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ABSTRACT

Gender Identity Threat in Same & Mixed-Gender Negotiations:
Speech accommodation & relational outcomes

Lauren J. Aguilar

In negotiation it is important to claim the most value, but also to establish positive regard in the social relationship. It may be particularly difficult for women to meet both these instrumental and relational demands, as negative stereotypes about women convey that masculine qualities are more beneficial than feminine qualities in negotiation (Kray & Thompson, 2005). When stereotypes about individuals are made salient in evaluative contexts this can induce identity threat—the apprehension about being judged on the basis of stereotypes (Steele & Aronson, 1995). The current studies examine how identity threat affects speech communication processes, relational connection, and instrumental outcomes in negotiations. In particular, the studies examine how women and men use speech accommodation in negotiations, as nonconscious speech accommodation is associated with affiliation and feelings of social connection (Aguilar, Downey, Krauss, Pardo, & Bolger, 2011).

In two studies I found that heightened gender-based identity threat affected speech accommodation in dyadic negotiations. Within same-gender dyads (Study 1) dispositional sensitivity to gender-based rejection in traditionally male settings (RS-gender) affected speech accommodation under identity threat (London, Romero-Canayas, Downey, Rattan & Tyson, 2011). Presumably, women higher in RS-gender, who are concerned about being judged on the basis of gender in social-evaluative situations, were in a heightened threat state when faced with an explicit reminder about gender
stereotypes in negotiation. When gender identity threat was explicitly neutralized, there were no differences in actors’ or partners’ speech accommodation based on RS-gender. When explicitly exposed to gender identity threat, women higher in RS-gender in showed less speech accommodation, while women lower in RS-gender use more speech accommodation. Also, partners of women higher in RS-gender exhibited more speech accommodation than partners of women lower in RS-gender under threat.

Within mixed-gender dyads (Study 2) when gender identity threat was explicitly neutralized, men accommodated marginally less than women; however when women were exposed explicitly to gender-based identity threat, males increased speech accommodation to female negotiation partners. Females did not show differential speech accommodation between the threat and no threat conditions, and specifically, did not reciprocate male partners’ increased accommodation while under threat.

Higher levels of speech accommodation were paralleled by higher levels of partner perceived social connection, although the links between speech accommodation and connection differed across same and mixed-gender dyads. Identity threat also influenced interpersonal impressions and undercut women’s instrumental outcomes in mixed-gender dyads. I argue that identity threat can affect communication processes in ways that go unnoticed and may affect women’s advancement in traditionally male domains such as negotiation.
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General Introduction & Literature Review

Negotiation

The act of negotiation is defined as “to confer with another so as to arrive at the settlement of some matter, to arrange for or bring about through conference, discussion, and compromise” (Merriam-Webster, 2011). Thus, negotiation occurs when individuals have differing interests, the outcomes of which are reliant on their counterparts’ interests, and communication is necessary to find a resolution. Thus, negotiation is a special type of social interaction that involves both instrumental and relational motivations, and where communication processes are critical to outcomes. It is distinct from other types of joint decision-making interactions such that individuals’ personal outcomes are dependent on the interests and behavior of their negotiation counterpart. A principled goal in negotiation is to protect one’s own interests, while maintaining a good relationship with one’s negotiation counterpart (Watson, 1994).

Negotiations are ubiquitous and necessary element of all social relationships both at work and at home (Chusmir & Mills, 1989) but negotiations in organizational settings are especially important for the acquisition of resources and advancement in one’s career (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999). Negotiation in organizations can involve formal processes like negotiating contracts, grievances, or conflicts or more informal processes such as the attainment of resources or privileges. Skill in negotiation is necessary for the daily business of many careers and is fundamental for those who wish to attain organizational positions of power, status, and responsibility (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999). Negotiation skills are particularly crucial in careers such as law, business and leadership, which are domains in which women are still underrepresented.
and marginalized (Bazerman, 1998). Although women comprise 50% of the American work force, and graduate in greater numbers from college than men, they still are not equal in senior positions of corporations, government, law, and large-scale organizations (ABA Commission on Women, 2005; Bowles, Babcock, & McGinn, 2005; Catalyst, 2007; www.ipu.org) and are still underpaid relative to men (Blau & Kahn, 2007). There are many other factors that may lead to these gender disparities in career advancement (such as discrimination, family-life choices, etc.) but there is evidence to suggest that gender differences in negotiation processes and behavior may account for some of the career advancement gap between women and men (Kray & Thompson, 2005). The current study aims to examine how relational processes in negotiation, and specifically speech communication, may subtly undercut women’s advancement, and in particular to assess how stereotypes about women in negotiation may affect relational outcomes in negotiation.

Relational & Instrumental Motivations in Negotiation. Negotiators inherently tread the line between the instrumental motivations for assertiveness (to express and advocate for one’s own interests) and relational motivations for empathy (to express concern and understanding for the opposition’s interests to protect relations) (Mnookin, Peppet, Tulumello, 1996). Practically this means that negotiators want to be both competitive and dominant, yet warm and likeable so that they can satisfy instrumental needs of claiming value from the negotiation and relational needs of creating and maintaining positive working relationships and reputation. Beyond longitudinal relational motivations, negotiators also want to make a positive impression within a single negotiation in order to secure profitable instrumental outcomes. Making a good
impression, being liked and trusted, has been shown to lead to more cooperation and information sharing during negotiation, which subsequently increases both joint and individual outcomes (Maddux, Mullen, & Galinsky, 2008). Although the relational and instrumental dimensions in negotiation are theoretically orthogonal, gender stereotypes overlay and complicate these dimensions.

**Gender Stereotypes & Negotiation**

Stereotypes & Relational Processes. There are pervasive gender stereotypes that masculine qualities are more beneficial than feminine qualities in negotiation: that men are strong, dominant, assertive, independent and rational, while women are weak, accommodating, emotional, passive and have greater concern for others (e.g. Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Eagly & Wood, 1982; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2007). Furthermore, women face impression trade-offs in traditionally male domains where they cannot be perceived as both likeable and competent, yet men can be high on both dimensions (Heilman et al., 2001). Although advocating for the self and expressing warmth and understanding for the negotiation partner are theoretically orthogonal aspects of a negotiation, they may only be orthogonal for men. Women in negotiation face a particularly difficult task of making impressions that are competitive and competent, yet which carry enough friendliness to facilitate social bonds and business relationships. The current study will focus on how speech communication affects relational connection in negotiations as these processes might have a subtle, unnoticed effect on women’s advancement in traditionally male domains.

Negotiation roles may be particularly likely to trigger a sense of social threat in women because of the uncertainties that remain in our culture about how to be an
effective negotiator when one is a woman. Stereotypes put women in a very precarious position. How do they behave in ways that achieve an effective balance between being perceived as competitive and competent while also remaining likeable? When women emphasize traditionally valued negotiation behaviors in (e.g. acting assertively) they are seen as competent but also seen as less interpersonally effective, less personable, and less likely to exert interpersonal influence (Heilman & Alcott, 2001; Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, and Tamkins (2004) have found that women are considered to be less competent but equally likeable to men when measures of success are ambiguous; however, when measures of success are clear, women and men both are considered competent but women are considered less likeable and more hostile. Thus, when women negotiators act in ways that contribute to their perceived competence, they may risk undermining their likeability and social relations; however, if they act in a gender-prescribed manner they may be liked but not seen as competent. Being perceived as competent is viewed as essential but it is impossible to be a truly effective negotiator without being likeable: negotiation counterparts are less likely to trust a negotiator they dislike and furthermore, attaining the social approval of others facilitates work relationships, access to social networks, and advancement opportunities (Carli, 2001; Catalyst, 2007). This likeability-competence tradeoff has repercussions for successful women in negotiation: they are likely to feel less comfortable and liked, or perhaps even alienated in their workplace, and may face barriers to advancement and promotions, all of which could contribute to undercutting their daily well-being and satisfaction at work and possibly career attrition.

Stereotypes & Instrumental Processes. Stereotypes about men and women in
negotiation may put women at an instrumental disadvantage at the bargaining table. For example, meta-analyses have shown that men behave more competitively and gain better outcomes than women in negotiations (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999; Walters, Stuhlmacher, & Meyer, 1998). Some research has found that women’s instrumental underperformance relative to men can be explained in part by gender stereotypes (Kray & Thompson, 2005). These gender stereotypes are pervasive and affect individuals even when they are unaware of them, despite whether individuals endorse them or not (Banaji & Hardin, 1996; Devine, 1989). Gender stereotypes affect how others perceive women, how women perceive themselves and they, in turn, affect negotiation expectancies, experience, and may also affect the relational outcomes of negotiation.

**Situational Gender-Based Identity Threat**

Negotiation is inherently a gender-stereotyped domain and the activation of gender stereotypes can lead to identity threat, which is the normal circumstance faced by women in traditionally male domains. Identity threat is the disruptive concern that one will be seen not as an individual but through the lens of a negative group stereotype (Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002). Identity threat is, in large part, a problem of social relations—a worry about how one will be perceived and whether one will be fully included and respected in stereotyped setting (Logel et al., 2009; Steele, 2010; Walton & Carr, in press; Walton & Cohen, 2007). Since gender identity threat is “in the air” in domains where negotiation is important, women’s latent ability is likely to be underestimated in such domains (Steele, 1997; Walton & Spencer, 2009). Over 15 years of research has proven that the threat of confirming an individual’s negative stereotype in a relevant domain leads to performance decrements (Steele & Aronson,
1995), and specifically to women’s underperformance in male gender stereotyped domains (Spencer, Steele & Quinn, 1999; Shih, Pittinsky, & Ambady, 1999) and specifically can undercut women’s performance in negotiations (Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky, 2001).

As, awareness of stereotypes concerning female ability can lead women to worry that such stereotypes will be confirmed by a poor evaluation (Steele & Aronson, 1995), identity threat can inhibit performance below women’s actual capability (Walton & Spencer, 2009). This apprehension can reduce cognitive capacity, working memory, concentration, and heighten anxiety and physiological arousal (Schmader & Johns, 2003; Cheryan & Bodenhausen, 2000; Spencer, Steele & Quinn, 1999; Ben-Zeev, Fein & Inzlicht, 2004; Blascovich, Spencer, Quinn & Steele, 2001). Even women who are highly identified with the domain are vulnerable to this threat (Nyugen & Ryan, 2008), and perhaps even more so than those women who are not (Davies, Spencer, Quinn, & Gerhardstein, 2002; Keller & Molix, 2007), leaving those women who are the most persistent in gender-stereotyped domains the most vulnerable to performance decrements. Environmental factors that make gender salient, even subtly, can induce identity threat (Davies, et al., 2002; Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000; Kray et al., 2001).

Identity threat not only leads to underperformance, but also has downstream consequences for attitudes and motivation in gender-stereotyped domains. Identity threat lowers performance expectations (Stangor, Carr, & Kiang, 1998) and also leads to more negative attitudes towards stereotyped disciplines and less of an association between the domain and the sense of self for women (Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002b). Identity threat also lowers women’s sense of belonging in gender-stereotyped
fields and leads to less desire to participate in activities in the field (Murphy, Steele, & Gross, 2007). Thus, for women working in traditionally male careers and engaging in stereotypically male-typed tasks like negotiation, identity threat is likely to be present and may hinder advancement. The identity threat research reviewed above demonstrates that threat undercuts intellectual performance but little research has addressed how threat identity affects processes in social interaction, and interpersonal outcomes in particular. The research reviewed next begins to address how identity threat manifests in social interaction and negotiation, but notably it only addresses instrumental outcomes rather than interpersonal outcomes.

**Identity Threat in Relational Settings.** If identity threat negatively affects women’s relational processes in traditionally male domains, in practice it may be systematically undercutting women’s advancement. Only two studies to date have looked at identity threat processes in social interaction. Logel, Walton, Spencer, Iserman, von Hippel, & Bell (2009) established that sexist men tend to display open, dominant postures during social interaction and that these cues lead women to later underperform in a gender-stereotyped domain. Another study by Bosson, Haymovitz, & Pinel (2003) found that when individuals are under identity threat they act more uncomfortable, awkward and anxious. It appears that identity threat can be transmitted during social interaction and that the threat can negatively affect social behavior, yet little is known about how threat affects social communication, interpersonal relations and interpersonal impressions, which are at the heart of negotiation. The current study will address how identity threat may interrupt relational processes in negotiation for women, which may undermine their business relationships and ultimately hinder their advancement. Identity threat may be
especially pronounced for some women in relational settings—those who have experienced gender-based marginalization in the past.

**Dispositional Gender-Based Identity Threat**

The need to belong and be accepted by others is a fundamental human motivation (Leary & Baumeister, 1995) and further a sense of belonging is crucial for advancement and persistence in achievement domains, especially for traditionally underrepresented individuals (Walton & Cohen, 2007; Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Pietrzak & Davis, 2002). The current study uses the framework proposed by Downey & Feldman (1996) to examine how women’s dispositional apprehension about being rejected or devalued in traditionally male domains may compound with situational identity threat in relational settings. Relational threat is not an apprehension about performing poorly in achievement domains like classic identity threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995); rather, it is concerned with social acceptance and rejection in settings where the male gender elicits preferential treatment. As I was interested in how identity threat affects negotiation outcomes, assessment of individual level of concern about gender-based rejection was important as threat may be more detrimental for those particularly concerned about gender biased treatment.

Individuals who have experienced interpersonal rejection may come to fear this rejection in their current social interactions. Rejection sensitivity (RS) has been described as a dispositional tendency to anxiously expect and readily perceive interpersonal rejection (Downey & Feldman, 1996). This disposition develops from and is maintained through rejection experiences. Thus, those high in rejection sensitivity come to be very concerned that they will be rejected and at the same time expect that
others will reject them. Conversely, low rejection sensitive individuals are less concerned with, and do not expect rejection. Because the threat of rejection is inherent in social encounters, highly rejection sensitive individuals may react in ways that trigger fulfillment of their expectations of rejection (Downey, Freitas, Michaelis, & Khouri, 1998). The rejection sensitivity model predicts that dispositional anxious expectations of rejection should motivate people to behave in ways intended to prevent rejection—provided rejection has not yet occurred—whereas confidence of social acceptance should not (Purdie & Downey, 2000; Romero-Canyas & Downey, 2005).

In an extension of the rejection sensitivity model, the gender-based rejection sensitivity model by London and colleagues (London, et al., 2011) addresses how the chronic concern about social rejection based on gender affects women in traditionally male domains. Women who have experienced gender-based rejection in the past may develop apprehension that they will continue to experience rejection in traditionally male domains. In settings where gender concerns are relevant—like negotiation—women who have marginalization experiences are more likely to worry that they might be judged or rejected by others on the basis of their gender. Recent work by has found that women who are particularly concerned with rejection, discrimination, or marginalization, based on their gender may cope with the threat of gender-based rejection in ways that may ultimately undermine their advancement.

Women high in gender-based rejection sensitivity (HiRS-gender) may be especially likely to behave in ways that undercut their perceived likeability and affiliation with others when they face identity threat in negotiations. A self-fulfilling prophesy may occur, in line with the original RS model (Downey, et al., 1998), such that when a highly
gender-based rejection sensitive woman negotiator is faced with stereotypes about women in negotiation she enters into a highly threatened state, does not connect relationally with her partner, and then is ultimately rejected because of the poor impression she makes. A goal of the current research is to understand how both situational and dispositional gender-based identity threat act in concert to affect how individuals connect to and form impressions of each other in negotiations.

**Implicit Communication of Connection**

Research has established that identity threat may undermine women’s performance in traditionally male domains; however, much less research has focused on how identity threat affects relational processes. The current research aims to examine how identity threat influences how men and women manage social interaction during negotiations, and specifically to examine subtle communicative cues that contribute to affiliation. In negotiation it is important to claim the most value, but also to establish positive regard in the social relationship, so examining the subtle ways individuals connect or fail to connect in negotiation is important. The focus of the current research is on the implicit, non-conscious communication of social connection as implicit communication behavior can often predict more accurately interpersonal perceptions and outcomes than can explicit behavior (e.g. Dovidio, Kawkami, & Gaertner, 2002). One ubiquitous and influential behavior that connects individuals during social interaction is behavioral accommodation, or mimicry.

**Behavioral Accommodation: Relational & Instrumental Mechanisms**

During social interaction individuals’ behavior tends to become more similar (Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, 1991; Chartrand, Maddux, & Lakin, 2005). Individuals
mimic the verbal and non-verbal behaviors of their interactants largely without awareness from either party. Behavioral accommodation is thought to facilitate the social interaction (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999) and fulfills both relational and instrumental goals. In the following section I will review the literature on verbal and non-verbal mimicry and propose that the study of behavioral accommodation, and speech accommodation in particular, during negotiation will lead to insights about how gender social identity threat affects relational and instrumental outcomes.

Speech Accommodation. Talkers tend to align their speech production through an unconscious priming mechanism of mutual accommodation at all levels varying from the semantic to the phonological (Krauss & Pardo, 2004; Pickering & Garrod, 2004) in a process I will refer to broadly as speech accommodation. Specifically, speech accommodation is the phenomenon whereby speakers change the lexical, sublexical, or paralinguistic dimensions of their speech to sound more like those with whom they speak. Human speech production is phonetically variable both within and between talkers but, despite this inconsistency, listeners are quite accurate in their perception of the acoustic-phonetic speech signal (Pardo, 2006). Speech accommodation typically begins slowly and increases over time (Welkowitz & Feldstein, 1969 as cited in Welkowitz, Feldstein, Finkelstein, & Ayelsworth, 1972; Welkowitz, et al., 1972; Natale, 1975; Pardo, 2006). Taken all together, the normative pattern of mutual accommodation during conversation is one in which talkers accommodate mutually, increasing their alignment gradually.

