

Analysis Report

This report is structured as follows.

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| Sample Characteristics | 2 |
| Outlier Screening | 4 |
| Reliability Test..... | 5 |
| Descriptive Statistics..... | 7 |
| Model Results - Men..... | 10 |
| Model Results - Women | 11 |
| Hypotheses Tests..... | 12 |
| Men | 12 |
| Women | 12 |

Sample Characteristics

The following analysis was conducted using R version 4.3.2. The initial sample consisted of 1,243 individuals. However, a series of exclusions were applied to ensure the integrity of the data. First, individuals who did not provide consent were removed, reducing the sample size to 1,032. Next, those who did not respond to the salary negotiation variable were excluded, resulting in a sample of 895 individuals. Following this, a comprehension check was administered, and 813 participants remained after excluding those who failed this check. Finally, individuals who self-excluded from the analysis were removed, leading to a final sample size of 810 participants.

Regarding the characteristics of the sample (table below), the majority of participants indicated fluency in the local language (98.8%). The sample was composed of 39.8% males, 59.6% females, and 0.6% identifying as diverse. The vast majority of participants were employed (94.6%), while 1.6% were university students, 0.2% were school students, and 3.6% fell into other categories.

In terms of negotiation experience, 69.3% reported having negotiated before, while 30.7% had no prior experience. The level of experience in negotiation ranged from 1 (8.6%) to 7 (4.0%), with the most frequent levels being 2 (23.5%), 3 (20.7%), and 5 (19.0%).

Regarding occupation, 17.5% were involved in sales or marketing, 17.5% in customer service, 17.5% in education, or healing others, 24.7% involved in organizing or administrative tasks, and 17.5% engaged in entrepreneurial or commercial activities. Additionally, 9.8% were involved in scientific research or data handling, 5.6% in practical activities related to tools, 2.9% in creative or artistic work, and 4.6% in other occupations.

The vast majority of participants (95.6%) had never worked in the energy industry, while 4.4% had prior experience in that sector. Finally, participants were asked to indicate how closely their real salary considerations aligned with the negotiation scenario presented. The most common responses were 1 (44.8%), 5 (13.0%), and 6 (9.6%).

| Category | Level | Count | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|--|-------|------------|
| Language | Yes | 800 | 98.8 |
| | No | 10 | 1.2 |
| Gender | Male | 322 | 39.8 |
| | Female | 483 | 59.6 |
| | Diverse | 5 | 0.6 |
| job | School | 2 | 0.2 |
| | University | 13 | 1.6 |
| | Employed | 766 | 94.6 |
| | Other | 29 | 3.6 |
| Ever Negotiated | Yes | 561 | 69.3 |
| | No | 249 | 30.7 |
| Experience in Negotiation | 1 | 70 | 8.6 |
| | 2 | 190 | 23.5 |
| | 3 | 168 | 20.7 |
| | 4 | 138 | 17.0 |
| | 5 | 154 | 19.0 |
| | 6 | 58 | 7.2 |
| | 7 | 32 | 4.0 |
| Occupation type | Practical activity; dealing with things and tools | 43 | 5.6 |
| | Researching, observing activity; scientific handling of data | 75 | 9.8 |
| | Creative, artistic activity | 22 | 2.9 |
| | Interactive activity; advising, educating, healing people | 268 | 35.0 |
| | Entrepreneurial, commercial activity | 134 | 17.5 |
| | Organizing, administrative activity | 189 | 24.7 |
| | Other | 35 | 4.6 |
| Ever Worked Energy Industry | Yes | 36 | 4.4 |
| | No | 774 | 95.6 |
| Real Salary Consideration | 1 | 363 | 44.8 |
| | 2 | 70 | 8.6 |
| | 3 | 59 | 7.3 |
| | 4 | 59 | 7.3 |
| | 5 | 105 | 13.0 |
| | 6 | 78 | 9.6 |
| | 7 | 76 | 9.4 |

The following descriptive statistics were computed for key variables in the dataset. The average age of participants was 47.44 years (SD = 10.85), with a median age of 48 years. The average number of working hours reported was 36.05 hours per week (SD = 7.28), and the median number of working hours was 39 hours per week.

