

Anger and Anxiety in Masculine Stereotypic and Male Dominated (MSMD)

Negotiating Contexts

Chiara Trombini, Logan A. Berg, and Hannah Riley Bowles

Harvard Kennedy School

Author Note

The authors are grateful for thoughtful feedback and suggestions from Charlie Dorison and Michael Haselhuhn and the support of the Harvard Kennedy School's Center for Public Leadership (CPL) and Women and Public Policy Program (WAPPP).

Abstract

In this chapter, we explore ways in which affective experience and expression might moderate effects of gender on negotiation, particularly in masculine-stereotypic and male-dominated (MSMD) contexts. We argue that, in MSMD contexts (as compared to more gender-equitable situations), men are likely to have a more chronic experience of power than women and that such gender differences in actual, perceived, and felt power are likely to reinforce gender stereotypes favoring men in negotiation. We articulate a set of propositions about the potential effects of anger and anxiety—two power-linked affective states—on gender in negotiations in MSMD contexts. We consider implications for negotiators' social and economic outcomes. In conclusion, we suggest practical considerations for managers in MSMD work environments.

Keywords: Anger, anxiety, gender, negotiation, power

Anger and Anxiety in Masculine Stereotypic and Male Dominated (MSMD)

Negotiating Contexts: Affect and the Study of Gender in Negotiation

At the close of the last century, anger and anxiety were salient in the discussion of gender in negotiation—not as analytic constructs, but as lived experiences. It was an era when women wore power suits, and the simple suggestion of gender differences in negotiation could evoke angry eyerolls. Personality studies were passé; the focus was on negotiation analytics. It was also a time when women intuited with reasonable anxiety that any conversation about “gender differences” would conclude men were better than women.

As illustrated by the richness and diversity of the chapters in this volume, the conversation about gender in the negotiation field has made enormous progress in the past 20 years. Perhaps, the most important advancement has been the revelation of gender stereotypes as a form of cognitive bias that influences the evaluation of negotiating counterparts and negotiators’ own behavior and performance (Bowles, 2013; Kennedy & Kray, 2015; Kray & Thompson, 2004). Kolb and Putnam (1997) deconstructed the masculine-stereotypic language of negotiation analytics, and Kray, Thompson, and Galinsky (2001) documented the pervasive descriptive stereotype that men are better negotiators than women because of their perceived masculine-stereotypical strengths (e.g., rational, competitive, etc.). Kray and colleagues showed further how implicit awareness of negative stereotypes about women as negotiators evoked stereotype threat (Steele, 1988) in female negotiators and undermined their bargaining performance (Kray, Galinsky, & Thompson, 2002; Kray et al., 2001).

Subsequent research revealed that prescriptive stereotypes also influence women’s negotiation performance (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Bowles, Babcock, & Lai, 2007).

Whereas descriptive stereotypes characterize how we anticipate men and women will behave and

perform, prescriptive stereotypes define how we expect men and women to behave from a normative perspective (i.e., what is socially appropriate and attractive) (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012). For instance, assertively negotiating for higher pay puts women (as compared to men) at greater risk of social backlash because self-advocacy violates the feminine ideal that women put others before themselves (Bowles et al., 2007). As a result, numerous studies show that women are more effective advocates for others than for themselves (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Bowles, Babcock, & McGinn, 2005; Mazei et al., 2015). In sum, negotiation scholars have now demonstrated in scores of studies that “gender differences” in negotiation are not about men’s and women’s personalities, but rather about gender stereotypes as an influential form of cognitive bias.

Revisiting Anger and Anxiety in the Conversation on Gender in Negotiation

If we are now clear minded about gender effects in negotiation being a function of cognitive bias, why revisit feelings of anger and anxiety? Another area of research that has blossomed in recent decades is the study of affect in decision making (for reviews, see Lerner, Dorison, & Klusowski, in press; Lerner, Li, Valdesolo, & Kassam, 2015), including negotiation (for reviews, see Olekalns & Druckman, 2014; Van Kleef & Côté, 2018; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004b). In this chapter, we suggest directions for future research on how affect—specifically the experience and expression of anger and anxiety—might moderate gender effects in negotiation.

Anger and Anxiety

We focus on anger and anxiety for multiple reasons. *Anger* is a discrete emotion that varies in intensity from mild irritation or annoyance to intense fury and rage (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, & Crane, 1983) and is elicited when one’s goals are blocked (Frijda, 1986).

Researchers have demonstrated numerous effects of anger on negotiation behavior and outcomes (for a review, see Van Kleef & Côté, 2018). For instance, there is evidence that anger can be advantageous for value claiming (e.g., Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006), but that it tends to interfere with integrative problem solving and the potential for future cooperation (e.g., Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, & Raia, 1997; Van Beest & Scheepers, 2013).

Emotion researchers commonly contrast anger with the discrete emotions of sadness and fear (for a review, see Lerner & Tiedens, 2006). We chose instead to focus on anxiety, which is an affective state related to fear (Öhman, 2008). *Anxiety* is characterized by distress or psychological arousal in response to threat and uncertain or undesirable outcomes (Brooks & Schweitzer, 2011; Öhman, 2008). We perceived the literature on anxiety (viz., state as opposed to trait anxiety) to have more conceptual and practical relevance to the study of gender in negotiation than the study of fear or sadness.

Anxiety has been shown to undermine competitive bargaining performance (Brooks & Schweitzer, 2011). It is also a mechanism of stereotype-threat (Blascovich, Spencer, Quinn, & Steele, 2001; Osborne, 2001, 2007), which (as explained above) inhibits women's negotiation performance (Kray et al., 2001). Both anger and anxiety have been shown to increase reliance on stereotype-based judgements (Bodenhausen, 1993; Bodenhausen, Sheppard, & Kramer, 1994; Fiske & Morling, 1996; Stephan & Stephan, 1985), which heighten the potential for gendered evaluations of a negotiator's behavior.

Another reason to focus on anger and anxiety is that they are related to the psychological experiences of power and status (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000), which are central constructs in the analysis of gender (Ridgeway, 2011; Rudman & Glick, 2008). Multiple studies suggest higher power people

may be more prone and normatively expected to express anger (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008; Keltner, Young, Heerey, Oemig, & Monarch, 1998; Ratcliff, Franklin, Nelson, & Vescio, 2012; Tiedens et al., 2000).¹ In contrast, anxiety is a characteristic of those with low power (i.e., those over whom others control resources and opportunities) (Gruenfeld, Inesi, Magee, & Galinsky, 2008; Keltner et al., 2003).

