

Online Supplement

Content	Page
Further Information Regarding Anticipated Backlash	2
Further Information Regarding Participant Gender	2
Further Information Regarding Comprehension Checks	3
Analyses Excluding Participants Who Indicated Suspicions	3
Hypothesis 1: Anticipated Backlash	4
Hypothesis 2: Salary Requests	4
Hypothesis 3: Mediation	5
Hypothesis 4: Self-Rated Competitiveness	5
Hypothesis 5: Verbal Behavior, Including Assertive Statements	5
Supplementary Analyses	5
Reservation Points, Target Points, and Anticipated Opening Offers	6
Additional Mediation Analysis	7
Further Rounds of Negotiation: Salary Requests	8
Slopes of Concessions	8
Further Rounds of Negotiation: Verbal Statements	9
Ethnicity/Race	10
Gender of Friend	11
Alternative Measure: Fear of Backlash	12
Self-Construal	13
Knowledge about Amanatullah and Morris's (2010) Original Study	14
Additional Supplementary Analyses: Impasse Rates	15
References	17
Table S1	18
Table S2	20
Table S3	21
Table S4	22

This Online Supplement includes additional details regarding our measurements, an overview of the slight differences between the original study by Amanatullah and Morris (2010) and our close replication as presented in Table S1, and supplementary analyses.

Further Information Regarding Anticipated Backlash

We made the following observations regarding the measure of anticipated backlash while preparing our data for analysis (for related information regarding further variables not included in our hypothesis tests, see below): Six participants responded to backlash items by providing two-digit numbers (as in “thousands of dollars”). These entries were changed to five-digit numbers. Two participants indicated a range (e.g., writing “55-60k”). Here, we used the lower bound (e.g., 55,000), as the questions asked about the “*threshold* at which respondents expected to incur negative social consequences” (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010, p. 260; emphasis added). One participant wrote “>60k,” which we changed to “61,000,” as the participant seemed to mean *more* than 60,000. One participant indicated “mid 50k’s,” so that we used “55,000” as the response. For one participant, the entries were simply unclear, so that we treated them as missing values and replaced them with the mean across all participants. One participant indicated “64,000+.” This response was changed to “64,000” because we understood the response as meaning 64,000 *or* more. Finally, one participant provided values of “2,000” and “1,000,” which we kept as is (as the comma was appropriately set to separate thousands; the same participant indicated “47,00” for the anticipated opening offer, which we changed to “47,000,” as the way in which the comma was set suggests that “47,000” was meant).

Further Information Regarding Participant Gender

To ensure that our replication conducted as an in-person laboratory study with a large sample size would run smoothly, and also to roughly monitor the participation rates of women and men, our experimenters created two piles of questionnaires in preparation for the

sessions: one pile for participants perceived as women and one pile for participants perceived as men (experimental conditions, that is, “agent” vs. “recruit,” were shuffled in each pile; as noted in our main manuscript, our participant code also included a letter indicating the gender of the participants). Thus, our experimenters had to make a guess regarding the participants’ gender. Importantly, in our analyses, we used participants’ self-indicated gender (the original questionnaire used the term “sex”; see the main manuscript). In three cases, the guess made by the experimenters was at odds with the participants’ self-indicated gender. Sensitivity analyses excluding these three cases did not make a difference in any of our hypothesis tests. On a final note, three participants preferred to self-describe their gender (indicating to be “nonbinary,” “non-binary, gender non-conforming,” and as “AFAB,” which stands for “assigned female at birth”). In line with our a priori plans and as noted in the main manuscript, they were excluded from all analyses.

Further Information Regarding Comprehension Checks

While preparing our data for analysis, we recognized that one participant chose both response options on the first comprehension check (i.e., asking for whom they primarily negotiated); accordingly, this participant was judged as failing at this comprehension check. For one participant, two pages of Packet 3 were simply missing; as such, this participant was not judged as failing at the comprehension checks (the same participant had a missing suspicion check). Five further participants had missing values regarding the second comprehension check (i.e., asking participants to indicate the name of their alleged counterpart). Notably, two of them explicitly noted “I don’t remember,” and one participant wrote a question mark. Therefore, these five participants were judged as failing at the comprehension check.

