43$), completing a job application ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.49$), and what to expect in a job interview ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 0.54$). The lowest ratings for reported concepts learned included determining the wage one will be paid ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 0.63$) and negotiating for pay ($M = 2.21$, $SD = 0.08$). See Table 3 for a complete breakdown of means and standard deviations according to gender.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to assess pattern of endorsement of beneficial topics as a function of gender. Levene's test of homogeneity of variances indicated that three topics violated homogeneity of variance, (completing a job application, what to expect in a job interview, and researching employment opportunities, $p < .05$). Patterns of endorsement of beneficial topics did not differ as a function of gender for any of the 11 topics.

When asked for the best time to provide formal instruction about negotiation skills in particular, the majority of participants (68.3%, $n_{\text{Male}} = 88$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 95$) indicated that high school (grades 10-12) would be the best time to provide this.

In summary, both male and female participants reported only being somewhat prepared for the workforce. Ratings of topics known, and perceived benefits of content received through formal financial education in secondary school did not differ between males and females. Generally, these findings indicate recognition and perceived value across many topics relevant to preparation for employment, but reveal a notable absence of information about wage determination and negotiation.

Sources of information. With respect to sources of information about finances and careers, participants' mean scores fell just above the midpoint of the 5-point scale (between "somewhat agree" to "feel neutral") regarding learning from family ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.93$) and just below the midpoint of the scale regarding learning from school ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.86$). Comparisons of these two sources indicated that overall, participants learned most of what they know about finances and career studies from family ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.14$) compared to school ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.23$), $t(266) = 8.61$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.53$. Specifically, most information was learned about these concepts from family for both males $t(130) = 4.45$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.39$ (M_{Family}

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

= 3.54, $SD = 1.16$; $M_{\text{School}} = 2.85$, $SD = 0.98$) and females, $t(135) = 7.75$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.66$ ($M_{\text{Family}} = 3.77$, $SD = 1.11$; $M_{\text{School}} = 2.54$, $SD = 1.11$). Males and females did not differ in their ratings of the amount of knowledge learned from family ($M_{\text{Male}} = 3.51$, $SD = 0.97$, $M_{\text{Female}} = 3.65$, $SD = 0.88$); however, females indicated learning less about career preparation and finances in school ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.79$) than their male counterparts ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 0.90$), $t(265) = 2.86$, $p = .005$, $d = 0.35$.

When asked who would be the first person they would contact as a source for information about developing their negotiation skills, 47.9% of participants indicated they would ask their father ($n_{\text{Male}} = 53$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 71$), whereas only 21.2% of participants indicated that they would ask their mother ($n_{\text{Male}} = 24$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 31$). In addition, 67.1% of participants indicated that they would consult the Internet if they wanted to improve their negotiation skills ($n_{\text{Male}} = 73$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 100$; see Tables 4 and 5 for full frequency reports). There were no significant differences across gender and the first person they would contact, $\chi^2(12, N = 259) = 15.68$, $p = .210$, or the first resource they would consult, $\chi^2(7, N = 258) = 12.35$, $p = .089$.

In summary, both male and female participants indicated learning more about career preparation and finances through family compared to in school; however, females reported learning less about these concepts through school compared to their male counterparts. Overall, more participants reported that they would consult their father rather than their mother if they wanted to improve their negotiation skills; however, the majority of participants indicated that they would use the Internet to gather information on building negotiation skills.

Wage knowledge. Just over half of the participants (54.9%) correctly identified the current minimum wage in Ontario, Canada, and only 6% correctly identified the current student wage. Participants provided a mean current minimum wage of \$14.12 ($SD = 1.52$) instead of the

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

actual value of \$14.00 per hour, and a mean current student wage of \$13.11 per hour ($SD = 1.60$) instead of the correct student wage of \$13.15 per hour. Two chi-square tests revealed no significant differences in knowledge of current minimum or student wage as a function of gender, $\chi^2(1, N = 264) = 0.21, p = .710$, and $\chi^2(1, N = 259) = 0.19, p = .798$, respectively).

Formal Work Experience

The majority (84%) of participants indicated having a formal job outside of the home in the past ($n_{\text{Male}} = 108, n_{\text{Female}} = 117$), and 31.3% ($n_{\text{Male}} = 35, n_{\text{Female}} = 49$) indicated that they currently held a paid formal job (see Table 6 for frequencies of paid formal positions). Only 6.1% of participants who had a previous formal job or current formal job indicated that this job was representative of a career they would like to have in the future ($n_{\text{Male}} = 8, n_{\text{Female}} = 4$). The majority of participants (78.3%) indicated that they enjoyed/currently enjoy their formal job ($n_{\text{Male}} = 82, n_{\text{Female}} = 84$). No significant differences emerged between males and females in terms of past formal employment status, $\chi^2 = (1, N = 268) = 0.44, p = .509$, or current formal employment status, $\chi^2 = (1, N = 268) = 2.55, p = .110$. Both males and females indicated that advancement was “somewhat unimportant” to “neutral” to them ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.72, SD = 1.28, M_{\text{Female}} = 2.57, SD = 1.30$).

Remuneration for formal work. Overall, mean scores indicated that participants were paid approximately \$14.20 ($SD = 2.83$) per hour for their formal job. Reported remuneration for males ranged from \$4.75 per hour to \$25.00 per hour, whereas females earned between \$1.50 per hour to \$30.00 per hour. There were no significant differences in remuneration between males and females, $t(220) = 1.05, p = .297, d = 0.14$. In terms of perceived satisfaction regarding remuneration, participants’ mean scores reflected a “neutral” evaluation ($M_{\text{Overall}} = 3.36, SD = 1.28; M_{\text{Male}} = 3.32, SD = 1.32, M_{\text{Female}} = 3.39, SD = 1.24$). No significant differences emerged

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

between males and females in terms of satisfaction for remuneration, $t(225) = -0.44$, $p = .659$, $d = 0.05$. In summary, most participants indicated some formal work experience with no differences in reported experience, remuneration, or satisfaction with remuneration as a function of gender.

Casual Work Experience

Approximately 55.6% of participants indicated having a past paid job that was casual in nature ($n_{\text{Male}} = 69$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 79$), and only 8.3% of participants indicated currently having a paid casual job outside of the home ($n_{\text{Male}} = 9$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 13$; see Table 7 for frequencies of paid casual positions). Only 8.0% of participants indicated that their paid casual job was representative of a career they would like to have in the future ($n_{\text{Male}} = 10$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 1$); however, 77.5% indicated that they liked their job ($n_{\text{Male}} = 52$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 55$). Overall, both males and females indicated feeling that advancement in this job was “somewhat unimportant” to them ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.00$, $SD = 1.21$, $M_{\text{Female}} = 2.03$, $SD = 0.96$). In terms of satisfaction, participants felt “neutral” to “somewhat satisfied” with their wage at their casual job ($M_{\text{Overall}} = 3.68$, $SD = 1.13$; $M_{\text{Male}} = 3.59$, $SD = 1.16$, $M_{\text{Female}} = 3.76$, $SD = 1.10$). No significant differences emerged between males and females in terms of past casual employment status, $\chi^2 = (1, N = 266) = 0.68$, $p = .411$, or current casual employment status, $\chi^2 = (1, N = 266) = 0.61$, $p = .435$.

Remuneration for casual work. Overall, mean scores indicated that participants were paid \$14.13 ($SD = 6.48$) per hour for their casual job. The range for casual wages earned by males was from \$2.00 per hour to \$45.00 per hour, compared to a range of \$5.00 per hour to \$30.00 per hour for females. An independent samples t-test indicated a significant difference between males and females, $t(137) = 2.80$, $p = .006$, $d = 0.47$, such that males ($M = 15.78$, $SD =$

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

7.79) were paid significantly more money per hour compared to their female counterparts ($M = 12.76$, $SD = 4.79$).

Disposable income. Interestingly, participants' ratings of disposable income reflected having "a little less" to "enough" disposable income ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.81$, $SD = 1.08$, $M_{\text{Female}} = 2.65$, $SD = 1.05$). There were no significant differences in level of disposable income as a function of gender, $t(266) = 1.23$, $p = .221$, $d = 0.15$.

In summary, males and females did not differ in terms of casual experience; however just over half of the participants reported previous casual work experience and few were currently engaged in casual work. Remuneration for casual work was greater for males than females, but overall disposable income did not differ as a function of gender.

Gender Typing of Jobs

Both formal and casual jobs were coded using the Coded Gender Typicality of Jobs as either male-typical ($n = 31$), female-typical ($n = 79$), or neutral ($n = 29$). Male-typical job positions were defined as those having less than 35% of females occupying the position, whereas female-typical jobs were defined as those having more than 65% of females occupying the position. Neutral jobs were defined as those with 36- 64% of females occupying the position.

Formal work. Given that the homogeneity of variance was violated, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of variance ($p < .001$), a one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to assess remuneration for a formal position as a function of the gender-typing of the job position. Remuneration for a formal job was statistically significantly different between gender-typed job positions, Welch's $F(2, 49.14) = 6.69$, $p = .003$, est. $\omega^2 = 0.05$. Games-Howell post hoc analyses revealed that female-typed job positions ($M = 13.65$, $SD = 1.98$) were paid significantly less than male-typed job positions ($M = 15.13$, $SD = 2.36$; -1.48 , 95% CI [0.25, 2.71], $p = .016$)

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

and neutral-typed positions ($M = 15.15$, $SD = 2.62$; -1.50 , 95% CI $[-2.98, -0.01]$, $p = .048$). There were no significant differences between neutral job positions and male-typed job positions (0.02 , 95% CI $[-1.80, 1.93]$, $p = 1.00$).

Casual work. Given that homogeneity of variance was violated, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p < .001$), a one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted to assess remuneration value for a casual position as a function of the gender-typing of the job position. Remuneration for a casual job was statistically significantly different between gender-typed job positions, Welch's $F(2, 44.40) = 10.25$, $p < .001$ estimated $\omega^2 = 0.12$. Games-Howell post hoc analyses revealed that female-typed job positions ($M = 11.86$, $SD = 3.98$) were paid significantly less than both male-typed job positions ($M = 16.29$, $SD = 7.46$; -4.43 , 95% CI $[-7.88, -0.98]$, $p = .009$) and neutral job positions ($M = 17.18$, $SD = 7.30$; -5.32 , 95% CI $[-8.95, -1.69]$, $p = .003$). There were no significant differences between neutral job positions ($M = 17.18$, $SD = 7.30$) and male-typed job positions (-0.89 , 95% CI $[-5.57, 3.78]$, $p = .891$).

In summary, female-typed job positions were paid less than both male-typed and neutral job positions for both casual and formal jobs.