Aspects of talkers’ speech tends to become more similar over the course of an interaction (Krauss & Pardo, 2004; see Pickering & Garrod, 2004 for a review). Much research has shown that talkers will converge their speech on dimensions such as word
and clause choice (Brennan & Clark, 1996; Niederhoffer & Pennebaker, 2002) and also on content-free dimensions such as syntactic constructions (Branigan, Pickering, & Cleland, 2000), speech rates (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991), vocal intensities (Natale, 1975), fundamental frequency or pitch (Gregory, 1990), and pronunciation (Giles, 1973; Bourhis & Giles, 1977). Furthermore, during conversation speakers align description representations (Pickering & Garrod, 2004; Brennan & Clark, 1996; Garrod & Doherty, 1994) and establish common ground to the exclusion and disadvantage of over hearers (Schober & Clark, 1989). Important to the current study, during dyadic interaction, talkers begin to accommodate their phonetic production—or pronunciation—towards that of their partner (Pardo, 2006). My prior research has established that phonetic speech accommodation, the phenomenon whereby speakers change phonetic dimensions of their speech (i.e. pronunciation) to sound more like those with whom they speak, is an important predictor of social connection and can also be motivated by the desire for common ground or message interpretability (Aguilar, Downey, Krauss, Pardo, & Bolger, 2011).

The interactive alignment account by Pickering & Garrod (2004) explains the automatic nature of speech accommodation, or conversational alignment, in which talkers align their representations at each level of processing and production (i.e. semantic representations, phonetic representations, etc.) through a generally automatic priming mechanism, the perception behavior-link (Dijksterhuis & Bargh, 2001). The perception-behavior link posits that perception of a behavior automatically activates representations of that behavior in the perceiver, making the behavior likely to be enacted. This is the hypothesized mechanism by which speech aligns naturally during
speech exchange. Yet, there is evidence of asymmetric accommodation patterns and little research on the origins, mechanisms, and functions of this asymmetry.

**Instrumental Mechanisms.** In the literature there is an emphasis on the relational mechanisms involved in behavioral accommodation; however, within verbal literature accommodation is also linked to building shared representations—to the desire to communicate one’s message effectively to an interactant. Instrumentally, speech accommodation fulfills goals to build common representations, find common ground, engage in audience design, and facilitate interpretability of messages during communication (Aguilar et al., 2011; Clark & Shaefer, 1989; Pickering & Garrod, 2004). That is, individuals engage in speech accommodation to enhance listener understanding (Gallois, Ogay, & Giles, 2005). In negotiation in particular, it is critical to come to common ground and a shared perspective to reach compromise, therefore, speech accommodation processes are likely to be important to the ways in which negotiators connect instrumentally during dyadic communicative interaction (Echterhoff, Higgins, Levine, 2009).

**Relational Mechanisms.** Mimicry is thought to unconsciously bond individuals together (Aguilar, et al. 2011; Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Lakin, Jeffris, Cheng & Chartrand, 2003). Mimicry connects interactants by promoting rapport, liking and harmony (e.g. Aguilar, et al., 2011; Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Lakin, et al., 2003; LaFrance, 1979). Predominantly in the non-verbal behavior literature, mimicry has been linked to positive interpersonal outcomes. Both Bernieri (1988) and LaFrance (1979, 1982) have found that individuals tended to synchronize their postures and movements in dyads and groups, respectively, and that this synchrony was positively related to self-
reports of rapport. Chartrand & Bargh (1999) have found that individuals automatically mimic postures, mannerisms, and facial expressions of their interaction partners. They posit that we automatically match behaviors to blend into the social environment. In one study they found that unaware participants would mimic the mannerisms (i.e. foot shaking) of a confederate. In another study they had a confederate mimic the mannerisms of participants and those that were mimicked reported more liking for the confederate and perceived the interaction as going more smoothly. Non-verbal mimicry has also been linked to tuning into another’s affective state (Stel & Vonk, 2010), subsequent altruistic behavior (van Baaren, Holland, Kawakami, & van Knippenberg, 2004) and receiving larger tips in the service industry (Van Baaren, Holland, Steenaert, & van Knippenberg, 2003). In prior work I found support for the hypothesis that, like non-verbal mimicry, speech accommodation leads to greater liking and rapport in same gender pairs (Aguilar et al., 2011).

Speech Accommodation Strategies & Relational Connection. The research reviewed above portrays accommodation as a process of mutual alignment; however, within dyadic interaction there is often asymmetric accommodation. Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) by Giles and colleagues (e.g. Giles, Coupland, and Coupland, 1991) proposes that asymmetries stem from social motivations and often reflect concerns about social identity. CAT posits that during conversation talkers will shift their speech patterns as a result of social-situational influences (Shepard, Giles & LePoire, 2001; Giles, Coupland, Coupland, 1991; Thakerar, Giles & Cheshire, 1982).

According to CAT, during the course of interaction features of speech may become more similar or divergent amongst speakers. For example, speech may vary on
very fine-grained levels such as phonetic articulation, or may change on higher levels such as syntax or semantic usage. *Accommodation* or convergence is defined as “the strategies by which individuals adapt or modify linguistic, paralinguistic, and non-verbal features to become more similar to their interaction partner” (Shepard, Giles, & Le Poire, 2001, pg. 35). *Non-accommodation*, or maintenance, is the act of maintaining one’s original speech pattern, regardless of the speech of the conversational partner. CAT posits that these communication strategies establish a desired state of psychological distance between the self and interaction partners. Accommodation serves instrumental needs to make one’s message more interpretable, but it also serves social or emotional motivations. Making communication behavior more similar reduces the social distance between interactants, and should lead to perceptions of similarity which are rewarding, which then facilitate liking and affiliation between individuals.

**Behavioral Accommodation in Negotiation.** As reviewed above, behavioral accommodation expressed in social interaction is associated with the relational and instrumental outcomes in social interaction. The goal of negotiation is not only to claim a big piece of the pie, but often also to build a rapport and establish fruitful long-lasting relationships with negotiation partners. Relationally, behavioral accommodation should lead to more rapport between negotiators, and a desire for future interactions, which are valued, and arguably essential, qualities for successful business relationships. Behavioral accommodation should also lead to more advantageous instrumental outcomes, like claiming more value and reaching an agreement in a given negotiation. It does seem that creating a connection with one’s negotiation counterpart can lead to more positive instrumental negotiation outcomes. For example, those that take the
perspective of others create better integrative strategies and win more resources during negotiation (Galinsky, Maddux, Gilin, & White, 2008). Perspective taking has also been associated with increases in mimicry, which subsequently elicits liking from one’s interactant (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). Taken together, it seems that behavioral accommodation should facilitate positive outcomes in negotiation, due to the connection that is forged between individuals.

There is some evidence to suggest that mimicry does, in fact, directly influence relational and instrumental negotiation outcomes. In one study by Maddux, Mullen & Galinsky (2008) half the negotiators in a dyadic negotiation class exercise subtly mimicked their partners’ mannerisms. Those that mimicked earned better individual outcomes and created more value for both negotiating parties by inventing creative ways to increase value for both parties, resulting in better outcomes for the dyad. In their second study, negotiators that mimicked were trusted more and this trust lead to uncovering compatible interests and reaching agreement. This research validates that behavioral accommodation facilitates both relational and instrumental negotiation outcomes; however, what is still needed is an account of how these processes might be different for women, who are more susceptible to identity threat within the domain of negotiation.

*Individual Relational Motivations in Accommodation.* Speech accommodation seems to serve affiliative goals (Krauss & Fussell, 1996; Putnam & Street, 1984; Street, 1984). Speech accommodation has been linked to affiliative social outcomes (Aguilar, et al., 2011). A key prediction of CAT is that a talker will accommodate to their conversational partner with the implicit goal of reducing social distance and eliciting
liking and acceptance from the partner. Thus some asymmetries in speech accommodation may reflect differences in need for acceptance that partners bring to an interaction. In support of this view, a rare laboratory study of naturalistic dyadic conversation showed that partners who were relatively higher in need for acceptance, indexed by the social desirability scale (Marlowe-Crowne, 1961), accommodated vocal intensity more than partners relatively lower in need for acceptance (Natale, 1975, Study 2). Also, nonverbal mimicry research showed that those who have previously experienced an experimentally induced failure to affiliate, and thus should be motivated to replenish belongingness, mimicked more than those who had a successful affiliation experience (Lakin & Chartrand, 2003).

Thus, those who are dispositionally concerned and anxious about rejection may be more likely to use accommodation as a means of affiliating with their communicative partner in situations where their rejection concerns are activated. In fact, previous research has found that individuals high in interpersonal rejection sensitivity (Downey & Feldman, 1996) accommodate their speech more when interacting with someone who is low in interpersonal rejection sensitivity, who fails to reciprocate the affiliative behavior (Aguilar, et al., 2011). Furthermore, in pilot research to this dissertation I found that within a cooperative task-oriented setting, women who were higher in gender-based rejection sensitivity (London et al., 2011) accommodated their speech more to partners, but it remains to be seen how speech accommodation will be affected in the competitive male-typed task of negotiation, where identity concerns may be elevated and disruptive. Women high in gender-based rejection sensitivity might perceive the negotiation as an anxiety-producing conflict with the potential for rejection, rather than an interaction to
resolve issues cooperatively. For instance, those high in interpersonal sensitivity to rejection relationship perceive conflict resolution discussions as likely to end in rejection (Downey, Freitas, Michaelis, & Khouri, 1998). The current research aims to extend this work to assess how women concerned with gender-based rejection use speech accommodation in a competitive negotiation setting when faced with explicit threats to their gender identity.

_Behavioral Accommodation & Identity Threat._ When individuals are not motivated to affiliate or are in an identity threatened state they may decrease their speech accommodation. CAT proposes that non-accommodation decreases or holds the psychological distance between the self and interaction partners (Gallois, et al., 2005). To support this claim an early CAT experiment found that after hearing an Englishman derogate their devalued identity—operationalized as calling Welsh a “dying language”—Welsh speakers identified with the Welsh culture increased the Welsh accentedness in their speech (Bourhis & Giles, 1977). This Bourhis & Giles (1977) study is oft cited as evidence for non-accommodation under general identity threat, but it is important to note that the cultural language threat was directly related to the feature of language that showed non-accommodation—accentedness. A more recent study found that more diffuse threats to one’s cultural social identity increased defensive linguistic behavior, such that threatened bilingual individuals used more of their own cultural language relative to non-threatened bilingual individuals who were more flexible in their language use (Vaes & Wicklund, 2002). Barring these two studies, strategies of non-accommodation under threat are highly understudied empirically and have only been studied in the realm of threats to cultural language and national social identity.
respectively. However, taken together, these two studies do build the rationale that identity threat should lead to disruptions in speech accommodation during dyadic interaction, but these studies did not measure speech accommodation dimensions that are completely divorced from the type of identity threat. The current investigation will build on this previous work and instantiate an identity threat that is theoretically orthogonal to dimension of speech that is measured—namely, phonetic accommodation.

Integral to the current study, female identity threat in the dyad should lead to decreased or disrupted accommodation, and further, I predict will lead to less favorable interpersonal outcomes since increased speech accommodation is associated with interpersonal connection. Thus, women negotiators who are exposed to gender-based identity threat should show less of the expected increase in their accommodation to negotiation partners, especially male partners, who are positively stereotyped in negotiation. Furthermore, I predict that individual dispositional concern about gender-based marginalization should compound the level of identity threat experience and exacerbate disruptions in speech accommodation. Theoretically, these decreases in accommodation should also reduce partners’ feelings of connection and affiliation towards threatened women.

**Speech Accommodation in Same and Mixed-Gender Dyads**

Within the communication literature there is disagreement as to whether there are differences in speech accommodation behavior involved in same and mixed-gender communication. Women are stereotyped as more accommodating and communication research provides some evidence that women are more convergent than men in their
speech patterns across situations and interactants (Eckert, 1989, 1999; Namy, Nygaard & Sauerteig, 2002; Willemys, Gallois, Callan & Pittam, 1997). Other work shows that both men and women converge their communicative patterns (Street, 1984; Bilous & Krauss, 1988). Some research on phonetic accommodation, of the sort measured in the current investigation, finds that dynamics of speech accommodation depend on both gender and the social role one employs and that female dyads may use accommodation behaviors differently than male dyads do (Pardo, 2006). For our research the more important question is not do women accommodate more than men, but how does the gender composition of the dyad predict particular speech accommodation dynamics within the gender-stereotyped domain of negotiation?

Chartrand & Lakin (2003) make the argument that mimicry evolved in humans because of our need for cooperation and coordination in social groups for survival. Following this logic, it has been proposed (e.g. Bourgeois & Hess, 2008) that individuals should mimic ingroup members more than outgroup members, since cooperation and affiliation with ingroup members is essential for survival. Additionally research from developmental gender perspective would also predict more mimicry in same-gender interactions because of our natural propensity to associate with same gender others (Jacklin & Maccoby, 1978; Lloyd & Smith, 1986; Maccoby, 1998; Serbin, Moller, Gulko, Powlishta & Colburne, 1994). Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981; 1982), a critical pillar for Communication Accommodation Theory, would also predict that there should be more mimicry in same gender dyads because of ingroup bias/favoritism and positive ingroup distinctiveness—motivation to protect and enhance positive group identity.
Research in the non-verbal accommodation literature has provided some initial evidence that individuals tend to mimic ingroup members more than outgroup members (Cheng & Chartrand, 2003). In one study, religious group membership predicted face-rubbing behavior mimicry of ingroup members more than outgroup members (Yaba, Johnston, Miles, Peace, 2006), while in others ethnic ingroup membership (Mondillon, Niedenthal, Gil, Droit, Volet, 2007), similarity of team or political affiliation predicted more facial expression mimicry (Bourgeois & Hess, 2008). The research on ingroup/outgroup mimicry has largely been conducted using nonverbal measures (cf. Bourhis & Giles, 1977), confederate, or non-interactive paradigms. The current study aims to contribute to our understanding of how group identity affects speech accommodation in true, real time dyadic interaction, especially in a context where the group identity is relevant to the task at hand.

Taken together, it seems that individuals are less likely to mimic outgroup members; however, there is not yet an account of how social identity affects mimicry within true social interaction, especially during interactions where a particular social identity is devalued. When women are negotiating against a man, as an outgroup member who also benefits from positive stereotypes in negotiation, she is likely to accommodate less than when she is negotiating with a woman. Perhaps simply negotiating with a man raises the threshold of identity threat even in the absence of external identity threat cues. Furthermore, it is possible that women who are particularly concerned with marginalization are likely to experience relatively more identity threat when facing a man in negotiation.
Interpersonal Outcomes

The literature review so far has argued that negotiation is a male stereotyped domain, and that women may face identity threat within this domain, which may undercut their relational and instrumental outcomes. Furthermore, it has argued that women who are particularly concerned with interpersonal gender-based rejection, or are negotiating with a man, are likely to experience greater identity threat in negotiation, and are even more likely to incur damaging interpersonal outcomes.

Generally, people want to earn both positive relational and instrumental outcomes in negotiation and I have suggested that speech accommodation may be one route through which individuals can accomplish these goals. However, identity threat should disrupt speech accommodation behavior, and women in negotiation are susceptible to identity threat. Thus I expect that women who face identity threat in negotiation are likely to decrease their accommodation to negotiation partners, which should then affect their interpersonal outcomes—how others perceive them and whether others desire to maintain relationships with them. If identity threatened women display decreased speech accommodation in negotiation, they may be perceived as less warm and friendly, in contrast to stereotypical expectancies for feminine behavior. Counter-stereotypical impressions may be especially likely to lead to poor interpersonal connection in mixed-gender negotiations (Rudman, 1998; but see Heilman, et al., 2004). In line with the stereotype threat model also expect that identity threat should undercut instrumental performance such that women under threat will earn less value in the negotiation (Steele & Aronson, 1995; Kray, et al., 2001).
Current Research

The current research will examine speech accommodation during competitive negotiations in same and mixed-gender dyads, and test whether identity threat decreases speech accommodation and undermines relational and instrumental outcomes. Identity threat is hypothesized to have a disruptive effect on alignment in the dyad, which should also disrupt mutual rapport and liking. Furthermore, the dyadic approach used in the current study allows for examining how female identity threat affects partners’ speech accommodation and partners’ impressions of and perceived connection to threatened women. The research will address the following questions: (a) Does situationally or dispositionally heightened gender-based concern decrease speech accommodation? Faced with identity threat, do those women who have a dispositionally high sensitivity to gender-based rejection decrease speech accommodation relative to those who are unconcerned about gender-based rejection? (b) Does situational and dispositional gender-based threat undermine relational and instrumental negotiation outcomes? What are the interpersonal impressions and affiliative outcomes that result from speech accommodation under threat? (c) How does dyadic gender composition affect implicit speech accommodation behaviors in competitive negotiations? Is there more speech accommodation in same gender dyads than mixed-gender dyads? (d) How does identity threat affect instrumental negotiation outcomes?

The current research will address these questions in two studies. The first of which examines how female identity threat and sensitivity to gender-based rejection affect speech accommodation in same-gender dyads, and the second of which examines how female identity threat affects speech accommodation in mixed-gender
dyads. The studies will address how identity threat and decreased speech accommodation may contribute to less favorable relational and instrumental negotiation outcomes.
Methodological Overview

Both studies of the dissertation utilized the same methodology. The only difference between the two studies was the dyadic gender composition—Study 1 was Female-Female, whereas Study 2 was Female-Male. Therefore, in this section I will describe in detail the methods and procedure used in both the experiments, and reserve only a short methodological recapitulation at the introduction of each separate study.