In developing our propositions, we have employed a social functional perspective on emotion (Keltner & Haidt, 1999; Van Kleef, 2009). Following this perspective, we conceptualize affective experience and expression as sources of information that guide negotiators' behavior and shape their impression of and inferences about negotiating counterparts. For instance, the experience of anger could make one defensive about perceived unfairness (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). Expressions of anger by a negotiating party could lead other parties to infer that they are powerful (Tiedens, 2001) or someone to avoid (Van Beest, Van Kleef, & Dijk, 2008). Our propositions relate to both intra-personal and interpersonal functions of emotions in negotiation.

Gender and Power

Gender stereotypes are a function of the traditional gendered division of household and paid labor (Eagly & Steffen, 1984) and the related *gender status hierarchy* in society (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Ridgeway, 2011). Historically and still in most societies, men tend to command more material resources and authority than women, and groups that command more material wealth and authority tend enjoy higher social status (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Ridgeway, 2001). Higher social status tends to evoke greater respect and prestige (Keltner et al., 2003), as well as expectations of higher competence (Berger et al., 1977). Gender

¹ While the expression of anger is associated with higher power, the experience of feeling angry might actually be more frequent for those in low- than high-power positions (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Bombari, Schmid Mast, & Bachmann, 2017).

stereotypes reflect and reinforce the gender status hierarchy by priming expectations for men to be in charge (e.g., dominant, analytic, competitive) and for women to be in support roles (e.g., agreeable, warm, cooperative).

In this chapter, we will focus on gender and “power” as opposed to “status,” but these are related, if distinct, constructs. Whereas status refers to how one is perceived, power is defined by the extent to which one has control over valued resources (for reviews, see Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Tost, 2015). In concept and practice, power and status tend to be mutually reinforcing. Those of higher status tend to be granted more power (i.e., control over social and material resources) as they are held in higher regard and expected to be more competent. Being from a group that holds power, particularly in terms of material resources and authority, enhances one’s status. In the case of gender, it is common in private organizations and public institutions for men to predominate in the highest positions of authority and pay—particularly men from the dominant majority (e.g., Whites in the United States or Europe) (Ridgeway, 2011). This propensity to be in higher power positions than women reinforces men’s higher status.

Both high status and high power activate a sense “agency” (Fiske et al., 2002; Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Tost, 2015). The term *agency* describes an individual’s propensity and competence to assert oneself and take mastery of one’s social and material environment (Bakan, 1966; Tost, 2015). Reflective of men’s higher status and power in society as compared to women, agency is the core of the masculine stereotype (Bakan, 1966; Conway, Pizzamiglio, & Mount, 1996; Eagly, 1987). Indeed, some scholars question whether findings that men are more agentic negotiators than women (e.g., more assertive and effective at meeting their own interests) is not better explained by men feeling more powerful than women in the negotiating context (Galinsky et al., 2019; Watson, 1994).

Power in Negotiation

Numerous studies have illuminated how the psychological experience of power enhances negotiators' sense of agency in negotiation (for a review, see Galinsky, Schaerer, & Magee, 2017). In general, the psychological experience of power tends to make people more goal focused (Guinote, 2007, 2017; Keltner et al., 2003) and prone to take action (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003). In negotiation, the experience of high power has been shown to increase parties' propensity to negotiate (Magee, Galinsky, & Gruenfeld, 2007; Small, Gelfand, Babcock, & Gettman, 2007), the assertiveness and the ambitiousness of their first offers (Schaerer, Swaab, & Galinsky, 2015), their own persuasiveness (G. J. Kilduff & Galinsky, 2013; Lammers, Dubois, Rucker, & Galinsky, 2013), and their immunity to countervailing persuasion tactics (Galinsky et al., 2017; Van Kleef, De Dreu, Pietroni, & Manstead, 2006; Van Kleef et al., 2008). With regard to gender effects in negotiation, priming the psychological experience of power has been shown to close gender gaps (favoring men) in the propensity to negotiate by increasing women's bargaining initiative (Galinsky et al., 2003; Small et al., 2007).

Masculine Stereotypic and Male Dominated (MSMD) Negotiating Contexts

Meta-analytic reviews of gender effects in negotiation suggest that gender differences favoring men in negotiation are greater when men and women are in negotiating contexts that reinforce the gender status hierarchy. One example is when the male negotiator is the hiring manager and the female negotiator is the candidate (Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999). Another is when the negotiators are in masculine-stereotypic bargaining roles (Kugler, Reif, Kaschner, & Brodbeck, 2018; Mazei et al., 2015). For instance, Bear and Babcock (2012) showed that they could close the gender gap in a competitive bargaining exercise by shifting the negotiating context from bargaining over "headlamps for motorcycles" to "lamp beads for jewelry."

We propose that negotiating contexts that are masculine stereotypic and male dominated (MSMD) will heighten men's psychological experience of power relative to women's. The psychological experience of power can stem from situational circumstances, such as holding a high position of authority (Tost, 2015), high social status (Brett & Thompson, 2016; Galinsky et al., 2017; Magee & Galinsky, 2008), a wealth of social capital (i.e., relationships that provide access to information, support, resources, and opportunities) (Galinsky et al., 2017; M. Kilduff & Brass, 2010), or a strong best alternative to negotiated agreement (BATNA) (Galinsky et al., 2017; Lax & Sebenius, 1986). A psychological experience of power can also emerge when one's construal of the social environment activates a sense of "having a relatively high ability to control the outcomes, experiences, or behaviors of others" (Tost, 2015, p. 30). We argue that, in MSMD negotiating contexts, men are more likely than women to benefit from situational factors that enhance their power (e.g., access to information, support, resources, or decision-making authority), as well as from a psychological sense that men are more powerful than women in such contexts. While some women are likely to have equal or greater power than some men in MSMD contexts (e.g., organizational position or bargaining alternatives), we argue that men will have a more "chronically accessible sense of power" (Tost, 2015) in MSMD domains.

We argue further that, in MSMD contexts, men are also more likely to be perceived as more powerful and higher status than women. This perception—independent of one's actual or personal sense of power—is also important to negotiation performance. Being perceived as more powerful and higher status likely reinforces perceptions that men are better negotiators than women (Berger et al., 1977; Kray et al., 2001) and that they have stronger alternatives to agreement and can, therefore, demand more value (Galinsky et al., 2017; Pinkley, 1995; Podolny, 2005; Rivera, 2016). More powerful and higher status actors are also granted more

social permission to bend social conventions (Hollander, 1958), including cheating (Bowles & Gelfand, 2010) or displaying aggression (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008; Keltner et al., 1998; Tiedens, 2001), which could gain a negotiator at least short-term bargaining advantages.

