

Does AI Coaching Prepare us for Workplace Negotiations?

Veda Duddu

University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, IL, USA
vduddu2@illinois.edu

Hanyi Min

University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, IL, USA
hanyimin@illinois.edu

Jash Rajesh Parekh

University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, IL, USA
jashrp2@illinois.edu

Ziang Xiao

Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD, USA
ziang.xiao@jhu.edu

Koustuv Saha

University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, IL, USA
ksaha2@illinois.edu

Andy Mao

University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, IL, USA
hanqim2@illinois.edu

Vedant Das Swain

New York University
New York, NY, USA
v.dasswain@northeastern.edu

Abstract

Workplace negotiations are undermined by psychological barriers, which can even derail well-prepared tactics. AI offers personalized and always-available negotiation coaching, yet its effectiveness for negotiation preparedness remains unclear. We built Trucey, a prototype AI coach grounded in Brett’s negotiation model. We conducted a between-subjects experiment (N=267), comparing Trucey, ChatGPT, and a traditional negotiation Handbook, followed by in-depth interviews (N=15). While Trucey showed the strongest reductions in fear relative to both comparison conditions, the Handbook outperformed both AIs in usability and psychological empowerment. Interviews revealed that the Handbook’s comprehensive, reviewable content was crucial for participants’ confidence and preparedness. In contrast, although participants valued AI’s rehearsal capability, its guidance often felt verbose and fragmented—delivered in bits and pieces that required additional effort—leaving them uncertain or overwhelmed. These findings challenge assumptions of AI superiority and motivate hybrid designs that integrate structured, theory-driven content with targeted rehearsal, clear boundaries, and adaptive scaffolds to address psychological barriers and support negotiation preparedness.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing** → **Empirical studies in HCI**; • **Applied computing** → *Psychology*.

Keywords

workplace, AI chatbots, prompting, professional negotiations, contestability, LLMs, future of work, experimental design

1 Introduction

Workplace negotiations—such as requesting promotions, asserting boundaries, or challenging authority—are recognized to be difficult and emotionally fraught [13, 61]. Existing theory and practice have

largely emphasized on negotiation strategies and tactics, focusing on structural, processual, and communicative components [7, 101]. However, upward negotiation is especially complex due to hierarchical power imbalances, institutional norms that reinforce authority structures, and workers’ concerns about retaliatory consequences [27, 100]. Such concerns often extend to fears of being negatively perceived within the workplace, damaging relationships, or jeopardizing career prospects [98, 100]. These fears create psychological barriers—increasing anxiety and reducing confidence—that undermine negotiation outcomes regardless of strategy, often leading to lowered expectations and premature withdrawal from bargaining [18, 136].

Furthermore, these psychological barriers can undermine self-efficacy and self-esteem, which in turn may not only lead to *negotiation impasse*, as well as but also affect a worker’s wellbeing, satisfaction, and performance [104]. Addressing such psychological barriers is therefore essential, as fear and low confidence often prevent workers from effectively enacting their negotiation strategies, making this challenge as critical as strategizing negotiation tactics.

Traditional negotiation coaching—whether through self-guided videos and resources or in-person training—has been shown to improve critical workplace outcomes such as promotions and salary increases [7, 15]. Yet, these forms of coaching are typically static, one-size-fits-all, and available only in scheduled sessions, limiting access round-the-clock and personalized support that workers may need. Further, these approaches primarily emphasize strategies of negotiation and communication, without directly coaching individuals through their psychological barriers. AI offers an opportunity to extend these supports—recent advances in generative AI (genAI), especially large language models, have enabled seemingly personalized and natural language communication, and early work highlights the promise of AI-assisted rehearsal and emotion regulation for workers [35, 38, 97, 124]. That said, it remains an open question: **How effective AI can be for negotiation coaching and what new challenges it may introduce.**

Building on the momentum of AI-assisted workplace technologies [79, 80, 108, 118], early investigations into AI support for interpersonal conflicts and related domains have highlighted both the strengths and gaps in tactical skill development and knowledge acquisition [49, 94, 130]. Shaikh et al. emphasized conflict resolution strategies, and Ma et al. emphasized the need to incorporate expert knowledge. Yet despite these advances, prior work has focused primarily on skills rather than psychological factors, even though psychological aspects such as self-efficacy are key in negotiation. Organizational psychology research notes that negotiators with greater self-efficacy are more resilient to setbacks, sustain a willingness to negotiate, and maintain a more positive orientation toward the negotiation process [104]. This highlights the critical need for AI systems that not only strengthen tactical preparation, but also directly reduce psychological barriers and empower individuals throughout their careers. Therefore, motivated by the limitations of traditional and AI-based negotiation training, our work is guided by the following research questions (RQs):

- RQ1:** How does a theory-driven AI negotiation coach influence psychological readiness for workplace negotiations?
- RQ2:** How do individuals perceive and make sense of a theory-driven AI negotiation coach?

For our study, we designed **Trucey**, an AI-powered interactive prototype that aims to prepare individuals for complex workplace negotiations by targeting both tactical and psychological barriers. Grounded in human-centered AI and Industrial-Organizational (I/O) psychology—particularly Brett and Thompson’s negotiation framework—Trucey was built using few-shot learning on fine-tuned GPT-4.1. Trucey delivers negotiation coaching through a structured conversational interaction: for a negotiation scenario, users receive tailored prompts to articulate goals and challenges, and then rehearse role-based exchanges with Trucey acting as a counterpart. Throughout, the AI provides feedback that highlights potential strategies, surfaces power dynamics, and invites reflection on confidence and emotional responses. Such an interaction was enabled by incorporating four key design features—1) *situational calibration*, 2) *role-based simulation*, 3) *dynamic contextual layering*, and 4) *iterative response alignment*. These design features help create negotiation scenarios that embed contextual and power dynamics known to trigger psychological barriers, providing a rigorous environment to examine how AI coaching interventions can influence negotiation readiness.

To address our RQs, we first conducted a pre-registered experimental study with $N=267$ participants across three conditions—1) **Trucey**, an AI-powered coach integrating negotiation theory ($N=134$); 2) **ChatGPT**, a generic AI without theory-driven negotiation scaffolding ($N=66$); and 3) **Handbook**, a static but theory-based negotiation resource without AI interactivity ($N=67$). Participants completed pre- and post-task surveys measuring psychological empowerment, self-efficacy, and preparedness of negotiation. This design enabled us to disentangle the contributions of AI interactivity and theory-driven negotiation support, providing a rigorous test of how these elements shape psychological readiness for workplace negotiation. In addition, we conducted an in-depth interview study ($N=15$) to explore participants’ mental models, their perceived strengths and limitations of each condition, and how AI- or

theory-driven support shaped their confidence and approach to workplace negotiation. This qualitative component complemented the experimental findings by providing richer insights into the experiential and interpretive dimensions of AI-assisted negotiation preparation.

Our experimental study demonstrated that participants significantly favored the theory-based Handbook over both AI coaching tools on usability and psychological empowerment, but Trucey significantly reduced fear compared to generic AI coaching (Cohen’s $d=-0.23$). We conducted linguistic analyses to examine how the language of interactions was associated with the psychological outcomes. Interviews revealed that participants preferred the Handbook’s comprehensive content because it provided greater control over their preparation process and allowed them to develop personalized strategies at their own pace. In contrast, they found AI coaching fragmented and insufficient for preparing across scenarios, though Trucey’s rehearsal component helped them practice uncomfortable conversations.

Taken together, our work makes both empirical and conceptual contributions. First, we develop and evaluate Trucey, a theory-driven AI negotiation coach that targets psychological factors such as self-efficacy, fear reduction, and empowerment in negotiation preparation. Second, we provide empirical evidence that the value of AI in negotiation is situated—shaped by stress, authenticity concerns, and contextual constraints—rather than universally beneficial. Our findings challenge common assumptions about the superiority of personalized, conversational AI, showing that in high-stakes workplace contexts, user control and access to comprehensive resources may be more critical for psychological empowerment than conversational guidance alone. Finally, this work bears methodological and design implications for AI-mediated communication, extending the scope of workplace technologies by emphasizing strategies that balance efficiency with authenticity, autonomy, and inclusivity to better support confidence, resilience, and equitable participation in professional interactions.

2 Related Work

2.1 Workplace Negotiation and Psychological Barriers

Workplace negotiations—such as requesting promotions, asserting boundaries, or challenging authority—are shaped by both structural and psychological barriers that make self-advocacy difficult. Employees often withhold input due to fears of retaliation, damaging relationships, or jeopardizing career prospects [41, 100], concerns that are amplified by hierarchical power asymmetries [54, 81]. Avoidance is further reinforced by conflict dynamics, as both relationship and task conflict reliably undermine performance [39], and by social norms such as gendered backlash for self-advocacy [10] and cultural expectations of harmony [142].

Self-efficacy predicts willingness to initiate and persistence through challenges [8], whereas anxiety and low confidence reduce joint value creation [17]. Socio-emotional skills, including emotion recognition and emotional intelligence, positively influence negotiation performance [44, 129]. Importantly, negotiation success extends beyond economic outcomes: subjective experiences regarding process, relationship, and self-evaluation independently predict long-term

negotiation behavior [32, 33]. Incremental beliefs about ability further enable negotiators to achieve better outcomes than those with fixed mindsets [87].

These insights underscore the importance of theory-driven frameworks to understand and intervene in negotiation behavior. Brett's synthesis of distributive and integrative approaches highlights how information sharing, culture, and cognitive biases systematically influence outcomes [15]. Complementing this, Bradley and Campbell's work on conversational staging shows how negotiation unfolds across temporal phases, with different barriers and opportunities emerging at each stage [13]. Together, these frameworks provide a structured account of negotiation dynamics that can guide both research and the design of interventions aimed at mitigating psychological barriers.

2.2 Human–AI Interaction: Strengths, Weaknesses, and Challenges

AI systems hold promise for enhancing human capabilities, productivity, and collaboration extending human capacities via automation, personalized feedback, and decision support [35, 124]. Yet many AI systems produce errors or outputs misaligned with organizational goals [112], and anticipating unintended consequences remains challenging [11, 29, 113, 143]. Recent research underscores that achieving human–AI alignment requires more than technical fixes: systems must adapt to users' goals, practices, and values, and misalignments can erode trust, limit agency, or distort decision-making [21, 73, 84, 147]. Scholars have responded with taxonomies of failures, design guidelines, and frameworks for transparency and accountability [4, 5, 23, 56, 92, 99, 113, 131, 132], emphasizing that reliable, ethical, and usable AI requires more than algorithmic performance alone.

Human–AI interactions also introduce distinct cognitive and social dynamics. Users often calibrate trust differently with AI, sometimes resisting algorithmic advice even when it is superior [42, 57, 59, 126, 145]. People may sacrifice financial gain to avoid bargaining with AI, preferring human negotiation partners [46, 47], and poorly calibrated trust can reduce effectiveness or create confusion in high-stakes or socially complex contexts [67, 105]. While traditional explanation methods partially improve understanding, few reliably enhance appropriate reliance, prompting exploration of alternatives like analogy-based explanations leveraging common-sense knowledge [55, 64, 127, 138]. Personalized AI can strongly influence judgment over time [76], and LLM-assisted systems show that trust in competence, integrity, and benevolence can reshape experiences, sometimes masking newly introduced burdens [77].

These challenges are amplified in organizational settings, where AI can affect power asymmetries, wellbeing, and professional relationships. Decision-support AI may influence promotions, evaluations, or workload distribution, with cascading effects on behavior and perceptions [2, 91]. Understanding these dynamics is essential for designing AI to support negotiation or other workplace interactions without exacerbating psychological barriers.

Taken together, while AI holds potential to augment human capabilities, realizing these benefits requires careful attention to trust, interpretability, human agency, and socio-organizational context. These insights motivate the development of AI interventions that

not only provide tactical support but also actively scaffold psychological readiness and decision-making in complex workplace scenarios. In this work, we examine human–AI interaction in workplace negotiations, focusing on how users perceive AI's role as a negotiation coach, alignment with their needs and agency, and how these perceptions shape the effectiveness of AI as both tactical support and psychological scaffold.

2.3 Human-centered Technologies for Workplace

A rich body of HCI and CSCW research explores technologies designed to support professional communication, skill development, and wellbeing in organizational settings [36, 37, 45, 102, 121]. These human-centered technologies increasingly integrate sensing, collaborative, and AI-driven approaches to address complex workplace needs. Workplace AI applications demonstrate both significant promise and inherent limitations [26, 79, 80, 108, 118]. On the one hand, AI can streamline routine tasks such as email management and meeting scheduling [71, 95], and a range of tools and methods [82, 88, 130, 151] highlight potential to scaffold workplace conversations [75].

On the other hand, current systems remain constrained: they often lack the contextual awareness and interpersonal sensitivity required for organizational life, leading to mismatches between what AI can deliver and the nuanced demands of workplace communication and collaboration [1, 34, 118]. Related research on AI-mediated communication highlights opportunities to reduce workload and stress while also raising concerns about fairness, privacy, and inclusion [34, 79, 80]. Within these systems, organizational power dynamics and competing stakeholder interests further complicate adoption and use [2, 26, 60, 89, 91], shaping whether interventions are perceived as empowering or threatening.

These tensions help explain why prior work revealed professionals' preference for human advice networks over algorithmic recommendations [93], and why concerns about over-reliance surface when automation is introduced into socially complex tasks such as negotiation [22]. The adoption of AI in the workplace raises ethical, social, and practical challenges at both individual and organizational levels [12, 144]. Organizational culture plays a critical mediating role in whether such systems are adopted successfully, and ethical issues demand accountability frameworks to protect sensitive interpersonal data [31, 78].

Our work extends this body of research by focusing on AI as a preparation coach for workplace negotiations rather than a direct participant. This framing preserves user agency while addressing key psychological barriers—such as fear and self-efficacy—that hinder negotiation preparedness. By empirically examining how AI-mediated coaching shapes psychological readiness, we contribute evidence that complements existing workplace technologies while highlighting design principles that emphasize autonomy, inclusivity, and resilience. More broadly, our findings add to ongoing CSCW and HCI discourse on how human-centered technologies can support socially complex, high-stakes interactions.

3 Study Design and Methods

We designed a preregistered mixed-methods study, consisting of a quantitative three-condition between-subject experiment $N=267$ followed by a qualitative semi-structured interview with $N=15$ participants to understand mechanisms and gain deeper insights (Fig. 1 provides a schematic overview of our study). In this section, we describe our study design, participant recruitment, and methodology.