Analyses Excluding Participants Who Indicated Suspicious

In addition to the results presented in the main manuscript, we also provide the results when excluding participants who indicated suspicions (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010, reported that this did not make a difference in their original study). Table S2 provides descriptive statistics. Table S3 provides regression analyses. For comparison purposes, the tables also give the results when including all participants and when including only attentive participants (see the main manuscript).

Hypothesis 1: Anticipated Backlash

When excluding participants who indicated to be suspicious ($N = 252$), the contrast was not significant, $t(108.85; \text{unequal variances}) = 0.34, p = .743$. Regarding the regression analysis, there were no significant effects. One reason for the absence of any effects here could be the loss of statistical power, as this analysis included only about half of the total sample size (for the means, see Table S2). Regarding the t -tests, there were no significant differences (all p 's $\geq .118$). Regarding nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis-tests, there were also no significant differences. Finally, regarding the additional exploratory t -test comparing women and men while collapsing across the advocacy-conditions, there was no significant gender difference, $t(77.58; \text{unequal variances}) = 1.32, p = .195, d = 0.25$ (there could be a loss of statistical power; the effect size was only slightly smaller as compared to the other empirical specifications).

Hypothesis 2: Salary Requests

In the analysis excluding participants who indicated to be suspicious ($N = 250$), the contrast was not significant, $t(246) = -0.81, p = .535$. Regarding the regressions, there were no significant effects (see Table S3). Regarding the t -tests, there were no significant differences (all p 's $\geq .417$). Regarding the Kruskal-Wallis-tests, other-advocating women requested significantly lower salaries than self-advocating men ($p = .009$), but no other differences were significant. Finally, when running an exploratory t -test comparing women

and men while collapsing across the advocacy–conditions, there was no significant gender difference, $t(248) = -0.02$, $p = .969$, $d = -0.00$.

Hypothesis 3: Mediation

There was again no significant difference between the conditional indirect effects (i.e., the effect of gender on salary requests through anticipated backlash as compared between the two advocacy–conditions): index of moderated mediation = 809.30, 95% CI [-19,189.63; 18,148.09]. There were no significant indirect effects within the self-advocacy condition and the other-advocacy condition. Finally, in a regression including gender and anticipated backlash as predictors of the salary requests (across conditions, as this regression examined the b -path in a mediation), anticipated backlash was a significant positive predictor ($p < .001$, and the 95% CI did not include zero).

Hypothesis 4: Self-Rated Competitiveness

In the analysis excluding participants who indicated suspicions, the contrast was significant, $t(248) = 2.28$, $p = .020$. Regarding the regressions, there were no significant effects. Regarding the t -tests, there was only a significant difference between self-advocating women and other-advocating men, $t(137) = -2.58$, $p = .006$, $d = -0.51$ (i.e., there were no other significant differences).

Hypothesis 5: Verbal Behavior, Including Assertive Statements

In the loglinear analysis, there was no significant highest-order three-way effect, $\chi^2(5) = 3.82$, $p = .576$. Regarding the follow-up χ^2 -analyses testing for associations between gender and the selected responses in Round 1, separately for the two advocacy–conditions, there was no such association: $\chi^2(5) = 5.51$, $p = .356$ for the self-advocacy condition; $\chi^2(5) = 8.23$, $p = .144$ for the other-advocacy condition.

Supplementary Analyses

We report below supplementary analyses that we planned a priori. We ultimately decided to run these supplementary analyses while including only attentive participants (see the main manuscript).