Personal Attributions of Gender-Typed Personality Characteristics

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess the series of 53 personality characteristics representing four separate scales. Masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics were assessed as a function of gender. Preliminary assumption checking revealed that the data met the assumptions for a one-way MANOVA. The data were normally distributed, as assessed by Q-Q plots. There were no drastic univariate or multivariate outliers, as assessed by boxplot and Mahalanobis distance ($p > .001$). There were linear relationships, as assessed by scatterplot,

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

no evidence of multicollinearity, and there was homogeneity of covariance matrices, as assessed by Box's M test ($p < .001$). Results indicated that scores on all scales differed significantly as a function of gender. Males attributed significantly more masculine characteristics to themselves ($M = 9.60, SD = 4.07$) compared to females ($M = 7.43, SD = 4.11$), $F(1, 266) = 18.86, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.07$. Similarly, females attributed significantly more feminine characteristics to themselves ($M = 9.62, SD = 3.44$) compared to their male counterparts ($M = 7.46, SD = 3.92$), $F(1, 266) = 23.11, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.08$. Further, males attributed significantly more competence characteristics ($M = 4.98, SD = 2.26$) compared to females ($M = 3.89, SD = 2.22$), $F(1, 266) = 15.79, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.06$. Females also ascribed significantly more social characteristics to themselves ($M = 7.07, SD = 1.96$ compared to males ($M = 6.34, SD = 2.58$), $F(1, 266) = 6.97, p = .009, \eta_p^2 = 0.03$.

Negotiating for Pay

General ratings of comfort asking for money in each of three contexts (from a family member, from a boss or employer in an informal setting, and from a boss or employer in a formal setting) resulted in low mean ratings overall. Specifically, mean ratings regarding comfort with asking for money from a family member, ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.78, SD = 1.27, M_{\text{Female}} = 3.17, SD = 1.30$), from a boss or employer in both informal ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.12, SD = 1.10, M_{\text{Female}} = 1.97, SD = 1.02$) and formal settings ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.23, SD = 1.29, M_{\text{Female}} = 1.98, SD = 1.21$) fell near or below the mid-point of the 5-point scale.

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine differences in comfort asking for money as a function of gender. Three contexts were assessed: comfort asking for money from a family member, from a boss or employer in an informal setting, and from a boss or employer in a formal setting. Preliminary assumption checking revealed that the data met the assumptions for a

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

one-way MANOVA. The data were normally distributed, as assessed by Q-Q plots. There were no drastic univariate or multivariate outliers, as assessed by boxplot and Mahalanobis distance ($p > .001$). There were linear relationships, as assessed by scatterplot, and no evidence of multicollinearity ($r = .18, p = .003$ between comfort asking from a family member and comfort asking from an informal boss, and $r = .28, p < .001$ between comfort asking from an informal boss and comfort asking from a formal boss). The assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was violated, as assessed by Box's M test ($p < .001$); however, there was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p > .05$). Results indicated that there was a significant difference between gender and comfort asking for money from a family member, $F(1, 266) = 6.16, p = 0.014, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$, such that males were less comfortable than their female counterparts ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.78, SD = 1.27, M_{\text{Female}} = 3.17, SD = 1.30$). There were no significant differences in comfort asking for money from an informal boss, $F(1, 266) = 1.37, p = .243, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$, or formal boss, $F(1, 266) = 2.71, p = .101, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$, as a function of gender.

Perception of Pay-for-Performance

An independent samples t-test was used to assess gender differences across ratings on the Pay-for-Performance Perception Scale (Kim et al., 2008) which assessed the perceived connection between work performance and financial benefit. A trend toward significance emerged, $t(186) = 1.88, p = .060, d = 0.27$, such that males scored higher on the Pay-for-Performance Perception Scale (Heneman et al., 1988; Kim et al., 2008) compared to females ($M_{\text{Male}} = 3.48, SD = 0.70$ and $M_{\text{Female}} = 3.27, SD = 0.81$), suggesting that males may perceive a higher association between their job performance and pay.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Beliefs and Exposure to Negotiation for Pay

With respect to implicit negotiation beliefs assessed through the Implicit Negotiation Belief Scale (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007), mean scores indicate that participants “somewhat disagree” that negotiation skills are basic and unmalleable traits ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 0.53$). An independent samples t-test did not support any gender differences regarding beliefs about the implicit nature of negotiation, $t(189) = -0.35$, $p = .731$, $d = 0.05$ ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.12$, $SD = 0.50$, $M_{\text{Female}} = 2.15$, $SD = 0.57$).

Participants were asked to indicate from which sources, if any, they had observed a negotiation for pay (see Table 8 for frequency statistics). Overall, 39.7% of participants indicated observed their friend negotiate, ($n_{\text{Male}} = 53$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 49$), 38.5% observed their father negotiate ($n_{\text{Male}} = 45$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 55$) and 31.3% observed their mother negotiate ($n_{\text{Male}} = 42$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 39$). The majority of participants (79.3%) indicated having observed a character in a TV show or movie negotiate for an increase in pay ($n_{\text{Male}} = 98$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 105$). When asked whether they would or would not use the strategy observed in the future for themselves, there was a significant difference between males and females, $t(231) = 2.15$, $p = .033$, $d = 0.28$ ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.11$, $SD = 0.72$, $M_{\text{Female}} = 1.92$, $SD = 0.63$), such that males were slightly higher on the scale indicating that they “might or might not use this negotiation strategy”. Overall, just under a quarter of participants (23.6%) would definitely use or definitely not use (22.7%) the observed strategy themselves.

In summary, participants reported that negotiation traits were malleable; however, no gender differences emerged. Further, the majority of participants indicated that they had observed a character in a television show or movie negotiate for a higher wage, whereas fewer participants reported observing a family member or friend negotiate for an increase in pay. While

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

participants overall reported feeling indifferent about using the same negotiation strategy themselves, males endorsed using the same negotiation strategy more than females.

Experience with Negotiating for a Higher Wage

Only 8.1% of participants indicated ever negotiating for a higher wage ($n_{\text{Male}} = 11$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 10$). Out of the 21 participants who stated that they had negotiated in the past, 14 indicated that they were able to do so successfully ($n_{\text{Male}} = 8$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 6$) and had only done this one time. An additional six participants indicated that they had successfully negotiated 2-4 times ($n_{\text{Male}} = 2$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 4$) and only one male participant indicated having negotiated successfully more than four times.

Mean scores for amount of money received after negotiating indicated that most participants with previous negotiation experience reported that they received “what [they] asked for” ($M_{\text{Male}} = 3.09$, $SD = 1.38$; $M_{\text{Female}} = 2.70$, $SD = 0.95$) in their negotiation(s). It is important to note that all participants who responded to this question had indicated that they were able to successfully negotiate for a wage increase in the past; however, eight participants received more money than requested, and eight received less money than requested. Only five received what they requested.

Participants who indicated that they had previously engaged in a negotiation ($n = 21$) were asked to think about one time when they negotiated in the past. Males indicated that they felt “neutral” about using a competitive strategy ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.13$), whereas females indicated that they “somewhat agreed” to “strongly agreed” about using a competitive strategy ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.70$). Males indicated that they “somewhat agreed” to “strongly agreed” with using a collaborative strategy ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.52$), whereas females indicated that they felt “neutral” to “somewhat agreed” with using a collaborative strategy ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 1.42$). Males

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

“somewhat disagreed” with using a compromising negotiation strategy ($M = 2.09, SD = 0.94$), whereas females “somewhat disagreed” to “felt neutral” about using this same strategy ($M = 2.60, SD = 1.27$). Finally, both males ($M = 2.91, SD = 1.38$) and females ($M = 2.90, SD = 1.20$) felt “neutral” about using an accommodating strategy.

Among those who had previously negotiated, use of a competitive strategy during the negotiation process was significantly correlated with feminine personality characteristics, $r(19) = -.46, p = .034$, such that higher levels of feminine personality characteristics were associated with less agreement with the use of a competitive strategy. There were no other significant correlations between types of negotiation strategy (collaborative, compromising, and accommodating) and masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, or social characteristics.

In summary, few participants reported negotiating in the past. Of those who had previously negotiated, descriptive examination indicated that females had a higher mean score endorsing a competitive strategy, whereas males had a higher mean score endorsing a collaborative strategy. Due to the small sample of participants who had previously negotiated, gender differences in use of strategy could not be calculated.

Perceptions of Negotiation

Overall, males and females felt that negotiating for pay had a neutral impact on their job when asked if negotiating had a positive impact ($M_{\text{Male}} = 3.25, SD = 0.99, M_{\text{Female}} = 3.05, SD = 0.57$) or negative impact ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.70, SD = 0.90, M_{\text{Female}} = 2.86, SD = 0.83$). When asked to select all factors that would encourage them to negotiate for a higher wage, 83.6% of all participants said they would be encouraged to initiate a negotiation if they needed to support themselves or someone else ($n_{\text{Male}} = 110, n_{\text{Female}} = 114$), and 78.7% of participants said they

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

would be encouraged to negotiate if they felt that other people in the workplace were making more money doing the same amount of work as they were ($n_{\text{Male}} = 102$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 109$). In contrast, 82.8% of participants indicated that they would be discouraged from initiating a negotiation for a wage increase for fear of losing their job ($n_{\text{Male}} = 106$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 116$), and 76.9% said they would avoid negotiating for fear of being seen as rude or aggressive by their boss or co-workers ($n_{\text{Male}} = 92$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 114$; see Tables 9 and 10 for full frequency statistics).

Gender Differences in Perception of Success of Negotiation Strategies

When presented with scenarios where four different negotiation strategies were utilized by male and female subjects (i.e., collaborative, competitive, accommodating and compromising), participants were asked to rate how successful they thought the subject would be in their negotiation attempt on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *definitely not* to 5 = *definitely yes*). Participants also rated negotiation subjects on masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics by selecting all that apply from a list of 53 adjectives. One point for each adjective selected was added to each scale, with higher scores on each scale representing higher endorsement of the characteristic.

Collaborative negotiation strategy. Overall, 81.6% of participants indicated that they would use the same collaborating negotiation strategy (i.e., maintaining high concern for receiving one's desired outcome as well as the anticipated outcome for the other party), as the person in the scenario ($n_{\text{Male}} = 100$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 108$).

Gender-typing of the negotiator using a collaborative strategy. A two-way MANOVA was conducted with two independent variables (gender of participant and gender of negotiator when using a collaborating negotiation strategy) and four dependent variables (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics of

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

the negotiator). There was a linear relationship between the dependent variables, as assessed by scatterplot, and no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by Pearson correlation ($|r| < .09$). There were no univariate outliers by inspection of a boxplot, and no multivariate outliers in the data, as assessed by Mahalanobis distance ($p > .001$). The dependent variables were normally distributed, as assessed by Q-Q plots. The assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was violated, as assessed by Box's M test ($p < .001$); however, there was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p > .05$).