3.1 Designing an Interactive Prototype: Trucey

3.1.1 Theoretical Foundation. Our study centered on the design of an AI-powered interactive prototype for workplace negotiation, Trucey. Trucey’s design was guided by two complementary theoretical frameworks from the organizational science literature. First, **Brett and Thompson’s** negotiation framework emphasizes how contextual factors and power asymmetries shape the effectiveness of negotiation strategies [15]. **Brett and Thompson’s** focus on situational dynamics, rather than fixed personality traits, aligned with our objective of supporting users in managing aspects of negotiation that are within their control. Second, we drew inspiration from **Bradley and Campbell’s** framework for managing difficult conversations [13]. **Bradley and Campbell** highlights three critical phases—preparation, in-conversation management, and post-interaction reflection [13]. This structured approach provides a process-oriented lens, ensuring that negotiation support extends beyond isolated tactics to scaffold the entire interaction.

Together, these two frameworks informed the design of Trucey as a theory-driven AI coach that integrates strategic guidance with conversational process support, enabling users to reflect, adapt, and navigate negotiations more effectively.

3.1.2 Prototype Architecture. Trucey translates the above theoretical foundations into practice through four key mechanisms that work together to provide contextually appropriate coaching, as listed below:

Situational Calibration ensures that shared contextual understanding enhances coaching efficacy in high-stakes scenarios, thereby mitigating the provision of generic advice incongruent with the user’s specific circumstances.

Role-based Simulation ensures the AI adopts an appropriate perspective during practice, thereby facilitating a realistic conversational dynamic for the user.

Contextual Layering emulates the incremental information delivery characteristic of effective human coaching across multiple dialogue turns. This approach reduces cognitive load and aims to prevent user overwhelm.

Iterative Response Alignment integrates active listening behaviors to maintain shared understanding and facilitate a situationally responsive coaching system.

3.1.3 Interaction Design. Trucey’s interaction design followed a structured five-stage workflow, combining *advice* and *rehearsal*, supporting both the preparation and practice components essential for effective negotiation coaching.

Scenario Assignment. First, Trucey would presents users with workplace negotiation scenarios with specific contextual details to make the situation more realistic. For example, scenarios contain details such as:

Problem to discuss: Asking For Time Off

Person you are talking to: Your boss

Your relationship: You have had a bad relationship for two months

Previous discussions: You have discussed this before

Work context: You are paid hourly wages

Personality Calibration. Second, Trucey asked users to complete a structured assessment of their supervisor’s behavioral patterns using Big-Five personality traits [133], which research shows significantly impact negotiation outcomes [15, 128]. This assessment enabled Trucey to predict the supervisor’s communication style, decision-making preferences, and likely reactions when pushed or under pressure during negotiations, allowing the system to tailor both strategic advice and simulation behaviors to match the specific supervisor’s profile.

Theory-guided Advice Generation. Third, Trucey delivered strategic coaching through incremental dialogue building, introducing negotiation concepts gradually across multiple conversation turns rather than providing comprehensive advice all at once. Each turn built on previous exchanges, allowing users to process guidance in manageable pieces while the system adapted advice complexity based on user responses and conversation context.

Role Based Rehearsal Simulation. Fourth, Trucey implemented interactive practice sessions where it embodied the supervisor’s personality profile to create realistic but controlled negotiation experiences.

Iterative Feedback Integration. Fifth, Trucey enabled users to provide feedback on interaction realism and tone, triggering system recalibration for subsequent responses.

3.1.4 Technical Implementation. We engineered Trucey using GPT-4.1 via OpenAI’s API, with a Python Streamlit interface and a SQL database for configuration and interaction logging (Fig. 2).

To personalize, we implemented a personality-matching mechanism that transformed users’ self-reported responses into vector embeddings and used cosine similarity to identify the most relevant supervisor profile. Each profile encoded characteristic strengths and challenges, enabling tailored strategic advice and realistic simulation behaviors—even under simulated pressure scenarios.

We applied few-shot learning with a theory-driven strategy, drawing examples from **Brett and Thompson’s** negotiation framework across five difficulty levels. These range from distributive tactics (e.g., ultimatums, direct demands) to integrative strategies (e.g., collaborative framing, interest alignment). This approach enables Trucey to dynamically adjust advice and practice activities according to both user context and the selected supervisor profile.

3.2 Conducting an Experimental Study

Toward our RQ1 of evaluating the effectiveness of Trucey as a negotiation coach, we conducted a large-scale online experiment on

Does AI Coaching Prepare us for Workplace Negotiations?




Figure 1: A schematic overview of Trucey and our study design.




Figure 2: Example screenshots of Trucey through various stages of user interactions.

Prolific, an online academic research platform designed for behavioral research [107]. The study was designed to simulate realistic workplace negotiation contexts and systematically compare across conditions. This procedure included participant screening and recruitment, informed consent, compensation, pre- and post- task surveys, and exposure to one of the three study conditions, which we describe below:

3.2.1 Participant Recruitment. We recruited participants through Prolific’s default interface. To ensure relevance to workplace negotiation contexts, several inclusion criteria were applied. Participants were required to be at least 18 years old, proficient in English, and have current or past work experience in a U.S. workplace. While U.S. residency was not mandatory, U.S. workplace experience was essential, as cultural norms play a critical role in shaping negotiation strategies [15] Additionally, participants were required to

have worked under a supervisor at some point in their career and to have experience initiating negotiations through asynchronous online communication (e.g., text or email).

Interested participants completed an initial screening survey and provided informed consent before proceeding. Attention checks were embedded throughout the study procedure, and participants failing these checks or timing out were excluded. Of the 368 initial participants, 87 were screened out for not fulfilling study requirements, and 14 failed attention checks or were timed out during the study. The remaining 267 participants constituted our final analytical sample. These participants reflected a diverse set of demographic and professional backgrounds (Table 1). Participants who completed the study received \$5 USD in compensation, while those excluded during screening were compensated \$0.15 USD for their time. On average, the study took 26.4 minutes to complete. These participants

Table 1: Demographic distribution of $N=267$ participants in the experimental study.

	Overall	Trucey	ChatGPT	Handbook
Sex				
Male	141	71	33	37
Female	121	61	32	28
Other/Prefer Not to Say	5	2	1	2
Race/Ethnicity				
White	181	94	38	49
Black or African American	50	29	14	7
Hispanic or Latino	6	2	3	1
Asian	10	2	3	5
Mixed/Other	20	7	8	5
Educational Level				
Associate Degree	29	16	7	6
Bachelors Degree	114	50	29	35
Graduate Degree	80	44	20	16
Other	44	24	10	10
Employment Type				
Employed full-time	197	99	46	52
Employed part-time	43	21	10	12
Other	27	14	10	3
Work Domain				
Administration/Operations	10	5	2	3
Creative/Design/Marketing	15	5	5	5
Education/Training	21	14	4	3
Engineering/Technology/Software	46	24	12	10
Finance/Accounting/Banking	24	10	5	9
Government/Public Service	9	2	3	4
Healthcare/Medical	26	13	7	6
Legal/Compliance	4	1	3	0
Management/Leadership	16	8	4	4
Sales/Business Development	23	17	3	3
Research/Analytics	6	2	1	3
Other/Mixed	67	33	17	17
Compensation Type				
Salaried (fixed annual amount)	124	62	34	28
Hourly wages	81	41	21	19
Other	62	31	11	20
Work Experience				
0-1 year	4	1	3	0
1-3 years	16	9	2	5
3-5 years	22	10	9	3
5-7 years	29	14	8	7
7 years or more	195	100	44	51
No response	1	0	0	1

completed both pre- and post-task surveys and were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions in approximately a 2:1:1 ratio: Trucey ($N=134$), ChatGPT ($N=66$), and Handbook ($N=67$).

3.2.2 Pre- and Post- Task Surveys. We employed a set of validated and study-specific measures to assess participants’ psychological preparedness for workplace negotiations and their perceptions of the intervention. All participants completed identical pre- and post-task surveys to establish baseline and outcome measures, in addition to their task (in assigned condition).

Pre-Task Measures. Participants first completed demographic questions and a battery of survey questionnaires on—1) Perceived AI Literacy using the PAILQ-6 questionnaire [62], 2) Personality Traits using the BFI-10 scale [111, 133], a validated 10-item measure of personality traits rated on 5-point Likert scales, 3) Occupational self-efficacy using the Occupational Self-Efficacy-6 Scale (OSS-6) [117], and 4) Personal empowerment using the Personal Empowerment Understanding (PEU) questionnaire [134] measuring four dimensions (meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact), and 5) Negotiation preparedness, measured using two

questions on perceived fear for negotiation and the willingness to initiate a negotiation—both using 5-point Likert scales.

Post-task measures. After completing the negotiation task, participants completed the same 1) OSS-6 [117], 2) PEU [134], and the 3) negotiation preparedness questionnaires included above. In addition, participants rated the intervention’s 4) usability using a 4-item Usability Metric for User Experience (UMUX) [50] and 5) appropriateness using the Intervention Appropriateness Measure (IAM) [149].

3.2.3 Experimental Study Conditions. For the task during the experimental study, participants were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions we designed. All participants worked through one of the three workplace negotiation scenarios—*requesting a raise, a promotion, or time off*. Time on task was held constant across conditions to ensure comparability. We designed the three conditions to enable us to disentangle the effectiveness of Trucey from both generic AI interactions (ChatGPT) and static theory-based instructions (Handbook). We describe the conditions below:

Trucey (Interactive AI + Theory-driven resource.) Condition was the experimental condition, where participants interacted with our prototype, Trucey. This prototype integrated negotiation theory with personality calibration, contextual advice generation, and an interactive rehearsal simulation. Participants engaged directly with Trucey to receive theory-driven, tailored coaching and practice strategies for an assigned negotiation scenario, including asking for a raise, asking for a promotion, or asking for time off.

ChatGPT (Interactive AI only) Condition served as the AI control condition. Here, participants interacted with a generic conversational AI (ChatGPT) without theoretical scaffolding or personality calibration. To minimize cross-LLM variability, we used GPT-4.5—the same underlying model as in Trucey. This condition isolated the potential benefits of AI interaction itself, independent of negotiation theory or personalization mechanisms.

Handbook (Static theory-driven resource) Condition served as another control condition, consisting of a negotiation resource (without any AI or interactivity). Participants received the same negotiation content provided in Trucey—drawn from the same negotiation frameworks [13, 15]—but presented as static, text-based instructions. This condition isolated the contribution of theoretical material from the medium of delivery.

3.3 Conducting a Semi-structured Interview Study

To complement the experimental findings and gain deeper insight into participants’ experiences with the interventions, we conducted a semi-structured interview study. Semi-structured interviews are well-suited for capturing nuanced perspectives while still providing consistency across sessions. Our protocol combined a core set of guiding questions with flexibility to probe participants’ reflections on their interaction with the conditions, their perceptions of its usefulness, and how it shaped their negotiation preparation. This approach enabled us to move beyond surface-level outcomes to explore the mechanisms through which participants engaged with the interventions, the challenges they encountered, and the value they

Table 2: Demographic distribution of $N=15$ participants in the interview study.

ID	Gender	Race	Work Exp.	Work Domain	Education
P1	Male	Asian	1-3 years	Engineering/Technology	Bachelor's
P2	Male	Asian	0-1 year	Engineering/Technology	Bachelor
P3	Female	White	1-3 years	Engineering/Technology	Bachelor
P4	Male	Asian	3-5 years	Education	Bachelor
P5	Male	Asian	1-3 years	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P6	Female	Asian	3-5 years	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P7	Female	Asian	0-1 year	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P8	Male	Asian	5-7 years	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P9	Male	Asian	0-1 year	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P10	Female	Asian	1-3 years	Engineering/Technology	Bachelor
P11	Male	Asian	1-3 years	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P12	Female	Asian	3-5 years	Legal/Management	Graduate
P13	Male	Asian	5-7 years	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P14	Male	Asian	3-5 years	Engineering/Technology	Graduate
P15	Male	Asian	7+ years	Engineering/Technology	Graduate

attributed to different forms of support. In this section, we describe our participant recruitment and interview design methodology.

3.3.1 Participant Recruitment. We recruited participants for the semi-structured interviews through targeted LinkedIn posts advertising our research on AI coaching for workplace negotiations. Interested individuals completed a Qualtrics screening form, provided consent, and were assessed for eligibility. We applied criteria very similar to the experimental study: participants had to be 18 or older, proficient in English, and have U.S. workplace experience. We received 138 responses to our interest form between July and August 2025. After screening out for inauthentic or low-quality responses through Qualtrics survey and phone-call-based screening, we recruited 15 participants for our study. Table 2 summarizes the demographics of the participants—while our recruited participants represent a mix of genders and professional backgrounds, with varying levels of workplace experience, the participant pool seemingly lack racial/ethnic diversity, which is a limitation. That said, “Asian” should not be understood as a single, uniform category—14 of our 15 participants identified as Asian, but represented cultural heterogeneity, including South Asian, East Asian, and Asian American participants, with diversity in immigrant status and countries of origin. The participants were interviewed for a one-hour remote interview conducted over Teams/Zoom. Each interview participant received a \$20 USD Amazon gift card upon completion.

3.3.2 Interview Design. Our interviews followed a structured protocol designed to balance standardization with a flexibility for deeper exploration. The first four interviews (with P1-P4) focused exclusively on Trucey, allowing us to probe deeply into its usability, potential issues, and participants’ interactions through extended think-aloud exercises and follow-up questioning. Based on these sessions, we revised the protocol to enable comparative evaluation across all three conditions (Trucey, ChatGPT, and Handbook).

Accordingly, participants engaged with both AI conditions (Trucey and ChatGPT) in a counterbalanced order, spending 20 minutes with each, followed by a 10-minute review of Handbook. To mitigate order effects, the sequence of AI conditions was systematically varied across participants. For each AI condition, participants worked through workplace negotiation scenarios using identical prompts to ensure comparability while still allowing for natural variation

in responses. The interviewer provided minimal guidance during these tasks to capture authentic user interaction.

After each condition, participants answered a series of open-ended questions exploring preferences, perceived effectiveness, and the impact on confidence, efficacy, and negotiation-related anxieties. This structure encouraged detailed, reflective responses while maintaining focus on how the interventions shaped user perceptions. All interviews were conducted via Zoom, recorded with participant consent, and transcribed. The within-subjects design of interviews enabled direct comparisons across conditions and generated rich insights into the mechanisms underlying our experimental findings.

3.4 Privacy, Ethics, and Reflexivity

Our study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at our university. Given the sensitive nature of workplace and interpersonal dynamics that surfaced during the surveys and interviews, we implemented strict privacy and ethical safeguards. The experimental study dataset was collected through Prolific and Qualtrics platforms, and was already anonymized at source. For the interview dataset, we removed all personally identifiable information and paraphrased quotes in the paper to reduce traceability while maintaining context in readership.

