Who Does the Talking Here? The Impact of Gender Composition on Team Interactions

David Hardt, Lea Mayer & Johannes Rincke University of Erlangen-Nuremberg

AEARCTR-0007989

August 30, 2023

Gender Diversity and Teamwork

Two long-term trends:

- Teamwork has become pervasive, workers rewarded for social skills [e.g., Deming, 2017; Weidmann and Deming, 2021; Edin et al., 2022]
- Workers tend to collaborate in increasingly gender-diverse environments [STEM jobs: Pew Research Center, 2021; company boards: Spencer Stuart, 2021; Alliance for Board Diversity and Deloitte, 2021]
- As a result, gender-diverse teamwork is on the rise

How does gender diversity affect the social interaction in teams?



The New York Times Magazine

THE WORK ISSUE

What Google Learned From Its Quest to Build the Perfect Team

Feb 25, 2016

Guardian Best ideas come from work teams mixing men and women

Nov 1, 2007

FINANCIAL TIMES Women in meetings should be heard as well as seen

nature

BOOK REVIEW

What NASA missions can teach us about teamwork

Nov 16, 2020

Mar 8, 2021

This Paper

Online experiment with students at U Erlangen-Nuremberg

Randomly composed teams of four: All-male, mixed, all-female

Gender-neutral real-effort team task with audio chat

Causal evidence on how team gender composition affects

- communication
- **•** team performance
- preferences & beliefs

- 1. All-male teams communicate more than mixed and all-female teams
- 2. Communication gaps translate into performance gaps
- 3. Males dominate females quantitatively in mixed-teams conversations
- **4.** Females less willing to engage in mixed teamwork shortly after working in a mixed team, males show opposite response

Contribution (1)

Mixed evidence on gender composition and team performance

[e.g., Apesteguia et al., 2012; Hoogendoorn et al., 2013; Lamiraud and Vranceanu, 2018; Marx et al., 2021]

▶ This paper: Focus on communication, all other channels ruled out by design

Male dominance through speaking time, hostility, and interruptions [e.g., Jacobi and Schweers, 2017; MacLaren et al., 2020; Dupas et al., 2021; Miller and Sutherland, 2022]

 This paper: First systematic analysis of style and quantity of communication in exogenously formed teams

Contribution (2)

Speaking time predicts emerging leadership, males more willing to lead [e.g., Schmid Mast, 2002; Alan et al., 2020; MacLaren et al., 2020; Born et al., 2022]

This paper: Causal evidence on gender gap in mixed-team communication

Worker heterogeneity and preferences for teamwork, attitudes are malleable [e.g., Hamilton et al., 2003; Kuhn and Villeval, 2015; Cooper et al., 2021; Dahl et al., 2021]

This paper: First evidence on gender gap in response to mixed teamwork

Experimental Design: Overview

Online platform at U Erlangen-Nuremberg

- \blacktriangleright ~10K registered users
- Log-in with unique student ID
- Link to registry data: Gender, A-level GPA, age, field of study, etc.

Invite random subsamples of users to online sessions

Randomly composed teams of four meet in chat room (no video)

- Stage 1: Team real-effort task, 30 minutes
- Stage 2: Choice experiment, preferences over future teamwork and beliefs

First Stage: Team Real-Effort Task & Incentives

Business cases, adapted from recruitment task of big strategy consultancy

Info material (text, tables, charts) presented on screen

2 business cases, each consisting of 5 single-choice problems

Teams have 3 minutes for each problem

Fixed reward $\in 10$, bonus of $\in 1$ per problem if all team members individually mark correct answer

Second Stage: Choice Experiment

Subjects meet in chat room in randomly composed pairs and talk for 1 minute

- Individual choice experiment
 - Possible further real effort task (5 problems)
 - Incentive-compatible elicitation of preferences: Teamwork with other subject, or individual work

Elicitation mechanism

Further beliefs: Productivity (own, other, team) & team communication

Example: Task Screen

	You ar	e: 🖪
Remaining working time: 2:57		
Task block A		3
Information Part 1	•	N A
Information Part 2	•	
Information Part 3	•	
Problem A4		
Which of the following statements does NOT help the team determine market access for MedOne in the re	spective market?	N 🛱
\bigcirc a) The larger the company's market share, the more difficult it is for the company to increase sales.		
\odot b) The higher the company's profit margin, the more difficult it is for the company to increase profits.	2	
$ m \bigcirc$ c) The better the company's performance, the riskier it is for the company to change its strategy.		N 12
$_{\bigcirc \ d)}$ The worse the company's performance, the more likely it is to have good opportunities to grow.		

Experimental Design: Timeline



Overall length of session for majority of subjects: 55 min

Sampling and Randomization

First Stage:

- Random assignment to teams of four (342 teams, 1368 subjects)
- ▶ Team gender compositions: All-male, mixed (2 females, 2 males), all-female
- In each team, 2 subjects of above-median and 2 of below-median ability Balancing checks, team level Balancing checks, individual level Further details

Second Stage:

 Each subject matched randomly with another subject from a different first-stage team

Details

Design Checks

Sample of 296 subjects, same task, but individual piece rate:

- No gender effect on performance
- No gender effect on likeability of task
- No effect of field of study
- Strong positive effect of cognitive skills

Balancing Performance & likeability Awareness

Stage 2: Belief about partner's productivity unaffected by partner's gender

Belief partner's productivity

Treatment Effects on Team Performance

(Pre-Registered)

All-Male Teams Outperform Mixed and All-Female Teams



Treatment Effects on Communication

(Pre-Registered)

Gender Gaps: Number of Words



Gender Gaps: Team Communication

	#Words #Topic word	
	(1)	(2)
Female (β_1)	-76.34***	-5.41***
	(23.49)	(1.35)
Mixed team (β_2)	93.03***	4.51^{***}
	(28.74)	(1.56)
Female $ imes$ Mixed team (β_3)	-173.39***	-9.46***
	(38.43)	(2.18)
A-level GPA	113.36***	6.90***
	(15.29)	(0.90)
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes
N. of obs.	1368	1368
Adj. R ²	0.100	0.108
Mean dep. var. all-male	519.4	31.8
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.000	0.000
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.001	0.000



Does the Effect of Team Gender Composition on Performance Work Through Communication?