There was a statistically significant interaction effect between gender of the participant and gender of the negotiator on competence characteristics, $F(1, 264) = 6.92, p = .009, \eta_p^2 = 0.03$. Follow up univariate two-way ANOVAs were conducted to assess components of this interaction. There was a significant main effect for gender for the collaborative negotiator for the competence characteristics scores for the male negotiator, $F(1, 264) = 6.45, p = .012, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$, but not for the female negotiator, $F(1, 264) = 1.29, p = .258, \eta_p^2 = 0.01$. The means for competence characteristics scores for male negotiators were lower when rated by male participants ($M = 3.64, SD = 2.08$) compared to when rated by female participants ($M = 4.70, SD = 2.30$). See Table 11 for full means and standard deviations of endorsement of personality characteristics scales.

Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using a collaborative strategy. Overall, participants indicated that they thought using a collaborating strategy “might or might not” be successful ($M_{\text{Male}} = 3.54, SD = 0.73; M_{\text{Female}} = 3.69, SD = 0.67$).

Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a male negotiator using a collaborative strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

characteristics) as rated by male and female participants. Both regressions of male participant ratings of a collaborative strategy used by a male negotiator, and female participant ratings of a collaborative strategy used by a male negotiator, did not significantly predict success of the male negotiator, $F(4, 56) = 0.91, p = .460, \text{adj. } R_2 = -.01$ and $F(4, 59) = 0.58, p = .681, \text{adj. } R_2 = -.03$, respectively.

Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using a collaborative strategy. Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a female negotiator using a collaborative strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics) as rated by both male and female participants. Male participant ratings of a female negotiator using a collaborative strategy did not significantly predict success of the negotiation, $F(4, 60) = 2.16, p = .084, \text{adj. } R_2 = .07$. Female participant ratings of a female negotiator using a collaborative strategy did not significantly predict success of negotiation, $F(4, 62) = 0.38, p = .823, \text{adj. } R_2 = -.04$.

In summary, the majority of participants reported that they would use a collaborating negotiation strategy themselves despite indicating that it “might or might not be” successful. Success ratings of the negotiation were not predicted by male or female participant ratings of endorsement of any personality characteristics for a male or female negotiator. However, a significant interaction emerged between gender of the participant and gender of the negotiator on endorsement of the competence index, such that scores on the competence index were lower for male negotiators when rated by male participants compared to when rated by female participants. There was no effect on endorsement of any personality characteristics for female negotiators.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Competitive negotiation strategy. Overall, only 8.2% of participants indicated that they would use the same competitive negotiation strategy (i.e., using persuasive and assertive language to achieve one's own preferred outcome over the other party's desired outcome) if in a similar situation as the negotiator subject ($n_{\text{Male}} = 15$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 6$).

Gender-typing of the negotiator using a competitive strategy. A two-way MANOVA was conducted with two independent variables (gender of participant and gender of negotiator when using a competing negotiation strategy) and four dependent variables (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics of the negotiator). There was a linear relationship between the dependent variables, as assessed by scatterplot, and no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by Pearson correlation ($|r| < .09$). There were univariate outliers by inspection of a boxplot; however, these scores were included in the analysis as the result will not be substantially affected by extreme scores. There were also eight multivariate outliers in the data as assessed by Mahalanobis distance ($p > .001$); however, these scores were included in the analysis as the result will not be substantially affected by extreme scores. The dependent variables were fairly normally distributed, as assessed by Q-Q plots. The assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was met, as assessed by Box's M test ($p < .001$); however, there was not homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p > .05$). There were no significant interaction effects between gender of the participant and gender of the negotiator on any dependent variables. There was a statistically significant main effect of gender of participant on ratings of the negotiator on the feminine scale, $F(1, 264) = 6.24$, $p = .013$, $\eta^2_p = 0.02$, and social scale, $F(1, 264) = 4.73$, $p = .030$, $\eta^2_p = 0.02$. Feminine characteristics were rated higher overall by male participants ($M = 0.66$, $SD = 1.37$) compared to when rated by female participants ($M = 0.33$, $SD = 0.72$). Social

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

characteristics were also rated higher overall by male participants ($M = 0.35$, $SD = 1.12$) compared to when rated by female participants ($M = 0.12$, $SD = 0.49$). See Table 11 for full means and standard deviations of endorsement of personality characteristics.

Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using a competitive strategy. Overall, participants indicated that they thought using a competitive negotiation strategy would “probably not” be successful ($M_{\text{Overall}} = 2.03$, $SD = 0.89$; $M_{\text{Male}} = 2.17$, $SD = 0.93$; $M_{\text{Female}} = 1.90$, $SD = 0.84$). Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a male negotiator using a competitive strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics) as rated by male and female participants.

The first multiple regression assessed male participants predicting success of a male negotiator using a competitive strategy. Linearity was assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.59. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values. There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. There were no studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 0.2, and no values for Cook's distance above 1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. The multiple regression model significantly predicted success of a male negotiator using a competitive strategy when rated by male participants, $F(4, 62) = 7.68$, $p < .001$, adj. $R^2 = .29$. Ratings of competence characteristics added significantly to the prediction, $p < .05$. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 12. The

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

second multiple regression did not significantly predict success of a male negotiator when rated by female participants, $F(4, 55) = 2.28, p = .073, \text{adj. } R_2 = 0.14$.

Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using a competitive strategy. Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a female negotiator using a competitive strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics) as rated by male and female participants.

The first multiple regression model significantly predicted success of a female negotiator using a competitive strategy as rated by male participants, $F(4, 52) = 3.92, p = .007, \text{adj. } R_2 = 0.17$; however, no individual variables added significantly to the prediction.

The second multiple regression model assessed female participants predicting success of a female negotiator using a competitive strategy. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. Additionally, independence of residuals (Durbin-Watson = 1.98) and homoscedasticity (visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values) were assessed and there was no evidence of multicollinearity (tolerance values greater than 0.1). There were also no studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 0.2, and no values for Cook's distance above 1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted success of a female negotiator using a competitive strategy when rated by female participants, $F(4, 66) = 4.26, p = .004, \text{adj. } R_2 = 0.16$. Ratings of social characteristics added significantly to the prediction, $p < .05$. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 13.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

In summary, few participants indicated that they would use a competitive strategy in the future and reported that a competitive strategy would “probably not” be successful. Success ratings of a male negotiator were significantly predicted by ratings of competence characteristics of the male negotiator when rated by male participants, but not female participants. Success ratings of a female negotiator were significantly predicted by ratings of social characteristics of the female negotiator when rated by female participants, but not male participants. Both feminine characteristic and social characteristic scores of the negotiator, regardless of gender, were rated higher overall by male participants compared to when rated by female participants.

Accommodating negotiation strategy. Overall, 36.9% indicated that they would use the same accommodating strategy (i.e., having more interest in the other party obtaining their desired outcome rather than one’s own desired outcome) as the negotiator in the scenario ($n_{\text{Male}} = 35$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 59$).

Gender-typing of the negotiator using an accommodating strategy. A two-way MANOVA was conducted with two independent variables (gender of participant and gender of negotiator when using an accommodating negotiation strategy) and four dependent variables (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics of the negotiator). There were no significant main effects of gender of participant or gender of the negotiator on any of the dependent variables. There was also no significant interaction effect. See Table 11 for full means and standard deviations of endorsement of personality characteristics.

Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using an accommodating strategy. Overall, participants indicated that they thought using an accommodating strategy “might or might not be” successful ($M_{\text{Male}} = 2.82$, $SD = 1.10$; $M_{\text{Female}} = 3.12$, $SD = 1.14$).

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a male negotiator using an accommodating strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics) as rated by male and female participants. Male participant ratings of a male negotiator using an accommodating strategy did not significantly predict success of the negotiation, $F(4, 52) = 1.20, p = .323, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.01$. The second multiple regression significantly predicted success of a male negotiator using an accommodating strategy when rated by female participants, $F(4, 66) = 3.93, p = .006, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.14$. While no individual variables added significantly to the prediction, there was a trend toward significance for feminine characteristics, $p = .068$.

Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using an accommodating strategy. Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a female negotiator using an accommodating strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics) as rated by male and female participants. The first multiple regression model assessed male participants predicting success of a female negotiator using an accommodating strategy. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. Additionally, independence of residuals (Durbin-Watson = 1.96) and homoscedasticity (visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values) were assessed and there was no evidence of multicollinearity (tolerance values greater than 0.1). There were also no studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations, and no values for Cook's distance above 1. There were six high-leverage points; however, these were kept in the analysis rather than removed as all other assumptions were

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

satisfied. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted success of a female negotiator using an accommodating strategy when rated by male participants, $F(4, 63) = 5.21, p < .001, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.20$. Ratings of feminine characteristics and social characteristics added significantly to the prediction, $p < .05$. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 14.

The second multiple regression model found that female participant ratings of a female negotiator using an accommodating strategy did not significantly predict success of the negotiation, $F(4, 55) = 0.66, p = .624, \text{adj. } R^2 = -0.02$.

In summary, participants indicated feeling neutral about using an accommodating strategy, and also reported feeling neutral about its potential success. No differences emerged as a function of gender of the participant or gender of the negotiator on endorsement of personality characteristics of the negotiator; however, success ratings of a female negotiator were significantly predicted by ratings of feminine characteristics and social characteristics of the female negotiator when rated by male participants, but not female participants.

Compromising negotiation strategy. Overall, 87% of participants indicated that they would use the same compromising negotiation strategy (i.e., using a give-and-take approach to reach a mutual consensus) if in a similar situation ($n_{\text{Male}} = 112, n_{\text{Female}} = 110$).

Gender-typing of the negotiator using a compromising strategy. A two-way MANOVA was run with two independent variables (gender of participant and gender of negotiator when using a compromising negotiation strategy) and four dependent variables (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics of the negotiator). There were no significant main effects of gender of participant or gender of the

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

negotiator on any of the dependent variables. There was also no significant interaction effect. See Table 11 for full means and standard deviations of endorsement of personality characteristics.

Perceptions of success of a male negotiator using a compromising strategy. Overall, using a compromising negotiation strategy was found to “probably” be successful ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.88$; $M_{\text{Male}} = 4.19$, $SD = 0.87$; $M_{\text{Female}} = 4.20$, $SD = 0.80$).

Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a male negotiator using a compromising strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics) as rated by male and female participants. Male participant ratings of a male negotiator using a compromising strategy did not significantly predict success of the negotiation, $F(4, 58) = 1.09$, $p = .366$, $\text{adj. } R_2 = .07$. Female participant ratings of a male negotiator using a compromising strategy did not significantly predict success in the negotiation, $F(4, 58) = 1.66$, $p = .172$, $\text{adj. } R_2 = 0.10$.

Perceptions of success of a female negotiator using a compromising strategy. Two multiple regressions were run to predict success in negotiation with a female negotiator using a compromising strategy from endorsement of personality characteristics (masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics, competence characteristics, and social characteristics) as rated by male and female participants.

The first multiple regression model assessed male participants predicting success of a female negotiator using a compromising strategy. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. Additionally, independence of residuals (Durbin-Watson = 1.96) and homoscedasticity (visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values) were assessed and there

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

was no evidence of multicollinearity (tolerance values greater than 0.1). There were also no studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 0.2, and no values for Cook's distance above 1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted success of a female negotiator using a compromising strategy when rated by male participants, $F(4, 57) = 7.13, p < .001, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.29$. Ratings of feminine characteristics and social characteristics added significantly to the prediction, $p < .05$. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 15.

The second multiple regression model assessed female participants predicting success of a female negotiator using a compromising strategy. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. Additionally, independence of residuals (Durbin-Watson = 2.25) and homoscedasticity (visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values) were assessed and there was no evidence of multicollinearity (tolerance values greater than 0.1). There were also no studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 0.2, and no values for Cook's distance above 1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted success of a female negotiator using a compromising strategy when rated by female participants, $F(4, 63) = 3.53, p = .012, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.13$. Ratings of social characteristics added significantly to the prediction, $p < .05$. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 16.

In summary, participants indicated that they would use a compromising strategy in the future and also reported that use of this strategy would “probably” be successful. No differences emerged as a function of gender of the participant or gender of the negotiator on endorsement of

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

personality characteristics of the negotiator; however, success ratings of a female negotiator were significantly predicted by ratings of feminine characteristics and social characteristics when rated by male participants, and by only social characteristics when rated by female participants.

Summarizing Patterns of Outcomes

An overall summary of the research questions and hypothesis related to outcomes is presented in Table 17.

Discussion

As financial literacy is a strong predictor of future financial success (e.g., Chen & Volpe, 1998), the present study investigated a pivotal point in development by assessing late-adolescents entering the workforce. Multiple aspects associated with work were examined. Specifically, the present study examined late-adolescents' early formal and casual work experience, remuneration for work, and perceptions of and experiences with negotiating for higher pay with attention to the impact of gender. Experiences and attitudes regarding financial education, casual and formal work experiences, remuneration and wage expectations, and exposure to and experience with negotiation were assessed as a function of gender to explore whether patterns found within extant literature using adult populations would be replicated.

This study also sought to explore how, when, and where late-adolescents learn about and practice skills related to remuneration and negotiation. Overall, results provide insights regarding the research questions and hypothesis investigated in the present study; however, limited negotiation experience in this sample restricted understandings in this domain.

Sources of Information About and Preparedness for the Paid Workforce

Overall, participants indicated that they were somewhat prepared to enter the workforce and this perception was consistent across gender. This response is concerning as it is clear that

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

these late-adolescents are not confident in their readiness for work. As past literature has shown that students entering college/university are not equipped with the knowledge to effectively deal with financial responsibilities, and thus, experience financial challenges (Joo et al., 2003; Maurer & Lee, 2011; Mae, 2002), the present study extends these shortcomings in financial preparedness to work readiness. Together, these findings reinforce the need for parents and educators to provide foundational readiness skills to students in an integrated fashion prior to entering the workforce.

Late-adolescents in the present study clearly identified the relative merits of sources for information and skills that would be relevant for future work. Related to the first research question examining the source of financial literacy information, participants indicated the home as a significant source of information. This outcome is supported by the parental socialization hypothesis (Conger et al., 2000; Kim & Chatterjee, 2013), which suggests that parents, through direct instruction, modelling, and other learning experiences, serve as a key source of information for their children (Conger et al., 2000; Kim & Chatterjee, 2013).

Although late-adolescents endorsed learning from the home regarding their sense of preparedness for work, they also acknowledged formal educational contexts as a source of information. In relation to the second research question assessing concepts learned in high school, most students indicated learning about concepts related to financial and career preparation in school, including in the Career Studies course offered in grade 10. Concepts learned include completing a job application, creating a resumé, preparing for a job interview, and personal-management skills. The acquisition of knowledge in these areas is consistent with the provincial guidelines for the Grade 10 Career Studies course. Participants also indicated that these concepts were somewhat-to-very beneficial to them as they enter the workforce, despite

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

indicating learning more through home environments. Acknowledgement and endorsement of content learned suggests that students feel as though this content is an important part of secondary school curriculum. For important skills that were not acknowledged or endorsed, future development is necessary to include these concepts in high-school curriculum.

In addition, participants in the present study felt more prepared for the workforce with skills acquired in the home compared to those acquired in school. The comparative value of parents over educational sources is an interesting outcome given some of the past literature assessing the effectiveness of formal financial education, as studies have demonstrated the positive impact that educators have on the financial behaviour of youth (Brenner, 1998; Danes & Haberman, 2007). Having participants in the present study indicate the relative contributions of these two sources provides insight into the considerable role that late-adolescents ascribe to the home environment. The findings also suggest that educational environments, although providing information, are not perceived to be as rich a resource as the home.

Interestingly, female late-adolescents reported learning significantly less in school compared to their male peers. This finding was unexpected given past literature which found that, although male students performed at a higher level than females after course exposure, female students showed greater learning gains than male students in terms of financial literacy (Danes & Haberman, 2007). This could suggest that female students are more aware of what they do not know when provided content in educational contexts, and, thus, females perceive that they learn less whereas male students have prior knowledge confirmed and expanded upon, which leads them to perceive that they have learned more. It is also possible that while formal financial education is supposed to be standardized across the province where most of the present participants reported their education, teachers and educators may provide less or different

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

instruction to female students due to internalized gender norms (e.g., female students will be engaged in child care and home responsibilities, or male students perform better in business and finance compared to female students; Danes & Haberman, 2007; Greene 1990). It is also possible that female students are less interested in participating in formal financial education due to the belief that they should or may have to delay financial success to achieve other goals such as rearing children and maintaining the home (e.g., Greene 1990; McClintock, 2018), which may explain the perceived difference between learning from family compared to school.

Learning about how to determine the wage one will be paid, and how to negotiate for pay were among the lowest reported concepts learned by late-adolescents. Given that pay negotiation is not formally included in the curriculum for the Career Studies course, it is possible that what students did learn about negotiating has not been beneficial to them because they have not learned it in an in-depth manner. Despite few late-adolescents indicating that they learned about negotiating for pay in high school, many said that secondary school (grades 10-12) would be the best time to provide formal instruction about negotiation. This finding could indicate the need for additional training in these remuneration-specific elements after the general introduction to concepts related to financial literacy. Recent research suggests that explicit instruction, prior to workforce entry, is needed with regards to negotiation (Saari et al., 2017). Few other studies have specifically assessed the perceived benefits of the Grade 10 Careers Studies course as late-adolescents transition into the realm of paid employment, thus, these findings provide initial confirmation that course content is perceived to be useful and is recalled over time. The current study's outcomes are also useful for both parents and educators in understanding the depth and breadth of knowledge that late-adolescents have and still require when entering the paid workforce.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Just over half of participants correctly identified the current minimum wage and only a small portion of participants knew the current student wage; however, mean wage estimates were close to the actual wages. It is possible that since 69% of students are not currently working in a formal setting, knowing the current minimum wage or student wage may not be directly relevant to them at this time. It is important to note that at the time that this study was conducted, the minimum and student wage had been increased in the previous 12 months, which may have contributed to some errors in correct identification among some participants in this domain. Given that the majority of participants indicated learning about minimum wage in high school, this lack of knowledge may indicate an opportunity for educators to focus more on the specifics of this area for students as they enter the workforce, such as informing students that they can research the minimum wage and employee rights before getting a formal part-time job.

Work Experiences and Remuneration for Paid Work

Most participants indicated having a past formal or casual job; however, fewer indicated having a current job in either of these contexts. This may be due to the fact that the majority of this sample was recruited through a university sample pool, particularly of students in first- and second- year university. The life transition into postsecondary education may not leave late-adolescents with much extra time to have a job. Overall, participants enjoyed their formal and/or casual jobs but did not think that these jobs were representative of a career they would like to have in the future. This may explain why advancement at their job was not rated as important by either the males or females in the present study. Average wages indicate that participants were paid approximately minimum wage for their jobs, which may suggest that they are working in minimum wage positions and this may contribute to why they reported low interest in

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

advancement. Given that they had their past job while in high school or their current job while in university, they may see the job as a way to make extra money but not as a goal for the future.

Related to the third research question examining remuneration for casual and formal work, there were no significant differences in remuneration between males and females for formal jobs, which may be explained by most participants having a job where the minimum wage is standardized by the government, and therefore less flexible across industry. However, females were found to make significantly less than males for casual jobs. This finding is consistent with past literature indicating that, in general, females are paid less than males (e.g., Moyser, 2017; World Economic Forum, 2020). Given that these jobs are casual in nature, it is likely that wages are not formally set and are therefore unstandardized across occupation compared to standardized requirements in place for formal jobs. The range for casual wages earned was also larger for males compared to females. Visual examination of the data indicates that some jobs may be perceived to be paid more per hour because they are predominantly “paid-by-task”. For example, it is possible that an adolescent could be paid \$10.00 per hour for a three-hour babysitting job (i.e., a female-typed job), whereas another adolescent is paid \$40.00 to shovel the driveway once (i.e., a male-typed job). It is possible that when asked to report their wage per hour, participants with jobs that were paid-by-task were unable to calculate and report their hourly wage. It would be beneficial to assess remuneration for casual positions by comparing jobs paid by the hour and jobs paid by task.

Recent literature examining the effects of type of job on remuneration has found that some of the difference contributing to the gender pay gap can be attributed to the gender-typing of job positions. For example, jobs within the “5 C’s” (caring, clerical, catering, cashiering, and cleaning) are typically female-dominated and tend to earn less than male-dominated occupations

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

(e.g., Moyser, 2017). To account for this, it is important to assess remuneration for gender-typed jobs exclusive of the gender of the person performing them. In the present study, female typed-jobs (office clerk/receptionist, cashier, child care, etc.,) earned significantly less than male-typed jobs and neutral jobs in both the casual and formal sectors. Supported by past literature, these results provide meaningful evidence that job-type is a contributor to the gender pay gap and may be important for late-adolescents to think about as they enter the workforce. This difference may also be a function of the difference between jobs paid by the hour and jobs paid by task. Jobs classified as male-typed included labour jobs such as stocking, landscaping, and other outdoor jobs, and may be paid on a task-completion basis rather than by the hour. This finding provides empirical evidence of a gender pay gap as a function of both gender of the worker and gender-typing of the job in late-adolescent workers.