Our interdisciplinary team comprises researchers of diverse gender, racial, and cultural backgrounds, including people of color and immigrants. The team brings interdisciplinary expertise in the areas of HCI, CSCW, computational social science, AI ethics, and I/O psychology. Multiple authors have conducted prior studies on workplace dynamics, and as individuals with lived experience in organizational settings, and our interpretations are also informed by lived experiences of being employed in organizational settings. While we have taken the utmost care to capture and faithfully synthesize the participants’ viewpoints, we recognize that our interpretations are situated and informed by our disciplinary training, professional backgrounds, and personal experiences.

4 RQ1: Psychological Readiness after (AI-driven) Negotiation Coaching

4.1 Comparing Psychological Effects of the Interventions

Table 3 summarizes the changes in psychological measures observed in the post-task surveys compared to the pre-task surveys for each of the three interventions—Trucey, ChatGPT, and Handbook. For each comparison between Trucey and ChatGPT as well as Trucey and Handbook, we computed effect sizes (Cohen’s d) and conducted independent-sample t -tests for statistical difference. Additionally, we performed Kruskal–Wallis H -tests to examine overall differences across all three interventions. Below, we summarize results for organizational self-efficacy, psychological empowerment, and negotiation preparation (fear and willingness to initiate).

Organizational Self-Efficacy (OSS-6) [117]. Trucey led to a slight positive change ($\Delta=+0.05$), while ChatGPT showed a small decrease ($\Delta=-0.19$) and Handbook showed the largest improvement ($\Delta=+0.58$). Compared to ChatGPT, Trucey performed modestly better, though with a very small effect size ($d=0.08$). Relative to Handbook, however, Trucey performed notably worse, with a small negative

effect size ($d=-0.16$). No statistically significant differences were observed across the three interventions per Kruskal–Wallis test.

Psychological Empowerment (PEU) [134]. Both Trucey and ChatGPT resulted in negligible and similar improvements ($\Delta=+0.04$ each). In contrast, Handbook yielded a higher increase ($\Delta=+0.26$), with a medium effect size when compared to Trucey ($d=-0.40$). This difference was statistically significant ($t=-2.63$, $p < 0.05$), and the Kruskal–Wallis test confirmed significant variation across conditions, indicating that Handbook was most effective in enhancing psychological empowerment.

Negotiation Preparedness First, among the three conditions, Trucey achieved the largest reduction in *negotiation-related fear* ($\Delta=-0.19$). In comparison, ChatGPT increased fear ($\Delta=+0.14$), whereas Handbook slightly reduced fear ($\Delta=-0.10$). Relative to ChatGPT, Trucey achieved a small effect ($d=-0.27$), and compared to Handbook the effect was very small ($d=-0.08$). Although the changes suggest that Trucey is promising for alleviating fear.

Next, all three interventions helped increase participants’ *willingness to initiate negotiations*. ChatGPT led to the largest improvement ($\Delta=+0.36$), followed by Handbook ($\Delta=+0.31$) and Trucey ($\Delta=+0.26$). Effect sizes between interventions were negligible, and the Kruskal–Wallis test showed no significant differences. Thus, while willingness to initiate improved across the board, no intervention demonstrated clear superiority. This universal improvement likely reflects that any form of preparation enhances readiness for challenging tasks [8].

Usability (UMUX) [50] and Appropriateness (IAM) [149]. During the exit survey, participants completed the Usability Metric for User Experience (UMUX; 0–100)[50] and the Intervention Appropriateness Measure (IAM; 4–20)[149] to evaluate their experience with each coaching condition. The results of these metrics are shown in Table 4.

For usability, mean UMUX scores were 74.22 for Trucey, 78.97 for ChatGPT, and 80.47 for Handbook. A Kruskal–Wallis test revealed significant differences across conditions. Pairwise comparisons showed that Trucey had significantly lower usability ratings than Handbook, while the difference between Trucey and ChatGPT was not significant. All conditions achieved usability scores above the 68-point threshold for acceptable usability [50]. This suggests that the Handbook was found the easiest to use amongst the users. For appropriateness, mean IAM scores were 15.63 for Trucey, 16.11 for ChatGPT, and 16.45 for Handbook, with no significant differences across conditions. All conditions scored in the *moderately appropriate to highly appropriate* range [149], suggesting participants viewed each coaching approach as a moderately appropriate fit with potential value for negotiation preparation.

4.2 Linguistic Analysis

An interesting observation from the above concerns how the effects of interacting with Trucey and ChatGPT did not show statistically significant differences for a majority of outcomes. To unpack this further, we quantitatively examined the differences in the language of interactions by Trucey and ChatGPT.

4.2.1 Linguistic Similarities with Theory-Driven Negotiation Elements. To begin with, we operationalized and measured the presence of various Brett and Thompson’s elements in the language

of Trucey and ChatGPT [15]. Our methodological approach is inspired by prior work on examining linguistic markers in workplace-related communication [37, 121]. For this purpose, we employed vector embeddings using Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (or BERT) language model, using pre-trained BERT-based sentence transformers [115]. We constructed embeddings for the seven core negotiation concepts in the Brett and Thompson’s framework: Strategy Development (SD), Information Asymmetry (IA), Interest Exploration (IE), Outcome Analysis (OA), Long-term Relationship (LTR), and Power Dynamics (PD). These concepts featured the same theoretical examples used in Trucey’s few-shot prompting. Similarly, we obtained the BERT embeddings of the linguistic interactions in Trucey and ChatGPT. We then computed cosine similarity scores between AI (Trucey and ChatGPT) language in responses and each negotiation element to quantify the degree to which the element was reflected in the responses.

Table 5 summarizes the comparative results across the two AI tools, including relative differences, effect sizes (Cohen’s d), and t -tests. Our analysis revealed several key differences. In Strategy Development, Trucey responses aligned more strongly with most components, except for phased SD. For Information Asymmetry (IA), Trucey produced slightly fewer references to prepared IA (–2%) but more strategic IA (+5%). In Interest Exploration (IE), Trucey showed reduced creative and limited IE but emphasized mutual and evaluative IE, pointing toward a more collaborative style. Within Outcome Analysis (OA), Trucey generated fewer flexible (–5%) and procedural (–1%) OA elements, though both AI tools were nearly identical on holistic OA. For Long-term Relationships, the two systems performed similarly, indicating parity in addressing relational considerations. Finally, in Power Dynamics, Trucey highlighted collaborative PD (+5%) while reducing authority-based PD (–4%).

Together, these findings suggest that Trucey is more directive and collaborative, embedding strategy and mutuality at the core of its language, while ChatGPT remains broader and more balanced across negotiation elements. Notably, the analysis also demonstrates that ChatGPT—even without specialized prompting—automatically incorporates several of Brett’s components by default, reflecting how large language models may implicitly encode negotiation theories. This distinction highlights the potential of targeted prompting to guide AI systems toward specific negotiation orientations, such as collaboration and strategic planning, beyond the general-purpose balance evident in default outputs.

4.2.2 Regression Modeling. Next, we built linear regression models to examine the effects of AI interventions, demographic and personality covariates, and negotiation element similarities on four outcome measures—occupational self-efficacy (OSS), psychological empowerment understanding (PEU), fear, and willingness to initiate negotiation (initiativeness). The models incorporated a rich set of independent variables collected during the pre-task survey, including demographic attributes (e.g., gender, race, education), workplace-related variables (e.g., employment type, work sector compensation type, relationship with supervisor), personality traits (BFI: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness), AI literacy, and pre-task baselines of the outcome measures themselves (e.g., pre-task OSS, PEU, fear, initiativeness). In addition, we tested a range of models with interaction terms. While

Table 3: Comparison of the changes in pre- and post- task surveys.

Measure	Trucey Mean Δ	ChatGPT Mean Δ	Handbook Mean Δ	Trucey vs ChatGPT Cohen's d	Trucey vs ChatGPT t-test	Trucey vs Handbook Cohen's d	Trucey vs Handbook t-test	Kruskal-Wallis H-stat.
<i>Organizational Self-Efficacy (OSS-6)</i>								
OSS	0.05	-0.19	0.58	0.08	0.48	-0.16	-1.06	2.37
<i>Psychological Empowerment Understanding (PEU)</i>								
PEU: Meaning	0.05	0.10	0.36	-0.06	-0.41	-0.38	-2.47	7.06*
PEU: Competence	-0.02	-0.02	0.25	0.00	0.01	-0.37	-2.46**	6.08*
PEU: Self-determination	0.03	0.00	0.11	0.05	0.3	-0.13	-0.81	2.34
PEU: Impact	0.11	0.05	0.31	0.07	0.46	-0.28	-1.81*	4.37
PEU: Aggregated	0.04	0.04	0.26	0.01	0.09	-0.40	-2.63**	8.36**
<i>Negotiation Preparedness</i>								
Negotiation Fear	-0.19	0.14	-0.1	-0.27	-1.8*	-0.08	-0.49	3.81*
Negotiation Initiativeness	0.26	0.36	0.31	-0.11	-0.73	-0.06	-0.4	0.75

Table 4: Comparison of the usability and acceptability of the various conditions of negotiation coaching.

Measure	Trucey Mean	ChatGPT Mean	Handbook Mean	Trucey vs ChatGPT Cohen's d	Trucey vs ChatGPT t-test	Trucey vs Handbook Cohen's d	Trucey vs Handbook t-test	Kruskal-Wallis H-stat.
UMUX	74.22	78.97	80.47	-0.24	-1.52	-0.32	-2.04*	3.19**
IAM	15.63	16.11	16.45	-0.14	-0.91	-0.24	-1.54	2.53

Table 5: Comparison of Brett and Thompson’s elements of successful negotiation between Trucey and ChatGPT with effect sizes reported as Cohen’s d and statistical significance via t-tests.

Element	Trucey	ChatGPT	Mean Δ%	Cohen's d	t-test
<i>Strategy Development</i>					
Basic	0.45	0.48	-2.38	-0.26	-3.60***
Phased	0.69	0.68	1.17	0.18	2.42**
Structured	0.76	0.78	-2.10	-0.32	-4.30***
Innovative	0.63	0.66	-2.82	-0.46	-6.24***
<i>Information Asymmetry</i>					
Prepared	0.68	0.70	-1.90	-0.27	-3.67***
Strategic	0.75	0.70	5.43	0.70	9.61***
<i>Interest Exploration</i>					
Limited	0.35	0.40	-5.03	-0.53	-7.27***
Evaluative	0.66	0.65	1.29	0.13	1.76
Mutual	0.69	0.68	1.17	0.18	2.42***
Creative	0.67	0.71	-3.86	-0.64	-8.78***
<i>Outcome Analysis</i>					
Procedural	0.60	0.61	-1.15	-0.19	-2.65**
Flexible	0.63	0.68	-5.04	-0.79	-10.72***
Holistic	0.64	0.64	0.73	0.12	1.63
<i>Long-Term Relationship</i>					
Conventional	0.60	0.61	-1.15	-0.19	-2.65**
Strategic	0.65	0.64	0.44	0.05	0.62
<i>Power Dynamics</i>					
Collaborative	0.75	0.70	5.43	0.70	9.61***
Authority Based	0.43	0.47	-3.96	-0.41	-5.59***

several combinations were explored, the most robust and significant patterns emerged when including interaction effects between the intervention condition (Trucey vs. ChatGPT) and the linguistic similarities to Brett’s negotiation elements (reported in the previous section). These interaction terms allowed us to assess not only whether a given negotiation element was associated with the outcomes, but also whether its effect was moderated by the AI.

We built separate regression models for each dependent variable, thereby allowing us to isolate the predictors most relevant to each outcome domain. This approach also facilitated a clearer interpretation of how Trucey and ChatGPT shaped different facets of negotiation experiences. Table 6 summarizes the β coefficients and

their statistical significance across all models. Below, we unpack the findings for each outcome variable in turn.

Overall, demographic and workplace attributes were not significant across any of the models, and personality traits only appeared sporadically. Instead, the most consistent predictors were the AI intervention condition and interaction terms with negotiation elements. We unpack these observations below:

Occupational Self-Efficacy (OSS). Being in the Trucey condition significantly increased OSS ($\beta=6.89$). Within negotiation elements, basic SD X Trucey ($\beta=520.50$) and phased SD X Trucey ($\beta=31.61$) were positively associated with OSS, suggesting that structured and stepwise strategy development enhanced self-efficacy when supported by Trucey. Trucey’s dynamic contextual layering works optimally with structured, straightforward approaches as they can be broken down effectively into digestible incremental pieces. However, innovative SD alone was positively associated ($\beta=235.50$), but its interaction with Trucey showed a significant negative effect ($\beta=-468.69$), indicating that Trucey’s incremental building approach contradicts the simultaneous understanding required for integrated thinking in creative solutions. Therefore, in the presence of this approach, the system’s inherent contradiction undermines a user’s self-perceived efficacy in ideating for a negotiation. Negative associations also emerged with limited IE ($\beta=-159.90$) unless combined with Trucey ($\beta=511.80$), where the direction reversed. Trucey helps provide users with more negotiation options to consider when they exist in a limited bargaining space due to the nature of their suggestions. Therefore, users feel less helpless in constrained situations. Pre-task OSS strongly predicted post-task OSS ($\beta=0.48$).