Reservation Points, Target Points, and Anticipated Opening Offers

The overarching notion in the research by Amanatullah and Morris (2010) was that gender differences result from women's awareness of, and strategic response to, the risk of incurring backlash. By contrast, gender differences were not attributed to a lack of willingness or ability among women to negotiate favorable economic outcomes (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010). Thus, we also did not expect any effects to emerge regarding participants' reservation points, target points, and anticipated opening offers (cf. Amanatullah & Morris, 2010). We again ran regressions and *t*-tests (all with bootstrapping; in the original study, the prenegotiation measures were, in all likelihood, analyzed with regressions and by comparing means; Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; E. T. Amanatullah, personal communication, June 18, 2020). Table S4 provides descriptive statistics.

While preparing the data for analysis, we observed the following regarding these items for the full dataset: Three participants provided two-digit numbers (as in “thousands of dollars”). These entries were changed to five-digit numbers. Two participants indicated a range (e.g., writing “52k – 48k”). Here, we used the lower bound (e.g., 48,000). For one participant, an entry was simply unclear, so we treated it as a missing value and replaced it with the mean on the respective variable across all participants. Finally, one participant indicated “47,00” for the anticipated opening offer. We changed that entry to “47,000” because the way in which the comma was set indicated that “47,000” was meant.

Regarding *reservation points*, there were no significant effects in the regression analysis (all p 's $\geq .199$). The *t*-tests showed that self-advocating women had *higher* reservation points than other-advocating women, $t(325) = 2.23$, $p = .028$, $d = 0.25$, but there

were no other significant differences (all p 's $\geq .175$). Notably, in the regression analysis regarding *target points*, there was a significant effect for gender, $b = -2,856.54$ ($SE = 866.94$), $p = .002$, for advocacy, $b = -3,204.67$ ($SE = 1,023.71$), $p < .001$, as well as a significant interaction, $b = 2,940.76$ ($SE = 1,169.10$), $p = .012$. The t -tests revealed that self-advocating women had lower target points than self-advocating men, $t(234) = -3.53$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.50$. Moreover, self-advocating men had higher target points than other-advocating men, $t(132) = 3.12$, $p = .003$, $d = 0.54$. No other comparisons were significant (all p 's $\geq .644$). Regarding *anticipated opening offers*, the regression only showed a significant effect for gender, $b = -2,646.99$ ($SE = 958.81$), $p = .007$ (both other p 's $\geq .063$). The t -tests revealed that self-advocating women indicated lower anticipated opening offers than self-advocating men, $t(154.69; \text{unequal variances}) = -2.75$, $p = .006$, $d = -0.37$, but there were no other significant differences (all other p 's $\geq .076$). In summary, unlike in the original study, a few gender differences emerged prior to the salary negotiation.

Additional Mediation Analysis

In addition to the mediation analyses described in our main manuscript, we examined whether anticipated backlash mediated the gender difference in salary requests within the self-advocacy condition, using Model 4 in PROCESS (Hayes, 2018; this additional analysis was not provided by Amanatullah & Morris, 2010). This additional analysis is interesting for the following reason: As per Amanatullah and Morris's (2010) theorizing, women should more readily anticipate backlash than men, which leads them to request lower salaries, yet only when they negotiate for themselves. As such, a mediation analysis among self-advocating negotiators should reveal mediation of gender differences in salary requests by anticipated backlash. Indeed, the results suggested that anticipated backlash mediated the effect of gender on salary requests within the self-advocacy condition: The indirect effect was estimated at $-1,711.97$, 95% CI $[-3,285.97; -304.97]$.

Further Rounds of Negotiation: Salary Requests

In line with Amanatullah and Morris (2010), we generally focused on salary requests in the first round of negotiation. Yet, we also analyzed participants' requests in the subsequent four rounds of negotiation. Regarding these supplementary analyses, please note that participants could not make a request in a certain round of negotiation if they had already accepted an offer in a previous round (see the characteristics of the standardized negotiation as described in our main manuscript). Thus, as we planned a priori, participants were assigned the value of their agreed upon salary for each round for which they were unable to make a request (it is unclear what the procedure for these analyses was in the original study; E. T. Amanatullah, personal communication, June 18, 2020). For the supplementary analyses, we ran the same regression analyses as were reported in the main manuscript. On a final note, please recall there were two participants who accepted the very first offer by their alleged counterpart. Thus, they were again not included in the following supplementary analyses.