(Exploratory)

Communication as a Possible Channel

Recall: When working individually, females and males are equally productive

Differences in team performance can only emerge through communication

Possible channels:

- Quantity of (topical) communication: #all words, #topic words
- Quality of communication: #topic words/#all words

Quantity Matters: #Topic Words Predicts Team Performance

	Number of	
	problems solved	
	(1)	
#all words (β_1)	-0.001**	
	(0.000)	
#topic words (β_2)	0.015^{***}	
	(0.004)	
N. of obs.	342	
Mean dep. var.	4.35	
Team-level controls	Yes	



No Gender Gap in Quality: Females Talk Equally Topical

	Share of topic words (1)
Female (β_1)	0.001
	(0.002)
Mixed team (β_2)	0.000
	(0.002)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	0.001
	(0.003)
A-level GPA	-0.001
	(0.001)
N. of obs.	1336
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.065
Subject-level controls	Yes
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.538
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.708



Communication and Team Performance: Discussion

Four pieces of evidence:

- All-male teams outperform mixed and all-female teams
- Usage of topical words drives team performance
- Males talk more than females
- No gender difference in share of topical words

Evidence suggests that

- Female and male talk is equally productive
- Differences in team performance driven by males talking more than females

Determinants of Communication Behavior: Gender vs. Cognitive Skills

(Exploratory)

Who Does the Talking? Gender vs. Cognitive Skills



Origins of Male Dominance in Mixed Teams

Little evidence that males use aggressive communication style or tone Sentiment Interruptions Passive interruptions

Gender roles and differences in self-confidence and social confidence [e.g., Kling et al., 1999; Croson and Gneezy, 2009; Ludwig et al., 2017; Alan et al., 2020; Born et al, 2022]

Gender-specific communication behavior seems to be socially acquired [e.g., Aukrust, 2008]

Stage 2: Preferences for Further Teamwork (Pre-Registered)

Preferences: Past Exposure and Partner's Gender

	= 1 if subject prefers teamwork	
	Females	Males
	(1)	(2)
Female partner 2nd stage (β_1)	0.031	-0.006
	(0.059)	(0.046)
Mixed team 1st stage (β_2)	-0.111*	-0.090
	(0.066)	(0.065)
Female partner 2nd stage \times Mixed team 1st stage (β_3)	0.058	0.210**
	(0.099)	(0.087)
N. of obs.	351	380
Mean dep. var. gender-homogenous teams	0.80	0.81
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.250	0.005
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.435	0.025

Specification

Conclusion

Systematic analysis of how team gender composition affects team interactions

- All-male teams communicate more than mixed and all-female teams
- Communication gaps translate into performance gaps
- Males dominate females in mixed-teams conversations
- Opposite effects on females' and males' willingness to work in mixed teams

Implications and further questions:

- How to encourage women to speak out in work teams?
- Gender gaps in leadership experience from low-stakes environments
- Measures to prevent male dominance in mixed teams

Backup Slides

Empirical Setup: Team-Level Outcomes

$$Y_g = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T \mathbf{1}_{FM,g} + \beta_2 T \mathbf{1}_{FF,g} + X'_g \gamma + u_g$$

\triangleright Y_g : Outcome of interest

[quantitative measures, distributional measures, sentiment, perceptions]

- ▶ $T1_{FM,g}$: Indicator for gender-mixed teams
- ▶ $T1_{FF,g}$: Indicator for all-female teams
- \blacktriangleright X_g : Team-level control variables

[GPA (mean, maximum, minimum), share A-level from top-tier high school type, age (mean, maximum,

minimum), share foreign nationality, shares for different fields of study, indicator for teams with silent members]

Robust SEs, extra tables with *p*-values adjusted for FWER

[Barsbai et al., 2020]

Empirical Setup: Individual-Level Outcomes, First Stage

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 F_i + \beta_2 T \mathbf{1}_{FM,i} + \beta_3 F_i \times T \mathbf{1}_{FM,i} + X'_i \gamma + u_i$$

• Y_i : Outcome of interest

[quantitative measures and perceptions]

- ► *F_i*: Indicator for female subjects
- ► *T*1_{*FM,i*}: Indicator for gender-mixed teams
- ► X_i: Individual-level control variables

[GPA, age, indicators for A-level from top-tier high school type, foreign nationality, field of study, indicator for

teams with silent members]

SEs clustered at team level, extra tables with *p*-values adjusted for FWER

[Barsbai et al., 2020]

Empirical Setup: Subject-by-Problem Panel

$$Y_{i,p} = \alpha + \sum_{p=2}^{10} \beta_p P_p + \sum_{p=1}^{10} \delta_p F_i \times P_p + \sum_{p=1}^{10} \eta_p T \mathbf{1}_{FM,i} \times P_p + \sum_{p=1}^{10} \theta_p F_i \times T \mathbf{1}_{FM,i} \times P_p + X'_i \gamma + u_{i,p} \times$$