Psychological Empowerment Understanding (PEU). Here again, positive coefficients indicate factors associated with higher PEU, while negative coefficients indicate factors associated with lower PEU. Although Trucey itself was not a significant predictor, several interaction effects emerged. Basic SD X Trucey ($\beta=885.00$) showed a positive effect, demonstrated substantial positive associations

Table 6: Linear regression models revealing the relationship between individual differences and linguistic similarity of interactions with Brett and Thompson’s framework’s aspects with our outcome measures (* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, * p<0.001). This model only includes the data from the two AI (Trucey and ChatGPT) interactions.**

Dep. Variables →	OSS	PEU	Fear	Initiativeness
Indep. Variables ↓	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.
Gender				
Race				
Education				
Employment Type				
Work Sector				
Compensation Type				
Relationship with Supervisor				
Condition: Trucey	6.89*	2.96	-20.43**	12.65*
Strategy Development: Basic X Trucey	520.50**	885.00**	115.70*	
Strategy Development: Phased			16.03***	-5.15*
Strategy Development: Phased X Trucey	31.61*		-14.89**	
Strategy Development: Structured			-52.34*	
Strategy Development: Structured X Trucey				
Strategy Development: Innovative	235.50**	41.05**	-60.39**	35.81*
Strategy Development: Innovative X Trucey	-468.69***	-64.69**		
Information Asymmetry: Prepared X Trucey	-109.83*		-27.51*	
Information Asymmetry: Strategic	-25.43*	-5.32*		
Information Asymmetry: Strategic X Trucey	58.47***	12.31***		
Interest Exploration: Limited	-159.90*			
Interest Exploration: Limited X Trucey	511.80**	87.02**		
Interest Exploration: Evaluative		-23.00*		
Interest Exploration: Evaluative X Trucey		32.82**	-50.89*	
Interest Exploration: Mutual				-5.16*
Interest Exploration: Mutual X Trucey			-14.80*	
Interest Exploration: Creative			-25.18*	38.51*
Interest Exploration: Creative X Trucey	-351.67***	-51.33***		
Outcome Analysis: Procedural	33.04**	7.58*	-11.80*	
Outcome Analysis: Procedural X Trucey	-64.65**	-11.96**	15.35*	
Outcome Analysis: Flexible				
Outcome Analysis: Flexible X Trucey	603.65***	97.86**		
Outcome Analysis: Holistic				-34.37*
Outcome Analysis: Holistic X Trucey	208.56**			
Long-Term Relationship: Conventional	33.30*	7.62*	-11.74**	
Long-Term Relationship: Conventional X Trucey	-64.18**	-11.89**	15.45**	
Long-Term Relationship: Strategic	101.66**	32.44**		
Long-Term Relationship: Strategic X Trucey	-217.46***	-49.27***	58.53**	
Power Dynamics: Collaborative	-24.50*	-5.17*		
Power Dynamics: Collaborative X Trucey	58.24***	12.28***		
Power Dynamics: Authority X Trucey	-963.40**	-163.80*	-214.10*	
BFI: Extraversion			0.24*	
BFI: Agreeableness				
BFI: Conscientiousness		0.01*	-0.26*	0.21*
BFI: Neuroticism			0.09*	
BFI: Openness				
AI Literacy				
OSS: Pre-task	0.48***			
PEU: Pre-task	1.93***	0.99***		
Fear: Pre-task			0.24***	
Initiativeness: Pre-task				0.63***
Task time				
	R²=0.87***	R²=0.86***	R²=0.65**	R²=0.74***

with empowerment, suggesting that Trucey’s incremental guidance approach enhances users’ sense of understanding and control when applied to straightforward negotiation scenarios. The system’s structured methodology appears to provide clear pathways for empowerment in contexts where step-by-step building can be effectively integrated. However, while Innovative SD’s ($\beta=41.05$), it’s interaction with Trucey was negative ($\beta=-64.69$). This indicated that the system’s structured approach may constrain the cognitive flexibility that users associate with empowerment in innovative contexts. Similarly, Creative IE also showed a modest positive association ($\beta=13.77$), which flipped to a large negative interaction

under Trucey ($\beta=-51.33$), suggesting that when users attempt creative approaches, the incremental methodology conflicts with their sense of empowered exploration. Conversely, Evaluative IE was negatively associated ($\beta=-23.00$), though its interaction with Trucey reversed to positive ($\beta=32.82$). Trucey helps provide users with solutions and reminders in approaching situations with ambiguity and therefore pro-actively empower them to react to a situation. Finally, procedural OA and conventional LTR were both positively associated with the outcome variables; however, their interactions with Trucey were negative. This negative moderation can be attributed to the embodiment of Trucey elements during simulation, which

subsequently diminishes users' sense of empowerment through deferral mechanisms. Similarly, strategic LTR demonstrated a positive main effect that was negatively moderated by Trucey. This interaction pattern reflects the influence of organizational knowledge disclosure and normative compliance requests, which collectively reduce user empowerment. Understandably, pre-task PEU predicted post-task PEU ($\beta=0.99$).

Fear of Negotiation. Here, negative coefficients indicate factors associated with lowering negotiation fear, while positive coefficients indicate factors associated with higher fear. Fear decreased significantly under the Trucey condition ($\beta=-20.43$). This reflects how structured AI guidance and contextual support may reduce uncertainty-driven negotiation anxiety by making users feel more prepared and supported. Several negotiation elements also shaped fear: phased SD ($\beta=16.03$) was associated with higher fear increasing anxiety by creating anticipation across multiple sequential stages, transforming a single anxiety-provoking event into multiple interconnected worries, whereas structured SD ($\beta=-52.34$) and innovative SD ($\beta=-60.39$) lowered fear by providing providing clear frameworks. These approaches reduce uncertainty through predictable pathways, reducing fear of rejection or inadequate performance.

For IE, evaluative IE X Trucey ($\beta=-50.89$), mutual IE X Trucey ($\beta=-14.80$), and creative IE ($\beta=-25.18$, $p<.05$) reduced fear as Trucey's incremental guidance provides scaffolding for complex interpersonal dynamics, making inherently uncertain social processes feel more manageable through structured breakdown and contextual calibration. Conversely, Procedural OA X Trucey ($\beta=15.35$) and conventional LTR X Trucey ($\beta=15.45$) were associated with greater fear, suggesting that procedural and conventional frames on outcome analysis may feel constraining when paired with Trucey. Personality traits such as extraversion ($\beta=0.24$), conscientiousness ($\beta=-0.26$), and neuroticism ($\beta=0.09$) showed modest associations. Unsurprisingly, pre-task fear was a strong predictor ($\beta=0.24$).

Willingness to Initiate Negotiation. In the case of willingness to initiate negotiations, positive coefficients indicate factors associated with higher initiativeness, and negative coefficients are associated with lower initiativeness. We find that initiativeness was significantly higher in the Trucey condition ($\beta=12.65$). This reflects how structured guidance and support increase users' confidence to initiate negotiations by making them feel better prepared and supported. Innovative SD ($\beta=35.81$) and creative IE ($\beta=38.51$) increased initiativeness. This could be accounted to allowing users to feel like they could produce unique value proposition, increasing their motivation to initiate negotiations. While mutual IE ($\beta=-5.16$), reduced initiativeness, likely because mutual approaches require consensus from the other party, making users hesitant to initiate, as they perceive a joint agreement is required. Holistic OA ($\beta=-34.37$) reduced initiativeness, suggesting that a comprehensive outcome analysis could create analysis paralysis due to the complexity of factors involved in turn with potential outcomes, making the process of initiating a negotiation overwhelming to start with. Pre-task initiativeness also significantly predicted post-task scores ($\beta=0.63$).

4.2.3 Lexico-Semantic Evaluations. Next, we conducted lexico-semantic comparisons in the interactions with Trucey and ChatGPT. We drew on prior work [38, 120] to operationalize and measure several

lexico-semantic measures. Table 7 summarizes the differences in AI's language as well as the users' language in interactions with the AIs. We describe the operationalizations and observations below:

Verbosity. The quantity of language, or verbosity, has been linked to perceived quality and emotional depth in support exchanges [58, 122]. We operationalized verbosity as the total word count per interaction turn. We find that Trucey's responses were 168% less verbose compared to ChatGPT's responses with a very large effect size (Cohen's $d=-4.14$) and statistical significance ($t=27.55$, $p<0.05$). Similar pattern was also followed in the users' responses to the AI, with queries to Trucey were 20% less verbose in comparison to those to ChatGPT (Cohen's $d=-0.37$).

Readability. Readability reflects the ease with which text can be comprehended [96, 146]. We used the Fleisch-Kincaid Readability Ease [53], which calculates readability based on the formula: $206.835 - 1.015 \left(\frac{\text{total words}}{\text{total sentence}} \right) - 84.6 \left(\frac{\text{total syllables}}{\text{total words}} \right)$

Higher readability ease indicates that the writing is easier to read. Trucey responses showed significantly higher readability scores (Trucey mean = 80.00) than ChatGPT responses (mean = 68.46), with a very large effect size (Cohen's $d=2.17$). This means that Trucey's responses had lower linguistic sophistication than ChatGPT's responses, and were easier to comprehend with lower levels of English education. That said, the language of participants' queries to both Trucey and ChatGPT showed no significant differences.

Repeatability. Repeatability, operationalized as the normalized frequency of non-unique words per sentence, serves as a measure of redundancy in written expression [48, 123]. Although repetition may reinforce key ideas, excessive use of the same words can reflect reduced linguistic precision. Trucey responses showed significantly lower (-8.55%) repeatability compared to ChatGPT responses with large effect size (Cohen's $d=-1.17$). This may be aligned with the notion that Trucey was more specific and specialized to negotiation rehearsal, whereas ChatGPT, being more generic, showed tendency toward reiterative phrasing. Interestingly, the language of users' queries showed an opposite pattern—users showed 11% more repetitive language in their queries to Trucey than to ChatGPT.

Complexity. Linguistic complexity captures the degree of syntactic and lexical sophistication and has been linked to cognitive effort in communication [86]. We quantified complexity using the average length of words per sentence [48]. We find that Trucey's responses were 2.84% less complex compared to ChatGPT's responses with a large effect size (Cohen's $d=-0.67$). The users' queries to Trucey and ChatGPT did not show any statistically significant difference.

Categorical-Dynamic Index (CDI). Language style can be conceptualized along a spectrum from categorical (structured and analytic) to dynamic (personal and narrative-driven) [110]. The Categorical-Dynamic Index (CDI) captures this continuum using the formula:

$$\text{CDI} = (30 + \text{articles} + \text{prepositions} - \text{personal pronouns} - \text{impersonal pronouns} - \text{auxiliary verbs} - \text{conjunctions} - \text{adverbs} - \text{negations}).$$

Higher CDI indicates a categorical style of writing, and a lower CDI indicates a dynamic or narrative style of writing. We computed CDI scores using LIWC-derived part-of-speech frequencies [141]. Interestingly Trucey showed a significantly lower CDI (by -30%)

compared to ChatGPT with a large effect size ($d=-0.76$). This indicates that Trucey’s language was significantly more dynamic and conversational in style than ChatGPT. However, users’ queries to both Trucey and ChatGPT did not show any statistical significance.

Politeness. Politeness contributes to rapport and trust in therapeutic and peer-support conversations [19]. We used a pre-trained classifier [135] that assigns a politeness score between 0 and 1. Trucey responses were significantly more polite (by 1.55%) than ChatGPT responses with medium effect size (Cohen’s $d=0.56$). However, the language of users’ queries to both the AIs did not show any significant differences.

Formality. Formality reflects sociolinguistic variation and has been linked to contextual appropriateness and audience expectations [69, 90]. We employed a RoBERTa-based classifier [6] trained on the GYAFC (Grammarly’s Yahoo Answers Formality Corpus) dataset [109, 114], which assigns a probability score (0 to 1) reflecting linguistic formality. Trucey responses showed a significantly lower (by -21%) formality than ChatGPT responses with very large effect size (Cohen’s $d=-1.73$). This suggests that Trucey’s tone was more casual—plausibly due to our fine-tuning by incorporating negotiation framework elements [15].

Empathy. Empathy is central to supportive communication and is defined as the expression of understanding, validation, and emotional resonance [68, 125]. We used a RoBERTa-based empathy model fine-tuned on responses to emotionally evocative content [20, 139]. Here, Trucey responses showed significantly lower (by -11.36%) lower empathy than ChatGPT responses with large effect size (Cohen’s $d=-1.35$). Recent research has shown how LLMs are increasingly capable of simulating empathetic language [74, 83, 150]—however, while incorporating a theory-driven negotiation approach, we did not explicitly fine-tune (or prompt) Trucey to be empathetic to users’ queries. This lower empathy can also be tied to the design choice in Trucey, where the simulated supervisor was intentionally configured to act mean and resistant in order to create a challenging negotiation context. That said, the users’ queries to both AIs did not show any statistically significant differences.

Persuasiveness. Persuasiveness is central to encouraging behavior change and fostering motivation in support-oriented discourse [140]. We applied a pre-trained persuasiveness classifier [148] that scores text on a continuous scale from 0 to 1. We found that Trucey responses showed higher persuasiveness (by 2%) than ChatGPT responses with medium effect size (Cohen’s $d=0.66$). This may reflect that Trucey was likely more assertive than ChatGPT, which may have exhibited more neutral, generic, and cautious language. In contrast, the persuasiveness exhibited in users’ queries to both AIs did not show any significant differences.

Theory-driven AI coaching produces context-dependent psychological benefits that differ from ChatGPT and Handbook. Trucey most effectively reduced negotiation fear through accessible, theory-integrated interactions, while all interventions universally improved willingness to initiate negotiations. However, regression analysis revealed a critical trade-off: Trucey enhanced outcomes for structured negotiation approaches but sometimes undermined creative strategies, suggesting that incremental theoretical guidance conflicts with exploratory styles. Linguistically, Trucey’s intentionally

challenging yet accessible design—lower empathy but higher readability and theory integration—explains this pattern. The core finding: theory-driven coaching creates a preparation paradox where realistic challenge effectively reduces anxiety through structured exposure but may constrain confidence in creative contexts. This suggests that AI negotiation coaching influences psychological readiness most positively when theoretical scaffolding aligns with structured preparation needs, but may require design adaptations to support diverse negotiation approaches.

5 RQ2: Participant Perspectives About (AI-Driven) Negotiation Coaching

We qualitatively analyzed our semi-structured interviews data. The interviews were transcribed by an AI companion and manually reviewed by the researchers. First, we conducted an exploratory inductive coding to develop a codebook, and then conducted reflexive thematic analysis [14]. The analysis of our semi-structured interview data allowed us to understand user experiences with different coaching approaches. Through iterative reading and comparison across transcript, three major themes with distinct sub themes.

This hierarchical analytical framework enabled the identification of participants’ strategic orientations and the underlying rationale for their chosen approaches during AI coach interactions. This analysis revealed how participants’ experiences and interactions were influenced by psychological barriers (if any). We found three major themes: 1) Preference for informational autonomy, 2) Cognitive load management under preparation stress, and 3) Rehearsal acceptance divide. We describe these themes and corresponding sub-themes in the following subsections.

5.1 Preference for Informational Autonomy

Research on learner autonomy has demonstrated that satisfying user’s autonomy needs enhances both satisfaction and learning effectiveness [72]. Our analysis revealed that informational autonomy, the ability to maintain control over when, how and at what pace users consumed preparation guidance, emerged as a fundamental driver to a user’s coaching tool preference. This superseded any technical features or interactive capabilities.

Participants consistently emphasized their need to “skim through everything” and access “bullet points” for effective navigation. This autonomy manifested through two distinct strategies that participants used to maintain agency over their preparation processes, each reflecting relationships with technology-mediated learning.

5.1.1 Maximum Autonomy Through Comprehensive Control. Six participants (P6, P7, P8, P10, P12, P15) prioritized tools that provided immediate and unmediated access to expert knowledge. They valued the Handbook’s structural affordances for complete user control, viewing external mediation as a barrier rather than a benefit. Their preference reflected deeper needs for informational autonomy—direct possession of knowledge rather than a technology-dependent access.

Participants described wanting “everything in front of you” when comparing Handbook to the AI-driven interaction (Trucey and ChatGPT). P15’s spatial metaphor captured this preference: comparing the Handbook to “having a printed map versus Google Maps”

Table 7: Comparison of lexico-semantic measures in the language of interactions with Trucey and ChatGPT.