The studies employed two phases, first—a recording task in which the identity threat was induced and the participants’ interaction during the negotiation task was recorded, and second—a perceptual assessment of conversational accommodation during the negotiation. In the recording phase of the experiment, this study induced an identity threat or no threat condition and then paired participants on an island land negotiation task that required verbal conversation. The task was for the negotiators to communicate through speech alone to negotiate who would take claim of each land region, which would then be marked on their individual island game boards. Land regions and entire islands were worth different point values. Participants were told the goal of the negotiation was to earn the most points. In the perceptual judgment phase of the experiment, accommodation was assessed by measuring the extent to which subtle phonetic attributes (pronunciation of vowels and consonants) of one dyad member’s speech increased in resemblance to the speech of the other dyad member in the course of the conversation. Accommodation assessments were made by an independent set of raters who judged the phonetic similarity of speech samples from the task (see Goldinger, 1998; Namy, Nygaard, & Sauerteig, 2002; Pardo, 2006). To establish the consequences of accommodation for feelings of liking and desire to work again together, participants provided ratings of their feelings about their partners following the interaction.
Identity Threat Manipulation Design

The goal of the experimental manipulation was to induce a blatant identity threat for women in negotiation. As this was an exploratory study of the effect of identity threat on a subtle communication behavior, I opted to induce a strong blatant threat manipulation in order to maximize the effect of the manipulation on phonetic accommodation. Furthermore, blatant vs. implicit identity threat manipulations have been shown to lead to disparate performance outcomes for women in negotiation as assimilation (or confirmation) vs. reactance orientations, respectively (Kray et al., 2001).

An identity threat can be induced when a negative ability stereotype is made accessible or salient to a stereotyped individual in an environment or task where the stereotype is relevant and confirmable (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Cues in the environment that remind the stereotyped individual of her relevant identity or being reminded that a task is diagnostic of ability have proven to induce identity threat in wide range of contexts (e.g. Kray et al., 2001; Steele & Aronson, 1995). Thus, I created an identity threat that explicitly told women that there are gender differences in performance on the negotiation task they are about to complete and that performance on this task is diagnostic of ability in negotiation courses and real world negotiations, all based on the threat manipulations used in Kray et al. (2001).

I aimed to create an experimental environment in which the negative ability stereotype for female negotiators would be confirmable and relevant. Thus, participants were told that they were completing a “Negotiation & Communication Study,” conducted by the Human Communication Laboratory of Columbia University and sponsored in part by the (fictitious) McCafrey Corporation. Participants received information about the
study, and the identity threat manipulation in a professional packet. The cover story
and threat manipulation were extensively piloted with naïve participants, who reported
believing the cover story. The study description as well as the threat manipulation was
adapted from Kray et al. (2001). Specifically, from Kray et al. (2001) I included both the
diagnosticity threat manipulation from their study 1 and the gender difference threat
manipulation from study 2 in our blatant threat condition. Participants were told that
McCafrey Corp. is an independent consulting and research firm committed to the
recruitment and training of exceptional negotiators. They were also told that the purpose
of this study is to examine what makes one a good negotiator. Participants then read
the following paragraph, which included the diagnosticity and gender difference
statements, intended to induce a blatant identity threat or no threat condition (No Threat
condition is denoted in *italics*).

“During this study, you will be working with another participant, your
competitor, on a negotiation task designed and tested by McCafrey Corp. This
task has been tested on negotiators from many different types of business and
politics. We have chosen this particular negotiation task for you to complete
because it is a challenging one for novice negotiators. As such, it is *(is not
particularly diagnostic)* an accurate gauge of your genuine negotiating abilities
and limitations. In the past we have found that how untrained participants do on
this negotiation is *(not)* particularly diagnostic of their performance in negotiation
courses and real world negotiations. Because this negotiation is *(not)* diagnostic
of your ability, you should use this negotiation as a learning tool.

Researchers are often interested in examining the various personal
factors that affect people’s ability to perform in important negotiation roles.
Because these personality characteristics tend to vary across gender, male and
female negotiators have been shown to differ in their performance on this task.
*(Because these personality characteristics do not vary across gender, male and
female negotiators do not differ in their performance on this task.)*”
After reading this study description and Identity Threat/No Threat induction, participants then read the negotiation task instructions also included in their experiment packet.

**Negotiation Task Design**

In order to instantiate a female identity threat in negotiation and examine concurrent phonetic accommodation, I had to create a negotiation task that would 1) have participants engage in a competitive typed negotiation task that is stereotypically male, in which females have shown vulnerability to identity threat (Kray et. al., 2001); 2) induce participants to produce and repeat identical lexical items during conversation (Pardo, 2006). Thus, I designed a negotiation task where participants would be forced to repeat lexical items during the natural process of negotiation communication. I sought a negotiation task that would have integrative potential and that would require strategy and extensive communication in order to figure out how both parties could benefit and then each party could attempt to claim the most value for themselves.

The design of the new negotiation task was completed through extensive piloting and focus group work. The negotiation task was a created by modifying a corporate island land negotiation task created by Gollwitzer and Tröetschel (2007). The original task by Gollwitzer and Tröetschel (2007) had one island on a game board in which the participants would negotiate over land regions differing in point value (Mountains, Forest, Quarry, Prairie, Grassland, and Desert). In order to assess phonetic accommodation, it is ideal that participants converse for at least 25-45 minutes and that I obtain a generous and repeated sample of their entire phonetic repertoire. In order to satisfy these time and utterance repetition needs, I expanded the Gollwitzer and
Tröetschel (2007) task to include 9 islands of differing sizes (number of land regions) and point values. Furthermore, I assigned each land region and island a unique label using region labels from previous experimental tasks, which assessed phonetic accommodation and provided a comprehensive sample of each participants’ phonetic repertoire (Aguilar, Downey, Krauss, Pardo, & Bolger, 2011; Pardo, 2006). Each participant used a 10-inch x 20-inch laminated color game board on which the islands were depicted (see Appendix). Participants marked and kept track of each land region they claimed with a purple translucent bingo chip.

Participants were told that the ultimate goal was to claim the most points in the negotiation. To ensure that the negotiation was competitive and engaging enough and lasted a sufficient amount of time, I added additional rules and bonus point opportunities to the negotiation. Recall that the islands were comprised of 6 different types of land regions—Mountains, Forest, Quarry, Prairie, Grassland, and Desert). Participants were informed that they and their partner might have differing values for the land regions but that they were not allowed to discuss numeric point values themselves. In fact one participant always had land regions valued as follows—Mountains (100), Forest (90), Quarry (80), Prairie (70), Grassland (60), and Desert (50), while the other participant had values of—Mountains (100), Quarry (90), Forest (80), Grassland (70), Prairie (60), and Desert (50). Thus, the most valuable [Mountains (100)] and least valuable [Desert (50)] regions were worth the same point values to both participants, but the mid-ranged regions [Forest (90/80), Quarry (90/80), Prairie (70/60), Grassland (60/70)] were worth different point values to each participant. Thus, this negotiation task included both shared and unshared information. If negotiators were able to figure out what types of
land regions the other party valued (unshared information) they could increase point earnings for both themselves and the other party. Thus the task was not a zero-sum negotiation; instead it had integrative potential that allowed for both parties to benefit.

I also added opportunities for bonus points in the negotiation. Participants could earn bonus points by claiming the most valuable regions, claiming individual land regions that bordered each other on the game board, and claiming entire islands. The inclusion of shared and unshared information and bonus point opportunities added extra strategy and additional conversation to the negotiation task.

I also added a few restrictions to the task so that participants would be sure to negotiate over and say each land region label, rather than just trading entire islands or land region types (e.g. all Mountains for all Prairies). They were told that they must make a verbal agreement with their negotiation competitor for each region claim agreement for example: “You can have the Round Hills Prairie if I can have the Teepees Prairie.” The participants were also told not to calculate the points during negotiation, as it would unnecessarily delay the negotiation. They were given scratch paper to keep track of a basic idea of how many points they had at any given time.

Pilot testing demonstrated that each design element of the negotiation was necessary (unshared/shared information, bonus points, trading restrictions) in order to create both a competitive stereotypically male negotiation task that produced sufficient lexical items to assess phonetic accommodation. Also pilot testing showed that participants believed that their goal was to earn the most points in the task relative to their partner.
Method

In the *Recording Phase* of the study participants provided speech samples before, and during the negotiation task, which were then presented to independent raters who rated the similarity of the speech samples in the *Perceptual Judgment Phase*.

Method: Recording Phase

Participants

Participants, scheduled in dyads, were all female (Study 1), or female and male (Study 2) undergraduates. All were native American-English speakers without hearing or speech disorders. They were compensated $20 or introductory psychology course credit.

Negotiation Task

For each negotiator, the goal was win the most points by claiming the most valuable land regions and entire islands. During the task, each participant naturally repeats the land region labels denoted on their game board many times. Samples of the land region and island labels were also elicited independently from each participant before and during the negotiation task.

*Negotiation Task Directions.* Participants were randomly assigned to represent the fictitious Green (or Red) Corporation and told that the task was to negotiate with their competitor to divide the land regions and that the goal was to win the most points. Participants read the following example directions (see appendix for full task directions).

“You are the CEO of the Green/Red Corporation. Recently you have discovered a chain of islands rich in resources. Unfortunately your negotiating competitor, the CEO of the Red Corporation, also discovered the islands at the same time. Since both of your
corporations discovered the islands at the same time, you and your negotiating competitor will negotiate the ownership of each region on the islands.

**TASK**: negotiate the division of the regions on the islands with your negotiation competitor

On the islands there are in all 6 different types of regions: **Mountainous** regions for ore mining, **Forest** regions for lumber, **Quarry** regions for mining clay, **Prairie** regions for growing wheat, **Grassland** regions for sheep farming, and **Desert** regions for date cultivation.

You will be negotiating for different regions on multiple islands. On the islands the different types of regions (mountains, forests, etc.) **exist in different frequencies** (see table below). Furthermore, depending on the respective commodities / resources (ore, wood, clay, etc.) the regions are worth different profit points.

Additionally participants were told that 1) some land regions were worth more than others, so it was in their best interest to gain ownership of the most valuable regions; 2) each connecting border between regions (land regions that touch on the game board) they claim earns them 10 bonus points; 3) if they claim an entire island they would be rewarded 300 bonus points. Therefore, participants could maximize their points by claiming the most valuable regions, claiming individual land regions that bordered each other on the game board, and claiming entire islands.

**Identity Threat Manipulation Assignment**

In both Studies 1 and 2 I was interested in how female identity threat affects a woman’s speech accommodation and her partner’s speech accommodation, when the partner was protected from identity threat. I was less interested in how female identity threat affected men (although it should actually lead to improved outcomes for men; Walton & Cohen, 2003) or how two women both under identity threat are affected. Across studies we were interested in how the discrepancy in identity threat across partners in a dyad (both No Threat vs. one Threat, one No Threat) affected negotiation processes and outcomes. Thus, within a given dyad, one participant was always given
the No Threat condition, while the other was randomly assigned to either the Threat or No Threat control conditions. Male participants (Study 2) were always given the No Threat control condition. This design allowed for examining effects of identity threat on partners and identity threatened women independently; however this focused approach is not a fully crossed between subjects-design so it is constrained in examining identity threat interactions between actors and partners (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006).

**Procedure**

Upon arrival, participants were seated in separate rooms without seeing each other. All speech samples were recorded with full bandwidth (22kHz) with no filtering of the full spectrum onto an iMac 10.5.8 using Soundstudio software (www.felttip.com). Participants were told that they would be providing recorded speech samples before and during an interactive task; they were then fitted with head-mounted microphones and given printed sheets with the speech sample prompts. Procedure and prompts for the Pre-task recording sessions were identical across participants. Prompts contained a numbered set of Negotiation task region labels to be embedded in a carrier phrase, “Number ____ is the ____”. Participants were instructed to speak in a normal speaking style using the printed sheets as a prompt.

After the Pre-task session, participants were brought into the negotiation task recording room and each received a points guides (to remind them of point and bonus point values, see Appendix for example points guide) scratch paper, and pencils. The pair was instructed to converse in order to accurately complete the negotiation task. Participants worked on the task while seated at desks separated by a divider that prevented them from seeing each other. All conversations were recorded digitally onto
separate synced audio channels to allow measurement of between-talker repetition latency (conversation duration: Female same-gender dyads, $M = 39$ min, $SD = 11$ min; Mixed-gender dyads, $M = 41$ min, $SD = 13$ min). Once the task was finished, participants were separated to complete the Post-task recordings and completed the final questionnaire packet with individual differences (RS-gender/RS-personal) and interpersonal impressions measures.

In order to probe for suspicion and awareness of mimicry, experimenters performed a funneled debriefing at the end of the experiment. They were first asked if any of their own behaviors of their partner stood out to them, then were asked if they noticed any changes in their own speech or the speech of their partners. Finally, experimenters asked participants what they thought the experiment was about. No participants reported that they thought the study was about speech mimicry, none noticed phonetic accommodation from their own or their partner’s speech, and none had any awareness of gender or RS-gender or perceived connection being related to speech behaviors. Therefore, phonetic accommodation was largely unconscious and all participants were blind to the speech accommodation hypotheses.

**Dispositional Measures**

**Gender-Based Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire** (Gender-RSQ, London, Downey, Romero-Canyas, Rattan, & Tyson, 2011). The Gender-RSQ captures the sense of threat experienced in gender-relevant situations where women seek acceptance but may be concerned about the prospect of gender-based marginalization, discrimination, or exclusion. The scenarios present subtle cues that activate variable levels of concern about gender-based rejection in women. Participants imagined 11
situations (e.g., “Imagine that you were just accepted into a graduate program. Your advisor/mentor for the program is a senior male professor. You meet your advisor for the first time on the first day of classes”) and first were asked to indicate ‘how anxious/concerned they would be that they might be rejected (or treated negatively) in the situation because of their gender’, e.g., “How concerned/anxious would you be that the professor might treat you differently than other students because of your gender” on a scale ranging from 1 (very unconcerned) to 6 (very concerned). Second, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they ‘expect that they will be treated with gender-bias in that situation’, e.g., “I would not expect to be treated differently” on a scale ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 6 (very likely). Anxious expectations of gender-based rejection are captured by weighting rejection expectation (reverse of acceptance) by the anxiety score and then computing a cross-situational average score (Gender-RS range = 1-36). Qualifying as high in Gender RS means having relatively high anxiety and expectations of gender-based rejection (HiRS-gender), while qualifying as low in Gender RS reflects having relatively lower anxiety and expectations of gender based rejection. Gender RS was measured continuously but was plotted at 1 SD above (HiRS-gender) or 1 SD below (LoRS-gender) the sample mean in graphs. Thus, in Study 1 high RS-gender women had values ≥ 9.82 and low RS-gender women had values ≤ 2.21; and in Study 2 high RS-gender women had values ≥10.82 and low RS-gender women had values ≤ 2.61.

Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (RSQ, Downey & Feldman, 1996). The RSQ captures the sense of threat experienced in personally important situations where people seek acceptance but are concerned about the prospect of rejection. Participants
imagined 18 situations (e.g., “You ask your friend to do you a big favor”) and indicated the anxiety they would experience in the situation (1=‘very unconcerned’, 6=‘very concerned’) and the likelihood they would be accepted (1=‘very unlikely’, 6=‘very likely’). Anxious expectations of rejection are captured by weighting rejection expectation (reverse of acceptance) by the anxiety score and then computing a cross-situational average score (RS range = 1-36, high values indicate greater sensitivity to rejection).

The RSQ was used as a control variable to assess whether women who scored as high or low in RSQ were sensitive to rejection in general or were particularly sensitive to gender based-rejection. All reported RS-Gender findings hold when controlling for general interpersonal RS, and thus interpersonal RS is not discussed further.

**Extraction of Speech Samples**

To assess phonetic accommodation, between-talker verbatim repetitions of region label phrases from the Negotiation task were selected for rater similarity judgments (see Pardo, 2006). To minimize effects of repetition latency in the conversation, only region label repetitions uttered within a 1-minute interval were included (most were within 10 seconds), and repetitions were selected equally from the first and second half of the conversation. To minimize first mention effects, the first utterance of a region label term in the negotiation was excluded. In order to explain the construction of the similarity judgment task, I will refer to the participants recorded on the Left channel and the participants recorded on the Right channel. Left and Right recording channels are arbitrary and not confounded with any of the experimental conditions. To assess direction of accommodation, 3 region repetitions where the Left’s
utterance preceded the Right’s and 3 where the Right’s preceded the Left’s utterance were chosen for each pair. Once 6 repetitions were chosen for each pair, corresponding region label utterances were extracted from each partner’s Pre-task recordings.

Label utterances were extracted from Pre- and Negotiation-Task recordings using Praat (www.praat.org) and Soundstudio software (www.felttip.com). Minimal digital editing was used to remove all items from their contexts—in sentences from Pre-Negotiation Task or within conversation during the Negotiation Task. Label utterances were extracted from recordings by cutting at the beginning and end of the utterance at zero-crossings in Soundstudio, and using spectrograms in Praat to decipher phonological divisions if articulations were compacted within the speech context of the utterance.

Temporal Classification. As mentioned above, region label repetitions were selected equally from the first and second half of each of the dyadic conversations. The repetitions were classified as occurring either Early or Late in the conversation if they occurred in the first or second half of the conversation, respectively. The temporal classification of repetitions permitted an analysis of the effect of the independent variables on the time course of accommodation during the interaction; however, I found no interactive effects of time (Early vs. Late repetition) with the other independent variables of interest so temporal classification is not discussed further.

Method: Perceptual Judgment Phase

Participants

Participants were college students who received either course credit or $10, provided similarity judgments for the samples. Participants’ judgments were excluded if
they were not native American-English speakers or technical problems occurred. Details about participants are contained in each individual study chapter.