In all rounds 2–5, the regression revealed a significant effect for gender (all p 's $\leq .005$). These results mirror those for the first round of negotiation that we reported in the main manuscript. Moreover, only in the fifth round of negotiation, there was a significant effect for advocacy ($p = .029$; all other p 's $\geq .066$), indicating that, among men, other-advocating negotiators made lower requests than self-advocating negotiators (as explained in the main manuscript, the regression analyses estimate simple effects, not main effects). Finally, there was no significant interaction in any round of negotiation (all p 's $\geq .128$). In summary, the results on the subsequent rounds were very similar to those found for the first round of negotiation.

Slopes of Concessions

Amanatullah and Morris (2010) also analyzed “the slopes of concessionary behavior across the negotiation rounds” (p. 262). This aspect is less central for our replication. Yet, as

planned a priori, we conducted a mixed ANOVA with a within-subjects factor capturing participants' requests in the five rounds of negotiation and the between-subjects factor of gender, separately for both advocacy conditions (it is not fully clear how the slopes of concessionary behavior were analyzed in the original study; in all likelihood, "simple slope analyses of the linear slope between Round 1 and Round 5" were conducted; E. T.

Amanatullah, personal communication, June 18, 2020). As the assumption of sphericity was violated (according to Mauchly's tests) and as the Greenhouse-Geisser criterion was always below .75, we used the Greenhouse-Geisser correction.

As for the *self-advocacy condition*, there was a significant effect for the round of negotiation, such that people made smaller requests over time (i.e., they made concessions; $p < .001$), a significant effect for gender (women requested lower salaries than men; $p = .001$), but no round $\times$ gender interaction ($p = .266$). As for the *other-advocacy condition*, there was again a significant effect for the round of negotiation, such that negotiators conceded ($p < .001$), but no effect for gender ($p = .097$). Notably, however, there was a significant round $\times$ gender interaction ($p < .001$). Inspecting estimated marginal means, we observed that men made higher salary requests than women in the first round of negotiation, but this gender difference vanished across the five rounds of negotiation. This result is interesting and noteworthy. Still, recall that the gender $\times$ advocacy interaction was not significant in any round of negotiation (see the previous section).

Further Rounds of Negotiation: Verbal Statements

We ran the same loglinear analyses on participants' chosen verbal statements as were provided for the first round of negotiation in the main manuscript. There was no significant highest-order three-way effect (i.e., gender $\times$ advocacy $\times$ statement) in any of the loglinear analyses on participants' responses to their alleged counterpart's offer or in any of the

loglinear analyses on participants' chosen statements to accompany their own offers (all p 's $\geq .251$).

Ethnicity/Race

Our participants had diverse backgrounds: Of the full sample, 41 identified as African American, 210 as Asian American, 134 as Caucasian American, 38 as Hispanic American, one as Native American, four as African, 31 as Asian (including from East Asia and Southeast Asia/India), one as Hispanic, one as International, one as Middle Eastern, two as white, and 16 preferred to not answer the question. Notably, the sample in the original study also included participants with diverse backgrounds (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010, p. 259).

Reflecting further on the backgrounds of our participants and also considering the fact that we did not—and could not, given statistical power constraints and the goals of this close replication—sample with the aim of analyzing the role of participants' ethnicity/race as an additional factor, we note that an exploratory analysis that would take into account the variation among all demographic groups within our sample was not possible. Still, an important take-away from intersectionality research is that the experiences of whites—the one group that is typically overrepresented in research (and, of course, in other domains of life)—must not be overgeneralized. Hence, we began by running two exploratory analyses that involve a dummy-variable of 0 = *Caucasian American/White* and 1 = *Non-Caucasian American/White*.