- P_p : Indicator for problem p = 1, ..., 10
- SEs clustered at team level

Back

Empirical Setup: Second Stage

 $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T 2_{F,i} + \beta_2 T 1_{FM,i} + \beta_3 T 2_{F,i} \times T 1_{FM,i} + X'_i \gamma + u_i$

- Separate regressions for females and males
- ► *Y_i*: Outcome of interest

[preferences for teamwork, productivity beliefs, communication-related beliefs]

- ▶ $T2_{F,i}$: Indicator for female potential partner in stage 2
- > $T1_{FM,i}$: Indicator for gender-mixed team in stage 1
- SEs clusters account for own and potential partner's first-stage team assignment, extra tables with *p*-values adjusted for FWER [Barsbai et al., 2020]



Stage 2: Awareness of Potential Partner's Gender

	= 1 if subject is aware of potential partner's gender		
	All	Females	Males
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Female partner 2nd stage (β)	0.005	0.014	-0.001
	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.014)
N. of obs.	731	351	380
Mean dependent variable	0.98	0.98	0.98
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes

Balancing checks, assignment of teammates
Productivity Beliefs: Past Exposure and Partner's Gender

	Belief about productivity:					
	Own		Partner		Tea	m
	Females (1)	Males (2)	Females (3)	Males (4)	Females (5)	Males (6)
Female partner 2nd stage (β_1)	0.303 (0.494)	0.285 (0.439)	-0.238 (0.482)	0.357 (0.417)	0.002 (0.441)	0.467 (0.413)
Mixed team 1st stage (β_2)	0.504 (0.546)	0.149 (0.553)	0.141 (0.561)	0.259 (0.478)	0.318 (0.472)	0.383 (0.523)
Female partner 2nd stage \times Mixed team 1st stage (β_3)	-0.317 (0.712)	0.326 (0.790)	0.713 (0.736)	0.020 (0.751)	-0.194 (0.645)	0.016 (0.720)
N. of obs.	351	380	351	380	351	380
Mean dep. var. gender-homogenous teams	10.07	11.55	11.69	12.26	14.27	15.00
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0 $ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.979	0.352	0.414	0.549	0.708	0.415
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0 \text{ (}p\text{-value)}$	0.693	0.424	0.077	0.644	0.785	0.461

Communication Beliefs: Past Exposure and Partner's Gender

		Belief about:						
	Positi	vity	Cooperat	iveness	Likeal	oility	Belief	ndex
	Females (1)	Males (2)	Females (3)	Males (4)	Females (5)	Males (6)	Females (7)	Males (8)
Female partner 2nd stage (β_1)	0.315***	0.153	0.355***	0.033	0.346***	0.154	0.544^{***}	0.173
	(0.081)	(0.093)	(0.074)	(0.089)	(0.126)	(0.124)	(0.128)	(0.144)
Mixed team 1st stage (β_2)	0.218^{*}	0.187^{*}	0.179	0.188^{*}	0.006	0.043	0.232	0.237
	(0.113)	(0.099)	(0.116)	(0.104)	(0.136)	(0.143)	(0.176)	(0.158)
Female partner 2nd stage \times Mixed team 1st stage (β_3)	-0.227	-0.104	-0.435***	0.002	-0.034	0.093	-0.404*	-0.015
	(0.141)	(0.146)	(0.154)	(0.153)	(0.192)	(0.200)	(0.229)	(0.227)
N. of obs.	351	380	351	380	351	380	351	380
Mean dep. var. gender-homogenous teams	4.48	4.45	4.48	4.49	4.09	4.07	0.02	-0.00
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.437	0.671	0.556	0.772	0.025	0.126	0.452	0.374
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.919	0.385	0.009	0.068	0.853	0.342	0.267	0.150

k MHT Exposure to mixed teamwork

Second-Stage Randomization

Second-stage clusters based on first-stage team pairs



Subjects from first-stage teams 1 Subjects from first-stage teams 3 and 2 form second stage cluster 1 and 4 form second stage cluster 2



Further Details

First stage: Teams dropped if any subject left session for > 90 seconds

For most subjects, experiment took ~ 55 minutes

Total payoff: fixed reward 1st stage 10€ + bonus ∈ $\{0, 1, 2, ..., 10\}$ € + fixed reward 2nd stage 2€ + bonus ∈ $\{0, 1, 2, ..., 5\}$ € if drawn for 2nd stage task

Data from pilot sessions (only 1st stage) included

Back

Second Stage: Mechanism to Elicit Preferences for Teamwork

Individual choice experiment

- Possible further real effort task (5 problems)
- Elicitation of preferences: Teamwork with other subject, or individual work

Mechanism: Random draw at pair level, three possible outcomes

- Case A: Individual work, irrespective of stated preferences
- Case B: Teamwork if preferred by both, individual work otherwise
- Case C: No task at all

Back

Balancing, Team Level

	All-male teams	Mixed teams	All-female teams	<i>p</i> -value all equal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Mean A-level GPA	2.73	2.74	2.76	0.30
	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.17)	
Maximum A-level GPA	3.45	3.47	3.43	0.59
	(0.30)	(0.26)	(0.31)	
Minimum A-level GPA	2.00	2.03	2.06	0.37
	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.30)	
Share top-tier high school	0.83	0.81	0.84	0.51
1 0	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	
Mean age	22.71	22.79	22.56	0.49
0	(1.60)	(1.41)	(1.49)	
Maximum age	26.32	26.50	25.76	0.08
Ū.	(2.90)	(2.55)	(2.44)	
Minimum age	19.71	19.67	19.77	0.88
0	(1.56)	(1.54)	(1.47)	
Share foreign nationality	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.42
0 ,	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)	
N. of obs.	114	113	115	342