In the Salary Negotiation Scenario variable (Salary.Negotiation.Scenario_v_633), the mean response was \$75,593.83 (SD = \$11,322.74), with a median of \$75,000. The Actual Request variable (Actual.Request_v_482) had a mean of \$77,940.74 (SD = \$10,968.39) and a median of \$78,000. The standard error of the mean (SEM) for these variables ranged from 0.26 for working hours to 397.84 for the Salary Negotiation Scenario, indicating the precision of the estimates provided in this analysis.

| Variable | Mean | Median | SEM | SD |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| Age | 47.441 | 48.000 | 0.381 | 10.846 |
| working.hours | 36.047 | 39.000 | 0.263 | 7.277 |
| Salary.Negotiation.Scenario_v_633 | 75593.827 | 75000.000 | 397.840 | 11322.739 |
| Actual.Request_v_482 | 77940.741 | 78000.000 | 385.390 | 10968.387 |

Outlier Screening

Outliers were evaluated using Z-scores for each of the key variables in the dataset. Specifically, 16 outliers were identified in the GRDS variable, with Z-scores ranging from 3 to 5. Additionally, five outliers were detected in the Forcing variable, with Z-scores ranging from 3 to 3.13, and three outliers were noted in the Yielding variable, with Z-scores ranging from 3 to 3.18.

For GRDS, the mean score was 7.63 (SD = 3.45) with a median of 6. The distribution exhibited a positive skewness of 1.54 and high kurtosis of 5.87, indicating a distribution with more extreme values and a longer tail on the right side. For GRD, the mean was 11.06 (SD = 5.31), with a median of 10, skewness of 0.45, and kurtosis of 2.33, suggesting a more symmetric distribution.

In the Forcing variable, the mean was 12.30 (SD = 2.65) with a median of 12, and both skewness (-0.08) and kurtosis (3.38) were close to normality. Similarly, the Yielding variable had a mean of 12.92 (SD = 2.81) with a median of 13, skewness of -0.13, and kurtosis of 3.06, also indicating a near-normal distribution. Masculinity Implications had a mean of 12.01 (SD = 8.31) with a median of 10, skewness of 0.87, and kurtosis of 2.77, suggesting moderate asymmetry and tail weight.

Given the presence of these outliers and the skewness and kurtosis observed in the data, bootstrap methods were employed in the regression models to account for non-normality and provide more robust estimates of the standard errors and confidence intervals. This approach is particularly appropriate for datasets where traditional parametric assumptions may not hold, enhancing the reliability of the regression results.

| Variable | Mean | Median | SEM | SD | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| GRDS | 7.632 | 6.000 | 0.121 | 3.453 | 1.539 | 5.874 |
| GRD | 11.064 | 10.000 | 0.187 | 5.313 | 0.452 | 2.332 |
| Forcing | 12.300 | 12.000 | 0.093 | 2.651 | -0.075 | 3.377 |
| Yielding | 12.919 | 13.000 | 0.099 | 2.807 | -0.134 | 3.059 |
| Masculinity_Implications | 12.010 | 10.000 | 0.292 | 8.308 | 0.872 | 2.768 |

Reliability Test

Cronbach's alpha was calculated to assess the internal consistency of the scales used in this study. A reliability analysis was performed on the GRDS, GRD, Forcing, Yielding, and Masculinity Implications subscales, as well as the total scores. The internal consistency for each variable is reported below.

For the GRDS subscale, the overall Cronbach's alpha was 0.803, indicating acceptable internal consistency. Item-total correlations (ITC) for the individual items in the GRDS subscale ranged from 0.630 to 0.886, with most items contributing positively to the overall reliability of the scale. The GRD subscale demonstrated excellent internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.922, and item-total correlations ranging from 0.859 to 0.890, further supporting the reliability of this scale.