**Perceptual Judgment Task**

New participants were recruited to judge the phonetic similarity of the speech samples from the Negotiation task in an AXB test (see Goldinger, 1998; Namy et al., 2002; Pardo, 2006). The test was designed to assess the degree to which each talker’s speech changed during the task in response to the speech of the partner. Although acoustic measures of speech accommodation may examine individual attributes of the speech signal, the use of a perceptual similarity test provides a more global measure of speech accommodation as detected by ordinary raters. On each trial, an utterance produced by one talker (focal utterance—X) was presented at 200 ms interstimulus interval between two utterances of the same phrase repetition produced by the talker’s partner (partner utterances—A/B). The flanking items produced by the partner were the Negotiation-Task repetition (the utterance repeated by the partner after the talker’s utterance) and the Pre-Task (baseline) version of the region label phrase. The raters judged which of the utterances by the talker’s partner, was more similar to the focal middle utterance made by the talker: the talker’s partner’s Negotiation task repetition (scored 100%) or the talker’s partner’s Pre-Task utterance (scored 0%). Scores were averaged over multiple trial presentations to index the percentage of trials in which accommodation occurred. If phonetic accommodation occurs, then the talker and partner Negotiation-Task repetitions should sound more similar than talker and partner Pre-Task utterance.
**Materials & Procedures**

Participants were instructed to judge the similarity of speech samples based on the talkers’ pronunciation of consonants and vowels, and to disregard other differences like pitch or speech rate. Stimuli were presented over Sennheiser HD280 headphones connected to Macintosh G3 computers running PsyScope (Cohen, Mac Whinney, Flatt, & Provost, 1993), and responses were collected via keyboard. Each AXB trial was presented 6 times in mixed random order (blocked by pair) and counterbalanced for item ordering (i.e., AXB vs. BXA). To avoid overtaxing participants, each participant made similarity ratings on only 4 of the dyads, one randomly chosen from each of the experimental conditions (Threat vs. No Threat).
Study 1

Dispositional & Situational Gender Identity Threat in Same-Gender Negotiations:
Speech accommodation & relational outcomes

Introduction

The dyadic goal of negotiation is to reach an agreement, thus the successful comprehension of information exchanged at the bargaining table is crucial. Interactants align their speech to accomplish instrumental tasks when information comprehension is important (Aguilar et al., 2011; Pardo, 2006; Pickering & Garrod, 2004). In the absence of identity threat concerns negotiators should align their speech accommodation. However, when women are concerned about their gender identity being a disadvantage in negotiation, that is, they are high in sensitivity to gender based rejection, this may disrupt the mutual speech accommodation process, which in addition to serving an information transmission function serves an affiliative function that is consequential for relationship formation.

Some women may experience a greater sense of threat about being disadvantaged because of their gender in male-typed domains. For such women, the salience of negative gender stereotypes should compound their concerns about gender disadvantage and lower their level speech accommodation behavior relative to women who are less concerned. As speech accommodation promotes feelings of social connection in its recipient, a reduction in accommodation should undercut social connection. Given that negotiations often take place within ongoing occupational
relationships, it is important to establish or maintain a positive relationship. Thus, Study 1 aims to examine how both situational and dispositional gender identity threat affect speech accommodation behavior and relational outcomes in same-gender negotiations.

**Speech Accommodation & Gender Identity Threat**

*Situational Identity Threat.* There is considerable evidence that identity threat undermines performance in instrumental situations (e.g. testing or academic achievement). It has been suggested that identity threat might act like a self-fulfilling prophecy, whereby the apprehension about confirming negative stereotypes leads to underperformance (Steele & Aronson, 1995). On the other hand, when individuals are assured that their identity should be unrelated to performance, the identity threat is neutralized and a state of identity safety is created. This state counteracts the threat-induced underperformance. In the same way, in the current study one female in the dyad was always assured that there were no gender differences in negotiation performance on this particular task and that her performance on the task was not diagnostic of future success.

The stereotype threat model by Steele and colleagues (Steele, 2010) explains how apprehension about stereotype confirmation undercut performance on instrumental tasks completed alone (e.g., standardized tests). Within the identity threat framework, considerably less attention has been paid to interpersonal effects of identity threat. Drawing on the rejection sensitivity framework, the present study asks how identity based concerns affect interpersonal communication and impression formation. Thus, in this study I will explore whether identity threat leads to apprehension about
being rejected on the basis of gender in the male-typed domain of negotiation, which may then lead to relational disruption and ultimately, social rejection.

The dissertation builds on work showing that expecting to be treated on the basis of a devalued identity can lead to negative relational experiences in social interaction (Shelton, Richeson, & Salvatore, 2005). Therefore, there is a basis for predicting that making gender stereotypes salient before a negotiation triggers a threat state that may disrupt relational processes during the negotiation. Those women in a heightened identity threat state are likely to show lower speech accommodation, which may ultimately damage the social impressions they create.

*Dispositional Identity Threat Within Negotiations.* Women who have experienced gender-based rejection, whether personally or vicariously, in the past may come to expect and be concerned that they will experience it again in the future. In social situations where gender concerns are relevant—like traditionally male domains—women who have been sensitized to gender-based rejection are more likely to expect and be concerned that they will be judged or rejected by others on the basis of their gender. For example, imagine that around the table at a corporate board meeting a woman offers her opinion on a new account. A women who has anxious expectations of gender-based rejection may be concerned that her opinion won't be taken seriously or that her work will be judged by different standards. On the other hand, situations that do not carry the threat of gender-based rejection—like gender-neutral domains where women and men are equally represented—should not raise these concerns. In the current study I examined how women’s dispositional expectations of gender-based
rejection affect speech accommodation when they are explicitly reminded in the negotiation setting that others hold low expectations for women in negotiation.

London and colleagues (London, Romero-Canyas, Downey, Rattan & Tyson, under review) have created a measure of women’s sensitivity to gender-based rejection, which assesses the extent to which women have anxious expectations of rejection in gender-relevant settings. The RS-gender measure captures the sense of threat that women feel that their gender may be a disadvantage in social-evaluative situations, that is, when their outcomes depend on others. Women higher in sensitivity to gender-based rejection (HiRS-gender) tend to anxiously expect rejection based on gender relative to women lower in sensitivity to gender-based rejection (LoRS-gender). In competitive, historically male contexts, women higher in RS-gender are more likely than are LoRS-gender women to show self-silencing to prevent rejection and to feel alienated and reduced motivation following the perception of gender-based rejection and coping with self-silencing.

Women high in RS-gender under threat are likely to view negotiation not as a cooperative interaction to resolve a joint task, but as an adversarial interaction. For example research shows that women high in interpersonal rejection sensitivity tend to see unresolved issues in relationships as unsolvable and likely to lead to rejection and become more dejected and hostile towards partners when discussing these issues (Downey, et al., 1998). In this example, negotiating a resolution about a relationship issue is perceived as a threat of rejection and leads those high in sensitivity to rejection to display behaviors that push others away and are likely to actually elicit rejection. Women high in RS-gender likely view negotiations as only adversarial and as such may
not display affiliative behavior towards negotiation partners. In organizational settings, if women high in RS-gender are failing to connect with negotiation partners, this could negatively impact their organizational relationships and the impressions they make on others, which may ultimately affect advancement.

Speech Accommodation by Identity Threatened Women. As one of the functions of speech accommodation is to align mental representations, mutual accommodation should occur during negotiations in the absence of identity threat. However, women higher in RS-gender are likely to have heightened concerns about being rejected on the basis of their gender under threat, which should disrupt the instrumental alignment process. In social-evaluative situations this alignment disruption may occur because women high in RS-gender are likely to be concerned with how their negotiation task behavior will reflect on the self and could elicit rejection, while those low in RS-gender likely to be more concerned simply with the negotiation task demands.

Research on RS-gender in a competitive, traditionally male setting shows that women may distance themselves from the threat of evaluation. In a law school women higher in RS-gender decrease their participation in the classroom by raising their hand less as the course progresses, and furthermore, when they do participate they feel increasingly worse about themselves (London et al., 2011). Women higher in RS-gender have been shown to avoid opportunities for one-on-one evaluation and assistance in academic settings in order to avoid the threat of rejection, which may ultimately hinder their opportunities for success and advancement (London et al., 2011). Thus when women high in RS-gender perceive more evaluative threat, they reduce their approach behavior to self-protect—to avoid the rejection they might otherwise face if
they offered their opinions and made themselves vulnerable to rejection. I argue that these decreases in participation in and avoidance of evaluative situations may be one way that women high in RS-gender maintain the psychological distance between themselves and the threat of rejection, and that within dyadic negotiations they may also behave in ways that increase psychological distance under identity threat.

Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) reasons that when threatened socially, individuals will create psychological distance between themselves and others during interaction, and decreases in speech accommodation are a subtle way that individuals manifest this psychological distance (Shepard, Giles, & Le Poire, 2001). If identity threat leads to relative decreases in speech accommodation, then women in a heightened threat state should show less speech accommodation. Therefore women higher in RS-gender explicitly threatened on the basis of gender identity are likely to show lower speech accommodation during interaction to protect the self, but this should come at an interpersonal cost.

When one fails to reduce the psychological distance between themselves and an interactant with non-speech accommodation, CAT predicts that this should result in less affiliation between the two interactants (Shepard, Giles, & Le Poire, 2001). Thus, greater similarity of speech between interactants should lead to increased affiliation, but less speech accommodation should lead to less affiliation. Evidence from my prior research finds that this is indeed the case—speech accommodation leads to more liking but when one’s speech accommodation is not reciprocated by a partner, the partner is liked less (Aguilar et al., 2011). If HiRS-gender women show less speech
accommodation during negotiation when faced with an explicit identity threat as predicted, then their negotiation partners should feel less connection to them.

Speech Accommodation Towards Identity Threatened Women. I also examined speech accommodation from negotiation partners towards Hi and LoRS-gender women negotiators under identity threat. In negotiation, interactants should mutually increase speech accommodation, as negotiation tasks require alignment of mental representation and perspective (Aguilar et al., 2011; Pardo, 2006; Pickering & Garrod, 2004). If women higher in RS-gender accommodate less under threat as predicted, then the instrumental task demands for mutual alignment in the dyad will not be met. Thus, partners of women high in RS-gender may compensate with an increase speech accommodation to meet instrumental task demands. It is also possible that partners of women higher in RS-gender will perceive the threatened state of such women and increase their accommodation out of a motivation to reduce their discomfort. Alternatively, it is also possible that the partners of women high in RS-gender may reciprocally show lower accommodation in response to the lack of their partner’s accommodation.

Interpersonal Impressions

As relational connection in negotiation is important for rapport in the interaction and future dealings, the current study assessed interpersonal impressions from the negotiators. I predict that women in an identity threatened state are likely to make an unfavorable impression on their negotiation partner. Specifically, I predict that when faced with a situational identity threat, women who are especially concerned with gender-based rejection will show less speech accommodation, and they should also
elicit less perceived connection from their negotiation partners. That is, partners of women with relatively higher anxious expectations of rejection should like such women less and have less desire to continue the relationship. The results of this study should shed light on the subtle ways identity threat affects interpersonal outcomes for women.

**Study Overview**

To test how identity threat affects communication and interpersonal outcomes, I examined women’s speech accommodation behavior during negotiations when negative stereotypes about women were made salient and also examined whether women who anxiously expected rejection based on their gender would show lower speech accommodation relative to unconcerned women. I had female dyads engage in a competitive negotiation, and measured their level of RS-gender. Right before the women entered the negotiation they were given the identity threat manipulation. Either they were assured that there were no known gender differences in this type of negotiation (*No Threat condition*), or were explicitly reminded of negative stereotypes about women in negotiations (*Threat condition*). One partner in the dyad was always in the no threat condition while their partner was randomly selected to be in either the Threat or No Threat conditions (see Methodological Overview section for details).

**Hypotheses**

**Speech Accommodation from Identity Threatened Women**

Other things being equal, reciprocal speech accommodation is assumed to be the norm in dyadic interaction dyads (Natale, 1975; Pickering & Garrod, 2004; Welkowitz, Feldstein, Finkelstein, & Ayelsworth, 1972). Thus, in the no threat condition women of Hi and Lo RS-gender should show no differences in speech accommodation
and interpersonal outcomes, since women were assured that there are no gender performance differences in this type of negotiation and should only be concerned with instrumental task demands. Given that gender-based rejection sensitivity is activated by threat cues, the system will not be engaged when there are no threats to gender identity present (Downey and Feldman, 1996; Downey, Mougios, Ayduk, London, & Shoda, 2004). When the situational cues do not elicit threat, as in the no threat condition, RS-gender should not affect speech accommodation.

On the other hand, those that have both expectations of rejection and threats to their identity in an interaction may exhibit decreased levels of speech accommodation (Bourhis & Giles, 1977). In the identity threat condition, women high in RS-gender would be more threatened by the possibility of gender disadvantage, while those low in RS-gender would be less threatened. Specifically, I predict that under threat women high in RS-gender will show lower speech accommodation relative to women low in RS-gender. If women low in RS-gender exhibit more speech accommodation towards their negotiation partners than women high in RS-gender, then negotiation partners of LoRS-gender women should also feel more connection and affiliation with them, while partners of women high in RS-gender should feel less connection and affiliation with them.

**Speech Accommodation Towards Identity Threatened Women**

This study will also explore how partners of Hi and LoRS-gender women accommodate their speech to such women. In the No Threat condition, I do not expect any RS-gender differences in partner accommodation. In the Threat condition it may be that partners will accommodate to women high in RS-gender more than to women low
in RS-gender in response to HiRS-gender’s decreased accommodation, as an instrumentally compensatory behavior. That is, partners of women high in RS-gender may increase their speech accommodation to compensate for HiRS-gender women’s decrease in accommodation in order to facilitate instrumental negotiation task demands to align representation and reach agreement. It may also be that partners of women high in RS-gender under threat may increase speech accommodation towards such women in response to cues of threat from high RS-gender women.

**Interpersonal Impressions**

Finally, I predict that speech accommodation should elicit perceived connection—liking and desire to continue the relationship—from negotiation partners. If women high in gender-based rejection sensitivity show relatively less speech accommodation under threat as predicted, then partners of women high in gender-based rejection sensitivity should also perceive less connection to such women.

**Method**

**Method: Recording Phase**

**Participants & Design**

Study 1 participants were 90 female undergraduates, scheduled in dyads (45 dyads—23 Threat condition, 22 No Threat condition). To test our hypotheses I used a mixed model design (Identity Threat: Threat vs. No Threat) x RS-gender (RS-gender measured continuously). Within a given dyad, one participant was always given the no threat condition, while the other was randomly assigned to either the identity threat or no threat conditions. RS-gender, a dispositional measure of gender-based rejection sensitivity, was treated as a continuous variable: It varied within and between dyads and
was uncorrelated with Threat condition ($b = .06\%$, $t (38) = .07$, $p = .95$). All participants were native American-English speakers who reported not having hearing or speech disorders. They were compensated with $20 or with course credit.

**Recapitulation of Procedure**

Upon arrival to the laboratory, participants 1) completed the baseline Pre-Negotiation Task recordings, 2) read the negotiation task directions packet, with the threat manipulation embedded therein, 3) engaged in the negotiation, while Negotiation Task recordings were taken, 4) completed the final questionnaire packet with individual differences (RS-gender/RS-personal) and interpersonal impressions measures.

**Interpersonal Impressions Measures**

**Perceived Connection.** The perceived connection composite was formed by averaging the scores of participants’ responses to 4 items assessing their attitudes toward the interaction and their partner (e.g., How much do you like your partner?/How excited are you to meet your partner (face-to-face)?/How bonded do you feel with your partner?/ How much would you like to spend more time with your partner?). Items were answered on a 6-point scale 1 = Not at all, 6 = Completely/Extremely). The mean was 3.34 ($SD = 1.07; \alpha = 0.88$). This scale captures the extent to which partners felt connected to actors (see Actor – Partner Interdependence Model (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006)).

**Method: Perceptual Judgment Phase**

**Participants**

One hundred seventy-six college students (96 Females, 80 Males), who received either course credit or $10, provided similarity judgments for the samples. Four
participant's judgments were excluded because they were not native American-English speakers or technical problems occurred.

**Results**

**Analysis**

*Phonetic Accommodation.* The AXB judgments were scored as average percentage across trials in which a partner’s Negotiation-task repetition was considered more similar to a talker’s focal Negotiation-task utterance than the partner’s Pre-task speech sample (*task accommodation*). Percentage accommodation varies around 50% chance as each trial received either a 0% or 100% score. Thus if AXB raters did not perceive any similarities or differences in Pre-task and Negotiation task utterances, scores would average to 50%. Scores above 50% indicate rater perceived phonetic accommodation, at or below 50% indicate non-accommodation.

By design, RS-gender is a mixed independent variable, it varies within and between dyads. RS-gender is measured continuously, but contrasts and graphical representations are plotted at 1 SD (3.81) above and below the sample mean (6.02). Threat condition is a between-dyad independent variable, but only one participant in each dyad was randomly chosen to receive either the threat or no threat condition. The dependent variable, accommodation, is also mixed because raters provided separate assessments of accommodation for each individual in each dyad. With this type of mixed design, actor and partner effects can be disentangled (Kenny, Kashy & Bolger, 1998; Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006). An RS-gender actor effect refers to how much one's own level of RS predicts one's accommodation to one's partner. An RS-gender partner effect refers to how much the partner's RS-gender predicts one's
accommodation to one’s partner. For example, imagine that you and a HiRS-gender participant X are working together on the task. An actor effect is how much the HiRS-gender participant X’s accommodates towards you. A partner effect is how much working with HiRS-gender participant X affects your accommodation towards her. To simultaneously assess actor and partner effects, the analyses treated each dyad member as both an actor and as a partner.

Data were analyzed using a multilevel regression model, implemented in PROC MIXED, a component of the SAS STAT 9.2 software (SAS Institute, 2008). To account for the non-independence of the data due to (a) repeated assessments by the same rater and (b) the pairing of participants in interaction dyads, both rater and dyad were treated as random effects. All other independent variables were treated as fixed effects. The current analyses used the most conservative approach in calculating degrees of freedom for statistical tests in multilevel models, and based them on the number of independently sampled dyads (Littell, Milliken, Stroup, Wolfinger & Schabenberger, 2006).

**Accommodation During the Negotiation Task**

As expected, there was no significant main effect of Identity Threat (Threat $M = 53.82$, No Threat $M = 52.96$, $b = .87\%$, $t (43) = .78$, $p > .44$). There was a significant main effect of RS-gender ($b = -.47\%$, $t (43) = -2.96$, $p = .005$), whereby those women high in RS-gender exhibited less speech accommodation than those low in RS-gender; however, this effect was driven by the interaction with Threat Condition as there were no differences in RS-gender in the No Threat condition. As hypothesized and shown in Figure 1, there was a significant interaction between Identity Threat X RS-gender ($b =
11.18%, $t(43) = 2.59, p = .01$). Planned contrasts showed that within the Threat condition, LoRS-gender women accommodated their speech significantly more than HiRS-gender women ($t(43) = -3.25, p > .002$). The accommodation level of Hi and LoRS-gender women in the No Threat condition did not significantly differ from each other ($t(43) = -0.48, p = .63$). Also, LoRS-Gender women accommodated their speech significantly more in the Threat condition than the No Threat condition ($t(43) = 2.38, p = .02$), while HiRS-gender women accommodated less in the Threat condition than the No Threat condition although the test did not reach significance ($t(43) = -1.34, p = .18$).