Metric	Trucey	ChatGPT	Mean $\Delta\%$	Cohen's d	t-test
<i>Linguistic Structure</i>					
Verbosity: AI	135.68	363.45	-167.88	-4.14	27.55 ***
Verbosity: User	46.89	56.54	-20.58	-0.37	2.45 **
Readability: AI	80.00	68.46	14.43	2.17	-14.42 ***
Readability: User	72.77	70.74	2.79	0.09	-0.61
Repeatability: AI	0.65	0.70	-8.55	-1.17	7.77 ***
Repeatability: User	0.43	0.38	11.30	0.42	-2.76 **
Complexity: AI	3.91	4.02	-2.84	-0.67	4.45 ***
Complexity: User	3.98	3.94	0.95	-0.10	-0.65
<i>Linguistic Style</i>					
Categorical Dynamic Index (CDI): AI	9.57	13.66	-29.93	-0.76	-10.32 ***
Categorical Dynamic Index (CDI): User	14.52	15.07	-3.65	-0.04	-0.59
Politeness: AI	0.98	0.97	1.55	0.56	-3.74 ***
Politeness: User	0.94	0.92	1.80	0.21	-1.39
Formality: AI	0.68	0.82	-20.98	-1.73	11.49 ***
Formality: User	0.79	0.81	-2.43	-0.12	0.81
Empathy: AI	0.72	0.80	-11.36	-1.35	8.99 ***
Empathy: User	0.83	0.81	1.75	0.23	-1.55
Persuasiveness: AI	0.88	0.87	2.10	0.66	-4.40 ***
Persuasiveness: User	0.88	0.87	1.13	0.20	-1.33
Linguistic Adaptability					
Linguistic Style Accommodation	0.57	0.60	-5.16	-0.08	-1.10

where comprehensive visibility of options trumped interactive guidance. This complete control allowed users to navigate preparation content according to their own cognitive rhythms and priorities.

The rejection of AI interaction requirements, system-driven engagement, and user-driven preparation. Participants characterized their approach through “personality-based” preferences, with some explicitly stating they “can’t endlessly chat with an AI assistant.” Rather than engaging with interactive processes, these participants preferred to “just read this and call it a day,” viewing additional interactions as cognitive overhead rather than value-added guidance.

This pattern reflects what Fischer characterizes as a shift from *passive consumer mindsets* toward informed participation [51]. Rather than accepting AI-mediated guidance as passive recipients, participants sought direct access to comprehensive knowledge that enabled active, self-directed preparation. Their preference for informational autonomy represents informed participation, a need to take control of both content access and problem-solving strategies rather than following system-imposed workflows.

For example, P12 showed interest in receiving the handbook, demonstrating an active stance toward knowledge acquisition, moving beyond consumption toward empowered engagement with preparation resources:

“I want this [negotiation Handbook] file. Do you mind sending it to me?” –P12

5.1.2 Strategic Autonomy Through Controlled Technology Integration. Four participants (P11, P13, P14, and P15) expressed an alternative autonomy strategy that extends Fischer’s informed participation framework in a different direction [51]. Rather than rejecting AI interventions entirely, they developed sophisticated methods to maintain agency while strategically leveraging current AI capabilities. These users demonstrated that empowered engagement with technology can be performed through controlled integration approaches that preserve user sovereignty over the preparation process. They emphasized the importance of maintaining autonomy while interacting with AI systems, positioning them not as sources

of passive guidance but as controlled tools for generating choices. This approach was particularly highlighted when users would like ChatGPT, which gave them “more control” as it gave them “multiple options.” This strategy highlights how participants actively chose to express interest in partaking in systems that provided multiple pathways, allowing them to exercise informed choice among AI-generated alternatives.

Furthermore, participants presented their thoughts on sophisticated hybrid workflows that allowed them to maintain autonomy over content selection and structural sequencing. P15 described a systematic approach: “I’d start with the Handbook, and then practice with Trucey three or four times.” This demonstrates how participants established foundational knowledge before engaging with interactive AI systems, maintaining control over timing and frequency. For instance, P13 outlined a strategic multi-system sequencing:

“I would first like a framework with headings, then ChatGPT when it provides more details, and then finally, the simulation part.” –P13

Similarly, P14 emphasized targeted engagement as they would like “to hone in to specific areas of concern.” These strategies demonstrate how participants maintained agency by strategically deploying different AI capabilities for specific preparation objectives rather than following system-designed workflows.

Together, these strategies demonstrate that information autonomy was one of the fundamental driver of coaching tool preference, creating two distinct but complementary approaches. Whether through direct knowledge ownership or controlled AI integration, participants consistently prioritized maintaining agency over their preparation process, showcasing a move from passive consumption towards informed participation [51].

While AI systems were positioned as flexible, controlled components, the handbook uniquely satisfied the dominant autonomy need for complete user control. This pattern validates prior research showing that satisfying autonomy needs enhances both satisfaction and learning effectiveness, extending these findings to workplace

AI coaching contexts. The handbook's dominance in PEU (Table 3) observed earlier reflects the centrality of informational autonomy in structuring negotiation preparation, regardless of users' specific autonomy strategy.

5.2 Cognitive Load Management Under Preparation Stress

Research on fear and information seeking demonstrates that when individuals cannot avoid aversive events, they seek information to mitigate anticipated stress, with complete information reducing fear more effectively than partial information [116]. Cognitive load theory further indicates that anxiety and stress reduce working memory capacity, making information processing more challenging precisely when support is most needed [106].

Our participants demonstrated acute sensitivity to information density and presentation format, particularly when experiencing negotiation-related anxiety in preparation.

5.2.1 Stress-Sensitive Information Processing Requirements. Four participants (P6, P8, P10, P13) explicitly connected information density to their emotional state and preparation effectiveness. They valued condensed, visually organized content that minimized cognitive processing burden during high-stress preparation periods. Participants expressed strong preferences for "skimmable" content and "bullet points" over verbose formats. P10 contrasted format effectiveness:

"ChatGPT is hard to get info in that wall of text. Here, it's all points. You can skim effectively. The Handbook tells you the same thing with less fluff." -P10

The stress-sensitive nature of negotiation preparation reveals deeper psychological mechanisms behind information preferences. Research shows that individuals facing unavoidable aversive events seek comprehensive information to reduce anxiety, with complete information proving more effective than partial information in mitigating fear responses [116]. Additionally, P10 connected verbosity to emotional stating that if they're anxious, they wouldn't like to "read such long messages." P13 expressed similar constraints, "don't have time to read this much." These responses reflect an anxiety driven need for immediate, comprehensive information access rather than effortful information construction through AI dialogue, which requires higher information processing.

This pattern suggests that cognitive constraints become more pronounced under preparation anxiety, with perceived time pressure compounding cognitive load challenges and making concise presentation crucial for tool acceptance during high-stress periods.

5.2.2 Information Architecture and Workflow Alignment Needs. Two participants (P13, P14) demonstrated sensitivity to information sequencing and search optimization, revealing expectations about how guidance should align with natural preparation workflows rather than system-convenient delivery patterns.

P13 critiqued AI systems' temporal mismatch: "When I'm starting the conversation, the first message is also talking about following up [after negotiation] and be open to feedback. These things should come much later." This highlights the importance of information architecture that matches users' mental models of preparation sequences rather than system-convenient delivery orders.

Participants also valued tools that reduced "mental burden" and "effort" in locating relevant information. They preferred a minimized cognitive overhead in information seeking with a higher preference to comprehensive information tools, contrasting AI's sequential delivery with the handbook's efficient search capabilities.

These preferences challenge AI design approaches emphasizing scaffolding and incremental knowledge building. When participants expressed they "feel like I don't have time to read this much" or preferred to "just read this and call it a day," they rejected interaction patterns that scaffolding AI requires.

These findings reveal a fundamental mismatch between current AI design thinking and user preferences in high-stakes preparation contexts. Current approaches emphasize "incremental construction of context and ideas through conversation" and "small information chunks" to reduce cognitive overload [16]. This approach assumes gradual information building creates more "cognitively manageable and emotionally sensitive dialogue." However, our participants directly contradicted these assumptions, seeking immediate access to comprehensive information rather than conversational layering. They preferred to "just read this and call it a day" rather than engage in sustained dialogue.

5.3 The Rehearsal Acceptance Divide: Authenticity Versus Technical Capability

The concept of AI-mediated rehearsal revealed fundamental philosophical differences about the nature of negotiation preparation and the role of simulation in skill development. Research on demonstrates that complex skills develop through deliberate practice with systemic variation and simulation based learning produces large positive effects on skill development [25, 40]. Yet, our participants demonstrated a clear divide regarding whether AI systems could provide authentic enough practice experiences. This divide centered not on system quality but on deeper questions about whether AI-mediated practice could address the inherently human and unpredictable aspects of workplace negotiations.

5.3.1 Conditional Acceptance Through Technical Enhancement Pathways. Five participants (P6, P9, P13, P14, P15) accepted rehearsal as conceptually valid but identified specific limitations that prevented current systems from reaching their potential. They consistently requested more "challenging scenarios" and "stricter pushbacks" rather than systems that were "too optimistic," believing Trucey was too "agreeable". P6 emphasized this need "I want Trucey to be like you cannot say no to me." This desire for realistic difficulty reflected their understanding that effective rehearsal should challenge and frustrate them, simulating the difficult dynamics rather than providing artificial optimism.

These participants conceptualized rehearsal as requiring iterative practice with consistent personality modeling rather than single interactions. They wanted AI systems that would challenge and frustrate them, simulating the difficult dynamics they expected in real workplace negotiations. Furthermore, they framed rehearsal as requiring repeated practice and exposure to varied scenarios to build confidence and adaptability, equating to "mock interviews." However, this was often contingent on the technical accuracy of the roleplay.

The conditional acceptance was reinforced by our quantitative findings, showcasing how exposure through interaction with Trucey, led to a reduction in fear. This aligns with research that varied stimulus exposure in controlled environments leads to fear reduction [119]. The observed anxiety reduction appeared to reflect a Dunning-Kruger correction, where initial overconfidence gave way to more accurate self-assessment after experiencing negotiation complexity [43, 65]. Rather than abandoning rehearsal, participants responded by seeking more challenging scenarios that matched their revised understanding of negotiation difficulty.

5.3.2 Fundamental Rejection Despite Transfer Learning Evidence. Six participants (P5, P7, P8, P10, P11, P12) explicitly rejected rehearsal regardless of potential benefits, perceiving AI-mediated practice as fundamentally inadequate for negotiation preparation. Prior work has shown that simulation effects do not guarantee transfer to real-world performance contexts [63], and this transfer uncertainty appeared to shape participants' evaluation of rehearsal value.

Their rejection centered on concerns that AI could not simulate the “unpredictability” and embodied psychological states inherent in workplace negotiations. Participants emphasized that AI failed to account for scenarios where people might “panic, shut down, or freeze” under pressure, or when someone might go into “fight or flight mode” during actual conversations. P10 captured this core limitation:

“It doesn't simulate scenarios like you might potentially panic or you might shut down, you might freeze. If you go into a fight or flight mode in the middle of the actual conversation, no AI can predict that.” –P10

Beyond physiological responses, participants questioned whether rehearsal could address the fundamental “uncertainty of what will actually happen” in real negotiations, arguing that even extensive rehearsal sessions represented only narrow subsets of possible workplace dynamics. Participants also experienced discomfort with AI interaction itself, trusting their own experiential knowledge over simulation and viewing rehearsal as introducing “unnecessary complexity”. Some described feeling “framed” by systems that created bidirectional prompting relationships, with one noting that “the simulation part pissed me off.” This rejection pattern reveals that for these participants, authentic preparation required human interaction and real-world unpredictability that could not be meaningfully reproduced through simulation, regardless of technical sophistication or demonstrated benefits such as fear reduction.

Individuals perceive theory driven AI negotiation coaching tools through the lens of informational autonomy and preparation context. Despite, Trucey's theoretical grounding, participants prioritized maintaining control over their process, often preferring access to immediate comprehensive information access over AI-mediated guidance. User acceptance of AI solutions hinged on autonomy preservation and cognitive load management under stress than on theoretical sophistication with a fundamental divide emerging around whether AI could authentically simulate workplace negotiation dynamics.

6 Discussion

The workplace is rapidly evolving with the adoption of AI to support professional communication, from drafting emails to rehearsing difficult conversations. Our work situates the AI-powered negotiation coach (Trucey) within this ecosystem of AI-Mediated Communication (AIMC), extending its scope to negotiation rehearsal and psychological preparedness. While the popular assumption and hype emphasize AI's ability to enhance efficiency and personalization, our findings reveal a more nuanced picture: the benefits of AI in negotiation preparation are highly contingent on users' needs, emotional states, time constraints, and perceptions of authenticity. Contributing to HCI and CSCW debates on AI in socially complex, high-stakes interactions, we show that an AI's value is situated rather than universal. We discuss our implications through four lenses: reframing cognitive load theory for stress-sensitive contexts, examining authenticity and adaptation as boundaries of AI acceptance, considering methodological, social, workplace, and policy implications, and deriving design implications for autonomy, scaffolding, holistic preparation, and adaptive architectures.

6.1 Reframing Cognitive Load Theory and AI's Situated Utility in Stress-Sensitive Contexts

Our findings highlight the utility of traditional, low-interaction learning modalities. Analogous to reading a textbook, a comprehensive Handbook often imposes intrinsically lower cognitive load for direct information acquisition [103]. This theoretical contribution reframes the optimal role of AI as being situated rather than universal: its value lies in easing extraneous cognitive factors in specific contexts, rather than always replacing direct content access.

Extending traditional cognitive load theory [137], which primarily focuses on the germane load, our study contextualized a critical, underexplored dimension in human-AI interactions—the influence of stress-sensitive, anxiety-inducing contexts on user tolerance. Participants described how AI interaction requirements (e.g., query formulation, response parsing) imposed significant cognitive load, which was exacerbated by emotional states and time constraints. Our regression analyses (Section 4.2.2) support this observation: while structured AI guidance generally improved self-efficacy and empowerment, it can increase cognitive load in scenarios needing integrative or creative thinking, highlighting that stepwise support may conflict with users' need for flexible, open-ended reasoning under stress. This finding challenges the assumption that AI universally reduces effort or enhances efficiency in learning and preparation tools.

Consequently, our work urges researchers in human-AI collaborative systems to rethink traditional cognitive load frameworks to account for this dynamic interplay of emotional states and time constraints. In light of these findings, our work advocates for a new pedagogical lens that emphasizes a theoretical framework prioritizing cognitive load optimization by actively managing extraneous factors. This reorientation is crucial for both designing more effective AI systems and fostering a nuanced understanding of how cognitive resources are allocated and managed across high-stakes contexts, presenting a wide spectrum of user emotional and temporal conditions.