Experience with and Perceptions of Negotiation

Overall, few late-adolescents reported having negotiated for pay in the past, which may be attributed to the fact that advancement in their job was not particularly important to them, or that their job was not representative of one they want in the future. For students who are in school full-time, they may not want to make the investment in their job by putting in the effort and/or time to negotiate for a higher wage if they are not concerned about the longevity of their career. This finding is concerning given that successful negotiation skill is best developed through both study and practice (e.g., Taylor, Mesmer-Magnus, & Burns, 2008; Thompson, 1991).

Despite the fact that many late-adolescents reported having past jobs, only a small portion of them reported negotiating for pay in the past, indicating that they do not have the first-hand experience that is necessary for completing a successful negotiation. For the most part, those

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

who did negotiate indicated that they received what they requested. Interestingly, eight participants indicated receiving less than what they asked for despite classifying the negotiation attempt as successful. It is possible that this question was misunderstood by participants, but it is also possible that due to inexperience, the mere act of negotiating despite the monetary outcome was enough to perceive a negotiation attempt as successful. Understanding the value of oneself as an employee and being able to successfully negotiate on these terms is a fundamental skill and the first step when understanding whether or not to accept a job. As past research has demonstrated that having successful negotiation skills results in long-term benefits (e.g., Kugler et al., 2018; Marks & Harold, 2009), late-adolescents should be using these first-work opportunities to practice these skills when the stakes are lower compared to when they are further on in their careers.

Although the hypothesis testing gender differences in negotiation experience could not be directly assessed because of the small number of participants with any negotiation experience, asking for money in other contexts where negotiating for remuneration could potentially occur were examined as a function of gender. No gender differences emerged in comfort asking for money from an informal or formal boss; however, males were significantly less comfortable with asking for money from a family member compared to their female counterparts. This finding did not replicate those found in the adult literature; however, it was not specified to participants whether asking for money from a family member was in a work or allowance context. Future research should further discriminate these contexts to better understand any potential gender differences in this domain.

While only a trend toward significance emerged, findings suggest that males perceived there to be a higher association between their job performance and pay such that better

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

performance results in higher pay. While there were no significant gender differences in the implicit beliefs about negotiation skills, mean scores indicated that both males and females felt that negotiation skills were malleable and could be learned. This finding is consistent with past literature that found that beliefs about malleability of negotiation increased with age in adolescents (Saari et al., 2017). It is important to note that these particular scales were developed for an older sample and may not be the most valid measure for late-adolescents. These measures address full-time occupations in which a salary negotiation may be more feasible. The majority of late-adolescents examined in the current study did not have full-time job experience, but rather part-time experience in the minimum wage sector. Future studies should assess and evaluate this measure and perhaps modify it or develop alternative measures designed for adolescent populations working in minimum wage positions and or in part-time work contexts.

Combined with the knowledge that late-adolescents have not reported learning about negotiation (in school, particularly), it is not surprising that few reported engaging in a negotiation. Exploratory findings also indicated that females endorsed using a competitive negotiation strategy more than males which is not supported in past adult literature, as females in previous research typically employ a more communal approach to negotiation (Eagly & Wood, 2012; Kugler et al., 2018). This was an interesting finding and the reason is not clearly understood within the context of the present study, though the present findings may be an artifact of the smaller sample size. Future research is warranted to better understand and interpret this finding. Ideally, recruiting a larger sample size of late-adolescents with negotiation experience from a broader community context, and from those who entered the workforce without post-secondary education, would be important to accurately analyze gender differences in choice of negotiation strategy.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Analysis of perceived success of negotiation strategies revealed an association between perceived success of the negotiation strategy and whether the participant would use it themselves. Participants rated use of a competitive strategy as “probably not successful”, and fittingly, only a small portion of participants stated that they would use the strategy themselves. Using a compromising strategy was perceived to “probably be successful”, and the majority of participants endorsed using this strategy themselves. Both collaborating and accommodating strategies were perceived to “maybe be successful”; however, the majority of participants endorsed using a collaborating strategy themselves, whereas only a fraction of participants endorsed using an accommodating strategy themselves. These findings may indicate a discrepancy between the negotiation strategies that late-adolescents perceive as successful, and their desire to use them in the future.

The use of competitive negotiation strategies elicited gender differences in this late-adolescent population despite participants indicating that they probably would not use the strategy themselves. As past literature shows that agentic negotiation strategies, such as a competitive strategy, are more successful, it is evident that females pay a price socially when using such strategies. This finding is consistent with the “backlash effect” identified in previous literature, where women experience retribution for violating gender norms (e.g., Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013; Kugler et al., 2018; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Interestingly, female participants assigned fewer feminine and social characteristics to a competitive negotiator, regardless of gender, compared to male participants. Since females typically exhibit friendliness and warmth during a negotiation, it is possible that females view a competitive negotiation strategy to be aggressive and dominating (e.g., Rudman & Glick, 1999) and are stricter in classifying these traits of a competitive negotiator as non-feminine. Male participants, in contrast, rated feminine

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

and social characteristics of a competitive negotiator higher than their female counterparts, indicating that males may not be as strict in their application of gender norms in terms of this negotiation strategy.

It is evident that late-adolescents adhere to similar gender norms when perceiving negotiations strategies used by males and females. Higher ratings of social skills of female negotiators also predicted a higher success rate when rated by female participants, whereas higher ratings of competence of male negotiators predicted a higher success rate when rated by male participants, which is consistent with the assignment of gender norms. Interestingly, cross-gender ratings (e.g., male participants rating a female negotiator or female participants rating a male negotiator) did not significantly predict a higher success rate of the competitive negotiation. Further, higher competence ratings were attributed to male negotiators using a collaborative strategy when rated by male participants compared to when rated by female participants. These results may indicate that male-type (i.e., competence) and female-type (i.e., social) characteristics are more strictly endorsed when the person who is observing the negotiation strategy is of the same gender as the negotiator.

Interestingly, masculine and feminine characteristics were not predictors of success rate using a competitive strategy for either males or females, indicating that gender differences may be driven by alternative measures of gender roles that are less traditional than masculine or feminine characteristics. These findings support past literature that competitive females are rated lower on social skills (e.g., Rudman & Glick, 1999); however, type of job was not included in the type of negotiation strategy used in the present study. Future research should investigate whether ratings of competence or social characteristics in competitive negotiation settings are influenced by the gender-typing of the job.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Counterintuitive to past research demonstrating that social and feminine characteristics are related in the context of negotiation (e.g., Rudman & Glick, 1999), more social characteristics predicted a higher success rate in female negotiators using both an accommodating and compromising strategy when rated by male participants, whereas fewer feminine characteristics predicted success of both strategies used by a female negotiator when rated by male participants. Interestingly, success of an accommodating strategy used by a female negotiator was not predicted by either of these characteristics when rated by a female participant. Though past literature has shown that women typically utilize negotiation strategies that favour a communal outcome rather than an egocentric outcome (e.g., Hernandez-Arenaz et al., 2019; Marks & Harold, 2009), no feminine or social personality characteristics were significant predictors of success of a collaborating female negotiator, which is also a communal negotiation strategy. Though these findings elicit some gender-differences in attributions of gender-typed personality characteristics to negotiators using various strategies, they are not completely consistent with patterns found in adult literature (e.g., Kugler et al., 2018).

Limitations and Future Directions

The present sample reflected a fairly homogeneous group of participants from North America. Education, culture, and ethnicity have been found to influence remuneration and work experiences (e.g., Hernandez-Arenas & Iriberry, 2019). In order to generalize beyond the constraints of the present sample, it would be important to study a more diverse sample of late-adolescents. Future studies would benefit from examining late-adolescents of different demographics outside of a university/college population, such as those who may have entered the workforce immediately after high school and/or those who have full-time occupations to increase the generalizability of findings. The current sample of students in post-secondary school full-

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

time may not be fully representative of the working population in Canada, particularly those who do not have a post-secondary education.

Further, future research could also examine participants from a wider age range to investigate age differences across adolescent development, which would also allow for multivariate analyses to be conducted. Since patterns of gender differences in remuneration and negotiation were found in late-adolescents, a longitudinal study where adolescents are followed as they enter the workforce and obtain steady careers may be beneficial in providing relevant information about when and how remuneration and negotiation are learned and subsequently put into practice. The current study provided an exploratory foundation of late-adolescence and should continue to be explored to uncover the precise points in development when knowledge, skills, and practical experiences regarding remuneration and negotiation are developed and utilized successfully.

Given the quantitative nature of this study, it is possible that some attitudes and beliefs about negotiation and remuneration were not entirely captured through an online survey. One concern is how participants understand what is being asked of them. In the present study, for example, questions that asked participants if they had witnessed/observed a negotiation take place would have been less ambiguous if followed by a series of additional questions or differing methodologies allowing for a more in-depth understanding of the context where these observations were made and who was engaged in the negotiation. Future studies may benefit from utilizing qualitative measures, such as focus groups, interviews, or open-text responses to further explore and better understand adolescent beliefs and experiences in this domain.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Conclusions

The transition that late-adolescents experience while entering the workforce for the first time allows them to put into practice knowledge and skills regarding finances, remuneration, and negotiation they may have observed or learned about at home or at school. While these experiences allow emerging adults to develop independence both socially and financially (Raby et al., 2018), many adolescents and early adults are not equipped with the financial literacy they need to succeed in the workforce (BMO Wealth Management, 2017). Adult literature indicates that negotiating for pay results in increased work benefits, one of which is higher overall salary (e.g., Kugler et al., 2018). Documented gender differences exist between males and females in terms of preparedness for the workforce both in financial knowledge (e.g., Danes & Haberman, 2007; Saari et al., 2017), and the ways in which they negotiate (or fail to negotiate) for higher pay (e.g., Babcock et al., 2006; Kugler et al., 2018). The current study extended current literature by investigating preparedness for the workforce among emerging adults. Knowledge about wages, experiences in both paid formal and casual jobs, and experience with negotiating in the workplace were assessed and examined as a function of gender.