![The Effect of Identity Threat x RS-Gender on Speech Accommodation](image)

*Figure 1: Speech accommodation from actor to partner in identity threat and no identity threat conditions by RS-gender of actor. RS-gender is plotted at 1 SD above and below the sample mean. Error bars show standard errors of means.*

As shown in Figure 2, there was a significant interaction between partners' Identity Threat X Partners' RS-gender on actors' accommodation ($b = .99\%, t(43) = 3.62, p = .002$). Planned contrasts showed that within the Threat condition, partners of
HiRS-gender women accommodated their speech significantly more than partners LoRS-gender women ($t(43) = 3.07, p = .004$), but there are no differences between partners of Hi and LoRS-gender in the No Threat condition ($t(43) = -1.07, p = .28$). Also, partners of HiRS-Gender women accommodated their speech significantly more in the Threat condition than the No Threat condition ($t(43) = 2.11, p = .04$), while partners of LoRS-gender women accommodated significantly less in the Threat condition than the No Threat condition ($t(43) = -2.58, p = .01$).

Additionally, I found a significant effect of actor accommodation on partner accommodation, meaning that the more an actor accommodated towards her partner, the more the partner reciprocated the accommodation ($b = .52\%, t(43) = 44.41, p < .0001$). Thus, females reciprocally accommodated their speech to one another in
negotiations.

Partner Perceived Connection

As hypothesized and shown in Figure 3, there was a significant interaction between Identity Threat X RS-gender on partner perceived connection ($b = -.12$, $t (43) = 2.07$, $p = .04$). Planned contrasts reveal that within the Threat condition, partners of LoRS-gender women perceived significantly more connection with the LoRS-gender women than partners of HiRS-gender women ($t (43) = 2.46$, $p = .02$). This contrast signifies that within the Threat condition negotiation partners felt more connected to LoRS-gender women than to HiRS-gender women. In the No Threat condition, partners did not perceive any more or less connection to Hi and LoRS-gender women, that is, level of partner perceived connection did not differ between having a negotiation partner who was high or low in RS-gender ($t (43) .11$, $p = .92$).

Figure 3: Partner perceived connection to women in identity threat and no identity threat conditions by RS-gender. RS-gender is plotted at 1 SD above and below the sample mean. Error bars show standard errors of means.
I completed additional analyses to assess whether speech accommodation influences partner perceived connection. As you can see above in Figure 3 partners perceived more connection with Lo-RS gender women under threat than HiRS-gender women under threat; however, there was no direct main effect of speech accommodation on partner perceived connection. A multilevel regression model with dyad treated as a random effect showed that an actor’s level of accommodation alone was a not significant predictor of the partner’s feelings of being accepted by the actor \( (b = .003, t(43) = .40, p = .69) \). I tested whether the effect of accommodation on partner perceived connection becomes apparent when the partner’s behavior and perception in the dyad is taken into account. Specifically I created two difference scores—actor minus partner (actor-partner) speech accommodation and partner minus actor (partner-actor) perceived connection and examined whether dyadic differences in accommodation predicted dyadic differences in perceived connection. There was no significant main effect of accommodation on partner perceived connection at the dyadic level, whereby differences in actor-partner accommodation did not predict differences in partner-actor perceived connection \( (b = .001, t(38) = .19, p = .85) \). This means that the degree of difference in the speech accommodation of the actor relative to the partner did not affect differences in the partner’s liking of the actor. This finding is anomalous and conflicts with the notion that speech accommodation elicits perceived connection within the dyad.

**Discussion**

**Speech Accommodation & Gender Identity Threat**

This study aimed to examine whether women who are faced with gender-based identity threat behave in ways that undermine relationship development in negotiations
as male stereotyped domain. The results reveal that indeed dispositional anxiety and expectancy of gender-based rejection combined with explicit identity threat additively leads to less nonconscious speech accommodation in female negotiation dyads.

*Speech Accommodation by Identity Threatened Women.* In the no threat condition there were no differences by RS-gender, but in the identity threat condition women higher in RS-gender showed lower speech accommodation towards their partners than women lower in RS-gender. Women higher in RS-gender showed a trend of less speech accommodation in the threat condition relative to the no threat condition. Interestingly, women lower in RS-gender actually showed significantly higher speech accommodation towards their partners under threat relative to the no threat condition.

The results suggest that identity threat can cause women who are anxious about discrimination to exhibit less subtle speech accommodation behaviors during negotiation. This finding is consistent CAT, which says that when one’s stigmatized identity is threatened, one is likely to exhibit less speech accommodation and thus maintain psychological distance (Gallois et al., 2005). HiRS-gender women in the threat condition were negotiating under an additive threat, whereby when faced with a situational gender-based threat they were at an increased risk for experiencing apprehension about gender-based rejection in negotiation. This apprehension leads them to decrease affiliative approach behavior and a failure to reduce the psychological distance between themselves and their negotiation partners. Their apprehension also seems to influence negotiation partners to like HiRS-gender women less and prefer not to spend more time with them. This finding is consistent with other types of HiRS-gender decrease in social approach behavior found in daily diary based research.
showing that women high in RS-gender entering competitive law school are more likely to self-silence their opinions following a sexist experience and to avoid threatening evaluative opportunities (London et al., under review). In the same study HiRS-gender women reported feeling alienated after such withdrawal (London et al., under review). London, Gonzalez and Jannone (2011) also found that anxious expectations of gender rejection predicted withdrawal and avoidance strategies. Thus, the current study is finding a similar HiRS-gender distancing dynamic, in nonconscious behavior at the dyadic level. Women high in RS-gender may be distancing themselves out of motivation to self-protect under threat in the current study; however, this failure to exhibit approach behavior is paralleled by a failure to elicit liking from negotiation partners.

Women anxious about gender-based rejection end up engaging in a self-fulfilling prophecy under threat, whereby they fail to create rapport with their fellow negotiators. It demonstrates that concern about gender in social-evaluative settings can undermine women’s relational performance, which may damage relationship formation and ultimately hinder women’s career success. However, it also highlights a way to uplift women—neutralizing the anxiety and expectation of gender-based rejection may improve women’s interpersonal relations.

Identity threat was neutralized in two different scenarios in the current study—assurance of gender equality in the no threat condition and also by women who entered the negotiation without dispositional anxious expectations of rejection. Women low in RS-gender actually increased their speech accommodation behavior, which seemed to pay off (although the direct link between accommodation and connection was not found)—LoRS gender women were liked more by their interaction partners. The
increase in speech accommodation is consistent with findings from London et al.’s (2011) research on how women low in RS-gender confront and engage with a source of threat when gender has been implicated in a social-evaluative situation. Thus, rather than distance themselves, women low in RS-gender are reducing psychological distance during negotiation, which may be motivated by their attention to task demands for alignment or perhaps a willingness to directly confront gender-based threat. If the latter motivates them, women low in RS-gender might be displaying a reactance orientation to identity threat (Kray et al., 2001). Future research should address the motivations behind LoRS-gender women’s approach reaction to explicit identity threat in order to identify means for resilience under threat.

As predicted, identity threat affected speech accommodation for women higher and lower in RS-gender, but when identity threat was neutralized, speech accommodation was mutually increased towards negotiation partners regardless of RS-gender. One female partner in each dyad received the no threat condition—were assured that their gender would have no bearing on their negotiation performance, which countered female interpersonal disadvantage. It is important to note that this type of identity safety assurance may have different implications on men and women, as their identities hold positive and negative implications for their performance, respectively (Walton & Cohen, 2003). One of the reasons for having mixed-gender dyads negotiate in the following investigation (Study 2) was to explore how gender-neutral assurance affected men’s speech accommodation behavior in reaction to female negotiation partners.
Speech Accommodation Towards Identity Threatened Women. The results of this dyadic study also bring to light how partners react to negotiating with a woman who is operating under situational and dispositional gender-based threat. There were no differences in partners’ accommodation towards women higher or lower in RS-gender when gender-based concerns were neutralized, in the no threat condition. The partner results in the threat condition are in direct opposition to the actor results discussed above—partners of women high in RS-gender women under identity threat display more speech accommodation than partners of women low in RS-gender women under identity threat.

Greater partner accommodation to women high in RS-gender may have been a compensatory response to meet negotiation task demands. Speech accommodation also serves to create shared representation and comprehension, as well as affiliation (Aguilar et al., 2011; Gallois et al., 2005). In negotiation it is important to come to common ground and a shared perspective (Echterhoff, Higgins, Levine, 2009). Thus when women high in RS-gender showed less of expected increase in speech accommodation, their partners might have increased their own accommodation in order to facilitate reaching a shared perspective in the dyad. At the dyadic level, partners of women high in RS-gender under threat may have been compensating in their own speech accommodation to meet instrumental task demands.

It is also possible that under threat HiRS-gender women may have been displaying behavior that conveyed cues of their threatened state to their partners and which ultimately elicited speech accommodation from their partners. These data cannot speak to exactly what distress or threat cues women high in RS-gender may have
conveyed above and beyond a decrease in speech accommodation; however, the possibility warrants future research.

**Interpersonal Impressions**

Nonverbal mimicry in same ingroup interaction has been found to lead to perceived connection and social bonding (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Lakin, Jeffris, Cheng & Chartrand, 2003). A recent study found that speech accommodation, and specifically phonetic accommodation—analogous to the type assessed in the present study—also leads to perceived connection (Aguilar, Downey, Krauss, Pardo & Bolger, under review). The current study found that when faced with an explicit gender identity threat, women higher in RS-gender, who displayed less speech accommodated, were liked less than those lower in RS-gender. Furthermore, the very partners who accommodated their speech to high RS-gender women under threat liked them less than women lower in RS-gender. Surprisingly, in the present study phonetic speech accommodation alone did not directly increase perceived connection from the partner—rather it was RS-gender and situational identity threat that predicted perceived connection outcomes. This means that either phonetic speech accommodation does not consistently lead to affiliative outcomes, or that under threat high and low in RS-gender women convey other verbal communication cues (negotiators could not see each other) that lead to disparate affiliative outcomes. The differences between the findings of past studies and the current study could also be explained by the nature of the interaction task. Past studies have measured perceived connection outcomes from mimicry in cooperative, affiliative interactions. The current study assessed mimicry in a competitive environment. Thus, the socio-environmental setting, and the cooperative-competitive
nature of the task, may affect whether mimicry leads to mutual perceived connection between individuals. Although more research is needed to conclusively determine why accommodation did not elicit liking directly, this study provides some evidence that the interpersonal outcomes of speech accommodation may have boundary conditions.

When faced with an explicit identity threat, women high in RS-gender were liked more by their partners than women low in RS-gender. Said another way, partners of women low in RS-gender perceived more connection with and desired to continue the relationship more with women low in RS-gender than with women high in RS-gender under threat. Thus women high in RS-gender do appear to enact a self-fulfilling prophecy, whereby their apprehension about rejection affects their social behavior in negotiations when they are reminded about others’ gender-based low evaluative expectations, in the end, this undermines relationship formation and the impressions they create.

Conclusion

The general goal of this study was to examine whether identity threat affected social interaction, communication, and subsequent interpersonal outcomes. This study has demonstrated that identity threat has the power to affect subtle communication behaviors during social interaction amongst women who are particularly concerned or unconcerned with gender disadvantage in traditionally male settings. This research is consistent with stereotype literature finding that there are individual differences in reactions and susceptibility to identity threat (Brown & Pinel, 2003; Davies, Spencer, Quinn, & Gerhardstein, 2002; Keller & Molix, 2007; Schmader, 2002). Furthermore, this study shows that under identity threat RS-gender affects whether interactants connect
relationally during negotiations. These interpersonal connection outcomes implicate that together heightened gender-based rejection sensitivity and situational identity threat may have repercussions for relationship formation in work settings for women in traditionally male domains, where negotiation is commonplace and relationships are important for career advancement.
Study 2

Gender Identity Threat in Mixed-Gender Negotiations: Speech accommodation & relational outcomes

Introduction

Study 2 examines how female gender identity threat affects speech accommodation behavior and relational outcomes in mixed-gender negotiations. Speech accommodation expressed in dyadic negotiation should lead to more perceived connection and a willingness to continue the relationship—important relational outcomes for successful negotiations—but identity threat should disrupt this dyadic accommodation-affiliation process for threatened women negotiating with men.

Mixed-Gender Negotiation as Identity Threat Context. Mixed-gender negotiations may be more threatening for women than same-gender dyads because of gender stereotypes about male superiority in negotiation and how such stereotypes inform men’s expectations of women’s negotiation competence (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Kray & Thompson, 2005). Further, a woman’s own gender identity and associated negotiation skill stereotypes, may be more dispositionally accessible, salient, and related to the sense of self when in mixed-gender contexts (Cota & Dion, 1986; Higgins, King & Mavin, 1982; Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000). Negotiating with men may put women under the microscope, where they are likely to feel scrutinized and judged by their male counterparts, and may have the burden of additional impression management that men do not carry (Kray & Thompson, 2005). Thus, a women may worry about being devalued and rejected on the basis of her gender when negotiating with a man, a man
who she may believe holds negative stereotypes about her and also who she may perceive to benefit from positive stereotypes about men in negotiation.

Mixed-gender negotiations are not only likely to be more threatening than same-gender negotiations, but are also a more common occurrence given female underrepresentation in traditionally male domains. Also, as women’s representation increases in these domains it becomes ever more important to understand how men react to negotiating with women. In the current investigation I study how women and men each use speech accommodation and form interpersonal impressions both when gender stereotypes are made salient to women and when negotiation is characterized as gender-neutral.

*Situational Identity Threat Within Mixed-Gender Negotiations.* Drawing on Steele and colleagues’ (Steele, 2010) stereotype threat model, when gender stereotypes are made salient, women should underperform instrumentally. That is, the apprehension about confirming the negative stereotypes about a devalued identity in an evaluative setting leads to performance disruption caused by anxiety and cognitive load. The current study assessed instrumental negotiation outcomes and, following the stereotype threat model, I expect threat will lead to negotiation performance decrements for women. In the current study I will measure both relational outcomes—perceived connection and interpersonal impressions, and instrumental outcomes—value claimed during the negotiation—for men and women.

**Speech Accommodation & Gender Identity Threat**

*Speech Accommodation by Identity Threatened Women.* The absence of identity threat should result in mutual accommodation by negotiators, as behavioral
accommodation facilitates shared representation, rapport, and instrumental outcomes in negotiation. However, situational and dispositional identity threat should disrupt this dyadic alignment process. Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) predicts that when individuals' social identity is threatened they will display non-accommodation during social interaction stemming from a motivation to create psychological distance between themselves and outgroup members (Bourhis & Giles, 1977; Shepard, Giles, & Le Poire, 2001). Thus, identity threat is hypothesized to disrupt mutual accommodation in the dyad and may reflect motivation to self-protect under threat. If identity threat leads to a relative decrease in speech accommodation as demonstrated in Study 1, then negotiating with a man when gender stereotypes are made salient—an especially threatening context—should also lead to disruption in dyadic mutual accommodation and specifically to a reduction in female accommodation. Evidence from my prior research finds that when a partner does not reciprocate one's speech accommodation, the partner is liked less (Aguilar et al., 2011). In the current study I expect that women faced with identity threat should display relatively less speech accommodation towards male partners, which should also lead to liking the woman less and forming less favorable impressions of her.

In Study 1, I found that chronic (RS-gender) and situational identity threat additively reduced women's speech accommodation and also partner's perceived connection to these threatened women. Thus, it was women in a particularly threatened state who were the most affected. In the current study, women who have been exposed to explicit negative stereotypes while negotiating with a man should be threatened and chronic sensitivity to gender-based rejection should theoretically heighten the level of
threat, following the results of Study 1. However, negotiating with a man could be threatening for all women, and heightened threat may occur regardless of women’s particular dispositional concern about gender disadvantage.

Speech Accommodation Towards Identity Threatened Women. This study also examines men’s speech accommodation patterns towards women under identity threat. When people have similar identity concerns during negotiation they should accommodate mutually as one of the functions of speech accommodation is instrumentally motivated—to build a shared representation or understanding (Gallois et al., 2005). However, when individuals are faced with different identity concerns this discrepancy should lead to discrepancies in speech accommodation behavior in the dyad. Study 1 found that negotiation partners of women who were particularly threatened (HiRS-gender women) accommodated their speech more to these women than to those who were less threatened (LoRS-gender women). I hypothesized that the increase in partner accommodation could serve instrumental motivation to maintain shared representation but that it could also reflect the negotiation partner perceiving distress from the threatened individual. If the latter is true, then signals of distress may elicit increases in accommodation from male negotiation counterparts. Following the results of Study 1, I expect male negotiations partners to accommodate their speech more to women under identity threat than to those not threatened.

Men were always subjected to the no threat condition in this study, meaning that they were assured of no known gender differences in and non-diagnosticity of performance on this type of negotiation task. Men and women may or may not react differently to this gender identity neutralization in their relational behavior. Men’s
instrumental performance is actually bolstered when reminded about gender differences, in a process known as stereotype lift, but explicit invalidation of the link between gender and performance abolishes the stereotype lift effect (Walton & Cohen, 2003). Study 2 will examine the possible differential effects of gender in the no threat condition on both relational and instrumental outcomes.

Taken all together, the stereotype threat and speech accommodation literature point to two predictions for the current study: 1) when the female identity is threatened women are likely to accommodate less towards male partners leading to less perceived social connection and less favorable interpersonal impressions; 2) male partners should accommodate their speech more towards threatened women leading to more perceived social connection and more favorable interpersonal impressions.