6.2 AI’s Situated Role: Authenticity, Acceptance, and Socio-Technical Adaptation

Our findings reveal a critical theoretical boundary in AI acceptance, contributing to theories on user acceptance, particularly in simulation fidelity [24, 63]. Prior work shows that the effects of simulation do not necessarily transfer to real-world contexts [63], and recent research highlights the limitations of LLM-based simulations—such as lack of diversity [24] and gaps between evaluation settings and real interactions [154]. Participants in our study echoed similar concerns, perceiving AI-mediated rehearsal as inadequate not only for technical reasons but also due to psychological barriers tied to the authenticity of practice experiences. This underscores the need to investigate how authenticity concerns manifest across preparation contexts and whether hybrid approaches (e.g., combining AI with peer rehearsal) might mitigate these limitations.

Yet, despite these authenticity-related limitations, AI coaching provides unique preparation advantages. Our findings in Section (4.2.2) demonstrate measurable benefits, with tools such as Trucey significantly improving user’s confidence, reducing fear, and increasing willingness to initiate a negotiation. These were particularly strong in strategic contexts, where AI tools can help break down problems and allow users to perceive information dynamically. Furthermore, AI also offers consistent availability for practice, especially in sensitive workplace scenarios that either cannot easily be shared with colleagues or friends or in which they may be unwilling or uncomfortable to engage. Additionally, AI can reliably provide challenging, adversarial scenarios without social consequences, something human practice partners often avoid to preserve relationships. Finally, AI addresses scalability and accessibility barriers, providing structured preparation support to workers who lack access to professional coaching or willing practice partners.

Taken together, our work calls for rethinking how AI adaptation mechanisms can be designed for socially complex, high stakes interactions. While current LLM prompting techniques optimize for structured reasoning, workplace negotiations demand sensitivity to power asymmetry, relational dynamics, and emotional nuances. By embedding these dimensions directly into interaction design enables adaptation to function as a mechanism for operationalizing social theories within AI-mediated interactions. Therefore, our work argues for theorized adaptation practices—moving beyond technical tuning toward encoding social science insights into input-output structuring—so that AI can better scaffold negotiation readiness in authentic, context-sensitive ways.

6.3 Methodological, Policy, and Workplace Implications

From a methodological perspective, our work provides preliminary insights into how prompt engineering can serve as a lightweight, cost-effective alternative to model fine-tuning and retraining. This is particularly important given the resource constraints many organizations and researchers face in customizing large models for specific social use cases. By embedding domain knowledge, social theory, and user context directly into prompts, we show how meaningful interactional shifts can be achieved without modifying the underlying model. This approach not only enhances customization

but also supports rapid prototyping and deployment of socially attuned AI tools across diverse workplace settings. Methodologically, this points toward a broader agenda in CSCW and HCI research: treating prompts as socio-technical scaffolds that mediate interaction, rather than as mere technical levers for content generation.

Further, our study offers a reusable and adaptable approach for AI-mediated rehearsal in professional contexts—such as preparing for difficult conversations with managers or navigating conflict in team settings. Extending beyond negotiation, this approach can also benefit domains such as career coaching, leadership training, or mental health support, where users must manage stigma, relational asymmetries, and emotionally fraught interactions. At the same time, social risks remain. AI-generated outputs are known to reproduce patterns of linguistic and social bias from their training data [9, 70]. In negotiation contexts, this could skew the way authority, assertiveness, or politeness are modeled, shaping users’ sense of agency or reinforcing harmful communicative patterns. Moreover, such technologies may disproportionately benefit individuals with high digital fluency or culturally dominant communication styles, while others—such as non-native speakers or underrepresented groups—may struggle to align their intentions with biased outputs or develop over-reliance on AI-generated suggestions.

From a workplace perspective, these dynamics highlight both opportunities and challenges for AI-mediated communication (AIMC) [28, 34, 38, 79, 80]. Tools like Trucey can scaffold negotiation preparation, boost confidence, and reduce fear, contributing to more equitable participation in high-stakes interactions. Yet they also raise concerns around bias, trust, accessibility, and cultural variance. Organizational hierarchies and cultural norms shape what counts as “appropriate” negotiation—whether assertiveness, hierarchy, or collaboration—and AI systems not calibrated to these contexts risk privileging dominant strategies while marginalizing others [34, 35]. Importantly, AI negotiation tools should not be seen as productivity enhancers for employers, but as user-facing supports for empowerment, inclusion, and resilience. Their value lies in enabling workers to prepare more confidently and equitably, while organizational policies and infrastructures can play a supporting role in ensuring such tools are accessible, trustworthy, and responsibly integrated into professional development ecosystems.

Taken together, these implications suggest that the development of AI coaching tools for workplace communication must proceed with attention to methodological rigor, social equity, and institutional accountability. Methodologically, lightweight but theory-informed prompt engineering offers a promising pathway for rapid, context-sensitive customization. Socially, systems must be designed to mitigate bias, support marginalized users, and accommodate diverse cultural norms of communication. At the workplace level, AI negotiation tools should be understood not merely as productivity aids, but as user-facing supports for empowerment, inclusion, and resilience. Their value lies in enabling workers to prepare more confidently and equitably for high-stakes interactions, while organizational policies and training infrastructures can play a supporting role in ensuring such tools are accessible, trustworthy, and responsibly integrated into professional development ecosystems.

6.4 Design Implications

6.4.1 Designing for Autonomy Needs. Participants operated under specific contextual pressures that revealed fundamental mismatches between conversational AI and workplace preparation needs (Section 5.1). When preparing for negotiations with supervisors, managing performance anxiety, and working within constrained windows, participants preferred comprehensive, readily accessible materials over conversational engagement. They wanted direct informational access that could be stored, reused, and revisited, rather than fragmented back-and-forth dialogue. This underscores a critical need for AI coaching tools to provide efficient, contextualized knowledge delivery tailored for high-stakes negotiation preparation.

Literature on repository-based knowledge systems has shown how information retrieval and content curation can support autonomy and re-usability [66]. Such systems could prompt users for explicit situational parameters (e.g., power dynamics, relationship type, stakes level) rather than relying solely on automatic inference, thereby increasing reliability and transparency. Based on these user inputs, AI can generate multiple options organized by theoretical frameworks—for example, integrative methods for collaborative contexts, distributive strategies for competitive situations, and principled approaches for complex dynamics [52]. This preserves user autonomy while leveraging AI's ability to curate and organize expert knowledge. Delivering this content in exportable formats (e.g., documents, slide decks) further supports offline access and long-term retention, which participants highlighted as essential for workplace preparation.

6.4.2 Context-Sensitive Scaffolding for Cognitive Load Management. Participants demonstrated stress-sensitive information processing patterns, highlighting a need for technology to adapt to cognitive load and time constraints. For example, a user with ample time may engage more deeply, while those facing immediate deadlines may express frustration with cognitively demanding interactions.

To address these stress-sensitive needs and decrease cognitive load, our work inspires designing innovative AI coaching architecture featuring dynamic and context-sensitive scaffolding. This aligns with cognitive load theory [137] and research on guided instruction [85], which show that structuring tasks reduces overload. Such tools can additionally incorporate flexibility modes, so that the user also has options to toggle what kind of information gathering they are looking for at a particular time. A binary scaffolding mode can be offered: streamlined versus detailed. The streamlined mode would deliver concise outlines of negotiation components and prioritized action steps, minimizing back-and-forth interaction for users already experiencing overload. The detailed mode would provide deeper theoretical grounding, case examples, and strategic frameworks for those with time to engage. Clear demarcation of preparation stages further reduces complexity, breaking down tasks into manageable units and surfacing only the most relevant information at each step. Similar adaptive scaffolding approaches have been explored in conversational AI for customer service [152], suggesting feasibility in negotiation coaching contexts.

6.4.3 Integrated Stages for Holistic Preparation and Psychological Resilience. Building on capabilities such as strategic advice and AI-powered role-based simulation showcased by Trucey, future

technologies can integrate distinct stages for holistic preparation—addressing both tactical and psychological sides of negotiation. Beyond generating strategies, such tools can incorporate structured reflection sessions after practice interactions. These reflections can aim to empower users to process emotional responses to preparation scenarios, pinpoint specific moments where confidence wavered, and develop targeted strategies for subsequent preparation cycles.

By serving as a continuous repository of learning and self-reflection, AI coaching tools can transcend beyond short-term and immediate support tools to become longer-term skill-building assistants throughout an individual's professional journey. This dual focus on tactical mastery and resilience aligns with evidence that negotiation training has sustained effects only when reinforced longitudinally [153]. Such technologies can uniquely bridge unilateral self-preparation (repository and reflection) with bilateral interaction (simulation and feedback), optimizing for long-term learning outcomes. Integrating wellbeing-support modules, such as stress regulation strategies could further enhance psychological resilience, connecting to literature on emotion regulation in high-stakes work contexts [38, 61].

6.4.4 Adaptive Information Architecture for User Autonomy and Learning Strategies. Multiple participants emphasized a need for integrating multiple AI tools into a personalized preparation workflow. This motivates a design consideration for AI coaching systems to provide an adaptive information architecture. Rather than prescribing a single interaction mode, AI tools can function more as intelligent, adaptable platforms where users can construct their own information pipelines—and such a design will also respect and empower users' autonomy in defining their learning strategies.

The above architecture prioritizes user agency by allowing explicit sequencing and combination of system components—comprehensive handbooks, simulations, strategic guidance, theoretical framings, or reflection modules. Research on learning personalization in intelligent tutoring systems supports this approach, showing that explicit control over scaffolding fosters greater motivation and engagement [3]. For users preferring interactive engagement, the system could provide dynamic recommendations informed by topic modeling (e.g., urgent need for information) or tonal analysis (e.g., desire for empathy and reassurance). In this way, the system becomes responsive to both situational context and user state, ensuring content delivery aligns with immediate needs while preserving overall autonomy. Integrating with external ecosystems (e.g., calendars, email, or document repositories) would further embed coaching workflows into users' daily [30].

6.5 Limitations and Future Directions

Our work has limitations, which also suggest interesting directions for future research. We did not place participants in an actual negotiation experience. Although our approach provided controlled insights into user perceptions and preparatory behaviors, future studies could create AI simulations of managers or supervisors with reward and resistance strategies to approximate real negotiations. Such settings would allow for richer evaluation of how AI coaching holds up in authentic, multi-turn, and high-stakes exchanges.

Again, participants may not have had an immediate need to negotiate at the time of the study. Although this allowed us to capture baseline perceptions of usefulness, it also limits ecological validity. Future research should evaluate AI coaching with participants facing real, imminent negotiation demands, where motivation, stakes, and outcomes are directly relevant to their workplace contexts. As with many studies in this space, our experimental study relied on a crowd sample (from Prolific) which constrains the generalizability of findings, as crowd participants may differ from professionals actively engaged in workplace negotiations, particularly in organizational role, cultural background, and lived experiences of power asymmetry. To complement this, we conducted a smaller qualitative study with 15 participants to gain deeper insights into how individuals navigated the system. However, because recruitment occurred through our social media and our LinkedIn networks, this pool was disproportionately composed of individuals from engineering and technology backgrounds, further limiting diversity of perspectives. Extending this line of work with field studies in organizational contexts would provide stronger ecological grounding.

Finally, while our findings suggest promising directions for prompt engineering as socio-technical scaffolding, the effectiveness of this approach in more ambiguous, multi-turn real-world conversations remains an open question. Future work should extend evaluation through live user studies across diverse workplace negotiations, coupled with expert assessments of negotiation quality and outcomes. This line of research could also explore cross-cultural variation in role expectations, tone perceptions, and power dynamics, as well as integrate prompt scaffolding into collaborative workplace tools. More broadly, future studies should theorize how conversational AI can act not only as coaches but also as mediators in other sensitive and asymmetric social interactions, such as performance reviews or conflict resolution.

7 Conclusion

This study studied AI's role in workplace negotiation preparation by empirically comparing a theory-driven AI coach (Trucey), a general-purpose AI (ChatGPT), and a traditional handbook (Handbook). Across $N=267$ participants and $N=15$ semi-structured interviews, we found that Trucey significantly reduced negotiation-related fear, yet the handbook consistently outperformed both AIs in usability and psychological empowerment by providing comprehensive, reviewable content that bolstered confidence. Interviews further revealed a trade-off: participants valued AI's availability and rehearsal opportunities; however, its fragmented, verbose guidance often imposed additional cognitive burden, leaving them uncertain or overwhelmed. We discussed how our findings challenge assumptions of AI superiority and point toward hybrid designs that combine the structured clarity of handbooks with the adaptive rehearsal capabilities of AI. More broadly, our work reframes AI's role as situated and contingent, most valuable when systems reduce extraneous cognitive load, respect users' psychological needs, and scaffold autonomy in high-stakes workplace interactions.