Balancing, Individual Level

	Males ass	gned to	Females assigned to			
	All-male teams (1)	Mixed teams (2)	<i>p</i> -value both equal (3)	All-female teams (4)	Mixed teams (5)	<i>p</i> -value both equal (6)
A-level GPA	2.73	2.75	0.71	2.76	2.73	0.52
	(0.63)	(0.62)		(0.60)	(0.62)	
Top-tier high school	0.83	0.82	0.79	0.84	0.81	0.27
	(0.38)	(0.39)		(0.36)	(0.39)	
Age	22.71	22.62	0.74	22.56	22.97	0.10
	(3.28)	(3.20)		(2.94)	(3.20)	
Foreign nationality	0.04	0.03	0.58	0.04	0.02	0.20
	(0.19)	(0.16)		(0.20)	(0.16)	
Study program: Master level	0.28	0.24	0.27	0.21	0.24	0.44
	(0.45)	(0.43)		(0.41)	(0.43)	
Study program: Arts and humanities	0.19	0.21	0.51	0.29	0.27	0.69
	(0.39)	(0.43)		(0.45)	(0.43)	
Study program: Engineering	0.28	0.19	0.01	0.13	0.14	0.81
	(0.45)	(0.37)		(0.34)	(0.37)	
Study program: Natural sciences	0.10	0.12	0.46	0.10	0.10	0.80
	(0.30)	(0.31)		(0.29)	(0.31)	
Study program: Economics and business	0.30	0.32	0.55	0.28	0.26	0.55
	(0.46)	(0.45)		(0.45)	(0.45)	
N. of obs.	456	226	682	460	226	686

Attrition, Team Level

	Non-attrited	Attrited	Diff.	Std. Diff.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Gender-mixed team	0.330	0.362	0.032	0.047
	(0.471)	(0.484)	(0.062)	
All-female team	0.336	0.304	-0.032	-0.048
	(0.473)	(0.464)	(0.062)	
Mean A-level GPA	2.741	2.724	-0.017	-0.074
	(0.165)	(0.150)	(0.021)	
Share top-tier high school	0.828	0.815	-0.013	-0.048
1 0	(0.191)	(0.190)	(0.025)	
Mean age	22.687	22.525	-0.162	-0.080
	(1.500)	(1.369)	(0.195)	
Share foreign nationality	0.036	0.065	0.029	0.205
	(0.092)	(0.111)	(0.013)	
Share study program Master level	0.243	0.214	-0.030	-0.098
	(0.203)	(0.224)	(0.027)	
Share study program arts and humanities	0.241	0.283	0.041	0.134
	(0.210)	(0.227)	(0.028)	
Share study program engineering	0.192	0.188	-0.004	-0.013
	(0.214)	(0.194)	(0.028)	
Share study program natural sciences	0.102	0.069	-0.033	-0.181
	(0.147)	(0.112)	(0.019)	
Share study program economics and business	0.289	0.272	-0.018	-0.054
* * ~	(0.240)	(0.222)	(0.031)	
N. of obs.	342	69	411	411

Attrition in Stage 1, Individual Level

	Non-attrited	Attrited	Diff.	Std. Diff.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Gender-mixed team	0.330	0.362	0.032	0.047
	(0.471)	(0.482)	(0.063)	
All-female team	0.336	0.304	-0.032	-0.048
	(0.473)	(0.461)	(0.061)	
A-level GPA	2.741	2.724	-0.017	-0.019
	(0.613)	(0.635)	(0.020)	
Top-tier high school	0.828	0.815	-0.013	-0.024
	(0.377)	(0.389)	(0.025)	
Age	22.687	22.525	-0.162	-0.038
	(3.143)	(2.890)	(0.183)	
Foreign nationality	0.036	0.065	0.029	0.095
•	(0.186)	(0.247)	(0.014)	
Study program: Master level	0.243	0.214	-0.030	-0.050
	(0.429)	(0.411)	(0.029)	
Study program: Arts and humanities	0.241	0.283	0.041	0.067
	(0.428)	(0.451)	(0.029)	
Study program: Engineering	0.192	0.188	-0.004	-0.007
	(0.394)	(0.392)	(0.026)	
Study program: Natural sciences	0.102	0.069	-0.033	-0.085
• • •	(0.303)	(0.254)	(0.016)	
Study program: Economics and business	0.289	0.272	-0.018	-0.028
• • •	(0.454)	(0.446)	(0.030)	
N. of obs.	1368	276	1644	1644

Descriptives on Primary Outcomes: Team Level

	Mean	Stand. Dev.	
	(1)	(2)	
Number of problems solved	4.35	1.69	
Number of words	1947.99	680.32	
Number of turns	147.77	51.91	
HHI words	0.34	0.06	
HHI turns	0.31	0.04	
Vocal semtiment: Positive	0.39	0.16	
Vocal semtiment: Negative	0.25	0.11	
Perception: Positivity	4.64	0.39	
Perception: Cooperativeness	4.65	0.35	
Perception: Likeability	4.01	0.57	
N. of obs.	342		



Descriptives on Primary Outcomes: Individual Level

	Mean (1)	Stand. Dev. (2)
A. First-stage outcomes:		
Number of words	487.00	361.92
Number of turns	36.94	23.23
Own vocal semtiment: Positive	0.39	0.20
Own vocal semtiment: Negative	0.26	0.14
Perception: Positivity	4.64	0.64
Perception: Cooperativeness	4.65	0.64
Perception: Likeability	4.01	0.93
N. of obs.		1368
B. Second-stage outcomes:		
Indicator: Subject prefers teamwork	0.80	0.40
Belief: Own productitivity	10.95	3.32
Belief: Partner's productivity	12.09	3.04
Belief: Team productitivity	14.73	2.95
Belief: Positivity	4.51	0.66
Belief: Cooperativeness	4.51	0.64
Belief: Likeability	4.09	0.85
N. of obs.		731