**Interpersonal Impressions**

Study 2 will examine how female identity threat affects women and men’s impressions of each other. Independent observers rate individuals implicitly primed with identity threat as more anxious, uncomfortable, and awkward in social interactions (Bosson, Haymovitz, & Pinel, 2003), yet research has not examined how individuals actually involved in an interaction perceive each other and behave under identity threat. This raises the questions: 1) How will male negotiators perceive women under identity threat? 2) How will female negotiators under identity threat view their male counterparts? 3) How will identity threat affect social connection and attraction between men and women? 4) Will patterns of interpersonal impressions mirror speech accommodation patterns such that increases in accommodation elicit perceived connection?
Women faced with an explicit identity threat have been found to act in counter-stereotypical ways in negotiations (Kray et al., 2001). Curhan and Overbeck (2008) found that in same-gender dyads when individuals were motivated to make good impressions they acted in a counter-stereotypical manner during negotiations, but this led to more liking for men and less liking for women. They argue that motivation to make a good impression makes stereotyped qualities within a given domain salient, which leads to reacting against stereotypical behavior. In the current study stereotypes are explicitly made salient and following the impression management logic, then women should behave in ways that create counter-stereotypical impressions. In negotiations, that means that women should act more assertive, competitive, and dominant and less warm and less cooperative under identity threat than in the absence of identity threat.

Competitiveness-Warmth Tradeoff. Women who act more competitive and cold during negotiations will be violating gender-norms and expectancies that women should be more warm and cooperative. Violating gender norms comes at a cost. Perceivers rate women who violate gender norms as less likeable, and report less willingness to hire them, and to continue relationships with them (Rudman, 1998). Women who succeed in male-typed domains are derogated and liked less than men in these same domains (Heilman et al., 2004).

It is clear that women working in traditionally male domains face tradeoffs that males do not. Whereas men can be viewed as both competent and likeable, women can only be viewed as either competent or likeable (Heilman et al., 2004). Women are already viewed as less competent overall, so to equal men in competence women are forced to undercut their perceived likeability (Wood & Karten, 1986). In light of the
backlash that women face for violating gender norms, in the current study I am interested in whether explicit stereotype activation would lead to impressions of women as more competitive but would come at the cost of being perceived as less warm and likeable or attractive.

**Study Overview**

In order to explore how gender identity threat affects communication and interpersonal outcomes in mixed-gender negotiations, I examined speech accommodation behavior during negotiations when negative stereotypes about women were made salient. I also examined whether women who are particularly worried about being disadvantaged on the basis of gender would show lower speech accommodation than those that are unconcerned about rejection. I had mixed-gender dyads engage in a competitive negotiation, manipulated exposure to identity threat, and measured RS-gender. Right before entering the negotiation half of the women were explicitly reminded of negative stereotypes about women in negotiations (*Threat condition*), while the other half of the women and all the men were assured that there were no known gender differences in this type of negotiation, which should counteract any identity threat effects (*No Threat condition*) (see Methodological Overview section for details). Thus, the male participant was always in the No Threat condition and his female partner was randomly assigned to either the Threat or No Threat conditions.

**Hypotheses**

**Speech Accommodation by Identity Threatened Women**

I expect that all women exposed to a situational identity threat while negotiating with a male will be especially concerned about gender-based rejection. It is possible
that women who are dispositionally concerned about gender-based rejection (HiRS-gender women) may experience a compounded threat; however, the situational threat may override individual gender-based rejection concern. I expect that in the no identity threat condition differences in speech accommodation between men and women will not emerge—a prediction based on the results of Study 1, where there were no differences in speech accommodation between women high and low in RS-gender when the threat of confirming stereotypes was neutralized. The norm in social interaction, and in instrumental tasks that require perspective alignment, is reciprocal speech accommodation, the expected dynamic in the no threat condition—where participants are assured that there are no gender differences in that particular type of negotiation.

On the other hand, under identity threat, speech accommodation should be disrupted such that there will be a discrepancy in speech accommodation within the dyad. Women under identity threat relative to those not threatened should display relatively less speech accommodation towards male negotiation partners, as negotiating with a male when explicitly reminded of gender stereotypes may be an especially threatening scenario for women. This hypothesis is derived from the results of Study 1, where HiRS-gender women, who were especially threatened when gender stereotypes were made salient, reduced speech accommodation.

**Speech Accommodation Towards Identity Threatened Women**

When women negotiating with men are explicitly exposed to identity threat, relative to explicitly exposed to gender-neutrality in the no threat condition, men may increase their speech accommodation towards them. This hypothesis is based on Study
1 finding that partners of HiRS-gender women, who were especially threatened in the negotiation, accommodated more than partners of LoRS-gender women.

**Interpersonal Outcomes**

*Relational Outcomes.* I predict that speech accommodation should elicit perceived connection—liking and desire to continue the relationship—from negotiation partners. As an entire process—women faced with identity threat should show less speech accommodation relative to their male partners and their male partners should perceive less connection with them and form less favorable impressions of them. Also, if male partners display more accommodation to threatened women relative to unthreatened women, such male partners should elicit more perceived connection from women and women should form more favorable impressions of such men.

*Instrumental Outcomes.* Based on the stereotype threat model (Steele & Aronson, 1995), I predict that identity threat should lead to relative decrements in instrumental performance for women relative to men—as measured by value claimed in points relative to that of negotiation partners’ points in the negotiation task.

**Method**

**Method: Recording Phase**

**Participants & Design**

Study 2 participants were 80 (40 male, 40 female) undergraduates, scheduled in dyads (40 dyads—20 Threat condition, 20 No Threat condition). To test our hypotheses I used a mixed model design (Female Identity Threat: Threat vs. No Threat) x (Gender: Female vs. Male) between-subjects design. Female threat condition was a dichotomous independent variable and varied between dyads but was not crossed within dyads (i.e.
males never received the Threat condition). Threat condition is characterized at the level of the dyad, whereby only the females in the dyad were subjected to the threat manipulation, while males always received the No Threat control condition. Threat condition was uncorrelated with RS-gender ($b = -1.19\%$, $t (38) = .92$, $p = .37$).

Therefore, once again the manipulation of Threat condition was not correlated with RS-gender measures that were taken after the negotiation (see Procedural Recapitulation below). All participants were native American-English speakers who reported not having hearing or speech disorders. They were compensated with $20 or with introductory psychology course credit.

**Recapitulation of Procedure**

The procedure of this study was identical to Study 1, with the exception of the gender composition of the dyad. The current study employed exclusively mixed-gender dyads. Within a given dyad, the male participant was always given the no threat control condition, while the female was randomly assigned to either the identity threat or no threat control conditions. The no threat control condition was designed to neutralize identity threat and act as an identity safety condition—participants were assured that the task was not diagnostic of future success and that there were no known gender differences associated with the negotiation task. Upon arrival to the laboratory participants: 1) completed the baseline Pre-Negotiation Task recordings, 2) read the negotiation task directions packet, with the threat manipulation embedded therein, 3) engaged in the negotiation, while Negotiation Task recordings were taken, 4) completed the final questionnaire packet with individual differences (RS-gender/RS-personal) and interpersonal impressions measures.
**Interpersonal Impressions Measures**

**Perceived Connection.** The perceived connection composite was formed (from a large subset of the items from Study 1) by averaging the scores of participants’ responses to 3 items assessing their attitudes toward the interaction and their partner (e.g., How much do you like your partner? How excited are you to meet your partner? How much would you like to spend more time with your partner?). Items were answered on a 6-point scale (1 = not at all, 6 = completely/extremely). The mean was 3.44 (SD = 0.85; \( \alpha = 0.71 \)). This scale captures the extent to which partners felt connected to actors (see Actor–Partner Interdependence Model (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006) explained above).

**Competitiveness.** The competitiveness composite was formed by averaging the scores of participants’ responses to 3 items assessing their impressions of their partner (How competitive/superior/dominant is your partner?) Items were answered on a 6-point scale (1 = not at all, 6 = very). The mean was 3.3 (SD = 0.64; \( \alpha = 0.71 \)).

**Warmth.** The warmth composite was formed by averaging the scores of participants’ responses to 2 items assessing their impressions of their partner (How warm/accommodating is your partner?) Items were answered on a 6-point scale (1 = not at all, 6 = very). The mean was 3.66 (SD = 0.77; \( \alpha = 0.62 \)).

**Competitiveness-warmth tradeoff.** The competitiveness-warmth variable was formed by creating a difference score between the competitiveness and warmth scales (competitive minus warmth). This variable measured whether participants were seen as more competitive relative to warm and vice versa, and allowed for assessment of
whether men and women incurred tradeoffs between the two dimensions. The mean was -0.36 (SD = 1.15).

**Attractiveness.** The attractiveness outcome measure was a single item assessing participants’ impressions of their partner (How attractive is your partner?) Items were answered on a 6-point scale (1 = not at all, 6 = very). The mean was 3.21 (SD = 1.26).

**Method: Perceptual Judgment Phase**

**Participants**

One hundred ninety-six college students (102 Females, 94 Males), who received either course credit or $10, provided similarity judgments for the samples. Five participants’ judgments were excluded because they were not native American-English speakers or technical problems occurred.

**Results**

**Analysis**

*Phonetic Accommodation.* The AXB judgments were scored as average percentage across trials in which a partner’s Negotiation-task repetition was considered more similar to a talker’s focal Negotiation-task utterance than the partner’s Pre-task speech sample (*negotiation task accommodation*).

Percentage accommodation varies around 50% chance as each trial received either a 0% or 100% score. Scores above 50% indicate rater perceived phonetic accommodation and below 50% indicate non-accommodation.
Threat condition is a between-subjects independent variable, but only the female participant in each dyad was randomly chosen to receive either the Threat or No Threat condition, while males always received the No Threat condition. Gender is a between-subjects variable that varied within dyads, but not between dyads (all dyads were mixed-gender). The dependent variable, accommodation, is also mixed because raters provided separate assessments of accommodation for each individual in each dyad. As with Study 1, with this type of mixed design, actor and partner effects can be disentangled (Kenny, Kashy & Bolger, 1998; Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006). To simultaneously assess actor and partner effects, the analyses treated each dyad member as both an actor and as a partner.

Data were analyzed using a multilevel regression model, implemented in PROC MIXED, a component of the SAS STAT 9.2 software (SAS Institute, 2008). To account for the non-independence of the data due to (a) repeated assessments by the same rater and (b) the pairing of participants in interaction dyads, both rater and dyad were treated as random effects. All other independent variables were treated as fixed effects. The current analyses used the most conservative approach in calculating degrees of freedom for statistical tests in multilevel models, and based them on the number of independently sampled dyads (Littell, Milliken, Stroup, Wolfinger & Schabenberger, 2006).

Accommodation During the Negotiation Task

Preliminary analyses with RS-gender, including the necessary three way interaction with RS-gender X Identity Threat X Gender did not reveal any significant effects and thus RS-gender was dropped from subsequent analyses and is not
discussed further.

There was no main effect of Identity Threat on speech accommodation (Threat $M = 56.14$, No Threat $M = 54.65$, $b = .70\%$, $t (38) = .57$, $p = .57$). There was also no main effect of Gender (Female $M = 55.27$, Male $M = 55.52$, $b = 2.4\%$, $t (38) = .32$, $p = .75$).

As hypothesized and shown in Figure 4, there was a significant interaction between Identity Threat X Gender ($b = 11.18\%$, $t (38) = 2.74$, $p < .01$). Planned contrasts showed that women did not differ significantly from the Threat to No Threat conditions ($b = .69\%$, $t (38) = .26$, $p = .80$). Within the No Threat condition, women accommodate their speech marginally more than men ($b = 1.94\%$, $t (38) = 1.71$, $p < .09$), but within the Threat condition, men accommodate their speech significantly more than women ($b = 2.43\%$, $t (38) = 2.16$, $p < .04$). Therefore, women did not differ in speech accommodation under identity threat as compared to when stereotypes are not activated, but they are less responsive to their male partners’ greater accommodation under threat—maintaining their original speech style. Further, negotiating with a female under threat elicited increased speech accommodation from male negotiators.

Additionally, I found a significant effect of actor accommodation on partner accommodation, meaning that to the extent that an actor accommodated towards their partner, the less the partner reciprocated the accommodation ($b = -.11\%$, $t (38) = 7.56$, $p < .0001$). Unlike same-gender dyads in Study 1, individuals in mixed-gender dyads tended not reciprocate speech accommodation from their partners in negotiations.
Interpersonal Impressions & Partner Perceived Connection

All outcome analyses were conducted with a multilevel regression model with dyad treated as a random effect.

Partner Perceived Connection. There were no main effects of Gender or Identity Threat; however, there was a significant interaction between Identity Threat X Gender on partner perceived connection ($b = .78$, $t (38) = 2.14$, $p < .04$), shown in Figure 5. Planned contrasts reveal that within the No Threat condition, when the negotiation involved women who were not under threat, men perceived more connection to women than women perceived connection to men ($b = .68$, $t (38) = 2.64$, $p = .01$), but that the difference was non-significant in the Threat condition ($b = -.10$, $t (38) = -.39$, $p = .70$). Also, women in the threat condition perceived more connection with men than women in the no threat condition perceived connection with men ($b = .68$, $t (38) = -2.64$, $p = .01$).
Men’s perception of connection with their female partners did not differ across the Threat and No Threat conditions ($b = .10, t (38) = .39, p = .70$).

I completed additional analyses to assess whether speech accommodation influences partner perceived connection. As you can see below in Figure 5, female partners perceived more connection with males when the females were in the Threat condition relative to when they were in the No Threat condition, a pattern which was associated with males’ increased speech accommodation in that condition. Furthermore, as females did not increase their speech accommodation towards male partners, males’ perceived connection to females did not change across conditions. To examine whether dyadic differences in accommodation predicted dyadic differences in perceived connection, I created two difference scores—actor minus partner (actor-partner) speech accommodation and partner minus actor (partner-actor) perceived connection. There was a marginally significant main effect of accommodation on partner perceived connection at the dyadic level, whereby differences in actor-partner accommodation predicted differences in partner-actor perceived connection ($b = .015, t (38) = 1.73, p = .09$). This means that the larger the speech accommodation of the actor relative to the partner, the larger the perceived connection of the partner relative to the actor. This finding supports the notion that speech accommodation directly elicits perceived connection, but underscores that dyadic dynamics affect this process.
Competitiveness. There was a main effect of Gender on perceived competitiveness, as men were perceived to be more competitive than women (Female $M = 3.16$, Male $M = 3.44$, $b = .03$, $t (38) = 2.08$, $p = .04$). There was also a significant interaction between Identity Threat X Gender on partner perceived competitiveness ($b = -.63$, $t (38) = 2.33$, $p = .03$), shown in Figure 6. Planned contrasts reveal that within the No Threat condition women perceived men as more competitive than men perceived women to be ($b = .60$, $t (38) = -3.12$, $p = .003$), but that the difference was eliminated in the Threat condition ($b = .03$, $t (38) = .17$, $p = .86$). Additionally, women under Threat perceived men to be less competitive than women in the No Threat condition perceived men to be ($b = -.45$, $t (38) = 2.34$, $p = .03$). Although men’s impressions of women’s competitiveness increased from the No Threat to Threat conditions, this difference did not reach significance ($b = .18$, $t (38) = -.95$, $p = .35$).
Figure 6: Partner perceived competitiveness of actor in female identity threat and no female identity threat dyads. Error bars show standard errors of means.

Warmth. There were no main effects of Gender or Identity Threat; however, there was a significant interaction between Identity Threat X Gender on partner perceived warmth ($b = .60, t (38) = 3.07, p < .004$), shown in Figure 7. Planned contrasts reveal that within the No Threat condition, men perceived women to be significantly more warm than women perceived men to be ($b = .68, t (38) = 2.64, p = .01$), but in the Threat condition women perceived men to be more warm than men perceived women to be, although this difference did not reach significance ($b = .28, t (38) = -1.41, p = .17$). Also, men perceived women in the Threat condition to be less warm than women in the No Threat condition ($b = -.48, t (38) = 2.01, p = .05$). Finally, women perceived men to be marginally more warm in the Threat condition than the No Threat condition ($b = .40, t (38) = -1.69, p = .098$).
Figure 7: Partner perceived warmth of actor in female identity threat and no female identity threat dyads. Error bars show standard errors of means.

Competitiveness-Warmth Tradeoff. Results confirm a main effect of Gender on the magnitude of difference between ratings of competitiveness and warmth, whereby women had significantly higher difference scores than men (Female $M = -0.58$, Male $M = -0.13$, $b = 0.31$, $t (38) = 2.33$, $p = 0.03$). There was a significant interaction between Identity Threat X Gender on ratings of competitiveness-warmth ($b = -1.51$, $t (38) = 3.94$, $p < .0003$), shown in Figure 8. Planned contrasts reveal that men in the No Threat condition also differ significantly from men and women in all other conditions ($b = 2.59$, $t (38) = 3.30$, $p = 0.002$). Men in No Threat condition are viewed by women as more competitive and less warm than men and women in all other conditions. Women in the No Threat condition differ significantly from everyone else ($b = -2.21$, $t (38) = -2.81$, $p = 0.008$). Women in the No Threat condition are viewed as warmer and less competitive than...
men and women in all other conditions.

![The Effect of Female Identity Threat x Gender on Competitive-Warmth Tradeoff](image)

**Figure 8: Partner perceived competitiveness-warmth tradeoff of actor in female identity threat and no female identity threat dyads. Error bars show confidence intervals of means.**

**Attractiveness.** There were no main effects of Gender or Identity Threat; however, there was a significant interaction between Identity Threat X Gender on partner perceived attractiveness ($b = 1.14, t (38) = 2.10, p < .05$), shown in Figure 9. Planned contrasts reveal that in the No Threat condition, men perceived women to be more attractive than women perceived men to be ($b = 1.02, t (38) = 2.56, p = .01$); however, there were no differences in male and female perceptions of attractiveness in the Threat condition ($b = -.13, t (38) = -.34, p = .74$). Also, men perceived women to be less attractive in the Threat condition than the No Threat condition ($b = -.85, t (38) = 2.02, p = .03$). Men were not perceived to be any more or less attractive by women in the Threat vs. No Threat conditions ($b = .29, t (38) = -.74, p = .46$).
Figure 9: Partner perceived attractiveness of actor in female identity threat and no female identity threat dyads. Error bars show standard errors of means.

