

Burint Bevis  
[b.bevis20@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:b.bevis20@imperial.ac.uk) | [www.burintbevis.com](http://www.burintbevis.com)

---

## EDUCATION

---

2021 - 2025	Imperial College London, PhD Management (Supervised by Mark Kennedy and Michael Yeomans)
2020 - 2021	Imperial College London, MRes in Management
2017 - 2018	King's College London, MSc Data Science
2004 - 2007	The University of Essex, BA Economics

## RESEARCH INTERESTS

---

Constructive Disagreement, Conflict Management, Polarization, Computational Social Science, Team Collaboration, Multimodal models

## JOB MARKET PAPER

---

**Bevis, B.**, Schroeder, J., Yeomans, M. "Speaking Makes Disagreement More Constructive Than Writing." Accepted at *Nature Communications*

## MANUSCRIPTS IN PREPARATION

---

**Bevis, B.**, Shi, Y., Yeomans, M. "The Politeness Package: Using Sentence Structure to Understand Conversational Text". Target Journal: *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*

**Bevis, B.**, Hu, X., Houghton, J., Kennedy, M. "Understanding Constructive Disagreements: Exploring Behaviors in High-Stakes Negotiation Outcomes." Target Journal: *Science*

**Bevis, B.**, Jordan, D., Harari, G., Gosling S., Back, M., Kroencke, L., Talaifar, S., "Exploring the Indirect Effects of Political Beliefs on Wellbeing via Social Media." Target Journal: *Psychological Science*

## WORK IN PROGRESS

---

**Bevis, B.**, Hu, X., Houghton, J., Kennedy, M. "Question Asking and Vocal Intensity as Mechanisms for Constructive Disagreement." Target Journal: *Organization Science*

Schroeder, J., **Bevis, B.**, Yeomans, M. "Does Communication Media Mediate the Relationship Between Gender and Constructive Disagreement?" Target Journal: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

**Bevis, B.**, Goglia, D., Wohlert, I., "A Unifying Theory of Constructive Disagreement" Target Journal: *Academy of Management Review*

**Bevis, B.**, Huang, E., Kumar, A., "A Novel LLM-based Approach for Annotating Conversation Turns." Target Journal: *Organizational Research Methods*

Kennedy, M., **Bevis, B.**, "Walled-ff worlds: Technology-Enabled Polarization and Institutional Fragility" Target Journal: *Academy of Management Review*

## **TEACHING EXPERIENCE (TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIP)**

---

2024 - 2025	Research Methods & Practice
2024 - 2025	Text Analysis for Business, instructed by Michael Yeoman
2023 - 2025	Quantitative Data Analysis, instructed by Sam Asher & Simon Quinn
2022 - 2025	Text Mining for Economics and Finance, instructed by Michael Yeomans
2022	Summer Institute for Computational Social Science, Imperial College London

## **CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS & INVITED TALKS**

---

### **“Learning to Disagree: An NLP Feedback System for Encouraging Conversational Receptiveness”**

- Paper presentation at International Association for Conflict Management, July 2022
- Presentation at Conference On Digital Experimentation (CODE@MIT), Nov 2021
- Poster presentation at Society for Judgment and Decision Making, Feb 2021

### **“Speaking Makes Disagreement More Constructive Than Writing”**

- Symposium presentation at AOM, August 2025
- Symposium presentation at 11th International Conference on Computational Social Science, July 2025
- Symposium presentation at AOM, August 2024
- Presentation at Subjective Probability, Utility, and Decision Making, August 2023
- Presentation at International Association for Conflict Management, July 2023
- Presentation at 5th Annual COMPEXT conference, May 2023

### **“Decoding Teamwork: The Computational Science of Collaboration”**

- Chaired AOM Symposium sponsored by the Conflict Management division, August 2024

### **“Abductive Study of Conflict Expressions Using Large Scale Multi-modal Data Analyses”**

- Chaired AOM Panel Symposium sponsored by the Conflict Management division, July 2025

### **“Understanding Constructive Disagreements: Exploring Behaviors in High-Stakes Negotiation Outcomes”**

- Presentation at International Association for Conflict Management, July 2025
- Symposium presentation at AOM, July 2025
- Invited talk at Amsterdam Business School, April 2025

## **SCHOLARSHIP & AWARDS**

---

2024 - 2026	NTR Research Grant Funding (\$16,000)
2022	NTR-IACM Early Career Scholars Program AWARD (\$2,000)
2022 - 2025	LISS-DTP Studentship
2020 - 2025	Imperial College Business School Graduate Teaching Assistant Scholarship

## **SERVICE**

---

2024	Co-organiser of the London OB Research Day at Imperial Business School
2023	OB Lab Manager
2021 - 2022	Student Staff Committee student representative (social)

## AFFILIATIONS

---

2025 - present	Society for Personality and Social Psychology
2023 - present	Association for Computing Machinery
2022 - present	Academy of Management
2022 - present	Society for Judgment and Decision Making
2022 - present	International Association for Conflict Management