References

- [1] Fran Ackermann and Colin Eden. 2011. Strategic management of stakeholders: Theory and practice. *Long range planning* 44, 3 (2011), 179–196.
- [2] Ifeoma Ajunwa, Kate Crawford, and Jason Schultz. 2017. Limitless worker surveillance. *Calif. L. Rev.* 105 (2017), 735.
- [3] Vincent Alevén, Elmar Stahl, Silke Schworm, Frank Fischer, and Raven Wallace. 2003. Help seeking and help design in interactive learning environments. *Review of educational research* 73, 3 (2003), 277–320.
- [4] Saleema Amershi, Dan Weld, Mihaela Vorvoreanu, Adam Fourney, Besmira Nushi, Penny Collisson, Jina Suh, Shamsi Iqbal, Paul N Bennett, Kori Inkpen, et al. 2019. Guidelines for human-AI interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 chi conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–13.
- [5] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Bénénet, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbedo, Salvador García, Sergio Gil-López, Daniel Molina, Richard Benjamins, et al. 2020. Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information fusion* 58 (2020).
- [6] Nikolay Babakov, David Dale, Ilya Gusev, Irina Krotova, and Alexander Panchenko. 2023. Don't Lose the Message While Paraphrasing: A Study on Content Preserving Style Transfer. In *International Conference on Applications of Natural Language to Information Systems*. Springer, 47–61.
- [7] William W. Baber. 2022. Confirming the impact of training on negotiators and Organizations. *Negotiation Journal* 38, 1 (Jan 2022), 111–136. doi:10.1111/nejo.12384
- [8] Albert Bandura. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Macmillan.
- [9] Emily M Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 610–623.
- [10] Hannah Riley Bowles, Linda Babcock, and Lei Lai. 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 (2007), 84–103.
- [11] Margarita Boyarskaya, Alexandra Olteanu, and Kate Crawford. 2020. Overcoming failures of imagination in AI infused system development and deployment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13416* (2020).
- [12] danah boyd and Kate Crawford. 2012. Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. *Information, communication & society* 15, 5 (2012), 662–679.
- [13] Graham L. Bradley and Amanda C. Campbell. 2016. Managing difficult workplace conversations. *International Journal of Business Communication* 53, 4 (Jul 2016), 443–464. doi:10.1177/2329488414525468
- [14] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2019. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health* 11, 4 (2019), 589–597.
- [15] Jeanne Brett and Leigh Thompson. 2016. Negotiation. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes* 136 (2016), 68–79.
- [16] Thomas C Brickhouse and Nicholas D Smith. 1994. *Plato's Socrates*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- [17] Alison Wood Brooks. 2014. Get excited: reappraising pre-performance anxiety as excitement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 143, 3 (2014), 1144.
- [18] Alison Wood Brooks and Maurice E. Schweitzer. 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 (May 2011), 43–54. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.01.008
- [19] Penelope Brown and Stephen C Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Number 4. Cambridge university press.
- [20] Sven Buechel, Anneke Buffone, Barry Slaff, Lyle Ungar, and João Sedoc. 2018. Modeling Empathy and Distress in Reaction to News Stories. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 4758–4765.
- [21] Carrie J Cai, Emily Reif, Narayan Hegde, Jason Hipp, Been Kim, Daniel Smilkov, Martin Wattenberg, Fernanda Viégas, Greg S Corrado, Martin C Stumpe, et al. 2019. Human-centered tools for coping with imperfect algorithms during medical decision-making. In *Proceedings of the 2019 chi conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–14.
- [22] Nicholas Carr. 2014. *The glass cage: automation and us*. WW Norton & co.
- [23] Stevie Chancellor, Michael L Birnbaum, Eric D Caine, Vincent MB Silenzio, and Mummun De Choudhury. 2019. A taxonomy of ethical tensions in inferring mental health states from social media. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 79–88.
- [24] Myra Cheng, Tiziano Piccardi, and Diyi Yang. 2023. CoMPoST: Characterizing and Evaluating Caricature in LLM Simulations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 10853–10875.
- [25] Olga Chernikova, Nicole Heitzmann, Matthias Stadler, Doris Holzberger, Tina Seidel, and Frank Fischer. 2020. Simulation-based learning in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research* 90, 4 (2020), 499–541.
- [26] Shreya Chowdhary, Anna Kawakami, Mary L Gray, Jina Suh, Alexandra Olteanu, and Koustuv Saha. 2023. Can Workers Meaningfully Consent to Workplace Wellbeing Technologies?. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 569–582.
- [27] Lilia M. Cortina and Vicki J. Magley. 2003. Raising Voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of*

- Occupational Health Psychology* 8, 4 (Oct 2003), 247–265. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.8.4.247
- [28] Shanley Corvite, Kat Roemmich, Tillie Rosenberg, and Nazanin Andalibi. 2022. Data Subjects' Perspectives on Emotion Artificial Intelligence Use in the Workplace: A Relational Ethics Lens. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* (2022).
- [29] Amanda Coston, Anna Kawakami, Haiyi Zhu, Ken Holstein, and Hoda Heidari. 2022. A Validity Perspective on Evaluating the Justified Use of Data-driven Decision-making Algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14983* (2022).
- [30] Justin Cranshaw, Emad Elwany, Todd Newman, Rafal Kocielnik, Bowen Yu, Sandeep Soni, Jaime Teevan, and Andrés Monroy-Hernández. 2017. Calendar help: Designing a workflow-based scheduling agent with humans in the loop. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2382–2393.
- [31] Kate Crawford and Jason Schultz. 2014. Big data and due process: Toward a framework to redress predictive privacy harms. *BCL Rev* 55 (2014), 93.
- [32] Jared R Curhan, Hillary Anger Elfenbein, and Noah Eisenkraft. 2010. The objective value of subjective value: A multi-round negotiation study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 40, 3 (2010), 690–709.
- [33] Jared R Curhan, Hillary Anger Elfenbein, and Heng Xu. 2006. What do people value when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 91, 3 (2006), 493.
- [34] Vedant Das Swain, Lan Gao, William A Wood, Srikruthi C Matli, Gregory D Abowd, and Munmun De Choudhury. 2023. Algorithmic Power or Punishment: Information Worker Perspectives on Passive Sensing Enabled AI Phenotyping of Performance and Wellbeing. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–17.
- [35] Vedant Das Swain and Koustuv Saha. 2024. Teacher, trainer, counsel, spy: How generative AI can bridge or widen the gaps in worker-centric digital phenotyping of Wellbeing. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Symposium on Human-Computer Interaction for Work*. 1–13.
- [36] Vedant Das Swain, Koustuv Saha, Gregory D Abowd, and Munmun De Choudhury. 2020. Social media and ubiquitous technologies for remote worker wellbeing and productivity in a post-pandemic world. In *2020 IEEE Second International Conference on Cognitive Machine Intelligence (CogMI)*. IEEE, 121–130.
- [37] Vedant Das Swain, Koustuv Saha, Manikanta D Reddy, Hemang Rajvanshy, Gregory D Abowd, and Munmun De Choudhury. 2020. Modeling Organizational Culture with Workplace Experiences Shared on Glassdoor. In *CHI*.
- [38] Vedant Das Swain, Qiuyue "Joy" Zhong, Jash Rajesh Parekh, Yechan Jeon, Roy Zimmerman, Mary Czerwinski, Jina Suh, Varun Mishra, Koustuv Saha, and Javier Hernandez. 2025. AI on My Shoulder: Supporting Emotional Labor in Front-Office Roles with an LLM-based Empathetic Coworker. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- [39] Carsten KW De Dreu and Laurie R Weingart. 2003. Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology* 88, 4 (2003), 741.
- [40] Robert DeKeyser. 2020. Skill acquisition theory. In *Theories in second language acquisition*. Routledge, 83–104.
- [41] James R Detert and Ethan R Burris. 2007. Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of management journal* 50, 4 (2007), 869–884.
- [42] Berkeley J Dietvorst, Joseph P Simmons, and Cade Massey. 2015. Algorithm aversion: people erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. *Journal of experimental psychology: General* 144, 1 (2015), 114.
- [43] David Dunning. 2011. The Dunning-Kruger effect: On being ignorant of one's own ignorance. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. 44. Elsevier, 247–296.
- [44] Hillary Anger Elfenbein, Abigail A Marsh, and Nalini Ambady. 2002. Emotional Intelligence and the Recognition of Emotion. *The wisdom in feeling: Psychological processes in emotional intelligence* (2002), 37.
- [45] Daniel A Epstein, Jennifer H Kang, Laura R Pina, James Fogarty, and Sean A Munson. 2016. Reconsidering the device in the drawer: lapses as a design opportunity in personal informatics. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM international joint conference on pervasive and ubiquitous computing*. 829–840.
- [46] Alexander Erlei, Richeek Das, Lukas Meub, Avishek Anand, and Ujwal Gadiraju. 2022. For what it's worth: Humans overwrite their economic self-interest to avoid bargaining with AI systems. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [47] Alexander Erlei, Franck Nekdem, Lukas Meub, Avishek Anand, and Ujwal Gadiraju. 2020. Impact of algorithmic decision making on human behavior: Evidence from ultimatum bargaining. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on human computation and crowdsourcing*, Vol. 8. 43–52.
- [48] Sindhu Kiranmai Ernala, Asra F Rizvi, Michael L Birnbaum, John M Kane, and Munmun De Choudhury. 2017. Linguistic markers indicating therapeutic outcomes of social media disclosures of schizophrenia. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 1, CSCW (2017), 1–27.
- [49] Horacio Arruda Falcão Filho. 2024. Making sense of negotiation and AI: The blossoming of a new collaboration. *International Journal of Commerce and Contracting* 8, 1-2 (2024), 44–64.
- [50] Craig Finstad. 2010. The usability metric for user experience. *Interacting with computers* 22, 5 (2010), 323–327.
- [51] Gerhard Fischer. 1998. Beyond "couch potatoes": From consumers to designers. In *Proceedings. 3rd Asia Pacific Computer Human Interaction (Cat. No. 98EX110)*. IEEE, 2–9.
- [52] Roger Fisher, William L Ury, and Bruce Patton. 2011. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin.
- [53] Rudolf Flesch. 2007. Flesch-Kincaid readability test. Retrieved October 26, 3 (2007), 2007.
- [54] Adam D Galinsky, Joe C Magee, M Ena Inesi, and Deborah H Gruenfeld. 2006. Power and perspectives not taken. *Psychological science* 17, 12 (2006), 1068–1074.
- [55] Simret Araya Gebreegziabher, Yukun Yang, Elena L Glassman, and Toby Jia-Jun Li. 2025. Supporting Co-Adaptive Machine Teaching through Human Concept Learning and Cognitive Theories. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [56] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé Iii, and Kate Crawford. 2021. Datasheets for datasets. *Commun. ACM* 64, 12 (2021), 86–92.
- [57] Katy Ilonka Gero, Zahra Ashktorab, Casey Dugan, Qian Pan, James Johnson, Werner Geyer, Maria Ruiz, Sarah Miller, David R Millen, Murray Campbell, et al. 2020. Mental models of AI agents in a cooperative game setting. In *Proceedings of the 2020 chi conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–12.
- [58] Thomas A Glass and George L Maddox. 1992. The quality and quantity of social support: stroke recovery as psycho-social transition. *Soc. Sci. Med.* (1992).
- [59] Ella Glikson and Anita Williams Woolley. 2020. Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. *Academy of management annals* 14, 2 (2020), 627–660.
- [60] Diego Gómez-Zarà, Leslie A DeChurch, and Noshir S Contractor. 2020. A taxonomy of team-assembly systems: Understanding how people use technologies to form teams. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4, CSCW2 (2020), 1–36.
- [61] Alicia A Grandey. 2000. Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of occupational health psychology* 5, 1 (2000), 95.
- [62] Simone Grassini. 2024. A psychometric validation of the pailq-6: Perceived artificial intelligence literacy questionnaire. In *Proceedings of the 13th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. 1–10.
- [63] Lawrence Grierson, Geoff Norman, Sandra Monteiro, and Matthew Sibbald. 2019. Simulation-based education and the challenge of transfer. In *Clinical simulation*. Elsevier, 115–127.
- [64] Gaole He and Ujwal Gadiraju. 2022. Walking on eggshells: Using analogies to promote appropriate reliance in human-ai decision making. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Trust and Reliance on AI-Human Teams at the ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI'22)*.
- [65] Gaole He, Lucie Kuiper, and Ujwal Gadiraju. 2023. Knowing about knowing: An illusion of human competence can hinder appropriate reliance on AI systems. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–18.
- [66] Marti Hearst. 2009. *Search user interfaces*. Cambridge university press.
- [67] Patrick Hemmer, Max Schemmer, Michael Vössing, and Niklas Kühl. 2021. Human-AI Complementarity in Hybrid Intelligence Systems: A Structured Literature Review. *PACIS* 78 (2021), 118.
- [68] Ilona Herlin and Laura Visapää. 2016. Dimensions of empathy in relation to language. *Nordic Journal of linguistics* 39, 2 (2016), 135–157.
- [69] Francis Heylighen and Jean-Marc Dewaele. 1999. Formality of language: definition, measurement and behavioral determinants. *Interne Bericht, Center "Leo Apostel", Vrije Universiteit Brussel* 4, 1 (1999).
- [70] Jess Hohenstein, Rene F Kizilcec, Dominic DiFranzo, Zhila Aghajari, Hannah Mieczkowski, Karen Levy, Mor Naaman, Jeffrey Hancock, and Malte F Jung. 2023. Artificial intelligence in communication impacts language and social relationships. *Scientific Reports* 13, 1 (2023), 5487.
- [71] Esther Howe, Jina Suh, Mehrab Bin Morshed, Daniel McDuff, Kael Rowan, Javier Hernandez, Marah Ihab Abdin, Gonzalo Ramos, Tracy Tran, and Mary P Czerwinski. 2022. Design of Digital Workplace Stress-Reduction Intervention Systems: Effects of Intervention Type and Timing. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–16.
- [72] Pingying Hu and Jiaxiu Zhang. 2017. A pathway to learner autonomy: A self-determination theory perspective. *Asia Pacific Education Review* 18, 1 (2017), 147–157.
- [73] Kori Inkpen, Shreya Chappidi, Keri Mallari, Besmira Nushi, Divya Ramesh, Pietro Michelucci, Vani Mandava, Libuše Hannah Vepřek, and Gabrielle Quinn. 2023. Advancing human-AI complementarity: The impact of user expertise and algorithmic tuning on joint decision making. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* 30, 5 (2023), 1–29.
- [74] Michael Inzlicht, C Daryl Cameron, Jason D'Cruz, and Paul Bloom. 2023. In praise of empathic AI. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* (2023).