Predicting Gender Effects in Negotiation with Anger and Anxiety

In the following sections, we lay out a series of propositions for future research on gender in negotiation. We propose ways in which the experience and expression of anger and anxiety could moderate gender effects on negotiation behavior and outcomes. We make predictions with regard to both social and economic outcomes. By “social outcomes,” we mean how the negotiator is perceived and the perceived potential for future collaboration exiting the negotiation or negotiation attempt (e.g., following Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013; Bowles et al., 2007). We use the term “economic outcomes” to refer to material gains from the negotiation, typically measured in terms of money or points in scored exercises.

Expressing Anger

In this section, we suggest a series of propositions related to how expressing anger could have differential implications for the social and economic outcomes of male and female negotiators, particularly in MSMD contexts.

Social Outcomes. As described already above, anger is a dominance-related emotion that is expected more in higher power and higher status actors (Hareli, Shomrat, & Hess, 2009; Ratcliff et al., 2012; Tiedens, 2001). Congruent with the agentic character of the masculine stereotype, the expression of anger is more strongly associated with men than with women (Hess, Adams, & Kleck, 2005). Brescoll and Uhlmann (2008) showed that anger displays have differential effects on the evaluations of men and women. Previous research had shown that expressing anger (versus sadness) enhances one’s perceived status, but had focused only on

evaluations of male actors (Tiedens, 2001). Brescoll and Ullman (2008) replicated this finding, but then demonstrated that the same behavior had the opposite effect on evaluations of women as compared to men: evaluators conferred lower (higher) status to angry women (men) than sad women (men). Moreover, regardless of organizational rank, the expression of anger (versus no emotion), made a woman appear less worthy of high reward and high pay.

Building on these findings, we hypothesize that expressions of anger in negotiation will have differential effects on the perceived competence of male and female negotiators, such as it will make men appear more competent and women appear less competent.

Proposition 1a. Increased expression of anger (as compared to no emotion) in negotiation will have a more positive effect on the perceived competence of male (as compared to female) negotiators.

This proposition may not hold if negotiators are able to shift attributions for their anger to external circumstances. Brescoll and Uhlmann (2008) found that when women provided an external reason (versus no reason) for being angry, they were conferred a similar status as compared to an angry man. For men, providing an external reason for being angry actually reduced their perceived status.

Proposition 1b. Gender differences in how competent male and female negotiators are perceived when they express anger (as compared to no emotion) will be greater when anger is attributed to the negotiator's personality as opposed to external factors.

We are motivating these propositions from a general set of findings, but we anticipate that these effects would be stronger in MSMD contexts in which men (as compared to women) are on average more powerful (e.g., in terms of authority or command of social and material resources) and positively stereotyped as the high performers.

Proposition 1c. Gender differences in how competent male and female negotiators are perceived when they express anger (as compared to no emotion) will be greater in MSMD contexts as compared to more equitable work and other performance contexts.

While we predict that a flash of anger might benefit men in some circumstances, we recognize that expressions of anger are not generally beneficial to negotiators' social outcomes. Negotiators tend to form less favorable impressions of angry counterparts (e.g., hostile, immoral, unreasonable) (Van Beest, Van Kleef, & Dijk, 2008; Van Kleef & De Dreu, 2010; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004). Expressions of anger can also reduce counterpart's trust (Côté, Hideg, & Van Kleef, 2013) and the willingness for future cooperation (Allred et al., 1997; Van Beest & Scheepers, 2013; Van Beest et al., 2008; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2010).

Economic outcomes. In terms of economic outcomes, research indicates that expressing anger can have material benefits, particularly for higher power negotiators (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef, De Dreu, Pietroni, & Manstead, 2006). For instance, Sinaceur and Tiedens (2006) showed that anger increases the ability to claim value, particularly when one's counterpart has a poor alternative to agreement. Overbeck, Neale, and Govan (2010) showed that anger can foster value creation, particularly when the more powerful party is angry. In general, if one's counterpart is in a relatively lower power position, expressing anger can be an effective

way to secure concessions (Sinaceur & Tiedens, 2006; Van Kleef & Côté, 2007; Van Kleef et al., 2004b, 2006; Wang, Northcraft, & Van Kleef, 2012). However, if the consequences of rejecting an angry demand are low, then expressions of anger can actually backfire in ways that undermine economic outcomes (Van Dijk, Van Kleef, Steinel, & Van Beest, 2008). For the lower power negotiator in a bargaining pair, expressing anger tends to undermine economic performance because it can evoke reciprocal anger, rather than fear, and smaller concessions from the counterpart (Lelieveld, Van Dijk, Van Beest, & Van Kleef, 2012).

Based on research on the performance advantages of anger expression for higher power negotiators, we propose that anger expression could have a more positive effect on the economic outcomes of male than female negotiators in MSMD contexts.

Proposition 2. In MSMD contexts (as compared to more gender equitable work and other performance contexts), expressing anger (as compared to no emotion) will have a more positive effect on male than female negotiators' economic outcomes in mixed-gender interactions.

We formulate this prediction in terms of mixed-gender pairs because the economic payoffs of anger expression would flow to the higher power party as opposed to high-power parties in general (e.g., no economic advantage in high-high dyads).

Research on the effects of anger expression in negotiation suggests that this prediction could be moderated by multiple factors. For instance, anger elicits concessions only when it is perceived as authentic (Côté et al., 2013) and appropriate (Van Kleef & Côté, 2007), which can be influenced by cultural factors (Adam, Shirako, & Maddux, 2010) or organizational norms

(Callister, Gray, Gibson, Schweitzer, & Tan, 2014). Therefore, Proposition 2 is less likely to hold if the expression of anger is perceived as fake or illegitimate. Anger is more likely to elicit concessions when it is directed at counterparts' behavior (Steinel, Van Kleef, & Harinck, 2008) or offers (Lelieveld, Van Dijk, Van Beest, Steinel, & Van Kleef, 2011) rather than at the counterpart directly. This suggests that Proposition 2 may not hold if the male negotiator is making *ad hominin* attacks on his female counterpart.

Experiencing Anger

In this section, we suggest a series of propositions related to how experiencing anger could have differential implications for the social and economic outcomes of male and female negotiators.

Social outcomes. The experience of anger could color how negotiators perceive their male and female counterparts. For instance, feeling angry makes people more distrustful (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Liu & Wang, 2010) and blameful toward others (Quigley & Tedeschi, 1996). Relevant to the study of gender in negotiation, feeling angry also increases the propensity to evaluate outgroups negatively (DeSteno, Dasgupta, Bartlett, & Cajdric, 2004) and increases the use of stereotypes as a form of heuristic processing (Bodenhausen, Mussweiler, Gabriel, & Moreno, 2001; Bodenhausen et al., 1994). For instance, Bodenhausen, Sheppard and Kramer (1994) found that participants led to feel anger as compared to sadness or neutral affect, were more likely to use stereotypes when evaluating whether a target was guilty of misconduct.