Results indicated that overall, late-adolescents could benefit from further education and experience in preparing to enter the workforce. Despite late-adolescents feeling somewhat prepared to get a job in the workforce, additional knowledge in areas such as knowing the current minimum and student wage, and gaining first-hand experience negotiating for pay would be beneficial to them. Further, late-adolescents reported learning more about finances and career preparation from their family compared to in school, despite most participants completing a dedicated Career Studies course in secondary school. Educators could address this experiential

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

difference, in part, through developing curricula that better addresses skills and concepts that are useful to late-adolescents as they enter the workforce.

Although gender differences did not completely replicate those found in adult populations, some similar patterns emerged with respect to gender disparity in knowledge, work preparation, and negotiation strategy. A gender pay gap did emerge across remuneration for a casual job such that females were paid less than males, suggesting that such gender differences develop and exist in adolescence even before a formal job is obtained. This finding suggests that late-adolescents should continue to be cognizant of gender norms that can influence their perceptions regarding appropriate remuneration.

While there was some impact of gender of the participant rating the negotiation and gender of the negotiator on success of the negotiation and endorsement of gender-typed characteristics, these findings did not fully replicate those found in adult literature. It is possible that this discrepancy is due to the fact that most late-adolescents in this sample have only had part-time jobs, and therefore do not view negotiation in the same formal context as an adult with a full-time occupation. Still, this finding suggests that some gender differences in perceptions of negotiation are present in late-adolescents, and should be further investigated throughout adult development.

The main goal of this study was to explore differences in knowledge about, perceptions of, and experiences with remuneration and negotiation among late-adolescents as a function of gender. Findings confirm that some gender differences consistent with adult populations are present across these contexts. This study provides initial evidence that some gender differences are present in late-adolescent populations and develop sometime during this developmental period. Findings support the need for improvement in explicit financial instruction in both school

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

and home, as well as additional opportunities for youth and emerging adults to learn about and practice successful remuneration and negotiation skills to benefit their future work experiences.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Preparedness for Workforce

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Male	131	4.04	0.96
Female	137	3.98	0.89

Note: Scale anchors 1 = *strongly disagree* , 5 = *strongly agree*

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 2

Frequency of Concepts Learned in Secondary School

Concept	Frequency of Concept Learned		
	Male	Female	Total ($n = 268$)
<u>Job Preparation</u>			
Completing a job application	102	118	220
What to expect in a job interview	95	109	204
Creating a resumé	115	128	243
Researching employment opportunities	84	100	184
Safety in the workplace	95	92	187
Employee/employer rights and responsibilities	84	89	173
<u>Self-Improvement Tools</u>			
Personal-management skills	101	117	218
Using assessment tools to produce a personal profile that describes interests, skills, and accomplishments	79	101	180
<u>Wage and Negotiation Skills</u>			
Minimum wage	105	92	197
Determining the wage you will be paid	44	37	81
Negotiating for pay	18	10	28

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 3

Frequency of Beneficial Concepts Learned in Secondary School

Concept	Frequency of somewhat beneficial concepts			Frequency of very beneficial concepts		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Job Preparation						
Completing a job application (<i>n</i> = 219)	16	31	47	83	84	167
What to expect in a job interview (<i>n</i> = 203)	27	21	48	62	85	147
Creating a resumé (<i>n</i> = 243)	16	12	28	96	113	209
Researching employment opportunities (<i>n</i> = 184)	27	31	58	48	64	112
Safety in the workplace (<i>n</i> = 187)	37	34	71	52	56	108
Employee/employer rights and responsibilities (<i>n</i> = 173)	24	23	47	57	62	119
Self-Improvement Tools						
Personal-management skills (<i>n</i> = 217)	30	28	58	69	84	153

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Using assessment tools	29	47	76	44	52	96
------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----

to produce a personal profile that describes interests, skills, and accomplishments ($n = 180$)

Wage and NegotiationSkills

Minimum wage ($n = 196$)	56	47	103	45	35	80
----------------------------	----	----	-----	----	----	----

Determining the wage you will be paid ($n = 80$)	17	16	33	21	20	41
--	----	----	----	----	----	----

Negotiating for pay ($n = 28$)	5	5	10	9	3	12
----------------------------------	---	---	----	---	---	----

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 4

Frequency of First Person as a Source of Information about Negotiation

Person	Frequency		
	Male	Female	Total
Father	53	71	124
Mother	24	31	55
Sibling	10	9	19
Grandfather/Grandmother	6	1	7
Uncle	2	1	3
Aunt	1	0	1
Cousin	2	2	4
Friend	11	9	20
Co-worker	2	3	5
Boss	5	3	8
Teacher/Professor	7	1	8
I would not contact anyone for information about developing my negotiation skills	3	1	4

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 5

Frequency of First Resource as a Source of Information for Negotiation

Resource	Frequency		
	Male	Female	Total
Internet	73	100	173
School/class notes or activities	7	2	9
YouTube videos	24	11	35
Research articles	12	9	21
Book(s)	2	2	4
Workshop	3	4	7
I would not use any resource for information about developing my negotiation skills	2	2	4

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 6

Frequency of Formal Paid Positions

Formal Paid Position	Frequency		
	Male	Female	Total
Cashier/retail worker	52	75	127
Food service worker	46	57	103
Office administration worker	14	16	30
Childcare worker	15	30	45
Coach/tutor/instructor	24	25	49
Delivery worker (newspaper, food, etc.,)	7	5	12
Lifeguard/Swim Instructor	10	14	24

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 7

Frequency of Casual Paid Positions

Casual Paid Position	Frequency		
	Male	Female	Total
Babysitter	20	67	87
Caregiver (children, elderly, exceptional)	5	8	13
House-worker (e.g., washing dishes, cleaning, handy-work)	12	15	27
Snow shoveler	30	10	40
Gardner/lawn care worker	20	8	28
Coach/tutor/instructor	18	27	45
Pet-sitter	9	17	26

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 8

Frequency of People Witnessed Negotiating

Person Witnessed Negotiating	Frequency		
	Male	Female	Total
Father	45	55	100
Mother	42	39	81
Brother	13	17	30
Sister	19	11	30
Uncle	19	13	32
Aunt	16	13	29
Grandfather	7	7	14
Grandmother	10	2	12
Cousin	28	22	50
Friend	53	49	102
Character in television show or movie	98	105	203
Co-worker	35	42	77
Boss	13	11	24
Teacher	22	28	50

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 9

Frequency of Factors That Would Encourage a Negotiation for Pay

Encouraging Factors	Frequency		
	Male	Female	Total
Need to support myself or someone else	110	114	224
If I felt other people in the workplace were making more money doing the same amount of work	102	109	211
To be recognized for my work	71	63	134
Want to earn more money	72	56	128
To gain experience in a higher paying role	54	55	109
To gain experience for my resumé/CV	43	38	81
Because my parents/family would encourage me to do that	25	28	53
To get experience negotiating	40	24	64

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 10

Frequency of Factors That Would Discourage a Negotiation for Pay

Discouraging Factors	Frequency		
	Male	Female	Total
Fear of being seen as rude or aggressive by my boss or co-workers	92	114	206
Fear of not getting what I negotiate for	49	56	105
Fear of losing my job	106	116	222
Too much effort to put into something that may not work out	30	38	68
Don't care enough about my current job	45	31	76
Because my parents/family would discourage me from doing that	12	11	23
Because my friends would discourage me from doing that	8	6	14
I feel I make a fair wage	45	38	83

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 11

*Means and Standard Deviations for Endorsement of Personality Scales and Gender of**Negotiator*

		Male Negotiator		Female Negotiator	
Strategy	Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	Masculine characteristics	7.93	4.53	6.73	4.50
Collaborating	Feminine characteristics	3.18	3.50	3.31	3.50
	Competence characteristics	4.18	2.25	3.59	2.46
	Social characteristics	2.94	2.58	2.76	2.72
	Masculine characteristics	8.59	4.07	7.56	4.57
Competing	Feminine characteristics	0.47	0.93	0.51	1.23
	Competence characteristics	2.78	1.94	2.75	2.21
	Social characteristics	0.26	0.83	0.21	0.89
	Masculine characteristics	1.72	2.88	1.20	2.18
Accommodating	Feminine characteristics	7.32	4.35	7.35	4.53
	Competence characteristics	1.09	1.67	0.74	1.29
	Social characteristics	4.02	2.75	3.82	2.74
	Masculine characteristics	8.35	4.21	7.68	4.78
Compromising	Feminine characteristics	2.53	2.18	2.54	2.81
	Competence characteristics	4.29	2.20	4.04	2.51
	Social characteristics	2.55	2.30	2.47	2.48

Note: Maximum scores: Masculine characteristics = 20, feminine characteristics = 20, competence characteristics = 9, social characteristics = 10.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 12

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Male Participants of a Male Negotiator

Using a Competitive Negotiation Strategy

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>β</i>
Constant	1.632	0.21	
Masculine Characteristics	-0.04	0.05	-0.19
Feminine Characteristics	-0.12	0.11	-0.17
Competence Characteristics	0.30	0.09	0.77*
Social Characteristics	-0.05	0.12	-0.06

Note. * $p < .05$, *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE_B* = Standard error of the coefficient; *β* = standardized coefficient

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 13

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Female Participants of a Female Negotiator Using a Competitive Negotiation Strategy

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>β</i>
Constant	1.50	0.26	
Masculine Characteristics	0.01	0.05	0.05
Feminine Characteristics	-0.15	0.14	-0.15
Competence Characteristics	0.10	0.10	0.21
Social Characteristics	0.55	0.21	0.38*

Note. * $p < .05$, B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_B = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 14

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Male Participants of a Female

Negotiator Using an Accommodating Negotiation Strategy

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>β</i>
Constant	3.37	0.26	
Masculine Characteristics	-0.11	0.11	-.025
Feminine Characteristics	-0.15	0.04	-0.60*
Competence Characteristics	0.31	0.17	0.46
Social Characteristics	0.16	0.07	0.40*

Note. * $p < .05$, B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_B = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 15

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Male Participants of a Female

Negotiator Using a Compromising Negotiation Strategy

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>β</i>
Constant	3.37	0.19	
Masculine Characteristics	0.05	0.04	0.29
Feminine Characteristics	-0.11	0.05	-0.41*
Competence Characteristics	0.71	0.08	0.21
Social Characteristics	0.14	0.07	0.42*

Note. * $p < .05$, *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE_B* = Standard error of the coefficient; *β* = standardized coefficient

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 16

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Ratings by Female Participants of a Female Negotiator Using a Compromising Negotiation Strategy

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>β</i>
Constant	3.82	0.23	
Masculine Characteristics	-0.05	0.03	0.24
Feminine Characteristics	-0.09	0.05	-0.29
Competence Characteristics	0.11	0.06	0.29
Social Characteristics	0.17	0.60	0.52*