The Forcing subscale exhibited a Cronbach's alpha of 0.760, indicating adequate reliability. The item-total correlations ranged from 0.677 to 0.811, suggesting that all items contributed moderately to the scale's reliability. The Yielding subscale demonstrated somewhat lower reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.714, but remained within the acceptable range. Item-total correlations for the Yielding subscale ranged from 0.724 to 0.811.

The Masculinity Implications subscale showed high reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.866, indicating strong internal consistency. Item-total correlations ranged from 0.792 to 0.877, suggesting that all items contributed positively to the reliability of the scale.

Overall, the reliability analyses indicate that the scales used in this study possess acceptable to excellent internal consistency, as reflected in the Cronbach's alpha values across the different subscales. These results support the use of these measures for further analyses.

| Variable | Mean | SEM | StDev | ITC | Alpha |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| GRDS_GRD_1 | 1.574 | 0.034 | 0.965 | 0.793 | |
| GRDS_GRD_2 | 1.456 | 0.029 | 0.812 | 0.630 | |
| GRDS_GRD_3 | 1.491 | 0.031 | 0.885 | 0.720 | |
| GRDS_GRD_4 | 1.499 | 0.031 | 0.880 | 0.803 | |
| GRDS_GRD_5 | 1.660 | 0.035 | 1.007 | 0.785 | |
| GRDS_Total | 7.632 | 0.121 | 3.453 | | 0.803 |
| GRDS_GRD_6 | 2.262 | 0.044 | 1.260 | 0.886 | |
| GRDS_GRD_7 | 2.181 | 0.042 | 1.185 | 0.859 | |
| GRDS_GRD_8 | 2.130 | 0.041 | 1.152 | 0.873 | |
| GRDS_GRD_9 | 2.191 | 0.041 | 1.163 | 0.861 | |
| GRDS_GRD_10 | 2.368 | 0.044 | 1.253 | 0.890 | |
| GRD_Total | 11.064 | 0.187 | 5.313 | | 0.922 |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_648 | 2.746 | 0.031 | 0.878 | 0.786 | |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_649 | 2.917 | 0.031 | 0.889 | 0.771 | |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_650 | 3.557 | 0.028 | 0.809 | 0.677 | |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_651 | 3.080 | 0.032 | 0.898 | 0.811 | |
| Forcing_Total | 12.300 | 0.093 | 2.651 | | 0.760 |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_652 | 3.116 | 0.033 | 0.953 | 0.745 | |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_653 | 3.532 | 0.033 | 0.951 | 0.729 | |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_654 | 3.869 | 0.031 | 0.884 | 0.743 | |
| Forcing_Yielding_v_655 | 2.401 | 0.036 | 1.031 | 0.724 | |
| Yielding_Total | 12.919 | 0.099 | 2.807 | | 0.714 |
| Masculinity.Implications_v_662 | 3.060 | 0.089 | 2.534 | 0.877 | |
| Masculinity.Implications_v_663 | 2.698 | 0.079 | 2.261 | 0.792 | |
| Masculinity.Implications_v_664 | 3.494 | 0.094 | 2.665 | 0.875 | |
| Masculinity.Implications_v_665 | 2.758 | 0.083 | 2.353 | 0.834 | |
| Masculinity_Implications_Total | 12.010 | 0.292 | 8.308 | | 0.866 |

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated to compare the means and standard deviations (SD) across different categorical variables, including language proficiency, gender, and experience in the energy industry. The focus is on notable differences in these groups. The analysis revealed several noteworthy findings.

Regarding gender differences, females had a lower mean score ($M = 7.530$, $SD = 3.335$) in the GRDS variable compared to males ($M = 7.904$, $SD = 3.514$). Additionally, the Masculinity Implications scores for females ($M = 13.447$, $SD = 8.700$) were substantially higher than those of males ($M = 9.863$, $SD = 7.192$), indicating a possible perception difference between genders in this area.