**Negotiation Instrumental Performance.** Figure 10 depicts the negotiation performance, points claimed into the negotiation, by men and women in the Threat and No Threat condition. There were no main effects of Gender or Identity Threat and the interaction between Identity Threat X Gender on individual negotiation point outcomes was non-significant \((b = 577, t (38) = .77, p = .45)\). However, differences in point outcomes between males and females revealed more sensitive tests of dyadic negotiation instrumental outcomes. This analysis focuses on discrepancies in point outcomes between negotiation partners. I completed additional analyses to assess whether there were significant differences between male and female points in a given dyad claimed in the negotiation in the Threat and No Threat conditions. To do so, I created a difference score—actor minus partner (actor-partner) points between each man and women in a given dyad. Within the No Threat condition there was not
significant discrepancy between male and female points claimed in negotiation dyads \( (b = -203, t(38) = -28, p = .78) \). However, within the Threat condition there was a marginally significant discrepancy between male and female points claimed in negotiation dyads such that females earned less than their male partners when the female in the dyad was exposed to threat \( (b = -1357, t(38) = -1.77, p = .08) \).

![The Effect of Female Identity Threat x Gender on Negotiation Performance](image)

**Figure 10:** Negotiation instrumental performance by gender in female identity threat and no female identity threat dyads. Error bars show standard errors of means.

**Discussion**

The results demonstrate that when gender-based threat was neutralized for females in the dyad, men displayed marginally less speech accommodation than women. However, when women were exposed to explicit gender-based identity threat in negotiation this led to more speech accommodation from men than women. Consequently, men increased their speech accommodation when negotiating with a
woman under threat, but the women under threat did not reciprocate this increase in accommodation—that is, she displayed relative non-accommodation. That is, identity threat led to a significant discrepancy in accommodation in the dyad. Neutralized female identity threat led to equal levels of partner perceived connection, while explicit female identity threat led to females feeling more connection to males. Speech accommodation may account for some of the increase in females’ feelings of connection to males under female threat, as differences in accommodation in the dyad were associated with differences in partner perceived connection. In interpersonal impressions, neutralized female identity threat led to stereotypical impressions of men and women, while explicit female identity threat counteracted these stereotypical impressions of men and women, as perceived by their partners. When there was an absence of female identity threat in the dyad there were no discrepancies in the points earned between men and women in a given dyad; however, under female identity threat females claimed marginally less value in the negotiation than men.

Speech Accommodation & Gender Identity Threat

Speech Accommodation Towards Identity Threatened Women. The results show that when females were not exposed to identity threat, men accommodated marginally less to women than women did to men. That is, when both men and women were explicitly told that gender is not linked to performance or diagnosticity on the negotiation task in the No Threat condition, neutralizing gender identity threat, men accommodated their speech relatively less to women than women did to men.

Men negotiating with women under an explicit identity threat displayed significantly more accommodation towards such women than these identity threatened
women did to men. That is men, increased their accommodation in the threat condition but women did not reciprocate this increase and instead displayed significant non-accommodation to men. Thus, threat led to a disruption in accommodation at the dyadic level such that women maintained their speech while males increased their accommodation. This finding that male partners accommodate their speech to females under identity threat is consistent with a similar finding from Study 1, which found that female partners of females who were exposed to identity threat and dispositionally anxious about gender-based threat, accommodated their speech more to such women (relative to those not anxious about the threat). Thus, both Study 1 and now Study 2 have found that partners of women especially threatened by explicit stereotypes—HiRS-gender women (Study 1) and women under threat negotiating with a man (Study 2)—accommodate their speech more to these women.

Across conditions, males were blind to their female partners’ threat condition and, further, females’ speech accommodation did not differ by threat condition. So males’ relative increase in speech accommodation behavior had to be directly in response to female’s behavior in the threat condition yet not their level of speech accommodation behavior as indexed in the current study. It is possible that the male partners were reacting to other indices of speech accommodation that are beyond the phonetic accommodation measured here or were reacting to other cues of female identity threat. In the no threat condition men actually accommodated marginally less and also women did not decrease their accommodation under threat relative to no threat—they maintained the same level of accommodation across conditions, thus it seems that males increased accommodation towards identity threatened women was
motivated by some unmeasured factor other than speech accommodation. As mentioned before these particular data cannot directly identify what possible other communication cues male partners were perceiving from threatened women, so I can only speculate as to why men displayed more accommodation towards threatened women despite the fact that women maintained their distance.

As accommodation does lead to instrumental and relational benefits in negotiation (Maddux et al., 2007), it is possible that male partners of women under threat may be strategically, albeit nonconsciously, using speech accommodation to ensure that the negotiation runs smoothly, by gaining the women’s favor. This is not to say that men’s accommodation was malevolent or manipulative, but was maybe a form of conciliation or “playing nice” to get the job done.

It is also possible that males’ speech accommodation to women under threat was driven by chivalry norms to “take care” of women, especially those who might seem to be under distress or seen to be trying too hard (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Indeed, men have been found in past research to use more placating behavior in mixed-gender negotiations (Watson & Hoffman, 1996). It may be that men are acting on the gender prescribed norm to protect and help women, which can be patronizing yet can contribute to favorable impressions of chivalrous men (Kiliansky & Rudman, 1998). These are all speculations and would need to be tested in future research to establish the true motivations behind males’ speech accommodation toward threatened women.

Thus, based on the results of both Study 1 and Study 2 it is worth exploring in future research the possibility that nonconscious speech accommodation may serve
strategic self-presentational functions, could be motivated by chivalry norms, or different instrumental task concerns between men and women in mixed-gender interactions.

_Speech Accommodation By Identity Threatened Women._ The results of this study support the hypothesis for women, showing that women under an explicit identity threat displayed non-accommodation to their partners. Women did not adjust their accommodation in the threat condition when males displayed increased accommodation. Thus, it is not that women accommodate any more or less under identity threat as compared to when stereotypes are not activated, it is that they are less responsive to a partners’ greater accommodation under threat—maintaining their original speech style, resulting in a discrepancy in accommodation between male and female accommodation under threat. In dyadic accommodation it is the discrepancy, the non-reciprocation that matters rather than the absolute level of accommodation (Aguilar et al., 2011). These results are consistent with Giles and colleagues (e.g. Gallois et al., 2005) Communication Accommodation Theory, which states that under an identity threat individuals are likely to display non-accommodation towards interactants, as a means of establishing or maintaining psychological distance. Thus, women under threat failed to reduce the psychological distance between themselves and their male negotiation partners.

Theoretically, chronic sensitivity to gender-based rejection (RS-gender) should have increased the experience of threat and thereby further decreased women’s speech accommodation under threat, as was found in Study 1. The results show that HiRS-gender and interactions with Threat Condition and Gender were not statistically
significant. The failure to find an effect of RS-gender could be due to the small sample size—half that of Study 1—or it could be because the threat of negotiating with a man and exposure to stereotypes was a particularly threatening for all women and overwhelmed any individual chronic gender-based concerns. Future research with larger sample sizes should explore this issue further.

**Partner Perceived Connection**

The results demonstrated that dyadic speech accommodation was associated with perceived connection in the dyad. Differences between actor and partner accommodation predicted marginally significant differences in partner and actor perceived connection, highlighting the importance of reciprocal accommodation for reciprocal perceived connection.

Men in the no female identity threat condition liked their female partners and wanted to continue the relationship, but women did not reciprocate the perceived connection. This asymmetry may be explained by the fact that males accommodated their speech significantly less to women than women did to men, when identity threat was neutralized in the no threat condition. However, when men increased their speech accommodation in the threat condition they also increased women’s perceived connection with them and the discrepancy in perceived connection was eliminated. In the threat condition men’s speech accommodation had the general predicted pattern—men’s increased speech accommodation elicited perceived connection from women exposed to gender-based identity threat in negotiations. The results are consistent with Aguilar et al. (2011) and findings in the non-verbal literature (e.g. Chartrand & Bargh, 1999), that being the recipient of accommodation leads to more liking and a desire to
continue the relationship—women felt more connection to the men who accommodated towards them in the threat condition.

**Interpersonal Impressions**

The manipulation of female identity threat influenced interpersonal impressions between negotiators. I will begin by making comparisons about how about how women and men each were seen differently across the two conditions and then follow with comparisons about how men and women within the threat conditions saw each other. Across condition comparison: Men see women under threat (relative to not threat) as less warm and less attractive, but women under threat (relative to no threat) see men as more warm and less competitive, yet equally attractive. Within dyad comparisons: within the no threat condition men perceived to be women to be more warm, less competitive, and more attractive than women perceived men to be; but in the threat condition, women and men saw each other as equally competitive, equally attractive, and women perceived men as marginally more warm. Female identity threat was associated with gender less stereotypical impressions within the dyad. Also, explicit identity threat undercuts how attractive men view women to be. Women faced a higher trade-off between impressions of competitiveness and warmth in these negotiations in general, but explicit female identity threat neutralized this trade-off for women, and increased the tradeoff for men.

Negotiation is an inherently gender stereotyped domain. That is, men are generally seen to be more competitive superior, dominant, and less warm, while women are seen to be less competitive and more warm (e.g. Fiske et al., 2002; Heilman et al.,
2004). This view is also held by those individuals and societies who endorse benevolent sexism, where the positive nurturing qualities of women are celebrated, yet these positive stereotypes of women have the side-effect of women still being viewed as less agentic and thus less competent in traditionally male domains (Glick & Fiske, 2001). The current study partially confirms these societal biases, as men were perceived to be more competitive, averaging over experimental conditions, but the results also show that activation of identity threat moderates stereotypical interpersonal perceptions. In the absence of gender-based threat men and women are seen in accordance with gender these stereotypes—women were perceived to be more warm, less competitive, and more attractive than men. However, when women are faced with identity threat, women and men saw each other as equally competitive, equally attractive, and men were seen as marginally warmer—going against common gendered perceptions.

Competitiveness-Warmth Tradeoff. Difference score analyses of whether men and women incurred competitiveness-warmth tradeoffs in the impressions they made revealed that overall women are seen as reliably more warm than competitive, and men do not reliably incur costs either way\(^4\). This finding is consistent with past work, which finds that women incur costs in likeability for gender-violating behavior where men do not (Heilman & Chen, 2005). Decrements in likeability that gender-violating women face have been accounted for in attributions to their lack of communality (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). Perhaps in the current study the warmth measure, which is a composite of warm and accommodative qualities, taps into males’ perceptions of women’s communality. That is, perhaps when women are seen as more competitive,
and thus less warm in negotiations, they are perceived to be lacking in communal qualities essential to perceptions of femininity (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007).

Above and beyond the main effect of gender, results demonstrated an interaction between gender and threat condition on competitive-warmth tradeoffs. Men perceived women in the no threat condition as warm and women perceived men as competitive, yet the pattern reversed under identity threat—women were seen as competitive and men as warm. Confidence levels of the competitiveness-warmth tradeoff (see Figure 8) encapsulated 0 for men in the no threat condition and women in the threat condition, signifying that individuals in these conditions do not necessarily incur tradeoffs between competitiveness-warmth in negotiations. Yet women in the no threat and men in the threat conditions do incur competitiveness-warmth tradeoffs as their values do not encapsulate 0. Interestingly, when a man is negotiating with a woman exposed to an explicit gender-based identity threat, he then incurs a competitiveness-warmth tradeoff. Future research will need to explore why men can’t be seen as both competitive and warm by women who have explicitly been exposed to gender-based stereotypes. The results also mean that being exposed to an explicit gender-based identity threat may neutralize the normal tradeoffs women face between competitiveness and warmth, perhaps because these women are taking a reactance stance against gender-based stereotypes (Kray et al., 2001).

Stereotypicallity in Interpersonal Impressions. The results of this study seem to show that in the absence of gender-based threat activation men and women form impressions of each other that confirm stereotyped expectancies, but when women are explicitly exposed to gender-based threat activation men and women form impressions
of each other that violate stereotyped expectancies (Kray et al., 2001). Counter-stereotypical impressions came at cost for women alone—men perceived women as less attractive in the threat condition relative to the no threat condition but men were equally attractive across conditions. Thus, when women violated gender norms in the negotiation they were considered less attractive but when men violated gender norms they did not experience the drop in attractiveness, which is consistent with research showing that only women face interpersonal costs of gender-norm violation (Heilman & Chen, 2005). Past research has found that females are more attracted to male targets when exposed to identity threat in confederate paradigms (Logel et al., 2009). Although the current findings are inconsistent with this particular past research, as males’ impressions of attractiveness were unchanged by threat, it does find more general support for the notion that threat affects attraction—females in the current study are found less attractive under threat.

**Instrumental Negotiation Outcomes**

Study 2 found evidence consistent with the stereotype threat model that gender-based identity threat lead to decrements in instrumental outcomes (negotiation value) relative to male partners, but that when the threat was neutralized there were no differences between men and women in instrumental outcomes (e.g. Steele & Aronson, 1995). Specifically, under threat women claimed marginally less points value than their male partners but neutralization of identity threat resulted in similar accrual of points for men and women in a given dyad. For women facing male negotiation partners, explicit threat undercut instrumental outcomes. Although these results are consistent with the stereotype threat model by Steele and colleagues, they are inconsistent with other
research finding that explicit threat actually lead to boosts in instrumental outcomes, while it is implicit threat that leads to decrements (Kray et al., 2001; 2004). The relational outcomes of this study seem to be in line with the basic predicts of Kray and colleagues stereotype reactance model; however, the instrumental outcomes seem to differ. The inconsistencies between the two studies may be explained by the negotiation setting (laboratory with volunteer participants vs. business school course classroom with MBA students) but future research will have to investigate further the relationships between explicit and implicit threat and subsequent instrumental and relational outcomes.

When considering the relational and instrumental outcomes of this study together it seems that men benefit when negotiating with a woman under threat. Men create more favorable impressions, are liked more by women, and win the negotiation. Further analyses showed that none of the measures taken in the current study (speech accommodation, perceived connection, warmth, competitiveness) explained the male advantage when negotiating with females under identity threat (all ps > .05). So, although men displayed more accommodation towards threatened women, they also benefited in the negotiation. It could be that men’s speech accommodation and favorable impressions indirectly led to more female concessions in the negotiation or perhaps like the stereotype threat model by Steele and colleagues (2010) identity threat led to cognitive load or anxiety and subsequent underperformance. I am currently conducting research using the current negotiation recordings in attempt to identify how males gained an advantage under female identity threat.

Limitations
One particular limitation of Study 2 was that we did not vary whether men received the female identity threat message, as they always received the gender identity threat-neutralizing message. Future research should explore men and women’s behavior and impressions when men are exposed to gender stereotypes in negotiation or are given no information about gender stereotypes in a true control condition. Varying the male as well as female’s stereotype activation will help clarify why men display speech accommodation towards and benefit relationally and instrumentally when negotiating with identity threatened women.

As messages of equality and diversity are the part of the current zeitgeist in organizations it is important to examine how these messages affect men’s instrumental and relational processes in negotiation. In Study 2 the exposure to explicit gender identity neutral message in the no threat condition could have had very different effects on men and women, as such messages actually undercut advantages that males would otherwise incur (Walton & Cohen, 2003). Thus, future research understanding how different identity messages affect men, and specifically men negotiating together, in dyads is important.

**Conclusion**

The dialectical forces in a negotiation pull for both competitiveness, to claim the most value, and warmth, to affiliate and ensure the relationship continues and this study reveals that exposure to identity threat both affect the way women and men balance these forces. The results of this study convey that when women are exposed to explicit reminders of gender-stereotyped expectancy for poor performance in negotiation this affects subtle speech accommodation behavior, as well as relational and instrumental
outcomes between male and female negotiators. While identity threat may undercut women’s instrumental performance in negotiation, it also elicits more speech accommodation from male negotiation partners. This study demonstrates that identity threat affects subtle speech accommodation behavior in negotiation, which has subsequent effects on perceived connection and relationship formation. While women’s speech accommodation is not directly affected by threat, her responsiveness to her partner’s speech accommodation is. This implies that identity threat can have effects that go beyond the individual to affect the behavior of and impressions made on a male negotiation partner.

This study also reveals that when a woman is exposed to identity threat this shifts men and women’s impressions of each other to become less stereotypical, but that this undercuts men’s perceptions of women’s attractiveness. This is consistent with previous research finding that males do not consistently get lower ratings of social attractiveness when they deviate from gender normative behavior but women do (Rudman, 1998). This dynamic may indicate the persistence of gender inequality that is perpetuated within daily social interactions.

Men seem to incur benefits by negotiating with a woman exposed to identity threat—they elicit more favorable impressions and accrue more value in the negotiation than women. The mechanisms by which men inadvertently benefit by female threat in dyadic negotiation are still unclear and require further investigation. Nonetheless, the current results demonstrate that identity threat has effects that may go unnoticed during dyadic social interaction and may destabilize women’s advancement.
General Discussion

Research Summary

In two studies I found that explicit activation of gender-based identity threat affected speech accommodation in dyadic negotiations. Furthermore, the explicit activation of identity threat also had ramifications for negotiators’ interpersonal impressions and perceived social connection.

*Identity Threat & RS-Gender in Same-gender Dyads.* In Study 1 I found that when explicitly exposed to gender identity threat in same-gender dyads, women who had anxious expectations of gender-based rejection in male-typed settings (HiRS-gender women), showed less speech accommodation, while women who were not anxious about or expectant of rejection use more speech accommodation. On the other hand, partners of women high in RS-gender exhibited more speech accommodation than partners of women low in RS-gender under threat. When gender identity threat was explicitly neutralized, there were no differences in actors’ or partners’ speech accommodation based on RS-gender.