First, we ran an ANOVA with this dummy-variable, gender, and advocacy as the independent variables, as well as anticipated backlash as the dependent variable. There were no significant interactions in this analysis (all p 's $\geq .057$), yet a significant main effect for the newly created dummy variable ($p < .001$), suggesting that Caucasian Americans/whites anticipated backlash less readily (there was another main effect for gender that mirrored the findings presented in the main manuscript). Second, in an ANOVA with the aforementioned

newly created dummy-variable, gender, and advocacy as the independent variables, as well as first round salary requests as the dependent variable, there was only a significant effect for gender ($p < .001$; see the main manuscript for related analyses; all other p 's $\geq .075$).

As a reviewer rightly pointed out during the editorial review process, further exploratory analyses could be helpful to better understand the role played by participants' ethnicity/race. Hence, we ran two additional exploratory analyses using the independent variables of gender, advocacy, and a newly created factor that had the following levels: 0 = *Caucasian American/White*, 1 = *Asian/Asian American*, 2 = *African/African American/Hispanic/Hispanic American*, and 3 = *Remaining Groups*. We highlight that this grouping does not account for important differences within each of the four levels. Please recall that our key aim was not to study people's race/ethnicity, in particular.

In an ANOVA with anticipated backlash as the dependent variable, there was a significant main effect of the four-level factor on participants' ethnicity/race ($p < .001$) and a significant interaction between gender and ethnicity/race ($p = .003$), but no other significant effects. Inspection of the estimated marginal means suggested that, among Caucasian Americans/whites, Asians/Asian Americans, and the Remaining Groups, women more readily anticipated backlash than men, whereas this pattern appeared to be reversed among Africans/African Americans/Hispanics/Hispanic Americans. In an ANOVA with first round salary requests as the dependent variable, there was only a significant main effect of gender ($p < .001$), such that women requested lower salaries than men (see the main manuscript).

Gender of Friend

Of all participants who were in the other-advocacy condition, 73 thought of their friend on whose behalf they were negotiating as male, 110 thought of a female friend, one thought of a non-binary friend (as this was the only participant who thought of a non-binary friend, this case was excluded from the analysis), and 71 did not think of their friend as

having a particular gender (there was one missing value; this case was also excluded from the supplementary analysis).

To examine the relevance of the friend's gender, we first ran an ANOVA with this factor (male friend, female friend, friend with no particular gender) and participant gender as the independent variables, and anticipated backlash as the dependent variable (of course, only participants who were in the other-advocacy condition are relevant for this and the following analysis). The analysis revealed a main effect for the friend's gender ($p = .023$) and also a significant interaction of friend gender and participant gender ($p = .048$), but no significant effect for participant gender ($p = .122$). Inspection of the estimated marginal means suggested that, whereas women (as compared to men) more readily anticipated backlash when they thought of their friend as being either male or female, this participant gender difference appeared reversed when they did not think of their friend as having a particular gender. Put differently, there appeared to be a "conventional" gender difference among participants who were picturing their friend as having a specific gender, but not among participants whose constituent remained unspecific to them. As noted by one of our reviewers, it could very well be that participants who had difficulties to think of a specific friend with a specific gender might have had difficulties to find the scenario realistic. As a result, the risk of incurring backlash might have felt unrealistic to them, too, which could have rendered gender differences unlikely (see also the Discussion section of our main manuscript).

We then ran a second ANOVA with the same independent variables and salary requests in the first round of negotiation as the dependent variable. Here, there was only a main effect for participant gender that resembled the analyses reported in the main manuscript ($p = .004$; both other p 's $\geq .246$).