Building from these findings, we predict that the more anger negotiating counterparts experience, the more likely they are to evaluate male and female counterparts in gender-stereotypic ways. This propensity for anger to increase stereotyping could have important implications for women who violate prescriptive gender norms, for instance, by self-advocating

for higher pay. Therefore, we predict that counterpart anger will moderate the potential for backlash against agentic female negotiators.

Proposition 3. The more angry a negotiating counterpart feels (as compared to a neutral state), the more likely they are to negatively evaluate a female negotiator who violates prescriptive gender norms (e.g., by self-advocating for higher pay or expressing anger).

The literature on emotion and decision making distinguishes between the effects of integral and incidental emotions. Integral affect refers to affect arising from the situation at hand while incidental affect refers to affect stemming from unrelated sources (for a review, see Lerner et al., 2015). In the context of negotiation, integral anger may be due to, for example, a counterpart's negotiating behavior (e.g., an unfair first offer). Incidental anger may occur from an event unrelated to the negotiation (e.g., an argument with a family member). Our reading of the literature suggests that this prediction would apply regardless of whether the anger was targeted at the female negotiator herself or stemmed from a source unrelated to the negotiation (e.g., DeSteno et al., 2004; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Liu & Wang, 2010; Quigley & Tedeschi, 1996). In future research, scholars of gender in negotiation might test whether backlash against a female negotiator would be stronger if the counterpart's anger stemmed from her actions in the negotiation as opposed to an unrelated source.

Economic outcomes. As compared to the literature on expressing anger in negotiation, research on the effects of experiencing anger on economic outcomes in negotiation is more limited. However, studies suggest that experiencing anger increases dominating, self-interested behaviors that could heighten the potential for impasse. Angry negotiators have less regard for

others' interests (Allred et al., 1997) and adopt more competitive and less cooperative orientations (Butt, Choi, & Jaeger, 2005). Angry negotiators are more likely to be deceptive (Yip & Schweitzer, 2016) and to make unfair offers to counterparts who angered them (Fabiansson & Denson, 2012).

Relatedly, experiencing anger increases the tendency for revenge. Angry negotiators are more likely to reject what they perceive as unfair offers in order to punish the proposer (Fabiansson & Denson, 2012; Pillutla & Murnighan, 1996; Srivastava, Espinoza, & Fedorikhin, 2009). This is consistent with the broader social psychological literature linking anger with blame and punishment (Keltner, Ellsworth, & Edwards, 1993; Lerner, Goldberg, & Tetlock, 1998; Quigley & Tedeschi, 1996; Weiner, 1995). Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, and Raia (1997) manipulated anger at a dyadic level and found that more angry dyads achieved fewer joint gains than less angry dyads. Punitive responses may be reduced when negotiators can regulate their anger, for instance, via reappraisal (Fabiansson & Denson, 2012; Srivastava et al., 2009).

While increased feelings of anger appear to be largely detrimental to negotiation performance, some research suggests that power dynamics could moderate these effects. Overbeck, Neale, and Govan (2010) found that experiencing anger led higher power negotiators to be more cognitively focused and behaviorally tough and to claim more value. In contrast, anger led lower power negotiators to be less cognitively focused and to claim less value. Therefore, in MSMD contexts, we predict that men may be more able to harness the benefits and reduce the costs of feeling angry in negotiation.

Proposition 4. In MSMD contexts (as compared to more gender equitable work and other performance contexts), increased experience of anger (as compared to a neutral state)

will have a more negative effect on the economic outcomes of female than male negotiators in mixed-gender pairs.

Again, we state this prediction in terms of mixed-gender pairs because the performance disadvantages of experiencing anger for lower power negotiators are more transparent in high-low power dyads.

Anxiety Expression

We have no propositions to offer with regard to gender differential effects of expressing anxiety on negotiators' social or economic outcomes.

Social outcomes. Our review of the literature suggests that displaying anxiety is likely to undermine both male and female negotiators' social outcomes, in terms of the impression they create on counterparts (Keltner et al., 2003; Van Kleef, 2009). Women are generally expected to experience and express affect more often than men (Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000), with the exceptions of high-power emotions, such as anger and pride (Keltner et al., 2003). While emotionality is normative for women (Rudman et al., 2012), women are more likely than men to be perceived as neurotic (Löckenhoff et al., 2014) and anxiety-related characteristics (e.g., approval seeking, melodrama) are perceived especially negatively in women (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). For men, emotional expression is generally proscribed (Rudman et al., 2012) and anxiety expression is likely to be perceived as a sign of weakness (Keltner et al., 2003).

Economic outcomes. We observed no direct evidence in the literature with regard to how anxiety expression would influence men's and women's economic outcomes in negotiation. If expressions of anxiety created the impression of weakness (Keltner et al., 2003), counterparts might act more competitively to exploit that perceived vulnerability (Galinsky et al., 2017; Yukl,

1974). As with social outcomes, we anticipate that the expression of anxiety would have similar, if any, effects on the economic outcomes of male and female negotiators.

Experiencing Anxiety

In this section, we suggest a series of propositions related to how experiencing anxiety could affect the social and economic outcomes of female negotiators in particular.

Social outcomes. Like anger, anxiety has been identified as an affective state that heightens intergroup biases (Bodenhausen, 1993; Fiske & Morling, 1996; Stephan, 2014; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Wilder, 1993; Wilder & Shapiro, 1989). Therefore, we anticipate (as above for anger) that female negotiators who violate prescriptive gender stereotypes, for instance, by negotiating for higher pay, could face stronger backlash if their negotiating counterpart is feeling anxious.

Proposition 5a. The more anxious a negotiating counterpart feels (as compared to a neutral state), the more likely they are to negatively evaluate a female negotiator who violates prescriptive gender norms (e.g., by self-advocating for higher pay or expressing anger).

This prediction may be particularly relevant to MSMD contexts because there is evidence that women competing effectively in masculine domains can increase men's feelings of anxiety (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). For instance, Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, and Weaver (2008) presented participants with bogus feedback on a test that measured their knowledge about stereotypically masculine or feminine topics. When men were told that they scored poorly for their gender (and similar to women), they reported higher feelings of anxiety than men that were

told they scored well for their gender (and better than women). Similarly, Netchaeva, Kouchaki, and Sheppard (2015) showed that men felt more threatened by women (compared to men) in superior roles and, as a result, asserted themselves more forcefully. Trombini, Bowles, and Moore (2019) found that reducing men's anxiety improved their evaluations of women attempting to negotiate for higher pay, such that they perceived the women as less dominant and they expressed greater willingness to work with them.