- [75] Farnaz Jahanbakhsh, Wai-Tat Fu, Karrie Karahalios, Darko Marinov, and Brian Bailey. 2017. You want me to work with who? Stakeholder perceptions of automated team formation in project-based courses. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*.
- [76] Farnaz Jahanbakhsh, Yannis Katsis, Dakuo Wang, Lucian Popa, and Michael Muller. 2023. Exploring the use of personalized AI for identifying misinformation on social media. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–27.
- [77] Jeongwon Jo, He Zhang, Jie Cai, and Nitesh Goyal. 2025. AI Trust Reshaping Administrative Burdens: Understanding Trust-Burden Dynamics in LLM-Assisted Benefits Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1172–1183.
- [78] Anna Jobin, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. 2019. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature machine intelligence* 1, 9 (2019), 389–399.
- [79] Harmanpreet Kaur, Daniel McDuff, Alex C Williams, Jaime Teevan, and Shamsi T Iqbal. 2022. “I Didn’t Know I Looked Angry”: Characterizing Observed Emotion and Reported Affect at Work. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [80] Anna Kawakami, Shreya Chowdhary, Shamsi T Iqbal, Q Vera Liao, Alexandra Olteanu, Jina Suh, and Koustuv Saha. 2023. Sensing Wellbeing in the Workplace, Why and For Whom? Envisioning Impacts with Organizational Stakeholders. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction (CSCW)* (2023).
- [81] Dacher Keltner, Deborah H Gruenfeld, and Cameron Anderson. 2003. Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological review* 110, 2 (2003), 265.
- [82] Pranav Khadpe, Lindy Le, Kate Nowak, Shamsi T Iqbal, and Jina Suh. 2024. DISCERN: designing decision support interfaces to investigate the complexities of workplace social decision-making with line managers. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–18.
- [83] William Kidder, Jason D’Cruz, and Kush R Varshney. 2024. Empathy and the Right to Be an Exception: What LLMs Can and Cannot Do. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14523* (2024).
- [84] Yoonsu Kim, Kihoon Son, Seoyoung Kim, and Juho Kim. 2024. Beyond prompts: Learning from human communication for enhanced ai intent alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05678* (2024).
- [85] Paul Kirschner, John Sweller, and Richard E Clark. 2006. Why unguided learning does not work: An analysis of the failure of discovery learning, problem-based learning, experiential learning and inquiry-based learning. *Educational psychologist* 41, 2 (2006), 75–86.
- [86] Gregory G Kolden, Marjorie H Klein, Chia-Chiang Wang, and Sara B Austin. 2011. Congruence/genuineness. *Psychotherapy* 48, 1 (2011), 65.
- [87] Laura J Kray and Michael P Haselhuhn. 2007. Implicit negotiation beliefs and performance: Experimental and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 93, 1 (2007), 49.
- [88] Tzu-Sheng Kuo, Hong Shen, Jisoo Geum, Nev Jones, Jason I Hong, Haiyi Zhu, and Kenneth Holstein. 2023. Understanding frontline workers’ and unhoused individuals’ perspectives on ai used in homeless services. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–17.
- [89] Carine Lallemand, Alina Lushnikova, Joshua Dawson, and Romain Teobosch. 2024. Trinity: A Design Fiction to Unravel the Present and Future Tensions in Professional Informatics and Awareness Support Tools. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Symposium on Human-Computer Interaction for Work*. 1–15.
- [90] Tove Larsson and Henrik Kaatari. 2020. Syntactic complexity across registers: Investigating (in) formality in second-language writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 45 (2020), 100850.
- [91] Min Kyung Lee, Daniel Kusbit, Evan Metsky, and Laura Dabbish. 2015. Working with machines: The impact of algorithmic and data-driven management on human workers. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual ACM conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1603–1612.
- [92] Q Vera Liao, Daniel Gruen, and Sarah Miller. 2020. Questioning the AI: informing design practices for explainable AI user experiences. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–15.
- [93] Chiara Longoni, Andrea Bonezzi, and Carey K Morewedge. 2019. Resistance to medical artificial intelligence. *Journal of consumer research* 46, 4 (2019), 629–650.
- [94] Zilin Ma, Yiyang Mei, Claude Bruderlein, Krzysztof Gajos, and Weiwei Pan. 2025. “ChatGPT, Don’t Tell Me What to Do”: Designing AI for Context Analysis in Humanitarian Frontline Negotiations. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Symposium on Human-Computer Interaction for Work*. 1–20.
- [95] Gloria Mark, Shamsi T Iqbal, Mary Czerwinski, Paul Johns, Akane Sano, and Yuliya Lutchyn. 2016. Email duration, batching and self-interruption: Patterns of email use on productivity and stress. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 1717–1728.
- [96] Nicholas McInnes and Bo JA Haglund. 2011. Readability of online health information: implications for health literacy. *Informatics for health and social care* 36, 4 (2011), 173–189.
- [97] Zachary Mckendrick, Lior Somin, Patrick Finn, and Ehud Sharlin. 2023. Virtual rehearsal suite: An environment and framework for virtual performance practice. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM International Conference on Interactive Media Experiences*. 27–39.
- [98] Frances J. Milliken, Elizabeth W. Morrison, and Patricia F. Hewlin. 2003. An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don’t communicate upward and why*. *Journal of Management Studies* 40, 6 (Aug 2003), 1453–1476. doi:10.1111/1467-6486.00387
- [99] Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasseran, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timmit Gebru. 2019. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 220–229.
- [100] Elizabeth Wolef Morrison and Frances J Milliken. 2000. Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management review* 25, 4 (2000), 706–725.
- [101] Janice Nadler, Leigh Thompson, and Leaf Van Boven. 2003. Learning negotiation skills: Four models of knowledge creation and transfer. *Management Science* 49, 4 (2003), 529–540.
- [102] Subigy K Nepal, Gonzalo J Martinez, Arvind Pillai, Koustuv Saha, Shayan Mirjafari, Vedant Das Swain, Xuhai Xu, Pino G Audia, Mumun De Choudhury, Anind K Dey, et al. 2025. A Survey of Passive Sensing for Workplace Wellbeing and Productivity. In *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer, 408–427.
- [103] Quynh N Nguyen, Anna Sidorova, and Russell Torres. 2022. User interactions with chatbot interfaces vs. Menu-based interfaces: An empirical study. *Computers in Human Behavior* 128 (2022), 107093.
- [104] Kathleen M O’Connor and Josh A Arnold. 2001. Distributive spirals: Negotiation impasses and the moderating role of disputant self-efficacy. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes* 84, 1 (2001), 148–176.
- [105] Kazuo Okamura and Seiji Yamada. 2020. Adaptive trust calibration for human-AI collaboration. *Plos one* 15, 2 (2020), e0229132.
- [106] Fred Paas, Alexander Renkl, and John Sweller. 2003. Cognitive load theory and instructional design: Recent developments. *Educational psychologist* 38, 1 (2003), 1–4.
- [107] Stefan Palan and Christian Schitter. 2018. Prolific.ac—A subject pool for online experiments. *Journal of behavioral and experimental finance* 17 (2018), 22–27.
- [108] Hyanghee Park, Daehwan Ahn, Kartik Hosanagar, and Joonhwan Lee. 2022. Designing Fair AI in Human Resource Management: Understanding Tensions Surrounding Algorithmic Evaluation and Envisioning Stakeholder-Centered Solutions. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–22.
- [109] Ellie Pavlick and Joel Tetreault. 2016. An empirical analysis of formality in online communication. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 4 (2016), 61–74.
- [110] James W Pennebaker, Cindy K Chung, Joey Frazee, Gary M Lavergne, and David I Beaver. 2014. When small words foretell academic success: The case of college admissions essays. *PLoS one* 9, 12 (2014), e115844.
- [111] Quinten AW Raaijmakers. 1999. Effectiveness of different missing data treatments in surveys with Likert-type data: Introducing the relative mean substitution approach. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 59, 5 (1999), 725–748.
- [112] Inioluwa Deborah Raji, I Elizabeth Kumar, Aaron Horowitz, and Andrew Selbst. 2022. The Fallacy of AI Functionality. In *ACM FAccT*.
- [113] Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Andrew Smart, Rebecca N White, Margaret Mitchell, Timmit Gebru, Ben Hutchinson, Jamila Smith-Loud, Daniel Theron, and Parker Barnes. 2020. Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 33–44.
- [114] Sudha Rao and Joel Tetreault. 2018. Dear Sir or Madam, May I Introduce the GYAF Dataset: Corpus, Benchmarks and Metrics for Formality Style Transfer. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. 129–140.
- [115] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084* (2019).
- [116] Juan C Restrepo-Castro, Francisco Javier Labrador, Carlos Gantiva, Katherine Camacho, and Leonidas Castro-Camacho. 2023. The effect of information seeking behaviors in fear control. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry* 78 (2023), 101797.
- [117] Thomas Rigotti, Birgit Schyns, and Gisela Mohr. 2008. A short version of the occupational self-efficacy scale: Structural and construct validity across five countries. *Journal of Career Assessment* 16, 2 (2008), 238–255.
- [118] Kat Roemmich, Florian Schaub, and Nazanin Andalibi. 2023. Emotion AI at work: Implications for workplace surveillance, emotional labor, and emotional privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–20.
- [119] Melissa K Rowe and Michelle G Craske. 1998. Effects of varied-stimulus exposure training on fear reduction and return of fear. *Behaviour research and therapy* 36, 7-8 (1998), 719–734.
- [120] Koustuv Saha, Yashvee Jain, Chunyu Liu, Sidharth Kaliappan, and Ravi Karkar. 2025. AI vs. Humans for Online Support: Comparing the Language of Responses

- from LLMs and Online Communities of Alzheimer's Disease. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare* (2025).
- [121] Koustuv Saha, Manikanta D Reddy, Stephen Mattingly, Edward Moskal, Anusha Sirigiri, and Munmun De Choudhury. 2019. Libra: On linkedin based role ambiguity and its relationship with wellbeing and job performance. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 3, CSCW (2019), 1–30.
- [122] Koustuv Saha and Amit Sharma. 2020. Causal Factors of Effective Psychosocial Outcomes in Online Mental Health Communities. In *ICWSM*.
- [123] Koustuv Saha, Ingmar Weber, and Munmun De Choudhury. 2018. A Social Media Based Examination of the Effects of Counseling Recommendations After Student Deaths on College Campuses. In *Twelfth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- [124] Omar Shaikh, Valentino Emil Chai, Michele Gelfand, Diyi Yang, and Michael S Bernstein. 2024. Rehearsal: Simulating conflict to teach conflict resolution. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–20.
- [125] Ashish Sharma, Adam Miner, David Atkins, and Tim Althoff. 2020. A Computational Approach to Understanding Empathy Expressed in Text-Based Mental Health Support. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 5263–5276.
- [126] Ashish Sharma, Sudha Rao, Chris Brockett, Akanksha Malhotra, Nebojsa Jojic, and Bill Dolan. 2023. Investigating agency of llms in human-ai collaboration tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12815* (2023).
- [127] Ashish Sharma, Kevin Rushton, Inna Wanyin Lin, David Wadden, Khendra G Lucas, Adam S Miner, Theresa Nguyen, and Tim Althoff. 2023. Cognitive reframing of negative thoughts through human-language model interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02466* (2023).
- [128] Sudeep Sharma, William P Bottom, and Hillary Anger Elfenbein. 2013. On the role of personality, cognitive ability, and emotional intelligence in predicting negotiation outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Psychology Review* 3, 4 (2013), 293–336.
- [129] Sudeep Sharma, Mugdha Gangopadhyay, Elizabeth Austin, and Manas K Mandal. 2013. Development and validation of a situational judgment test of emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 21, 1 (2013), 57–73.
- [130] Ryan Shea, Aymen Kallala, Xin Liu, Michael Morris, and Zhou Yu. 2024. ACE: A LLM-based Negotiation Coaching System. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 12720–12749.
- [131] Hua Shen, Tiffany Kneare, Reshmi Ghosh, Kenan Alkiek, Kundan Krishna, Yachuan Liu, Ziqiao Ma, Savvas Petridis, Yi-Hao Peng, Li Qiwei, et al. 2024. Towards Bidirectional Human-AI Alignment: A Systematic Review for Clarifications, Framework, and Future Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09264* (2024).
- [132] Kacper Sokol and Peter Flach. 2020. Explainability fact sheets: a framework for systematic assessment of explainable approaches. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 56–67.
- [133] Christopher J Soto and Oliver P John. 2017. The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 113, 1 (2017), 117.
- [134] Gretchen M Spreitzer. 1995. Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of management Journal* 38, 5 (1995), 1442–1465.
- [135] Anirudh Srinivasan and Eunsol Choi. 2022. TyDiP: A Dataset for Politeness Classification in Nine Typologically Diverse Languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*. 5723–5738.
- [136] Brandon A Sullivan, Kathleen M O'Connor, and Ethan R Burris. 2006. Negotiator confidence: The impact of self-efficacy on tactics and outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 42, 5 (2006), 567–581.
- [137] John Sweller. 2011. Cognitive load theory. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*. Vol. 55. Elsevier, 37–76.
- [138] Annalisa Szymanski, Noah Ziem, Heather A Eicher-Miller, Toby Jia-Jun Li, Meng Jiang, and Ronald A Metoyer. 2025. Limitations of the llm-as-a-judge approach for evaluating llm outputs in expert knowledge tasks. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. 952–966.
- [139] Shabnam Tafreshi, Orphée De Clercq, Valentin Barriere, João Sedoc, Sven Buechel, and Alexandra Balahur. 2021. Wassa 2021 shared task: predicting empathy and emotion in reaction to news stories. In *Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity and Sentiment Analysis (WASSA), held in conjunction with EACL 2021*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 92–104.
- [140] Chenhao Tan, Vlad Niculae, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Lillian Lee. 2016. Winning arguments: Interaction dynamics and persuasion strategies in good-faith online discussions. In *Proc. WWW*.
- [141] Yla R Tausczik and James W Pennebaker. 2010. The psychological meaning of words: LIWC and computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of language and social psychology* 29, 1 (2010), 24–54.
- [142] Stella Ting-Toomey. 1988. A face negotiation theory. *Theory and intercultural communication* (1988), 47–92.
- [143] Rama Adithya Varanasi and Nitesh Goyal. 2023. “It is currently hodgepodge”: Examining AI/ML practitioners' challenges during co-production of responsible AI values. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–17.
- [144] Claudia Wagner, Markus Strohmaier, Alexandra Olteanu, Emre Kicman, Noshir Contractor, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. 2021. Measuring algorithmically infused societies. *Nature* 595, 7866 (2021), 197–204.
- [145] Dakuo Wang, Justin D Weisz, Michael Muller, Parikshit Ram, Werner Geyer, Casey Dugan, Yla Tausczik, Horst Samulowitz, and Alexander Gray. 2019. Human-AI collaboration in data science: Exploring data scientists' perceptions of automated AI. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction* 3, CSCW (2019), 1–24.
- [146] Lih-Wern Wang, Michael J Miller, Michael R Schmitt, and Frances K Wen. 2013. Assessing readability formula differences with written health information materials: application, results, and recommendations. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy* 9, 5 (2013), 503–516.
- [147] Qiaosi Wang, Koustuv Saha, Eric Gregori, David Joyner, and Ashok K Goel. 2021. Mutual Theory of Mind in Human-AI Interaction: How Language Reflects What Students Perceive About a Virtual Teaching Assistant. In *Proc. CHI*.
- [148] Xuewei Wang, Weiyang Shi, Richard Kim, Yoojung Oh, Sijia Yang, Jingwen Zhang, and Zhou Yu. 2019. Persuasion for good: Towards a personalized persuasive dialogue system for social good. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06725* (2019).
- [149] Bryan J Weiner, Cara C Lewis, Cameo Stanick, Byron J Powell, Caitlin N Dorsey, Alecia S Clary, Marcella H Boynton, and Heather Halko. 2017. Psychometric assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures. *Implementation science* 12, 1 (2017), 108.
- [150] Anuradha Welivita and Pearl Pu. 2024. Is chatgpt more empathetic than humans? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05572* (2024).
- [151] Lance T Wilhelm, Xiaohan Ding, Kirk McInnis Knutsen, Buse Carik, and Eugenia H Rho. 2025. How Managers Perceive AI-Assisted Conversational Training for Workplace Communication. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14452* (2025).
- [152] Anbang Xu, Zhe Liu, Yufan Guo, Vibha Sinha, and Rama Akkiraju. 2017. A new chatbot for customer service on social media. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 3506–3510.
- [153] Alfred Zerres, Joachim Hüffmeier, Philipp Alexander Freund, Klaus Backhaus, and Guido Hertel. 2013. Does it take two to tango? Longitudinal effects of unilateral and bilateral integrative negotiation training. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 98, 3 (2013), 478.
- [154] Huiqi Zou, Pengda Wang, Zihan Yan, Tianjun Sun, and Ziang Xiao. 2025. Can llm “self-report”? Evaluating the validity of self-report scales in measuring personality design in llm-based chatbots. *To appear at Conference on Language Modeling* (2025).