Alternative Measure: Fear of Backlash

On the seven items of the alternative measure of fear of backlash, there were eight missing values, which were replaced with the mean across all participants. Moreover, one participant marked two response options on one item; this datum was also replaced with the mean across all participants. We then created a scale ($\alpha = .91$; $\omega = .92$), with higher values reflecting higher fear of backlash. Afterwards, we ran the same regression analysis (again with bootstrapping) presented above and in the main manuscript. There was a significant effect for gender ($p < .001$), a non-significant effect for advocacy ($p = .074$), and—notably—a significant interaction ($p = .028$). We followed up on this interesting finding by comparing women and men with *t*-tests, separately for the two advocacy-conditions. In the self-advocacy condition, women (as compared to men) reported higher fear of backlash ($p < .001$), but there was no gender difference in the other-advocacy condition ($p = .203$). Although this finding is interesting, recall that fear of backlash had to be measured *after* the original study protocol came to an end—that is, after participants were debriefed, and also after they learned about the key findings by Amanatullah and Morris (2010) as an item included in our Packet 3. Moreover, the analysis was exploratory.

Self-Construal

For the 24 items capturing interdependent and independent self-construal, there were twelve missing values, which were replaced with the mean across all participants. Moreover, there were three instances in which participants marked two response options (these cases were again also replaced with the mean across all participants). We then created scales for participants' interdependent self-construal ($\alpha = .79$; $\omega = .79$) and their independent self-construal ($\alpha = .77$; $\omega = .76$), and again ran regressions. In the regression with *interdependent self-construal* as the criterion, there were no significant effects (all p 's $\geq .453$). In the regression with *independent self-construal* as the criterion, there was only a significant negative effect for gender ($p < .001$; all other p 's $\geq .055$; as noted in the main manuscript,

gender was coded as 0 = *men* and 1 = *women*, and advocacy was coded as 0 = *self-advocacy* and 1 = *other-advocacy*).

Knowledge about Amanatullah and Morris's (2010) Original Study

As noted in our main manuscript, participants were asked to indicate whether they knew about the paper by Amanatullah and Morris (2010). Of all participants, the vast majority (i.e., 483 participants) did not know about the original paper (33 indicated to know it, and there was one missing value). We also asked participants whether they knew about the main findings from the original study (which were described to them). Here, 251 participants indicated to know about the findings, whereas 265 did not (there was again one missing value). Regarding the latter result, please note, however, that participants had already been debriefed when they were described the main findings and asked about their knowledge.

To examine the relevance of participants knowledge, we again ran regression analyses while excluding not only participants who failed at a comprehension check or made requests outside of the prespecified range, but also those who indicated to know about the original paper by Amanatullah and Morris (2010). Mirroring the findings reported in the main manuscript, the analysis on anticipated backlash as the criterion only revealed a significant effect for gender ($p = .031$; both other p 's $\geq .198$). The same was observed in an analysis with salary requests in the first round of negotiation as the criterion ($p < .001$ for gender; both other p 's $\geq .219$).

Finally, we ran the same regressions while excluding not only participants who failed at a comprehension check or made requests outside of the prespecified range, but also those who indicated to know about the findings from the original study. Please note the substantially lowered statistical power in these exploratory analyses, as about half of the participants indicated to have known about the finding (recall also the unclear validity of this question because we had to ask it *after* participants were debriefed, in order to avoid altering

the original study protocol). The analysis on anticipated backlash as the criterion did not include a significant effect, although the coefficient for gender was similar in size as in the main analysis in the main manuscript ($b = 2303.12$, $p = .096$; both other p 's $\geq .331$). The analysis on salary requests again revealed only a significant effect for gender ($p = .047$; both other p 's $\geq .558$).

Additional Supplementary Analyses: Impasse Rates

We also considered impasse rates across conditions (e.g., Ma et al., 2024)—we thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion. As explained in detail in the main manuscript, the negotiation ended in impasse if a participant never accepted an offer made by the counterpart (i.e., “Brian”) and kept requesting a salary across all rounds of negotiating that was higher than what “Brian” was offering (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010). Specifically, the final offer by “Brian” was \$39,000, so that all negotiations in which participants made a final request that exceeded this value ended in impasse (as stated in the main manuscript, this number was also adapted to address inflation). Notably, the majority of negotiations—422 out of the total number of $N = 517$ (81.6%)—ended in impasse. One reason for this relatively high impasse rate might be that the original paradigm was designed to measure participants' behavior during a negotiation that can include up to five rounds. As such, it would have been unfortunate if negotiations would readily come to an agreement without a need for the participants to keep making requests.