In terms of language proficiency, participants who did not speak the primary language had higher GRDS scores ($M = 9.500$, $SD = 4.790$) compared to those who did ($M = 7.609$, $SD = 3.430$). The difference in GRD scores followed a similar pattern, with those who did not speak the primary language scoring higher ($M = 13.300$, $SD = 6.413$) compared to the primary speakers ($M = 11.036$, $SD = 5.297$). These differences suggest a possible impact of language on these specific negotiation-related variables.

When comparing participants who had worked in the energy industry with those who had not, the means were similar across most variables, with only slight differences. Participants with energy industry experience had a slightly higher mean Yielding score ($M = 13.556$, $SD = 2.645$) compared to those without such experience ($M = 12.889$, $SD = 2.812$). However, their Masculinity Implications score was lower ($M = 9.389$, $SD = 6.371$) than participants with no energy industry experience ($M = 12.132$, $SD = 8.370$), indicating a potential divergence in perceptions related to gender roles in this specific industry.

| Variable | Language | | | | Gender | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------|
| | Yes | | No | | Female | | Male | | Diverse | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD |
| GRDS | 7.609 | 3.430 | 9.500 | 4.790 | 7.530 | 3.335 | 7.904 | 3.514 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| GRD | 11.036 | 5.297 | 13.300 | 6.413 | 11.186 | 5.480 | 11.053 | 4.911 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Forcing | 12.300 | 2.663 | 12.300 | 1.418 | 12.346 | 2.775 | 12.214 | 2.419 | 13.400 | 4.669 |
| Yielding | 12.915 | 2.804 | 13.200 | 3.190 | 12.694 | 2.913 | 13.267 | 2.627 | 12.200 | 0.837 |
| Masculinity_Implications | 11.994 | 8.326 | 13.300 | 6.848 | 13.447 | 8.700 | 9.863 | 7.192 | 11.400 | 8.173 |

| Variable | Ever Worked Energy Industry | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | No | | Yes | |
| | M | SD | M | SD |
| GRDS | 7.615 | 3.443 | 8.000 | 3.688 |
| GRD | 11.043 | 5.317 | 11.528 | 5.283 |
| Forcing | 12.292 | 2.651 | 12.472 | 2.688 |
| Yielding | 12.889 | 2.812 | 13.556 | 2.645 |
| Masculinity_Implications | 12.132 | 8.370 | 9.389 | 6.371 |

For job type, individuals in the "Other" category showed higher GRDS scores ($M = 9.241$, $SD = 4.650$) compared to those employed ($M = 7.563$, $SD = 3.381$). Those in the "University" category also had a higher GRD score ($M = 12.615$, $SD = 5.796$) compared to individuals employed ($M = 10.973$, $SD = 5.283$). However, individuals in the "School" category had a lower GRD score ($M = 7.500$, $SD = 3.536$). These differences suggest that job type may play a role in influencing negotiation-related variables.

Regarding negotiation experience, individuals who had previously negotiated showed slightly lower GRDS scores ($M = 7.513$, $SD = 3.251$) than those who had not negotiated before ($M = 7.900$, $SD = 3.863$). A similar pattern emerged for the GRD variable, where experienced negotiators had lower GRD scores ($M = 10.900$, $SD = 5.195$) compared to those without negotiation experience ($M = 11.434$, $SD = 5.563$). In contrast, individuals with negotiation experience demonstrated higher Yielding scores ($M = 13.155$, $SD = 2.719$) compared to those without ($M = 12.386$, $SD = 2.931$), suggesting possible differences in how individuals approach yielding during negotiations.