Proposition 5b. In MSMD contexts (as compared to more gender equitable work and other performance contexts), the more anxious a male negotiating counterpart feels (as compared to a neutral state), the more likely he is to negatively evaluate a female negotiator who violates prescriptive gender norms (e.g., by self-advocating for higher pay or expressing anger).

Economic outcomes. Women are also more likely to anticipate being negatively stereotyped as negotiators in MSMD contexts (as compared to other more equitable work and performance domains). Research on stereotype threat has shown that awareness of being negatively stereotyped in a performance domain with which one identifies heightens feelings of anxiety that tax performance (Osborne, 2007; Steele, 1997; Steele & Aronson, 1995). Kray et al. (2001) were the first to demonstrate the effect of stereotype threat on women's negotiation performance. They also showed that women's performance could be improved by presenting the negotiation as a learning exercise as opposed to a diagnostic of true ability, which presumably reduced the sense of threat and anxiety. Rudman, Dohn, and Fairchild (2007) demonstrated that affirmation interventions that reduce anxiety can reduce the negative effect of identity-related

threats. We propose that reducing women's anxiety could mitigate the effects of stereotype threat and enhance female negotiators' economic performance in MSMD contexts.

Proposition 6a: Stereotype threat is more likely to negatively affect the economic performance of female negotiators in MSMD contexts (as compared to more gender equitable work and other performance contexts).

Proposition 6b: Anxiety will explain the increased negative effect of stereotype threat on female negotiators' economic performance in MSMD contexts (as compared to more gender equitable work and other performance contexts).

Proposition 6c. Interventions to reduce women's anxiety will mitigate the negative effects of stereotype threat on female negotiators' economic performance in MSMD contexts (as compared to more gender equitable work and other performance contexts).

Discussion

In this chapter, we suggest future potential directions for research on gender in negotiation. Specifically, we highlight ways in which affective experience and expression might moderate the effects of gender on negotiation. Past research on gender in negotiation has shown that descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotypes play centrally defining roles in the effects of gender on negotiation performance and the evaluation of negotiators' behavior. Because gender stereotypes are fundamentally related to inequalities in men's and women's social status and power, we focused on two emotions associated with the psychological experience of high and low power—respectively, anger and anxiety. We propose ways in which these emotions could

heighten or contribute to demonstrated gender effects on negotiation performance, particularly those favoring men in economic and social outcomes.

Limitations

What about feminine-stereotyped and female-dominated (FSFD) contexts? One might ask whether we would make inverse predictions for FSFD contexts. We would not for at least three reasons. First, in many FSFD work environments (e.g., elementary education, libraries, fashion houses), the most senior levels of authority still tend to be dominated by men (Ridgeway, 2011; Williams, 1995). This suggests that FSFD contexts do not reverse the broader societal gender status hierarchy that cues expectations that men will be in charge and women in support roles. Second, feminine stereotypic norms proscribe agentic self-advocacy and other dominance related behavior in women, heightening their vulnerability to backlash by women as well as men (e.g., Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013; Bowles et al., 2007; Rudman et al., 2012). Indeed, some research suggests that women may be at greater risk of backlash for displaying self-serving agency in femininized work contexts (Rudman & Glick, 1999). Finally, while the masculine stereotype (e.g., dominant, competitive) aligns with agentic displays of power, the feminine stereotype (e.g., communal, cooperative) is effectively orthogonal to it: one can act agentially in service of oneself, others, or the larger good (Tost, 2015). In situations in which women ruled, the stereotypes of women in charge would likely reinforce their capacity for integrative and relational problem-solving as opposed to their competitive dominance (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Kray et al., 2002). Therefore, masculine-stereotypic power-related emotional displays, such as flares of anger, would probably still not enhance perceptions of women's power or competence.

What about intersecting gender identities? One important limitation of this chapter is that we have not systematically considered how the intersection of gender and other status-linked social identities might moderate our predictions. There is a growing body of evidence indicating that negatively stereotyped men (e.g., African Americans, “locals” competing for global employment) experience the same types of constraints on their negotiating performance as have been documented for women (Al Dabbagh, Bowles, & Thomason, 2016; Ayres & Siegelman, 1995; Hernandez, Avery, Volpone, & Kaiser, 2019). This would suggest that our propositions would apply primarily to relatively economically and socially privileged men (e.g., White educated men in the United States and Europe). For instance, research on intersecting gender and racial stereotypes suggests that it may be more socially acceptable for black female negotiators to express anger than black male negotiators (Rosette, Koval, Ma, & Livingston, 2016; Wingfield, 2007, 2010). Toosi et al. (2019) found that Asian-American men, who are stereotypically less assertive than White American men, made lower first offers than White men because they anticipated backlash if they made a more aggressive first offer. As emphasized in Semnani-Azad et al.’s chapter in this volume, it is critically important that negotiation scholars adopt intersectional perspectives when theorizing and testing gender effects.

What about culture? Our propositions could be moderated by culture. Perhaps most importantly, the masculine stereotype described in this chapter is more representative of the masculine stereotype in individualistic than collectivistic cultures. As the dominant group in most cultures, the national cultural ideals tend to be associated more strongly with men than with women. Collectivistic societies associate communal traits more strongly with men than women (Cuddy et al., 2015; Shan, Keller, & Joseph, 2019). Therefore, our propositions may not extend

to collectivistic cultural contexts. The Semnani-Azad et al. chapter in this volume provides a deeper exploration of how culture moderates effects of gender on negotiation.

Practical Implications

From a practical perspective, managers should be aware that gender stereotypes (e.g., that men are better negotiators than women) are likely to be reinforced in MSMD work contexts as compared to more gender-equitable environments. This could lead to heightened risks of negative performance effects of stereotype threat (Kray et al., 2001), as well as social backlash in reaction to women's self-advocacy (Bowles et al., 2007). New research on organizational culture as a masculinity contest suggests that some MSMD work environments heighten feelings of anxiety and give social permission for dominant behaviors, such as anger expression (Berdahl, Cooper, Glick, Livingston, & Williams, 2018). The propositions outlined in this chapter suggest how such work environments could exacerbate disadvantageous gender effects for women in negotiation. Strategies for mitigating gender biases could include raising awareness of the potentially deleterious effects of stereotypes (Johns, Schmader, & Martens, 2005; Kray & Shirako, 2011) and reducing feelings of anxiety that contribute to stereotype-based judgements and stereotype threat (Rudman et al., 2007; Trombini et al., 2019).