	= 1 if aware of exact team gender composition (1)	= 1 if aware of whether team is mixed or not (2)
Female (β_1)	-0.016	-0.015
•	(0.019)	(0.019)
Mixed team (β_2)	-0.014	-0.014
	(0.020)	(0.020)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	-0.106***	0.026
	(0.031)	(0.024)
N. of obs.	1352	1352
Mean dep. var.	0.94	0.96
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.97	0.97
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.000	0.439
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.000	0.532

Awareness of Team Gender Composition, First Stage

Balancing Checks: Subjects Working Individually

	Males	Females	<i>p</i> -value
			both equal
	(1)	(2)	(3)
A-level GPA	2.70	2.75	0.47
	(0.62)	(0.57)	
Top-tier high school	0.81	0.80	0.84
	(0.39)	(0.40)	
Age	23.32	22.94	0.27
	(3.04)	(2.90)	
Study program: Master level	0.30	0.19	0.03
	(0.46)	(0.39)	
Foreign nationality	0.05	0.05	0.81
	(0.23)	(0.21)	
N. of obs.	149	147	296



Performance & Likeability Under Individual Piece Rate

	Number of	Likeability
	problems solved	of the task
	(1)	(2)
Female	-0.121	-0.152
	(0.211)	(0.127)
A-level GPA	0.725***	-0.076
	(0.168)	(0.105)
Study program: Arts & humanities	0.103	0.220
	(0.288)	(0.176)
Study program: Engineering	0.300	0.300
	(0.334)	(0.187)
Study program: Natural sciences	-0.356	0.024
	(0.358)	(0.234)
Study program: Economics & business	-0.208	0.203
	(0.337)	(0.189)
Mean dep. var. males	4.46	3.21
N. of obs.	296	296
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes



Stage 2: Beliefs About Potential Partner's Productivity

	Belief indivio	Belief about partner's individual productivity			
	All Females Males				
	(1)	(2)	(3)		
Female partner 2nd stage (β)	0.212	0.084	0.333		
	(0.262)	(0.384)	(0.344)		
N. of obs.	731	351	380		
Mean dependent variable	12.09	11.85	12.32		
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes		

Quantitative Measures of Communication, Team Level



Quantitative Effects on Communication: Team Level

	#Words	#Topic words
	(1)	(2)
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-134.68	-12.15**
	(86.36)	(4.70)
All-female team (β_2)	-297.51***	-20.24***
	(94.63)	(5.16)
N. of obs.	342	342
Mean dep. var. all-male	2077.73	127.25
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.079	0.093
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.121	0.013
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.006	0.000



Quantitative Effects on Topic Words

	Depen	Dependent variable: Number of topic words				
		#topic words considered				
	10	20	30	40	50	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-12.2**	-19.3***	-21.8***	-24.2***	-26.0***	
	(4.7)	(6.6)	(7.4)	(8.1)	(8.7)	
All-female team (β_2)	-20.2***	-29.5***	-32.3***	-35.1***	-37.1***	
	(5.2)	(7.2)	(8.0)	(8.8)	(9.4)	
N. of obs.	342	342	342	342	342	
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mean dep. var. all-male	127.3	159.3	174.7	185.3	192.8	
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.093	0.119	0.150	0.175	0.193	

Perceived Communication: Team Level, Secondary Outcomes

	Sufficient communication	Symmetric communication	Letting others finish
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-0.126	-0.065	-0.038
	(0.077)	(0.094)	(0.043)
All-female team (β_2)	-0.078	0.182^{**}	-0.050
	(0.075)	(0.092)	(0.045)
N. of obs.	342	342	342
Mean dep. var. all-male	4.29	3.31	4.71
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.552	0.007	0.806
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.428	0.511	0.607
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.672	0.239	0.713

Distributional Effects on Team Communication

	HHI words	HHI turns
	(1)	(2)
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	0.013	0.007
	(0.009)	(0.005)
All-female team (β_2)	-0.007	-0.002
	(0.008)	(0.005)
N. of obs.	342	342
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.34	0.31
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.017	0.072
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.365	0.351
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.547	0.666



Effects on Sentiment: Team Level Communication

	Positive (1)	Negative (2)
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	0.088***	-0.008
	(0.017)	(0.015)
All-female team (β_2)	0.254^{***}	-0.063***
	(0.017)	(0.015)
N. of obs.	342	342
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.27	0.27
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 = \beta_2 \ (p\text{-value})$	0.000	0.000



Effects on Perceived Communication: Team Level

	Positivity	Cooperativeness	Likeability
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-0.029	-0.017	-0.021
	(0.051)	(0.046)	(0.077)
All-female team (β_2)	-0.034	-0.004	-0.113
	(0.057)	(0.051)	(0.081)
N. of obs.	342	342	342
Mean dep. var. all-male	4.65	4.66	4.06
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.929	0.797	0.253
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.952	0.976	0.958
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.971	0.948	0.556



Gender Gap in Total Speaking Time



Gender Gap in Number of Turns



Illustration: Number of Words vs. Total Speaking Time



Effects on Communication: Individual Level

	#Words	#Topical words
	(1)	(2)
Female (β_1)	-76.34***	-5.41***
	(23.49)	(1.35)
Mixed team (β_2)	93.03***	4.51***
	(28.74)	(1.56)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	-173.39***	-9.46***
	(38.43)	(2.18)
A-level GPA	113.36***	6.90***
	(15.29)	(0.90)
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes
N. of obs.	1368	1368
Adj. R ²	0.100	0.108
Mean dep. var. all-male	519.4	31.8
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$	-249.7	-14.9
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.000	0.000
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	-80.4	-5.0
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.001	0.000
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.003	0.000
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.003	0.004
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.000	0.000