The following supplementary analyses were again conducted while including only attentive participants. To explore whether impasse rates varied by experimental condition, we first ran a loglinear analysis. There was no significant highest-order three-way effect (i.e., gender $\times$ advocacy $\times$ impasse), $\chi^2(1) = 0.01$, $p = .923$. Moreover, we also ran χ^2 -analyses testing for associations between gender and impasse, separately for the two advocacy—

conditions. There was no such association within the self-advocacy condition, $\chi^2(1) = 0.20$, $p = .659$, nor within the other-advocacy condition, $\chi^2(1) = 0.38$, $p = .536$.

References

- 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, 256–267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017094>
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Ma, A., Ponce de Leon, R., & Rosette, A. S. (2024). Asking for less (but receiving more): Women avoid impasses and outperform men when negotiators have weak alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 109(7), 1145–1158. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001138>

Table S1*Comparison Between Original Study and Close Replication*

Aspect	Original study	Close replication	Notes
Location	Columbia Business School (New York City, USA)	Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, USA)	The study locations are both labs at a business school of an Ivy League institution, located in a metropolis on the East Coast of the United States.
Recruitment	Recruited participants for the study using flyers and local advertisements.	Recruited participants who had registered with the Wharton Behavioral Lab by sending an e-mail advertisement.	We used the Wharton Behavioral Lab's standard recruitment procedure (e-mailing registered participants), which enabled efficient recruitment at the scale needed for our larger sample.
Session size	1–2 participants per session	Multiple participants per session	We ran more participants per session to achieve the larger sample size. To align with the original study's setup, we maintained participant privacy by seating them in screened-off cubicles and having them wear headphones to ensure a private negotiation experience.
Advocacy role assignment	Manual by experimenter	Randomized via participant ID codes	We used pre-coded IDs to streamline random assignment and enable larger sessions so that the researcher did not have to enter anything in the computer for individual participants.
Compensation	\$5	\$12–\$15 (adjusted for inflation and local norms)	The original study paid \$5, which was standard at the time. We paid \$12–\$15 to reflect current institutional norms and to fairly compensate participants for the longer duration of our sessions. Although the compensation amount differed, the payment was fixed and non-contingent in both studies, preserving the same incentive structure.

Photo procedure	Real photo taken and incorporated in study	Simulated photo process (no actual photo used)	The original study used real participant photos to enhance realism. In our replication, we simulated the photo-taking process to preserve the feel of the interaction while complying with IRB restrictions (as photos are considered identifying information) and to accommodate larger session sizes. This preserved the intended psychological experience without collecting actual images.
Participant gender	Participants selected their gender on the questionnaire (male/female only). No information provided about how gender balance was tracked during data collection.	Participants selected their gender on the questionnaire (with an option to self-describe). To ensure that participants received the appropriate materials and to monitor gender balance, experimenters made a judgment about participants' gender at check-in and distributed materials accordingly. All analyses used self-identified gender.	All analyses were based on participants' self-reported gender in both studies. Mismatches were rare and did not affect results. Nonbinary participants were excluded per preregistration.
Comprehension checks	Not included	Added at the end of study	We added comprehension checks to ensure that participants understood key aspects of the study (e.g., who they were negotiating for and the identity of their counterpart). These checks were introduced to assess data quality and were used as exclusion criteria.
Software	Software program that is no longer available and paper materials	Qualtrics and paper materials	The original software method of administering the online negotiation was no longer available.