References

- Adam, H., Shirako, A., & Maddux, W. W. (2010). Cultural variance in the interpersonal effects of anger in negotiations. *Psychological Science, 21*(6), 882–889.
- Al Dabbagh, M., Bowles, H. R., & Thomason, B. (2016). Status reinforcement in emerging economies: The psychological experience of local candidates striving for global employment. *Organization Science, 27*(6), 1453–1471.
- Allred, K. G., Mallozzi, J. S., Matsui, F., & Raia, C. P. (1997). The influence of anger and compassion on negotiation performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 70*(3), 175–187.
- Amanatullah, E. T., & Morris, M. W. (2010). Negotiating gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women's fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(2), 256–267.
- Amanatullah, E. T., & Tinsley, C. H. (2013). Punishing female negotiators for asserting too much...or not enough: Exploring why advocacy moderates backlash against assertive female negotiators. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 120*(1), 110–122.
- Anderson, C., & Berdahl, J. L. (2002). The experience of power: Examining the effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies, *83*(6), 1362–1377.
- Ayres, I., & Siegelman, P. (1995). Race and gender discrimination in bargaining for a new car. *The American Economic Review, 85*(3), 304–321.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

- Bear, J. B., & Babcock, L. (2012). Negotiation topic as a moderator of gender differences in negotiation. *Psychological Science, 23*(7), 743–744.
- Berdahl, J. L., Cooper, M., Glick, P., Livingston, R. W., & Williams, J. C. (2018). Work as a masculinity contest. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(3), 422–448.
- Berger, J., Fisek, M. H., Norman, R. Z., & Zelditch, M. E. (1977). *Status characteristics and social interaction: An expectation-states approach*. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Blascovich, J., Spencer, S. J., Quinn, D., & Steele, C. (2001). African Americans and high blood pressure: The role of stereotype threat. *Psychological Science, 12*(3), 225–229.
- Bodenhausen, G. V. (1993). Emotions, arousal, and stereotypic judgments: A heuristic model of affect and stereotyping. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping* (pp. 13–37). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bodenhausen, G. V., Mussweiler, T., Gabriel, S., & Moreno, K. N. (2001). Affective influences on stereotyping and intergroup relations. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *The handbook of affect and social cognition* (pp. 319–343). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bodenhausen, G. V., Sheppard, L. A., & Kramer, G. P. (1994). Negative affect and social judgment: The differential impact of anger and sadness. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 24*(1), 45–62.
- Bombardi, D., Schmid Mast, M., & Bachmann, M. (2017). Felt power explains the link between position power and experienced emotions. *Emotion, 17*(1), 55–66.
- Bowles, H. R. (2013). Psychological perspectives on gender in negotiation. In M. K. Ryan & N. R. Branscombe (Eds.), *The sage handbook of gender and psychology* (pp. 465–483). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & Lai, L. (2007). Social incentives for gender differences in the propensity to initiate negotiations: Sometimes it does hurt to ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *103*(1), 84–103.
- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & McGinn, K. L. (2005). Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*(6), 951–965.
- Bowles, H. R., & Gelfand, M. (2010). Status and the evaluation of workplace deviance. *Psychological Science*, *21*(1), 49–54.
- Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science*, *19*(3), 268–275.
- Brett, J., & Thompson, L. (2016). Negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *136*, 68–79.
- Brooks, A. W., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2011). Can Nervous Nelly negotiate? How anxiety causes negotiators to make low first offers, exit early, and earn less profit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *115*(1), 43–54.
- Butt, A. N., Choi, J. N., & Jaeger, A. M. (2005). The effects of self-emotion, counterpart emotion, and counterpart behavior on negotiator behavior: A comparison of individual-level and dyad-level dynamics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(6), 681–704.
- Callister, R. R., Gray, B., Gibson, D. E., Schweitzer, M., & Tan, J. S. (2014). Anger at work: Examining organizational anger norms impact on anger expression outcomes. In O. Ayoko, N. Ashkanasy, & K. Jehn (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict management research* (pp. 270–287). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, M. T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(1), 25–38.
- Côté, S., Hideg, I., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2013). The consequences of faking anger in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*(3), 453–463.
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Wolf, E. B., Glick, P., Crotty, S., Chong, J., & Norton, M. I. (2015). Men as cultural ideals: Cultural values moderate gender stereotype content. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*(4), 622–635.
- DeSteno, D., Dasgupta, N., Bartlett, M. Y., & Caidric, A. (2004). Prejudice from thin air: The effect of emotion on automatic intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Science, 15*(5), 319–324.
- Dunn, J. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion on trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(5), 736–748.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing men and women. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 569–591.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573–598.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(4), 735–754.

- Fabiansson, E. C., & Denson, T. F. (2012). The effects of intrapersonal anger and its regulation in economic bargaining. *PLOS ONE*, 7(12), e51595.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902.
- Fiske, S. T., & Morling, B. (1996). Stereotyping as a function of personal control motives and capacity constraints: The odd couple of power and anxiety. In R. M. Sorrentino & T. E. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (Vol. 3, pp. 322–346). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Galinsky, A. D., Anicich, E. M., Turek, A., Rucker, D. D., Bowles, H. R., Liberman, N., & Magee, J. C. (2019). *Are many sex differences really power differences in disguise science?* Working paper, Columbia University.
- Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(3), 453–466.
- Galinsky, A. D., Schaerer, M., & Magee, J. C. (2017). The four horsemen of power at the bargaining table. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 32(4), 606–611.
- Gruenfeld, D. H., Inesi, M. E., Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Power and the objectification of social targets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(1), 111–127.
- Guinote, A. (2007). Power and goal pursuit. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(8), 1076–1087.

- Guinote, A. (2017). How power affects people: Activating, wanting, and goal seeking. *Annual Review of Psychology, 68*(1), 353–381.
- Hareli, S., Shomrat, N., & Hess, U. (2009). Emotional versus neutral expressions and perceptions of social dominance and submissiveness. *Emotion, 9*(3), 378–384.
- Hernandez, M., Avery, D. R., Volpone, S. D., & Kaiser, C. R. (2019). Bargaining while Black: The role of race in salary negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(4), 581–592.
- Hess, U., Adams, R., & Kleck, R. (2005). Who may frown and who should smile? Dominance, affiliation, and the display of happiness and anger. *Cognition and Emotion, 19*(4), 515–536.
- Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review, 65*(2), 117–127.
- Johns, M., Schmader, T., & Martens, A. (2005). Knowing is half the battle. *Psychological Science, 16*, 175–179.
- Keltner, D., Ellsworth, P. C., & Edwards, K. (1993). Beyond simple pessimism: Effects of sadness and anger on social perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(5), 740–752.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review, 110*(2), 265–284.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition & Emotion, 13*(5), 505–521.
- Keltner, D., Young, R. C., Heerey, E. A., Oemig, C., & Monarch, N. D. (1998). Teasing in hierarchical and intimate relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(5), 1231–1247.