Effects on Communication: Individual Level

	#Words	#Words	#Turns	#Turns
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female (β_1)	-76.34***	-81.18***	-4.02**	-4.18**
	(23.49)	(24.25)	(1.77)	(1.76)
Mixed team (β_2)	93.03***	99.10***	6.16***	6.61***
	(28.74)	(28.07)	(2.12)	(2.01)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	-173.39***	-182.98***	-10.87***	-11.31***
	(38.43)	(38.17)	(2.66)	(2.61)
A-level GPA	113.36***	116.77***	5.87***	6.46^{***}
	(15.29)	(15.04)	(0.96)	(0.95)
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls include Big 5	No	Yes	No	Yes
N. of obs.	1368	1281	1368	1281
Adj. R ²	0.100	0.207	0.085	0.204
Mean dep. var. all-male	519.4	517.0	38.6	38.3
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$	-249.7	-264.2	-14.9	-15.5
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	-80.4	-83.9	-4.7	-4.7
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.001	0.001	0.009	0.008
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.003	0.002	0.025	0.021
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.005	0.002	0.006	0.003
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Gender Gap Is Stable Over Time



Gender Gaps in Total Speaking Time

Total speaking time	
(in minutes)	
(1)	(2)
-0.18	-0.19
(0.14)	(0.15)
0.76***	0.82***
(0.17)	(0.17)
-1.20***	-1.29***
(0.24)	(0.23)
0.69***	0.67***
(0.10)	(0.10)
Yes	Yes
No	Yes
1336	1254
0.090	0.191
3.29	3.27
-1.38	-1.48
0.000	0.000
-0.43	-0.47
0.008	0.004
0.220	0.198
0.000	0.000
0.000	0.000
	Total spea (in mi -0.18 (0.14) 0.76*** (0.17) -1.20*** (0.24) 0.69*** (0.10) Yes No 1336 0.090 3.29 -1.38 0.000 -0.43 0.008 0.220 0.000 0.000



Effects on Perceived Communication: Individual Level

	Positivity	Cooperativeness	Likeability	Perception index
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female (β_1)	0.001	-0.007	-0.082	-0.042
	(0.049)	(0.045)	(0.074)	(0.082)
Mixed team (β_2)	0.033	-0.001	0.133^{*}	0.081
	(0.053)	(0.050)	(0.078)	(0.078)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	-0.100	-0.032	-0.177*	-0.166
	(0.080)	(0.082)	(0.103)	(0.129)
N. of obs.	1358	1357	1362	1356
Mean dep. var. all-male	4.66	4.66	4.06	0.03
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$	-0.099	-0.038	-0.259	-0.208
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.123	0.578	0.000	0.036
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	-0.068	-0.033	-0.044	-0.085
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.325	0.615	0.623	0.451
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.984	0.998	0.785	0.625
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.959	0.999	0.431	0.494
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.727	0.990	0.436	0.430

Lexical Sentiment Score

	Lexical sentiment score
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-0.006
	(0.004)
All-female team (β_2)	-0.008
	(0.005)
N. of obs.	342
Mean dep. var. all-male	-0.01
Team-level controls	Yes
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.626
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.180
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.199



Gender Gap in Team Communication: Share of Turns



Gender Gap in Mixed-Team Communication: Rank by #Turns



Who Dominates a Team's Communication?

	= 1 if subject ranked first in #words			
	Mixed teams (1)	All-male teams (2)	All-female teams (3)	
Female	-0.329***			
	(0.044)			
A-level GPA	0.105***	0.092**	0.135***	
	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.038)	
Openness	0.010^{*}	-0.003	0.003	
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	
Conscientiousness	-0.002	-0.003	0.010	
	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.006)	
Extraversion	0.018***	0.019***	0.018^{***}	
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	
Agreeableness	-0.006	-0.016**	-0.020**	
ě	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.008)	
Neuroticism	0.007	0.004	0.009*	
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	
N. of obs.	417	430	434	
Mean dep. var.	0.25	0.25	0.25	
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	



Does Usage of Topic Words Correlate With Team Performance?

		Number of problems solved						
		#topic words considered						
	10	20	30	40	50			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
#all words (β_1)	-0.001**	-0.001**	-0.001**	-0.001**	-0.001**			
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)			
#topic words (β_2)	0.015***	0.011^{***}	0.010***	0.010^{***}	0.008***			
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)			
N. of obs.	342	342	342	342	342			
Mean dep. var.	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35			
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			

No Gender Gap in Usage of Topic Words

	Share of topic words #topic words considered						
	10	20	30	40	50		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
Female (β_1)	0.001	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	-0.003		
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)		
Mixed team (β_2)	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.001		
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)		
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	0.001	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001		
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)		
A-level GPA	-0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002*	0.003**		
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)		
N. of obs.	1336	1336	1336	1336	1336		
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.065	0.079	0.085	0.089	0.093		
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.538	0.541	0.319	0.188	0.148		
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.708	0.996	0.777	0.606	0.555		

Back Team level
No Gender Gap in Usage of Topic Words - Team Level

	Number of problems solved							
	#topic words considered							
	10 20 30 40 50							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-0.000	-0.002	-0.003	-0.004*	-0.004**			
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)			
All-female team (β_2)	0.000	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004^{*}	-0.004**			
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)			
N. of obs.	342	342	342	342	342			
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.062	0.077	0.085	0.089	0.093			
$\beta_1 = \beta_2 \ (p\text{-value})$	0.813	0.974	0.926	0.964	0.951			