Study 1 also demonstrated that dispositional RS-gender affected interpersonal outcomes. When gender identity threat was explicitly neutralized, there were no differences in partner’s perceived connection based on RS-gender. However, when women with dispositional high sensitivity to RS-gender were faced with explicit situational cues of identity threat, her partners felt less connected to her, but when women with dispositional low sensitivity to RS-gender were faced with explicit threat, her partners felt more connection to her. The results highlight the fact that individual chronic expectancies and anxieties about being rejected on the basis of gender in a
social-evaluative domain are revealed by nonconscious communication behavior. Expectancies of gender-based rejection seemed to manifest into self-fulfilling prophecies whereby those most worried about rejection were indeed liked the least (Downey & Feldman, 1996).

Female Identity Threat in Mixed-Gender Dyads. In Study 2 I extended the investigation to mixed-gender dyads and found that when gender identity threat was explicitly neutralized, men accommodated marginally less than women; however, when women were exposed explicitly to gender-based identity threat, males increased speech accommodation to female negotiation partners, which elicited increased liking from females for males. Females did not show differential speech accommodation between the threat and not threat conditions, and specifically, did not reciprocate male partners’ increased accommodation while under threat. That is, they were unresponsive to males’ increase in accommodation. Differences in speech accommodation in the dyad were marginally significantly associated with differences in perceived connection. Female identity threat also led to less stereotypical impressions for both men and women. Importantly, female identity threat marginally undercut women’s, relative to men’s, instrumental performance in the negotiation.

Implications Across Studies 1 & 2

Speech Accommodation. The current studies are consistent with predictions from Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT; Howard Giles and colleagues) in finding that an explicit identity threat affects subtle communication behavior, exemplified in this case by phonetic accommodation. In same-gender female dyads faced with explicit identity threat, women higher in RS-gender did not accommodate their speech, yet their
partners increased accommodation towards them. In mixed-gender dyads explicit identity threat led to non-accommodation from women, yet an increase in male accommodation towards them. Taken together, those that are in a heightened identity threat state due to situational and/or dispositional factors seem to display non-accommodation which leads to a discrepancy in accommodation between negotiators in the threat condition dyads (see Figure 11). These displays of non-accommodation seem to be failures to decrease psychological distance and may result from motives to maintain distance under threat for self-protective reasons.

In both same and mixed-gender dyads I found that partners accommodated their speech relatively more towards those under heightened identity threat (see Figure 11). These findings are truly “partner” effects (Kenny, et al., 2006), whereby the experimental manipulation and individual difference in the target affected the partner’s behavior when the partner was blind to target condition. Said another way—partners are regulating their behavior in relation to identity threatened targets. It could be that the disruption that threat brings to the representation alignment process in negotiations pulls for partners to compensate with increased speech accommodation to meet task demands (e.g. Pickering & Garrod). It is also possible that identity threatened women are emitting cues of distress under threat that were unmeasured in the present approach but which elicits the speech accommodation. Within mixed-gender dyads men may possibly be enacting chivalry norms, or trying to gain the approval of women to facilitate the negotiation, with their increased accommodation. Examining why partners accommodate more to those under threat and how partner motivation may differ in same and mixed-gender dyads should be addressed in future research, as partner
accommodation may affect perceptions of social connection and belonging for women working in traditionally male domains.

Relational Outcomes: Perceived Connection. In mixed-gender dyads (Study 2) I found marginally significant evidence that dyadic differences in accommodation predicted dyadic differences in perceived connection, supporting the notion that accommodation promoted feelings of connection. However, this does not mean that accommodation alone lead to more connection. It could very well be that accommodation acted in concert with other cues of affiliation to elicit perceived connection. In same-gender dyads (Study 1) analyses failed to find that differences in accommodation predicted differences in perceived connection. This failure to find the direct speech accommodation-perceived connection link is anomalous. It could be that phonetic accommodation in particular may have weak or inconsistent effects on perceived connection if overwhelmed by other behavioral cues. This anomalous finding calls for replication and further investigation.

Relational Outcomes: Interpersonal Impressions. In mixed-gender dyads, men and women exposed to explicit gender stereotype activation made less stereotypical interpersonal impressions on their partners relative to men and women exposed to explicit gender neutrality activation. I did, in fact, take the same interpersonal impressions measures in the same-gender female dyads but none of the measures reached significance (all Fs < 1, ps > .05). It is possible that in the same-gender dyads women in HiRS were also displaying counter-stereotypical behavior or that their impressions were not influenced by identity threat. We do not know if HiRS women were acting in a counter-stereotypical manner, but they were liked less, which is in line with
studies that show women penalize other women more than men penalize women for gender deviance (Rudman, 1998; but see Heilman et al., 2004). For instance, junior women in male-dominated firms derogated their female superiors as acting too masculine (Ely, 1994). Either way, this means that within the negotiation setting and possibly other settings, interpersonal impression formation operates differently for same and mixed-gender dyads. The classic out-group homogeneity effect may partially account for this difference (for a review see Hilton & von Hippel, 1996), as there is more variability within intragroup as opposed to intergroup perceptions. These interpersonal impression findings should be explored more in future research as it may be that female identity threat affects interpersonal behavior or affects how women under threat perceived their interaction partners, or some combination of the two.

Limitations & Future directions

These studies suffered from several limitations that should be remedied and explored in future research. The sample of women in Study 2, mixed-gender dyads, was not sufficiently large to test for interactions between RS-gender and identity threat within women. So, it is unclear whether the dispositional effects of RS-gender are overwhelmed by the situational threat of negotiating with a man or if small female sample size is to blame. Future work should increase the sample size or pre-select women who are especially high or low in RS-gender in order to more powerfully test whether the RS-gender effect from Study 1 replicates in mixed-gender dyads.

In the current studies, RS-gender measures were taken after the negotiation, so it is hypothetically possible that the threat manipulation affected RS-gender scores; however, I do not think this occurred for several reasons. First, the RS-gender measure
indexes stability of gender-based concerns that are chronic and build up over time. Second, as reported in each individual study, analyses show that threat manipulation did not affect level of RS-gender and furthermore, that RS-gender was equally and randomly distributed amongst the experimental conditions for females in both studies. If the one-time threat manipulation increased RS-gender within the time-course of the experiment then females’ RS-gender scores should be higher in the threat conditions, and they were not. Third, further analyses showed that the identity threat manipulation did not affect partner’s RS-gender scores or the correlation between actor’s and partner’s RS-gender (all ps > .05). In order to conclusively rule out any effect of experimental threat manipulations on level of chronic RS-gender, future studies should obtain measures of RS-gender before the experiment.

In Study 2 I found a marginal effect of female threat on female decrements in performance. Negotiation performance measures could be made more sensitive by increasing the negotiation earning motivation, perhaps by using monetary incentives for participants. In Study 1, portion of the data was lost due to experimenter photographic error (although patterns where in the predicted direction—no differences in the no threat condition, and higher negotiation earnings for women lower in RS-gender than women higher in RS-gender under threat). Future research could computerize the map negotiation to ensure checks on participants’ negotiation claims and avoid lost data. Also future research should implement manipulation checks to assess participants’ perceptions of the goals of the negotiation.

Future work should also extend this paradigm to other types of dyadic compositions, and specifically same-gender male dyads. In the current paradigm I could
not directly test how explicit gender stereotype activation versus explicit gender neutrality activation affects men’s accommodation. For instance in male dyads explicit stereotype exposure might lead to stereotype lift—improved negotiation performance in line with competitive male stereotypes (Walton & Cohen, 2003), or it may reverse the male partner effect I found in Study 2 if the male speech accommodation towards women did in fact result from chivalry motivations. Or further, the explicit identity threat might make men worry about confirming masculine identity threat and temper their competitiveness with warmth as was found in past research (Curhan & Overbeck, 2008). Finally, I did not take individual difference measures that were specifically targeted to understanding the motivation behind men’s speech accommodation patterns. Future research should include individual difference measures such as hostile and benevolent sexism, implicit gender bias, and sex-typing to clarify this mechanisms perpetuating the male partner accommodation effect (Bem, 1981; Logel et al., 2009; Glick & Fiske, 2001).

The current research manipulated explicit identity threat; however, the effect of implicit threat on speech accommodation and interpersonal impressions has yet to be examined. This research should also be extended to other types of intergroup interaction—ethnic, status, age, class, religion, etc.—and other social performance contexts—job interviews, public speaking, romantic dating, teaching —where identity threat may affect the interaction and where the prediction for the accommodation dynamics may be very different than those for gender (e.g. Dovidio, et al., 2002; Shelton, et al., 2005).
Future research should address if speech accommodation patterns can show patterns of inequality and exclusion of women and minorities in fields where they continue to be underrepresented (Boggs & Giles, 1999). Of course, there are circumstances where women negotiate quite well, for example, when they have power (Kray, Reb, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2004), or when they negotiate on someone else's behalf (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010), or when positive stereotypes about women in negotiation are made salient (Kray et al., 2001) or when negative female stereotypes are neutralized (current Study 2). Future research should continue to explore how identity threat can be neutralized for women in traditionally male domains and how partner behavior may accentuate or attenuate the effects of threat. Finally, research should examine if behavioral accommodation can be used as a social intervention to make underrepresented women feel a sense of belonging without undercutting instrumental outcomes in non-traditional contexts, as accommodation does lead to perceived connection (Walton & Cohen, 2007).

Conclusion

The present research provides a window into how identity threat affects everyday interactions in gender-stereotyped settings when women interact with other women or men—who are in the numeric majority in these settings and often represent an idealized prototype of what a “good negotiator” should look like. The research implies that studying communicative accommodation patterns should be able to reveal a great deal about how women are viewed and how women view themselves in male-typed domains. The present investigation also elucidates the fact that identity threat unknowingly affects the way others treat a target individual, which further points to how
processes of identity threat fly under the radar in everyday social encounters. Boggs & Giles (1999) state that communication markers can act like the “canary in the coalmine” by bringing attention to patterns of exclusion and rejection that exist below the surface in organizational settings. In the future I hope to extend my dissertation research to examine how stereotypes, identity threat, and perceptions of social connection can be either maintained or changed between individuals in relational contexts (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004).
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Footnotes

1 The negotiation task was created in consultation with Prof. Dan Ames from Columbia University Graduate School of Business.

2 The same instrumental negotiation outcomes were assessed in Study 1; however, technical error resulted in loss of most of the data, which was then unable to be analyzed.

3 Women under threat were also seen as more competitive, aggressive, and dominant yet the difference did not reach significance.

4 Furthermore, the magnitude of the female estimate (-.58) is over four times as large as the male estimate (-.13) of the difference between competitiveness and warmth, representing the notion that women contend with much larger tradeoffs than men between competitiveness and warmth.

5 The reasons why men and women violated gender norms within the female identity threat condition must be very different, as men always received the gender identity neutralization condition (no threat) while women received the explicit gender identity threat. That is, men were blind to their female partner’s condition so could not have been “reacting” to the mention of explicit stereotypes in the stereotype reactance model’s literal sense (Kray et al., 2001). These findings should be explored more in future research as it may be that women under threat were perceiving men to be more warm and likeable, and less competitive (changed the women’s perceptions) or that men actually acted more warm and less competitive (changed the men’s behavior), or some combination of the two. I am presently attempting to address this question by having outside observers rate males’ and female’s interpersonal behavior.
Figure 11: Graphs across both studies of speech accommodation, partner perceived connection, and interpersonal outcomes respectively.
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Appendix A

Negotiation Task Packet—Identity Threat Condition Example.

The Negotiation & Communication Study

Human Communication Laboratory of Columbia University
Sponsored in part by the McCafrey Corporation
Welcome to the Negotiation & Communication Study, in partnership with McCafrey Corporation. McCafrey Corp. is an independent consulting and research firm committed to the recruitment and training of exceptional negotiators. McCafrey Corp. has partnered with researchers here at Columbia University to study effective negotiation and is collaborating with the researchers here at Columbia University in creating a negotiation course for their company. The purpose of this study is to better understand what makes one a good negotiator. Your participation in this study will aid in our understanding of effective negotiation and how best to train the negotiators of tomorrow.

During this study, you will be working with another participant, your competitor, on a negotiation task designed and tested by McCafrey Corp. This negotiation task has been tested on negotiators from many different types of business and politics. We have chosen this particular negotiation task for you to complete because it is a challenging one for novice negotiators. As such, it is an accurate gauge of your genuine negotiating abilities and limitations. In the past we have found that how untrained participants do on this negotiation is particularly diagnostic of their performance in negotiation courses and real-world negotiations. Because this negotiation is diagnostic of your ability, you should use this negotiation as a learning tool.

Researchers are often interested in examining the various personal factors that affect people’s ability to perform in important negotiation roles. For example, previous research has shown that the most effective negotiators in negotiations like the one that you’ll do today are rational and assertive, and demonstrate a regard for their own interests throughout the negotiation, rather than being emotional, passive, and overly accommodating. Because these personality characteristics tend to vary across gender, male and female negotiators have been shown to differ in their performance on this task.

While you are negotiating in the task, your conversation will be recorded and you will later be judged on your negotiation performance by McCafrey Corp. experts and the researchers here at Columbia University. Please read the instructions on the following pages carefully.
Negotiation Task A

You are the CEO of the Green Corporation. Recently you have discovered a chain of islands rich in resources. Unfortunately your negotiating competitor, the CEO of the Red Corporation, also discovered the islands at the same time. Since both of your corporations discovered the islands at the same time, you and your negotiating competitor will negotiate the ownership of each region on the islands.

**TASK:** negotiate the division of the regions on the islands with your negotiation competitor

On the islands there are in all 6 different types of regions: Mountainous regions for ore mining, Forest regions for lumber, Quarry regions for mining clay, Prairie regions for growing wheat, Grassland regions for sheep farming, and Desert regions for date cultivation.

You will be negotiating for different regions on multiple islands. On the islands the different types of regions (mountains, forests, etc.) exist in different frequencies (see table below). Furthermore, depending on the respective commodities / resources (ore, wood, clay, etc.) the regions are worth different profit points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21 Mountainous regions</th>
<th>23 Forest regions</th>
<th>21 Quarry regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each region: 100 Points</td>
<td>Each region: 90 Points</td>
<td>Each region: 80 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Prairie</td>
<td>21 Grassland</td>
<td>22 Desert regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each region: 70 Points</td>
<td>Each region: 60 Points</td>
<td>Each region: 50 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note:
  - Some regions are worth more than others, so it is in your best interest to gain ownership of the most valuable regions.
  - If you control an entire island you will be rewarded 300 bonus points.
  - Each connecting border between territories you control earns you 10 bonus points.

Directions:

1. Before you begin the actual negotiation, take a few minutes to think about what territories, regions, and islands you want to claim.
   During negotiation you can negotiate single regions or multiple regions at the same time. The regions claimed do not have to be adjacent and do not have to be on the same island; however, 300 bonus points are given for controlling an entire island, and 10 bonus points are given for each connecting border of a territory.

2. Mark the regions you claim with the appropriate flags.
   During the negotiation, you will have a map on which the island's regions are shown, and using this map you will mark those regions that you claim during the negotiation. Similarly, all regions your negotiating competitor claims will be marked with their flags.

3. Your corporations may have assigned different values to the land regions.
   Thus, point values may be different but you are not allowed to discuss the point values themselves.

4. Make sure to communicate about who has which region and establish region claim agreements to avoid accidental double claims on a given region.
   Notice that some regions have the same name both within and between islands, so make sure to clearly communicate which specific regions you are claiming. Since you can’t see each other it is especially important that you communicate clearly.

5. You MUST make a verbal agreement with your negotiation competitor for each region claim agreement.
   A negotiation claim between your and your competitor’s corporations is not considered legally binding until an oral contract has been made.
   Example: “You can have the Round Hills Prairie if I can have the Teepees Prairie.”
   Be as clear and specific as possible in these claims.
6. **There can be no sharing of regions.**
   Regions cannot be claimed by both your and your negotiating competitor’s flags. By the end of the negotiation you and your competitor MUST have decided which one of you owns which region.

7. **Your goal is to earn the most points for YOUR CORPORATION.**
   Thus:
   a. Try to claim the most valuable regions.
   b. Try to control entire islands for bonus points.
   c. Try to control border-connecting territories for bonus points.

Since this is a **negotiation and not an arithmetic task**, we also include following rules:

8. **Do not calculate the points of the regions during negotiation.**
   This would unnecessarily delay the negotiation. You may, however, use the scratch paper provided to keep a basic idea of how many points you have at any given time.

9. **A conversation about winning points (about individual or multiple regions or types of regions) is not allowed.**

10. **For the negotiation, take as much time as you need.**

11. **At end of the negotiation, once you have settled on every region, make sure to go through island by island and double-check your flags with your competitor. You must avoid mistakenly placed flags, double-claims, and competitor errors.**

Now, please select those regions on the attached sheet that you want to claim at the beginning of the negotiation. The regions claimed do not have to be adjacent; however, 300 bonus points are given for controlling an entire island, and 10 bonus points are given for each connecting border between territories.
Appendix B

Negotiation Task Points Guide.

**GOAL:** Earn the most points for your corporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountainous</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mountain Points = 2100 points

Total Forest Points = 2070 points

Total Quarry Points = 1680 points

Total Prairie Points = 1610 points

Total Grassland Points = 1260 points
Total Desert Points: **1100 points**

**ISLAND POINT VALUES:**

- Wishing Well Island = **2150**
- Milk Island = **1590**
- Ancient Island = **1920**
- Chapel Island = **1280**
- Pirate Ship Island = **610**
- Old Tower Island = **790**
- Small Island = **100**
- Telescope Island = **570**
- Abandoned Monastery Island = **810**

**BONUS POINTS:**

**- ISLAND BONUS:**
  - **300 Bonus Points** for owning an entire island

**- BORDER BONUS:**
  - **10 Bonus Points** for each connecting border between territories

→ Desert regions = **50 points**
Appendix C

Negotiation task game board.