When considering occupation types, individuals involved in "Creative, artistic activity" had notably higher GRDS scores ($M = 8.182$, $SD = 5.569$) and GRD scores ($M = 13.182$, $SD = 6.780$) compared to other occupational categories. The highest Masculinity Implications scores were also observed in this category ($M = 15.318$, $SD = 10.035$), highlighting the significant variability in gender role perceptions across different occupations. On the other hand, those involved in "Practical activity; dealing with things and tools" exhibited relatively lower Masculinity Implications scores ($M = 9.837$, $SD = 6.761$).

| Variable | Job | | | | | | Ever Negotiated | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------|-------|--------|-------|------------|-------|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Employed | | Other | | University | | School | | No | | Yes | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD |
| GRDS | 7.563 | 3.381 | 9.241 | 4.650 | 8.154 | 4.100 | 7.500 | 3.536 | 7.900 | 3.863 | 7.513 | 3.251 |
| GRD | 10.973 | 5.283 | 13.034 | 5.641 | 12.615 | 5.796 | 7.500 | 3.536 | 11.434 | 5.563 | 10.900 | 5.195 |
| Forcing | 12.289 | 2.642 | 12.069 | 2.672 | 13.462 | 3.178 | 12.500 | 2.121 | 12.586 | 2.660 | 12.173 | 2.640 |
| Yielding | 12.949 | 2.819 | 12.690 | 2.238 | 12.308 | 2.898 | 8.500 | 2.121 | 12.386 | 2.931 | 13.155 | 2.719 |
| Masculinity_Implications | 11.932 | 8.207 | 15.862 | #### | 8.538 | 7.160 | 8.500 | 3.536 | 12.277 | 8.436 | 11.891 | 8.255 |

| Variable | Occupation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|-------|--|-------|---|-------|--|-------|--------|-------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | Organizing, administrative | | Entrepreneurial, commercial activity | | Interactive activity; advising, educating, healing | | Practical activity; dealing with things and tools | | Researching, observing activity; scientific handling of data | | Other | | Creative, artistic activity | |
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD |
| GRDS | 7.931 | 3.839 | 7.306 | 3.201 | 7.474 | 3.038 | 8.279 | 3.112 | 6.973 | 3.067 | 7.229 | 2.941 | 8.182 | 5.569 |
| GRD | 11.005 | 5.355 | 10.172 | 4.887 | 11.321 | 5.464 | 9.837 | 4.191 | 11.067 | 5.323 | 11.000 | 4.646 | 13.182 | 6.780 |
| Forcing | 11.974 | 2.575 | 12.104 | 2.302 | 12.451 | 2.781 | 11.977 | 2.006 | 12.640 | 3.070 | 12.371 | 2.636 | 13.409 | 2.684 |
| Yielding | 12.894 | 2.853 | 13.313 | 2.743 | 12.948 | 2.905 | 13.116 | 2.674 | 12.520 | 2.728 | 12.743 | 2.694 | 12.682 | 2.784 |
| Masculinity Implications | 12.677 | 8.371 | 11.194 | 7.974 | 11.832 | 8.018 | 9.837 | 6.761 | 11.747 | 8.310 | 12.343 | 9.324 | 15.318 | 10.035 |

Model Results - Men

In the present analysis, multiple linear regression models were employed to assess the impact of two predictors, GRDS (Gender Role Discrepancy Scale) and GRD (Gender Role Discrepancy), on five response variables: Salary Negotiation Scenario (v 633), Actual Request (v 482), Forcing, Yielding, and Masculinity Implications. The models were fitted separately for male and female participants using R version 4.3.2. Bootstrapping was employed to obtain confidence intervals for the model coefficients.