Effects on Sentiment: Vocal Features, Individual Level

	Positive (1)	Negative (2)
Female (β_1)	0.260***	-0.064***
	(0.014)	(0.013)
Mixed team (β_2)	-0.002	-0.000
	(0.017)	(0.015)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	-0.035*	0.037**
	(0.021)	(0.018)
N. of obs.	1336	1336
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.26	0.28
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.000	0.021
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.008	0.009



	Sufficient communication	Symmetric communication	Letting others finish
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Female (β_1)	-0.049	0.171**	-0.029
	(0.067)	(0.085)	(0.042)
Mixed team (β_2)	-0.091	-0.119	-0.036
	(0.080)	(0.100)	(0.047)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)	0.022	-0.084	0.025
	(0.104)	(0.124)	(0.070)
N. of obs.	1357	1362	1357
Mean dep. var. all-male	4.29	3.31	4.71
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$	-0.027	0.087	-0.003
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.737	0.344	0.950
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	-0.069	-0.203	-0.011
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.457	0.045	0.846

0.935

0.825

0.828

0.296

0.814

0.916

0.853

0.941

0.921

Perceptions: Individual Level, Secondary Outcomes

 $\beta_1 = 0$ (*p*-value MHT)

 $\beta_2 = 0$ (*p*-value MHT)

 $\beta_3 = 0$ (*p*-value MHT)

Active and Passive Interruptions



Passive Interruptions in Mixed Teams



Effects on Team Performance

	Number of problems solved
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-0.402*
() 1/	(0.225)
All-female team (β_2)	-0.550**
	(0.254)
N. of obs.	342
Mean dep. var. all-male	4.61
Team-level controls	Yes
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.529
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.083
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.062



Coordination Within Teams

	#problems with perfect coordination	Teams with perfect coordination: #problems solved
	(1)	(2)
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-0.096	-0.436
	(0.180)	(0.274)
All-female team (β_2)	0.099	-0.565*
	(0.151)	(0.325)
N. of obs.	342	200
Team-level controls	Yes	Yes
Mean dep. var. all-male	9.29	5.04
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.237	0.680

Robustness Check: Exclude Teams with Silent Members

	Number of problems solved
	(1)
Gender-mixed team (β_1)	-0.419*
	(0.236)
All-female team (β_2)	-0.580**
	(0.266)
N. of obs.	311
$\beta_1 = \beta_2$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.516

Back

Mixed Teams: Gender Gap in Who Ranks First or Second





Attrition, Stage 2

	Non-attrited	Attrited	Diff.	Std. Diff.
Cender-mixed team	0.326	0 393	0.067	0.099
Gender-mixed team	(0.469)	(0.489)	(0.045)	0.077
All-female team	0.317	0.332	0.015	0.022
	(0.466)	(0.472)	(0.042)	01022
A-level GPA	2.740	2.737	-0.004	-0.004
	(0.615)	(0.618)	(0.043)	
Top-tier high school	0.818	0.843	0.025	0.047
1 0	(0.386)	(0.365)	(0.027)	
Age	22.648	22.991	0.343	0.074
0	(3.052)	(3.498)	(0.254)	
Foreign nationality	0.021	0.057	0.036	0.133
· ·	(0.142)	(0.232)	(0.016)	
Study program: Master level	0.231	0.214	-0.017	-0.029
	(0.422)	(0.411)	(0.031)	
Study program: Arts and humanities	0.268	0.197	-0.072	-0.120
	(0.443)	(0.398)	(0.030)	
Study program: Engineering	0.182	0.183	0.001	0.003
	(0.386)	(0.388)	(0.028)	
Study program: Natural sciences	0.093	0.127	0.034	0.076
	(0.291)	(0.333)	(0.026)	
Study program: Economics and business	0.272	0.288	0.016	0.025
	(0.445)	(0.454)	(0.034)	
N. of obs.	731	229	960	960

Preferences: Past Exposure to Mixed Teamwork

	= 1 if	subject	
	prefers teamwork		
	(1)	(2)	
Female (β_1)	-0.027	-0.002	
	(0.031)	(0.036)	
Mixed team (β_2)	-0.037	-0.000	
	(0.031)	(0.043)	
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)		-0.076	
		(0.062)	
N. of obs.	731	731	
Mean dep. var. all-male	0.81	0.81	
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.149	
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.089	



Productivity Beliefs: Past Exposure to Mixed Teamwork

	Belief about productivity:						
	Own		Partner		Team		
	(1) (2)		(3) (4)		(5)	(6)	
Female (β_1)	-1.290***	-1.348***	-0.373	-0.458	-0.650***	-0.600**	
	(0.270)	(0.333)	(0.260)	(0.326)	(0.247)	(0.301)	
Mixed team (β_2)	0.322	0.239	0.321	0.199	0.250	0.322	
	(0.262)	(0.400)	(0.264)	(0.381)	(0.239)	(0.379)	
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)		0.171		0.252		-0.150	
		(0.564)		(0.518)		(0.528)	
N. of obs.	731	731	731	731	731	731	
Mean dep. var. all-male	11.55	11.55	12.26	12.26	15.00	15.00	
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.011		0.617		0.086	
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.269		0.211		0.604	



