You cite work that suggests that social attitudes (liking, in- vs. out-group) affect how much we align/adapt to others. (nice introduction, btw) For our meeting, think about whether these studies assesses adaptation/alignment in production or perception. In particular:

Can you think of a priori reasons why adaptation in the two modalities (speaking & listening) might not be affected equally be social attitudes?

Which modalities were studied in Babel et al and similar papers? Are there any papers that look at perception? (perhaps revisit the Hay et al cartalk paper, too)

Could you clarify a bit further whether your question about how perception is affected by a) familiarity with a talker’s way of talking a vs. b) the attitude towards the talker vs. c) the attention of the listener to the task (& talker)? Or rather, of these three factors (and there might be more but let’s start with these three) … do you hypothesize that the effects of one factor are mediated by the one of the other factors?

If attention or task-engagement plays a role, do you have ideas as to how you could distinguish effects on how much participants do the task vs. how much they adapt? I.e., how would we distinguish listeners generally being less interested in the task vs. participants adapting less?

You propose a within-subject design in which the manipulation is embedded in two different voices. The rationale for that is that listeners can clearly distinguish those voices (likely true) but does it follow from that they we expect talker-specific adaptation? In particular, do the papers you cite (e.g., Trude & Brown-Schmidt) deal with VOT? What do other papers say about the talker-specificity of adaptation to VOT (Kraljic & Samuel for short-term exposure; Munson, 2011 for long-term exposure to talker-specific shifts in VOT distributions)? What would some potential consequences of this be for your within-subject design?

* Most of the papers focused on production, not perception (Save for the Babel et al., 2012 paper I cited; will return to that)
* There is a good reason for that! Production is a behvaiour that is apparent to the other party in a conversation, whereas perception is not so it may not be as beneficial for building relationships
* (I'll check that paper you mentioned)
* My focus would be best described as looking at attitude. Rather than claiming that we are more receptive to adapting our perception for people we like, I am more focused on the desires/intentions prosocial cues prime. The distinction is that prosocial cues are not necessarily used to target a specific interaction (direct prosocial behaviour towards a specific individual); rather they create more of a mindset that results in primed individuals being more willing to interact prosaically.
* I think factors like attention and familiarity *could* have an effect, and in my design I tried to prevent them from confounding the results (e.g., having the prosocial cue be separate from the acoustic input)
* Because it is a within-talker design (at present), I would imagine that we would see equal desire to do the task between both talkers. However, I also suggest that which voice the Prosocial cue is associated with be counterbalanced within each condition. If there is a gender bias in the data, then this suggest a gender confounding factor. In short, I think we could tell from the design.
* I was talking with Shawn, and apparently him and Dr. Theodore found that the listeners would separately judge the talkers, and the voices are distinctly different if I change the gender in Praat (He said I could send you that paper, but otherwise asked me not to share it). Granted, that was with s-sh; I don't know too much about how that's different from d-t, but I do recall reading the VOT has had contamination effects in the same experiment, I think? I'll look into that more :)

Because I am such a busy person ~~(not)~~, I'm going to continue to expand on this (in thread to keep it together for future reference). Going back to #2, maybe it would be a combination between attitude and attention. I am trying to eliminate familiarity as a factor because that could --in this specific experiment especially-- reflect biased expectations from earlier experiments, which might then be hard to tease apart from an underlying factor that moderates speech perception adaptation. I imagine that both attitude and attention play a role in priming behaviour. I don't think there is much literature on differentiating attitude and attentional changes that are elicited by primes that cause the resultant behaviour, but I think the experimental design would allow us to differentiate if prosocial cues reflect A) how the listener perceives a specific talker or B) how the listener perceives talkers in general, which I think has potential to narrow down what exactly prosocial priming does in the future. Also, having the PBIS at the end of the experiment will allow us to have a measure of prosocial intentions after having engaged with the primes may help distinguish the adaptation from doing the task brough up in #3.