For men, the results revealed no significant effects of GRDS or GRD on the Salary Negotiation Scenario or Actual Request, with p-values of 0.962 and 0.349 for GRDS and GRD in the Salary Negotiation Scenario, and 0.838 and 0.171 for the Actual Request. However, significant effects were observed in the Forcing and Yielding models. In the Forcing model, GRDS ($\beta = 0.084$, $p = 0.042$) and GRD ($\beta = 0.075$, $p = 0.010$) were significant predictors, with confidence intervals excluding zero. Similarly, in the Yielding model, GRDS ($\beta = 0.101$, $p = 0.027$) and GRD ($\beta = -0.073$, $p = 0.024$) were significant predictors. The Masculinity Implications model showed no significant effects of GRDS or GRD ($\beta = 0.537$, $p = 0.000$ for GRDS; $\beta = 0.060$, $p = 0.488$ for GRD).

| Response Variable | term | estimate | std.error | statistic | p.value | CI Lower | CI Upper | R Squared |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Salary.Negotiation.Scenario v 633 | (Intercept) | 78805.702 | 1839.535 | 42.840 | 0.000 | 74893.902 | 82851.153 | 0.003 |
| | GRDS | 9.591 | 199.162 | 0.048 | 0.962 | -484.588 | 456.806 | |
| | GRD | -133.702 | 142.510 | -0.938 | 0.349 | -409.503 | 152.267 | |
| Actual.Request v 482 | (Intercept) | 82122.007 | 1780.466 | 46.124 | 0.000 | 78740.923 | 86001.467 | 0.008 |
| | GRDS | -39.452 | 192.767 | -0.205 | 0.838 | -449.431 | 380.144 | |
| | GRD | -189.065 | 137.934 | -1.371 | 0.171 | -453.736 | 70.439 | |
| Forcing | (Intercept) | 10.720 | 0.378 | 28.360 | 0.000 | 9.984 | 11.480 | 0.053 |
| | GRDS | 0.084 | 0.041 | 2.043 | 0.042 | -0.001 | 0.168 | |
| | GRD | 0.075 | 0.029 | 2.576 | 0.010 | 0.018 | 0.139 | |
| Yielding | (Intercept) | 13.282 | 0.417 | 31.841 | 0.000 | 12.329 | 14.079 | 0.022 |
| | GRDS | 0.101 | 0.045 | 2.228 | 0.027 | 0.013 | 0.195 | |
| | GRD | -0.073 | 0.032 | -2.269 | 0.024 | -0.146 | -0.001 | |
| Masculinity Implications | (Intercept) | 4.957 | 1.108 | 4.472 | 0.000 | 2.807 | 7.104 | 0.079 |
| | GRDS | 0.537 | 0.120 | 4.479 | 0.000 | 0.223 | 0.862 | |
| | GRD | 0.060 | 0.086 | 0.694 | 0.488 | -0.126 | 0.250 | |

Model Results - Women

For women, the results were notably different. GRDS significantly predicted outcomes in both the Salary $P = 0.000$ (estimate: -590.899, $p < 0.001$), with confidence intervals that did not include zero. GRD also significantly predicted outcomes in both the Salary $P = 0.003$ (estimate: 294.097, $p < 0.001$) and Actual Request $P = 0.106$ (estimate: 153.903, $p = 0.106$). Forcing was not significant ($p = 0.057$). Yielding was not significant ($p = 0.019$). Masculinity Implications was not significant ($p = 0.040$).