Table S2*Descriptive Statistics for Hypotheses 1, 2, and 4*

	Self-advocating women <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)	Self-advocating men <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)	Other-advocating women <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)	Other-advocating men <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)
Anticipated backlash				
All participants (<i>N</i> = 517)	56,501.36 (7,814.56; 184)	58,881.39 (7,729.47; 77)	54,703.30 (7,775.50; 182)	57,510.14 (11,381.95; 74)
Not suspicious (<i>N</i> = 252)	55,525.94 (6,345.22; 106)	57,741.94 (9,200.43; 31)	53,920.73 (7,469.47; 82)	56,121.21 (14,247.28; 33)
Attentive participants (<i>N</i> = 461)	55,831.82 (6,414.97; 165)	58,343.20 (7,506.95; 71)	54,805.56 (6,647.57; 162)	55,884.92 (8,635.05; 63)
Salary requests				
All participants (<i>N</i> = 515)	59,891.30 (70,164.40; 184)	58,849.35 (7,370.65; 77)	53,863.89 (7,963.75; 180)	58,702.70 (12,617.37; 74)
Not suspicious (<i>N</i> = 250)	62,830.19 (92,277.40; 106)	58,225.81 (8,413.12; 31)	52,481.25 (8,008.08; 80)	58,181.82 (16,856.85; 33)
Attentive participants (<i>N</i> = 459)	54,536.36 (7,722.82; 165)	58,061.97 (6,785.58; 71)	53,378.13 (7,287.83; 160)	56,571.43 (7,283.91; 63)
Self-rated competitiveness				
All participants (<i>N</i> = 517)	4.28 (1.57; 184)	5.00 (1.40; 77)	4.65 (1.71; 182)	4.90 (1.36; 74)
Not suspicious (<i>N</i> = 252)	4.27 (1.70; 106)	4.65 (1.45; 31)	4.57 (1.76; 82)	5.11 (1.37; 33)
Attentive participants (<i>N</i> = 461)	4.27 (1.60; 165)	5.07 (1.37; 71)	4.65 (1.70; 162)	4.85 (1.29; 63)

Note. Salary requests are from the first round of negotiation.

Table S3*Regression Analyses for Hypotheses 1, 2, and 4*

	Anticipated backlash		Salary requests		Self-rated competitiveness	
	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>
All participants						
Gender	-2380.03 (1061.32)	.027	1041.95 (5283.32)	.756	-0.73 (0.20)	< .001
Advocacy	-1371.26 (1596.79)	.395	-146.65 (1698.87)	.946	-0.10 (0.23)	.664
Gender × advocacy	-426.80 (1802.69)	.822	-5880.77 (5513.75)	.424	0.48 (0.29)	.099
Not suspicious						
Gender	-2215.99 (1788.03)	.218	4604.38 (9155.61)	.614	-0.37 (0.30)	.224
Advocacy	-1620.72 (2991.84)	.591	-43.99 (3244.62)	.993	0.46 (0.35)	.182
Gender × advocacy	15.51 (3166.73)	.995	-10304.95 (9669.66)	.421	-0.17 (0.43)	.708
Attentive participants						
Gender	-2511.38 (1020.84)	.014	-3525.61 (997.38)	< .001	-0.80 (0.20)	< .001
Advocacy	-2458.28 (1433.95)	.083	-1490.54 (1209.96)	.219	-0.22 (0.23)	.344
Gender × advocacy	1432.02 (1600.52)	.375	332.31 (1463.42)	.823	0.60 (0.30)	.044

Note. Salary requests are from the first round of negotiation.

Table S4*Descriptive Statistics for Prenegotiation Measures*

	Self- advocating women <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)	Self- advocating men <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)	Other- advocating women <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)	Other- advocating men <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i> ; <i>n</i>)
Reservation points	47,160.61 (4880.90; 165)	47,197.20 (4,509.10; 71)	45,969.14 (4,794.44; 162)	46,111.11 (5,233.61; 63)
Target points	59,594.16 (5,379.99; 165)	62,450.70 (6,375.82; 71)	59,330.25 (5,026.38; 162)	59,246.03 (5,381.32; 63)
Anticipated opening offer	58,972.73 (7,540.19; 165)	61,619.72 (6,412.86; 71)	58,410.49 (6,688.25; 162)	59,666.67 (5,926.98; 63)