Note. * $p < .05$, *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE_B* = Standard error of the coefficient; *β* = standardized coefficient

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Table 17

Summary of Major Findings for Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research Questions	Findings
<p>1) Will late-adolescents' sources of information about financial skills indicate equal or different levels of input from the home or school environments? Will these sources of information differ across gender?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learned significantly more from home than school • Females learning significantly less from school sources compared to males
<p>2) Will late-adolescents schooled in Ontario report having learned about financial information through the Career Studies course that is taken in secondary school? If so, what concepts will they report having learned and benefitted from? Will these differ by gender?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learned about concepts related to job preparation and self-improvement skills in secondary school (minimum wage, completing a job application, preparing for a job interview, creating a resumé, researching employment opportunities, safety in the workplace, employee/employer rights, personal-management skills, using assessment tools) • Concepts related to wage and negotiation skills were not highly endorsed • No gender differences emerged

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

- 3) Will remuneration for casual and formal jobs differ as a function of gender in late-adolescents?
- Casual work: Male workers were paid more per hour than female workers
 - Formal work: no gender difference emerged in remuneration

Hypothesis

- It was hypothesized that experiences with negotiation and perceptions of a negotiator would differ as a function of gender.
- Perceptions of a negotiator differed as a function of gender
 - Small sample size for late-adolescents reporting negotiation ($n = 21$)

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Appendices

Appendix A

Supplementary Material

Family Composition

9% of participants reported living with a single mother ($n_{\text{Male}} = 12$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 12$), 2.2% reported living alone ($n_{\text{Male}} = 2$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 4$), 1.9% reported living with a single father ($n_{\text{Male}} = 1$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 4$), 1.9% reported rotating between parents ($n_{\text{Male}} = 1$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 4$), 0.7% reported living with an adult guardian who is not a family member ($n_{\text{Male}} = 2$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 0$), and 0.4% reported living with a romantic partner ($n_{\text{Male}} = 0$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 1$).

Socio-Economic Status

8.2% of participants reported having a mother with a Master's degree ($n_{\text{Male}} = 12$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 10$), 4.5% with a professional degree ($n_{\text{Male}} = 8$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 4$), 4.5% with an Associate degree ($n_{\text{Male}} = 4$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 8$), 2.2% with less than a high school diploma ($n_{\text{Male}} = 3$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 3$), and 1.9% with a doctorate ($n_{\text{Male}} = 3$, $n_{\text{Female}} = 2$).

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Appendix B

Personality Characteristics from the Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) and Competence Index and

Social Skills Index (Rudman & Glick, 1999)

- Acts as a leader
- Aggressive
- Ambitious
- Analytical
- Assertive
- Athletic
- Competent
- Competitive
- Computer-skilled
- Confident
- Defends own beliefs
- Determined
- Dominant
- Forceful
- Has leadership abilities
- Independent
- Individualistic
- Makes decisions easily
- Masculine
- Self-reliant
- Self-sufficient
- Strong personality
- Willing to take a stand
- Willing to take risks
- Works well under pressure
- Affectionate
- Cheerful
- Childlike
- Compassionate
- Does not use harsh language
- Eager to soothe hurt feelings
- Feminine
- Flatterable
- Friendly
- Gentle
- Good listener
- Gullible
- Helpful
- Kind

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

- Likeable
- Loves children
- Loyal
- Popular
- Sensitive to the needs of others
- Shy
- Sincere
- Soft spoken
- Supportive
- Sympathetic
- Tender
- Understanding
- Warm
- Yielding

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Appendix C

Modified Negotiation Strategy Scale (Marks & Harold, 2009)

Please think of a time when you negotiated. Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly agree
In the negotiation process, I presented information about my past qualifications and the value I could bring to the job.	<input type="radio"/>				
I went to the person I wanted to negotiate with to start a conversation about the negotiation process.	<input type="radio"/>				
Through the negotiation process, I did not get exactly what I wanted but worked with the employer to come to an agreement.	<input type="radio"/>				
Though I attempted to negotiate, I found myself going along with much of what the employer wanted.	<input type="radio"/>				

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Appendix D

Pay-for-Performance Perception Scale (Heneman et al., 1988; Kim et al., 2008)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
If I perform especially well on my job, it is likely that I would get a pay raise.	<input type="radio"/>				
The pay raises that I receive on my job make me work harder.	<input type="radio"/>				
The best workers get the highest pay raises.	<input type="radio"/>				
*High performance and low performers seem to get the same pay raises.	<input type="radio"/>				

* Indicates a reverse-coded item

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Appendix E

Implicit Negotiation Belief Scale (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
The kind of negotiator someone is, is very basic and can't be changed very much.	<input type="radio"/>				
*All people can change even their most basic negotiation qualities.	<input type="radio"/>				
Good negotiators are born that way.	<input type="radio"/>				
People can approach negotiation differently, but the important part of how they handle conflict can't really be changed.	<input type="radio"/>				
Everyone is a certain kind of negotiator and there is not much that can be done to really change that.	<input type="radio"/>				
*Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic negotiation skills.	<input type="radio"/>				
*In negotiations, experience is a great teacher.	<input type="radio"/>				

* Indicates a reverse-coded item

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Appendix F

Gendered Negotiation Scenarios

Collaborating

James/Jennifer would like to ask their boss for a wage increase. They have been doing this job for a while, and believe they have a skill set that is of high value to the company. James/Jennifer approaches their boss to discuss the possibility of a wage increase. James/Jennifer wants to make sure that their boss is happy with the negotiation outcome and feels that James/Jennifer deserves the wage increase. James/Jennifer also wants to ensure that they personally feel the negotiation outcome is fair and that they obtain the desired outcome.

Competing

Patrick/Penelope would like to ask their boss for a wage increase. They have been doing this job for a while and believe that they have a skill set that is of high value to the company.

Patrick/Penelope approaches their boss and threatens to leave the job if their wage is not increased. They continue to persuade their boss to get the outcome that they desire.

Accommodating

Adam/Abigail would like to ask their boss for a wage increase. They have been doing this job for a while and believe that they have a skill set that is of high value to the company. Adam/Abigail approaches their boss and implies that they want a wage increase but does not want to upset their boss with their request. Through the process, Adam/Abigail makes sure that their boss is completely satisfied with the desired outcome, even if it is not exactly what Adam/Abigail wanted.

Compromising

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Kyle/Kyla would like to ask their boss for a wage increase. They have been doing this job for a while and believe that they have a skill set that is of high value to the company. Kyle/Kyla approaches their boss to discuss the possibility of a wage increase. Kyle/Kyla gives their opening request, and their boss counters with an alternative request. They go back and forth until they both reach what Kyle/Kyla deems as an acceptable middle ground.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

References

- Allen, M. W. (2008). Consumer finance and parent-child communication. In J. J. Xiao (Ed.), *Handbook of consumer finance research* (pp. 351-361). New York: Springer.
- Amanatullah, E. T. & Morris, M. W. (2010). Negotiation gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women's fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 256-267. doi:10.1037/a0017094
- Amanatullah, E. T., & Tinsley, C. H. (2013). Ask and ye shall receive? How gender and status moderate negotiation success. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 6, 253–272. doi: 10.1037/a0017094
- Askari, S. F., Liss, M., Erchull, M. J., Staebell, S. E., & Axelson, S. J. (2010). Men want equality, but women don't expect it: Young adults' expectations for participation in household and child care chores. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34, 243-252. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01565.x
- Babcock, L., Gelfand, M., Small, D., & Stayn, H. (2006). Gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations. In D. de Cremer, M. Zeelenberg, & J. K. Murnighan (Eds.), *Social psychology and economics* (pp. 239–259). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(2), 155-162. doi:10.1037/h0036215
- Beverly, S., & Clancy, M. (2001). Financial education in a children and savings account policy demonstration: Issues and options. St. Louis: Center for Social Development, Washington University.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

- BMO Wealth Management. (2017). *Generation why! Take notice of millennials- they're devoted, educated, and focused to succeed*. Retrieved from https://www.bmo.com/assets/pdfs/wealth/BW_report_generation_why_E04.pdf
- Boisclair, D. (2014). *Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning in Canada*. Cambridge, Mass: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Borden, L. M., Lee, S., Serido, J., & Collins, D. (2008). Changing college students' financial knowledge, attitudes, and behavior through seminar participation. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 29(1), 23-40. doi:10.1007/s10834-007-9087-2
- Braunstein, S. & Welch, C. (2002). Financial literacy: An overview of practice, research, and policy. *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, 88(11), 445-457.
- Brenner, M. E. (1998). Meaning and money. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 36, 123-155.
- Charlesworth, S., & Macdonald, F. (2014). Women, work and industrial relations in Australia in 2013. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 56, 381–396. doi:10.1177/0022185614523160
- Chen, H., & Volpe, R. P. (1998). An analysis of personal financial literacy among college students. *Financial Services Review*, 7(2), 107-128. doi:10.1016/S1057-0810(99)80006-7
- Conger, R. D., & Dogan, S. J. (2007). Social class and socialization in families. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 433-460). New York: Guilford Press.
- Conger, R. D., Cui, M., Bryant, C., & Elder Jr., G. H. (2000). Competence in early adult romantic relationships: A developmental perspective on family influences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 224-237. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.2.224
- Crofts, J. & Coffey, J. (2017). Young women's negotiations of gender, the body, and the labour market in a post-feminist context. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 26(5), 502-516. doi:

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

10.1080/09589236.2015.1130610

- Curhan, J., & Overbeck, J. (2008). Making a positive impression in a negotiation: Gender differences to response in impression motivation. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 1*(2), 179–193. [http:// dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2008.00010.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2008.00010.x)
- Danes, S. M. (1994). Parental perceptions of children’s financial socialization. *Financial Counseling and Planning, 5*, 127-146.
- Danes, S. M. & Hira, T. K. (1987). Money management knowledge of college students. *Journal of Student Financial Aid, 17*(1), 4-16.
- Danes, S. M., & Haberman, H. R. (2007). Teen financial knowledge, self-efficacy, and behaviour: A gendered view. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning, 18*(2) 48-60.
- Dew, J. (2008). Debt change and marital satisfaction change in recently married couples. *Family Relations, 57*(1), 60-71. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2007.00483.x
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2012). Social role theory. In P. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 458–476). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222.n49>
- Elardo, R., Bradley, R., & Caldwell, B. (1977). A longitudinal study of the relation of infant’s home environments to language development at age three. *Child Development, 4*, 595-603.
- Furnham, A. (1999). The saving and spending habits of young people. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 20*(6), 677–697. doi: 10.1016/S0167-4870(99)00030-6
- Gatrell, C. J. (2013). Maternal body work: How women managers and professionals negotiate pregnancy and new motherhood at work. *Human Relations, 66*, 621–644. doi:

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

10.1177/0018726712467380

Gerhart, B., & Rynes, S. (1991). Determinants and consequences of salary negotiations by male and female MBA graduates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(2), 256-262. doi:

10.1037/0021-9010.76.2.256

Grable, J. E., & Joo, S. (1998). Does financial education affect knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour? An empirical analysis. *Personal Finances and Worker Productivity, 2*(2), 213-220.