| Response Variable | term | estimate | std.error | statistic | p.value | CI Lower | CI Upper | R Squared |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Salary.Negotiation.Scenario v 633 | (Intercept) | 76181.316 | 1373.233 | 55.476 | 0.000 | 73322.954 | 78949.737 | 0.040 |
| | GRDS | -672.693 | 160.726 | -4.185 | 0.000 | -954.746 | -360.088 | |
| | GRD | 294.097 | 97.807 | 3.007 | 0.003 | 76.319 | 503.438 | |
| Actual.Request v 482 | (Intercept) | 79498.060 | 1333.136 | 59.632 | 0.000 | 76758.867 | 82248.144 | 0.029 |
| | GRDS | -590.899 | 156.033 | -3.787 | 0.000 | -879.946 | -319.679 | |
| | GRD | 153.903 | 94.951 | 1.621 | 0.106 | -47.472 | 339.836 | |
| Forcing | (Intercept) | 10.654 | 0.341 | 31.206 | 0.000 | 9.994 | 11.310 | 0.057 |
| | GRDS | 0.100 | 0.040 | 2.500 | 0.013 | 0.019 | 0.187 | |
| | GRD | 0.084 | 0.024 | 3.454 | 0.001 | 0.033 | 0.136 | |
| Yielding | (Intercept) | 13.615 | 0.366 | 37.238 | 0.000 | 12.897 | 14.334 | 0.019 |
| | GRDS | -0.025 | 0.043 | -0.594 | 0.553 | -0.105 | 0.060 | |
| | GRD | -0.065 | 0.026 | -2.505 | 0.013 | -0.126 | -0.008 | |
| Masculinity Implications | (Intercept) | 9.008 | 1.080 | 8.339 | 0.000 | 7.129 | 11.099 | 0.040 |
| | GRDS | 0.417 | 0.126 | 3.298 | 0.001 | 0.159 | 0.655 | |
| | GRD | 0.116 | 0.077 | 1.510 | 0.132 | -0.043 | 0.261 | |

Diagnostic plots were used to evaluate the assumptions of model residuals. These charts include the Residuals vs. Fitted plot, the Q-Q plot of residuals, the Scale-Location plot, and the Residuals vs. Leverage plot.

The Residuals vs. Fitted plots indicated a fairly random distribution of residuals across all models, suggesting no obvious patterns, which supported the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity (constant variance of residuals). The Q-Q plots showed that the residuals followed a near-normal distribution, with most points falling on the diagonal line, indicating that the assumption of normality was met. The Scale-Location plots further supported the homoscedasticity assumption, as the residuals appeared to be spread equally along the fitted values. Lastly, the Residuals vs. Leverage plots did not show any points with excessive leverage or large influence. All assumptions were met, and the use of bootstrapping further strengthened the robustness of the models.

Hypotheses Tests

Men

Hypothesis 1: The more men experience gender role discrepancy stress (GRDS), the higher is the salary they aim for in a negotiation (i.e., goal).

Not supported: Coefficient = 9.59, $p = 0.962$.

Hypothesis 2: The more men experience gender role discrepancy stress, the higher is the salary they intend to ask for in a negotiation.

Not supported: Coefficient = -39.45, $p = 0.838$.

Hypothesis 3a: The more men experience gender role discrepancy stress, the greater is their willingness to engage in "forcing."

Supported: Coefficient = 0.084, $p = 0.042$.

Hypothesis 3b: The more men experience gender role discrepancy stress, the lower is their willingness to engage in "yielding."

Supported: Coefficient = -0.073, $p = 0.024$.

Hypothesis 4: The more men experience gender role discrepancy stress, the more do they perceive negotiations to have masculinity implications.

Supported: Coefficient = 0.537, $p < 0.001$.

Women

Hypothesis 1: The more women experience gender role discrepancy stress (GRDS), the higher is the salary they aim for in a negotiation (i.e., goal).

Not supported: Coefficient = -672.69, $p < 0.001$ (opposite direction).

Hypothesis 2: The more women experience gender role discrepancy stress, the higher is the salary they intend to ask for in a negotiation.

Not supported: Coefficient = -590.90, $p < 0.001$ (opposite direction).

Hypothesis 3a: The more women experience gender role discrepancy stress, the greater is their willingness to engage in "forcing."

Supported: Coefficient = 0.100, $p = 0.013$.

Hypothesis 3b: The more women experience gender role discrepancy stress, the lower is their willingness to engage in "yielding."

Not supported: Coefficient = -0.025, $p = 0.553$.

Hypothesis 4: The more women experience gender role discrepancy stress, the more do they perceive negotiations to have masculinity implications.

Supported: Coefficient = 0.417, $p = 0.001$.