## WORK EXPERIENCE

---

2022 - present	Data science consultant, Freelance, London
2014 - 2017	Head of Advanced Analytics, Ebiquity, Sydney
2013 - 2014	Principal consultant, Data2Decision, London
2012- 2013	Econometrics consultant, Ninah Consulting, London
2011 - 2012	Manager, MROI Solutions, Nielsen, Sydney
2009 - 2011	Consultant, Ninah Consulting, London
2007 - 2009	Modelling Consultant, Nielsen, Oxford

## REFERENCES

---

**Mark Kennedy**  
Professor  
Imperial College London  
mark.kennedy@imperial.ac.uk

**Michael Yeomans**  
Assistant Professor  
Imperial College London  
m.yeomans@imperial.ac.uk

**Juliana Schroeder**  
Professor  
Haas School of Business  
University of California, Berkeley  
jschroeder@berkeley.edu

## **SELECTED ABSTRACTS**

### **Speaking Makes Disagreement More Constructive Than Writing**

Bevis, B., Schroeder, J. & Yeomans, M.; Accepted at *Nature Communications*

Amid rising global polarization, finding ways to disagree constructively is vital. This paper examines whether the medium of disagreement—spoken or written—shapes conversation outcomes. A series of randomized experiments ( $n = 1,576$  conversation partners who had 1,842 conversations;  $n = 1,432$  observers) suggests that spoken conversations with a disagreeing counterpart lead to greater understanding, lower conflict, more favorable impressions of one's counterpart, and greater attitude alignment than written ones. Across experiments, speech also fostered more conversational receptiveness—cues in language that signal openness to opposing viewpoints—which partly mediates the effects of medium on these constructive disagreement outcomes. The conversation medium further moderated the association between language and outcomes: receptiveness was a stronger predictor of constructive disagreement in writing than in speech, suggesting people use less receptive language in the very medium in which it may be most effective (i.e., the written medium). A final study suggests that people may misjudge the effects of medium, wrongly believing spoken (versus written) disagreement will be less constructive and preferring to write to disagreeing counterparts. Despite people's erroneous beliefs, spoken conversation offers a promising path to disagreeing constructively.

### **Understanding Constructive Disagreements: Exploring Behaviors in High-Stakes Negotiation Outcomes**

Bevis, B., Hu, X., Houghton, J., Kennedy, M.; Target Journal: *Science*

High-stakes problem-solving requires exploring different paths to solutions, yet this often triggers unconstructive disagreements. Using dyadic video-call data from contexts with higher ( $N = 4,153$  turns) and lower stakes ( $N = 63,416$  turns), we examine how disagreements relate to perceived constructiveness. In constructive dyads, partners engaged their differences clearly with question-asking, positive framing, and inclusive language. Conversely, dissatisfied dyads avoided direct engagement and eventually exhibited jarring breaks from politeness to abrupt commands, negation, and low concern for others. These findings link effective problem-solving to robust engagement of differences with maintenance of mutual regard. This evidence of constructive difference engagement suggests benefits to not just mitigating the risks of disagreement, but also to more actively pursue the rewards of disagreement.

### **The Politeness Package: Using Sentence Structure to Understand Conversational Text**

Bevis, B., Shi, Y., & Yeomans, M.; Target Journal: *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*

Organizations are filled with conversations, and how people treat each other can have a big impact on their performance, trust, learning, and satisfaction. Politeness is a critical dimension of those

conversations. While most analyses of organizational text focus on content - the topics, ideas, and beliefs being talked about - previous work has suggested that how a topic is talked about can also have a large impact. In particular, elements of sentence structure—how a thought is phrased—can influence how a message is perceived. In this paper, we discuss and update the politeness R package, which applies linguistic theory to extract features of sentence structure from natural language text. While early models of politeness features have been discussed in computer science journals, we integrate that work into the study of organizations and introduce major improvements in the package. We also report new empirical findings showing that the current version of the package outperforms all previous versions (and other common benchmarks) for reproducing human annotations in new data.

### **Exploring the Indirect Effects of Political Beliefs on Wellbeing via Social Media Usage**

Bevis, B., Talaifar, S., Jordan, D., Harari, G., Gosling S., Back, M., Kroencke, L.; Target Journal: *Psychological Science*

Research consistently shows a partisan well-being gap, with liberals reporting lower well-being than conservatives. We test whether differences in social media use explain this gap. To test this possibility, we test whether liberals' lower wellbeing is mediated by their greater social media use. Students from UT Austin ( $N = 1,578$ ) reported their political orientation, wellbeing (i.e., affective wellbeing, life satisfaction, loneliness), social media app use (hours and minutes on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, TikTok, Snapchat, Reddit and YouTube), at monthly, weekly and momentary levels. Replicating prior research, we found that liberals had lower overall wellbeing, life satisfaction and felt lonelier. Critically, we also found that liberals used more social media (i.e., TikTok and Twitter) than conservatives, which mediated the relationship between liberalism and lower wellbeing at the weekly level. We plan to replicate these findings in a broader young adult sample to assess generalizability.