- Kennedy, J. A., & Kray, L. J. (2015). A pawn in someone else's game? The cognitive, motivational, and paradigmatic barriers to women's excelling in negotiation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *35*, 3–28.
- Kilduff, G. J., & Galinsky, A. D. (2013). From the ephemeral to the enduring: How approach-oriented mindsets lead to greater status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*(5), 816–831.
- Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2010). Organizational social network research: Core ideas and key debates. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *4*(1), 317–357.
- Kolb, D. M., & Putnam, L. L. (1997). Through the looking glass: Negotiation theory refracted through the lens of gender. In S. Gleason (Ed.), *Frontiers in dispute resolution in industrial relations and human resources* (pp. 231–257). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Kray, L. J., Galinsky, A. D., & Thompson, L. (2002). Reversing the gender gap in negotiations: An exploration of stereotype regeneration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *87*(2), 386–410.
- Kray, L. J., & Shirako, A. (2011). Stereotype threat in organizations: An examination of its scope, triggers, and possible interventions. In M. Inzlicht & T. Schmader (Eds.), *Stereotype Threat Theory, Process, and Application* (pp. 173–187). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kray, L. J., & Thompson, L. (2004). Gender stereotypes and negotiation performance: A review of theory and research. In B. M. Staw & R. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior series* (Vol. 26, pp. 103–182). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Kray, L. J., Thompson, L., & Galinsky, A. (2001). Battle of the sexes: Gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(6), 942–958.
- Kugler, K. G., Reif, J. A. M., Kaschner, T., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2018). Gender differences in the initiation of negotiations: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 144*(2), 198–222.
- Lammers, J., Dubois, D., Rucker, D. D., & Galinsky, A. D. (2013). Power gets the job: Priming power improves interview outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*(4), 776–779.
- Lax, D. A., & Sebenius, J. K. (1986). *The manager as negotiator: Bargaining for cooperation and competitive gain*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Lelieveld, G.-J., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., Steinel, W., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2011). Disappointed in you, angry about your offer: Distinct negative emotions induce concessions via different mechanisms. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(3), 635–641.
- Lelieveld, G.-J., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2012). Why anger and disappointment affect other's bargaining behavior differently: The moderating role of power and the mediating role of reciprocal and complementary emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(9), 1209–1221.
- Lerner, J. S., Dorison, C. A., & Klusowski, J. (in press). Theories and frameworks for understanding emotion and decision making. In A. Scarantino (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Emotion Theory* (p. 45). Abingdon, UK.

- Lerner, J. S., Goldberg, J. H., & Tetlock, P. E. (1998). Sober second thought: The effects of accountability, anger, and authoritarianism on attributions of responsibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*(6), 563–574.
- Lerner, J. S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P., & Kassam, K. S. (2015). Emotion and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*(1), 799–823.
- Lerner, J. S., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2006). Portrait of the angry decision maker: How appraisal tendencies shape anger's influence on cognition. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *19*(2), 115–137.
- Liu, M., & Wang, C. (2010). Explaining the influence of anger and compassion on negotiators' interaction goals: An assessment of trust and distrust as two distinct mediators. *Communication Research*, *37*(4), 443–472.
- Löckenhoff, C. E., Chan, W., McCrae, R. R., De Fruyt, F., Jussim, L., De Bolle, M., ... Terracciano, A. (2014). Gender stereotypes of personality: Universal and accurate? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *45*(5), 675–694.
- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1), 351–398.
- Magee, J. C., Galinsky, A. D., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2007). Power, propensity to negotiate, and moving first in competitive interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*(2), 200–212.
- Mazei, J., Hüffmeier, J., Freund, P. A., Stuhlmacher, A. F., Bilke, L., & Hertel, G. (2015). A meta-analysis on gender differences in negotiation outcomes and their moderators. *Psychological Bulletin*, *141*(1), 85–104.

- Netchaeva, E., Kouchaki, M., & Sheppard, L. D. (2015). A man's (precarious) place: Men's experienced threat and self-assertive reactions to female superiors. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41*(9), 1247–1259.
- Öhman, A. (2008). Fear and anxiety. In M. Lewis, J. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (3rd ed., pp. 709–729). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Olekalns, M., & Druckman, D. (2014). With feeling: How emotions shape negotiation. *Negotiation Journal, 30*(4), 455–478.
- Osborne, J. W. (2001). Testing stereotype threat: Does anxiety explain race and sex differences in achievement? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26*(3), 291–310.
- Osborne, J. W. (2007). Linking stereotype threat and anxiety. *Educational Psychology, 27*(1), 135–154.
- Overbeck, J. R., Neale, M. A., & Govan, C. L. (2010). I feel, therefore you act: Intrapersonal and interpersonal effects of emotion on negotiation as a function of social power. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 112*(2), 126–139.
- Pillutla, M. M., & Murnighan, J. K. (1996). Unfairness, anger, and spite: Emotional rejections of ultimatum offers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 68*(3), 208–224.
- Pinkley, R. L. (1995). Impact of knowledge regarding alternatives to settlement in dyadic negotiations: Whose knowledge counts? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(3), 403–417.
- Plant, E. A., Hyde, J. S., Keltner, D., & Devine, P. G. (2000). The gender stereotyping of emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*(1), 81–92.
- Podolny, J. M. (2005). *Status signals: A sociological study of market competition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 269–281.
- Quigley, B. M., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1996). Mediating effects of blame attributions on feelings of anger. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(12), 1280–1288.
- Ratcliff, N. J., Franklin, R. G., Nelson, A. J., & Vescio, T. K. (2012). The scorn of status: A bias toward perceiving anger on high-status faces. *Social Cognition*, 30(5), 631–642.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). How do status beliefs develop? The role of resources and interactional experiences. In J. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice and intergroup relations* (pp. 357–377). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rivera, L. A. (2016). *Pedigree: How elite students get elite jobs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosette, A. S., Koval, C. Z., Ma, A., & Livingston, R. (2016). Race matters for women leaders: Intersectional effects on agentic deficiencies and penalties. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 429–445.
- Rudman, L. A., Dohn, M. C., & Fairchild, K. (2007). Implicit self-esteem compensation: Automatic threat defense. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(5), 798–813.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(5), 1004–1010.

- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(1), 165–179.
- Schaerer, M., Swaab, R. I., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). Anchors weigh more than power: Why absolute powerlessness liberates negotiators to achieve better outcomes. *Psychological Science, 26*(2), 170–181.
- Shan, W., Keller, J., & Joseph, D. (2019). Are men better negotiators everywhere? A meta-analysis of how gender differences in negotiation performance vary across cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 1–27*.
- Sinaceur, M., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2006). Get mad and get more than even: When and why anger expression is effective in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*(3), 314–322.
- Small, D. A., Gelfand, M., Babcock, L., & Gettman, H. (2007). Who goes to the bargaining table? The influence of gender and framing on the initiation of negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(4), 600–613.
- Spielberger, C. D., Jacobs, G., Russell, S., & Crane, R. S. (1983). Assessment of anger: The state-trait anger scale. *Advances in Personality Assessment, 2*, 159–187.
- Srivastava, J., Espinoza, F., & Fedorikhin, A. (2009). Coupling and decoupling of unfairness and anger in ultimatum bargaining. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 22*(5), 475–489.

- Steele, C. M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 261–302). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 613–629.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(5), 797–811.
- Steinel, W., Van Kleef, G. A., & Harinck, F. (2008). Are you talking to me?! Separating the people from the problem when expressing emotions in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(2), 362–369.
- Stephan, W. G. (2014). Intergroup anxiety: Theory, research, and practice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *18*(3), 239–255.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, *41*(3), 157–175.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *52*(3), 653–677.
- Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: The effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(1), 86–94.
- Tiedens, L. Z., Ellsworth, P. C., & Mesquita, B. (2000). Sentimental stereotypes: Emotional expectations for high-and low-status group members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(5), 560–575.

- Toosi, N. R., Mor, S., Semnani-Azad, Z., Phillips, K. W., & Amanatullah, E. T. (2019). Who can lean in? The intersecting role of race and gender in negotiations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 43*(1), 7–21.
- Tost, L. P. (2015). When, why, and how do powerholders “feel the power”? Examining the links between structural and psychological power and reviving the connection between power and responsibility. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 35*, 29–56.
- Trombini, C., Bowles, H. R., & Moore, C. (2019). *Can values affirmation reduce gender bias? Decreasing men’s backlash against agentic women*. Working paper, Harvard Kennedy School.
- Van Beest, I., & Scheepers, D. (2013). Challenge and threat responses to anger communication in coalition formation. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 38*, 50–57.
- Van Beest, I., Van Kleef, G. A., & Dijk, E. V. (2008). Get angry, get out: The interpersonal effects of anger communication in multiparty negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*(4), 993–1002.
- Van Dijk, E., Van Kleef, G. A., Steinel, W., & Van Beest, I. (2008). A social functional approach to emotions in bargaining: When communicating anger pays and when it backfires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(4), 600–614.
- Van Kleef, G. A. (2009). How Emotions Regulate Social Life: The Emotions as Social Information (EASI) Model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18*(3), 184–188.
- Van Kleef, G. A., & Côté, S. (2007). Expressing anger in conflict: When it helps and when it hurts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1557–1569.

- Van Kleef, G. A., & Côté, S. (2018). Emotional dynamics in conflict and negotiation: Individual, dyadic, and group processes. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 437–464.
- Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. K. W. D. (2010). Longer-term consequences of anger expression in negotiation: Retaliation or spillover? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(5), 753–760.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004a). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(1), 57–76.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004b). The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(4), 510–528.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2010). An interpersonal approach to emotion in social decision making. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 45–96.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., Pietroni, D., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2006). Power and emotion in negotiation: Power moderates the interpersonal effects of anger and happiness on concession making. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(4), 557–581.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Oveis, C., van der Löwe, I., LuoKogan, A., Goetz, J., & Keltner, D. (2008). Power, distress, and compassion: Turning a blind eye to the suffering of others. *Psychological Science*, 19(12), 1315–1322.

- Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*(2), 101–113.
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1325–1339.
- Wang, L., Northcraft, G. B., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2012). Beyond negotiated outcomes: The hidden costs of anger expression in dyadic negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 119*(1), 54–63.
- Watson, C. (1994). Gender versus power as a predictor of negotiation behavior and outcomes. *Negotiation Journal, 10*(2), 117–127.
- Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Wilder, D. A. (1993). The role of anxiety in facilitating stereotypic judgments of outgroup behavior. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 87–109). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wilder, D. A., & Shapiro, P. (1989). Effects of anxiety on impression formation in a group context: An anxiety-assimilation hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 25*(6), 481–499.
- Williams, C. L. (1995). Riding the glass elevator. In *Still a man's world: Men who do women's work* (pp. 81–108). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Wingfield, A. H. (2007). The modern mammy and the angry Black man: African American professionals' experiences with gendered racism in the workplace. *Race, Gender & Class, 14*(1/2), 196–212.

- Wingfield, A. H. (2010). Are some emotions marked “whites only”? Racialized feeling rules in professional workplaces. *Social Problems*, 57(2), 251–268.
- Yip, J. A., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2016). Mad and misleading: Incidental anger promotes deception. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 137, 207–217.
- Yukl, G. A. (1974). Effects of opponent’s initial offer, concession magnitude, and concession frequency on bargaining behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 332–335.

Dr. Chiara Trombini is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Harvard Kennedy School. Her research interests focus primarily on cognitive and affective biases in decision-making and in negotiations, with a gender perspective. Dr. Trombini uses a multi-method approach that includes laboratory and field experiments, secondary data, experience sampling methodology, as well as eye-tracking. She holds a Ph.D. in Business Administration and Management from Bocconi University, an M.Sc. Degree in Economics and a B.S. Degree in Economics and Management from Ca' Foscari University of Venice. Her work earned an Honorable Mention in the 2017 APS RISE Research Award.

Logan Berg is a joint research fellow at the Harvard Kennedy School's Center for Public Leadership and Women and Public Policy Program. Her research interests include motivational factors in decision making, self-regulation and overconfidence. She holds a B.A. in Psychology from Colby College and an M.S. in Social Psychology from Texas A&M University.

Hannah Riley Bowles is the Roy E. Larsen Senior Lecturer in Public Policy and Management at the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) and co-director of the HKS Women and Public Policy Program. Her research focuses on women's leadership advancement and on negotiation as a micro-mechanism of inequality. She received her doctorate from Harvard Business School, a master's degree from the Harvard Kennedy School, and a BA from Smith College.