Greene, A. L. (1990). Great expectations: Constructions of the life course during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 19*(4), 289-306. doi: 10.1007/BF01537074

Greig, F. (2008). Propensity to negotiate and career advancement: Evidence from an investment bank that women are on a “slow elevator.” *Negotiation Journal, 24*, 495–508. doi:

10.1111/j.1571-9979.2008.00200.x

Gudmunson, C. G. & Danes, S. M. (2011). Family financial socialization: Theory and critical review. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 32*(4), 644-667. doi: 10.1007/s10834-011-9275-y

Heckman, S., Lim, H., & Montalto, C. (2014). Factors related to financial stress among college students. *Journal of Financial Therapy, 5*(1), 19-39. doi: 10.4148/1944-9771.1063

Heneman, R. L., Greenberger, D. B., & Strasser, S. (1988). The relationship between pay-for-performance perceptions and pay satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 745-761. doi:

10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00651.x

Henry, R. A., Weber, J. G., & Yarbrough, D. (2001). Money management practices of college students. *College Student Journal, 35*, 244–247.

Hernandez-Arenaz, I., & Iriberry, N. (2019). A review of gender differences in negotiation. In

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

- Oxford Research Encyclopedia, Economics and Finance (pp. 1-22), doi:
10.1093/acrefore/9780190625979.013.464
- Hirschman, C. & Voloshin, I. (2007). The structure of teenage employment: Social background and the jobs held by high school seniors. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 25(3), 189-203. doi: 10.1016/j.rssm.2007.07.001
- John, D. R. (1999). Consumer socialization of children: A retrospective look at twenty-five years of research. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 26, 183–213. doi: 10.1086/209559
- Joo, S., Grable, J. E., & Bagwell, D. C. (2003). Credit card attitudes and behaviors of college students. *College Student Journal*, 37, 405–420.
- Jorgensen, B. L., & Salva, J. (2010). Financial literacy of young adults: The importance of parental socialization. *Family Relations*, 59(4), 465-478.
- Kerr, M. K., & Chedale, T. (1997). Allocation of allowances and associated family practices. *Children's Social and Economics Education*, 2(1), 1–11. doi:10.2304/csee.1997.2.1.1
- Kim, J., & Chatterjee, S. (2013). Childhood financial socialization and young adults' financial management. *Association for Financial Counseling and Planning Education*, 24(1), 61-92.
- Kim, J., LaTaillade, J., & Kim, H. (2011). Family processes and adolescents' financial behaviours. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 32(4), 668-679.
doi:10.1007/s10834-011-9270-3
- Kim, S., Mone, M. A., & Kim, S. (2008). Relationships among self-efficacy, pay-for-performance perceptions, and pay satisfaction: A Korean examination. *Human Performance*, 21, 158-179. doi: 10.1080/08959280801917727

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

- Kray, L., & Haselhuhn, M. (2007). Implicit negotiation beliefs and performance: Experimental and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(1), 49-64. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.1.49
- Kray, L., Galinsky, A., & Thompson, L. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(6), 942-958. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.942
- Kray, L., Reb, J., Galinsky, A., & Thompson, L. (2004). Stereotype reactance at the bargaining table: The effect of stereotype activation and power on claiming and creating value. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(4), 399-411. doi:10.1177/0146167203261884
- Kroska, A. (2003). Investigating gender differences in the meaning of household chores and child care. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 456-473. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00456.x
- Kugler, K. G., Reif, J. A. M., Kaschner, T., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2018). Gender differences in the initiation of negotiations: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 144*(2), 198-222. doi:10.1037/bul0000135
- Lintonen, T., Wilska, T., Koivusilta, L., & Konu, A. (2007). Trends in disposable income among teenage boys and girls in Finland from 1977 to 2003. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 31*(4), 340-348. doi:10.1111/j.1470-6431.2006.00559.x
- Lorber, J., & Farrell, S. A. (1991). Introduction. In J. Lorber & S. A. Farrell (Eds.), *The social construction of gender* (pp. 7-11). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2008). Planning and financial literacy: How do women fare? *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings, 98*(2), 413-417.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Mae, N. (2002). Undergraduate students and credit cards: An analysis of usage rates and trends.

Braintree, MA.

Mandell, L. & Klein, L. S. (2009). The impact of financial literacy education on subsequent financial behaviour. *Journal of Financial Counselling and Planning*, 20(1), 15-24.

Marks, M., Harold, C. (2009). Who asks and who receives in salary negotiation? *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 32, 371-394. doi:10.1002/job.671

Maurer, T. & Lee, S. (2011). Financial education with college students: Comparing peer-led and traditional classroom instruction. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 32(4), 680-689. doi:10.1007/s10834-011-9266-z

Mazei, J., Huffmeier, J., Freund, P., Stuhlmacher, A., Bilke, L., & Hertel, G. (2015). A meta-analysis on gender differences in negotiation outcomes and their moderators.

Psychological Bulletin, 141(1), 85-104. doi:10.1037/a0038184

McClintock, E. A. (2018). Changing jobs and changing chores? The longitudinal association of women's and men's occupational gender-atypicality and couples' housework performance. *Sex Roles*, 78, 165-181. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0794-3

McCormick, M. H. (2009). The effectiveness of youth financial education: A review of the literature. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 20(1), 70-83.

Moyser, M. (2017). Women and paid work. Women in Canada: A gender-based statistical report. *Statistics Canada, Ottawa. Catalogue*, (89503X).

Nelson, N., Bronstein, I., Shacham, R., & Ben-Ari, R. (2015). The power to oblige: Power, gender, negotiation behaviors, and their consequences. *Negotiation and Conflict*

Management Research, 8(1), 1-24. doi:10.1111/ncmr.12045

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Norvilitis, J. M. & Santa Maria, P. (2002). Credit card debt on college campuses: Causes, consequences, and solutions. *College Student Journal*, 36(3), 356-363.

OECD (2014), *PISA 2012 Results: Students and Money: Financial Literacy Skills for the 21st Century (Volume VI)*, PISA, OECD Publishing.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264208094-en>

O'Shea, P. G., & Bush, D. F. (2002). Negotiation for starting salary: Antecedents and outcomes among recent college graduates. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16, 365–382.

doi:10.1023/A: 1012868806617

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2006). *The Ontario Curriculum Grades 9 and 10: Guidance and Career Education*. Retrieved from

<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/guidance910currb.pdf>

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2016). Financial Literacy: Scope and Sequence of Expectations.

Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/policy/finlitgr4to8.pdf>

Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act, 2016 (ON): Retrieved from

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute.90o01>

Raby, R., Lehmann, W., Easterbrook, R., & Helleiner, J. (2018). “I’ll be more prepared than most people”: Very young Canadian workers talking about their first jobs. *Childhood*,

25(2), 237-252. doi:10.1177/0907568218758148

Roberts, J. A., & Jones, E. (2001). Money attitudes, credit card use, and compulsive buying among American college students. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35, 213–240.

doi:10.1111/j.1745-6606.2001.tb00111.x

Rubin, J. Z., & Brown, B. R. (1975). *The social psychology of bargaining and negotiation*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 629-645. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629
- Rudman, L. A. & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(5), 1004-1010. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629
- Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 157–176. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157
- Saari, M. L., Wood, E., & Wood, K. (2017). Work, remuneration, and negotiation for pay in early adolescence: Exploring early causes of gender pay inequity. *Journal of Financial Counselling and Planning, 28*(1), 20-32. doi:10.1891/1052-3073.28.1.20
- Sato, T. (2011). Minding money: How understanding of value is cultural promoted. *Integrative Psychological & Behavioral Science, 45*, 116-131.
- Schuchardt, J., Danes, S.M., Swanson, J. & Westbrook, E. (1991). Financial management literacy for American youth. In V. Haldemann (Ed.), *37th Annual American Council on Consumer Interests Proceedings*. Columbia, MO: American Council on Consumer Interests.
- Serido, J., & Deenanath, V. (2016). Financial parenting: Promoting financial self-reliance of young consumers. In J. J. Xiao (Ed.), *Handbook of consumer finance research* (2nd ed., pp. 291–300). New York, NY: Springer.
- Shanks, T. R. W. (2007). The impact of household wealth on child development. *Journal of Poverty, 11*(2), 93-116. doi:10.1300/J134v11n02_05

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

- Shim, S., Serido, J., Bosch, L., & Tang, C. (2013). Financial identity-processing styles among young adults: A longitudinal study of socialization factors and consequences for financial capabilities. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 47(1), 128-152. doi:10.1111/joca.12002
- Sinha, G., Tan, K., & Zhan, M. (2018). Patterns of financial attributes and behaviors of emerging adults in the United States. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 93, 178-185. doi:10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.07.023
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 653-677. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00175.x
- Taylor, K. A., Mesmer-Magnus, J., & Burns, T. M. (2008). Teaching the Art of Negotiation: Improving Students' Negotiating Confidence and Perceptions of Effectiveness. *Journal of Education for Business*, 83(3), 135-140.
- Terriquez, V. & Guarantz, O. (2014). Financial challenges in emerging adulthood and students' decisions to stop out of college. *Emerging Adulthood*, 3(3), 204-214. doi:10.1177/2167696814550684 ea.sagepub.com
- Thompson, B. (1991). Negotiating training: Win- win or what? *Training*, 28(6), 31-39.
- Thompson, L. L., Wang, J., & Gunia, B. C. (2010). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 491-515. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100458
- Trombitas, K. (2012). *Financial Stress: An Everyday Reality for College Students*. Retrieved from https://www.inceptia.org/PDF/Inceptia_FinancialStress_whitepaper.pdf
- Volpe, R. P., Chen, H., & Pavlicko, J. J. (1996). Personal investment literacy among college students: A survey. *Financial Practice and Education*, 6, 86-94. doi:10.1016/S1057-0810(99)80006-7

PAY NEGOTIATION AND REMUNERATION IN YOUTH

Williams, M. J., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2016). The subtle suspension of backlash: A meta-analysis of penalties for women's implicit and explicit dominance behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *142*, 165–197. doi:10.1037/bul0000039

World Economic Forum (2020). *The Global Gender Gap Report*. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2020.pdf