Communication Beliefs: Past Exposure to Mixed Teamwork

		Belief about:						
	Posit	Positivity Cooperativeness		Likeability		Belief index		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Female (β_1)	0.059	0.051	-0.060	-0.000	0.057	0.059	0.022	0.054
	(0.051)	(0.067)	(0.050)	(0.060)	(0.067)	(0.089)	(0.078)	(0.102)
Mixed team (β_2)	0.132***	0.121^{*}	0.090^{*}	0.177^{**}	0.052	0.054	0.151^{*}	0.199^{*}
	(0.044)	(0.064)	(0.053)	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.105)	(0.077)	(0.108)
Female $ imes$ Mixed team (β_3)		0.022		-0.179*		-0.005		-0.098
		(0.108)		(0.100)		(0.155)		(0.168)
N. of obs.	731	731	731	731	731	731	731	731
Mean dep. var. all-male	4.45	4.45	4.49	4.49	4.07	4.07	-0.00	-0.00
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_1 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.371		0.033		0.642		0.732
$\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.057		0.975		0.634		0.402



Preferences: Past Exposure

= 1 if s	subject
prefers t	eamwork
(1)	(2)
-0.027	-0.002
(0.031)	(0.036)
-0.037	-0.000
(0.031)	(0.043)
	-0.076
	(0.062)
731	731
0.81	0.81
Yes	Yes
	-0.077
	0.149
	-0.076
	0.089
0.398	0.999
0.407	0.999
	0.494
	= 1 if prefers to (1) -0.027 (0.031) -0.037 (0.031) 731 0.81 Yes 0.398 0.407

Preferences: Past Exposure and Partner's Gender

	= 1 if subject prefers teamwork		
	Females	Males	
Female partner 2nd stage (β_1)	0.031	-0.006	
	(0.059)	(0.046)	
Mixed team 1st stage (β_2)	-0.111*	-0.090	
	(0.066)	(0.065)	
Female partner 2nd stage \times Mixed team 1st stage (β_3)	0.058	0.210**	
	(0.099)	(0.087)	
N. of obs.	351	380	
Mean dep. var. gender-homogenous teams	0.80	0.81	
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$	0.089	0.204	
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.250	0.005	
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	-0.053	0.120	
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.435	0.025	
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.846	0.898	
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.367	0.497	
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.899	0.087	



Productivity Beliefs: Past Exposure

	Belief about productivity:									
	O	wn	Par	tner	Team					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)				
Female (β_1)	-1.290***	-1.348***	-0.373	-0.458	-0.650***	-0.600**				
	(0.270)	(0.333)	(0.260)	(0.326)	(0.247)	(0.301)				
Mixed team (β_2)	0.322	0.239	0.321	0.199	0.250	0.322				
	(0.262)	(0.400)	(0.264)	(0.381)	(0.239)	(0.379)				
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)		0.171		0.252		-0.150				
		(0.564)		(0.518)		(0.528)				
N. of obs.	731	731	731	731	731	731				
Mean dep. var. all-male	11.55	11.55	12.26	12.26	15.00	15.00				
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$		-1.176		-0.206		-0.750				
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.011		0.617		0.086				
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$		0.410		0.451		0.172				
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.269		0.211		0.604				
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.000	0.000	0.388	0.495	0.045	0.214				
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.382	0.917	0.341	0.933	0.309	0.807				
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)		0.914		0.881		0.779				



Productivity Beliefs: Past Exposure and Partner's Gender

	Belief about productivity:							
	Ow	/n	Part	ner	Tea	m		
	Females (1)	Males (2)	Females (3)	Males (4)	Females (5)	Males (6)		
Female partner 2nd stage (β_1)	0.303 (0.494)	0.285 (0.439)	-0.238 (0.482)	0.357 (0.417)	0.002 (0.441)	0.467 (0.413)		
Mixed team 1st stage (β_2)	0.504 (0.546)	0.149 (0.553)	0.141 (0.561)	0.259 (0.478)	0.318 (0.472)	0.383 (0.523)		
Female partner 2nd stage \times Mixed team 1st stage (β_3)	-0.317 (0.712)	0.326 (0.790)	0.713 (0.736)	0.020 (0.751)	-0.194 (0.645)	0.016 (0.720)		
N. of obs.	351	380	351	380	351	380		
Mean dep. var. gender-homogenous teams	10.07	11.55	11.69	12.26	14.27	15.00		
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$	-0.014	0.611	0.474	0.377	-0.192	0.482		
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.979	0.352	0.414	0.549	0.708	0.415		
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	0.187	0.475	0.854	0.278	0.124	0.399		
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.693	0.424	0.077	0.644	0.785	0.461		
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.999	0.998	1.000	0.994	0.996	0.956		
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.980	1.000	0.997	1.000	0.998	0.996		
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	1.000	0.999	0.974	1.000	1.000	1.000		

Balancing Stage 2: Origin from Homogenous vs. Mixed Teams

	Males assigned to			Females ass		
	All-male teams	Mixed teams	<i>p</i> -value both equal	All-female teams	Mixed teams	<i>p</i> -value both equal
A-level GPA	2.72	2.72	0.99	2.76	2.77	0.85
	(0.61)	(0.61)	0177	(0.62)	(0.61)	0100
Top-tier high school	0.81	0.82	0.79	0.85	0.76	0.02
I O	(0.39)	(0.41)		(0.35)	(0.41)	
Age	22.67	22.53	0.68	22.65	22.71	0.84
-	(3.28)	(3.00)		(2.84)	(3.00)	
Foreign nationality	0.03	0.02	0.55	0.02	0.02	0.98
	(0.16)	(0.13)		(0.13)	(0.13)	
Study program: Master level	0.27	0.24	0.61	0.19	0.22	0.52
	(0.44)	(0.42)		(0.39)	(0.42)	
Study program: Arts and humanities	0.21	0.24	0.53	0.34	0.29	0.26
	(0.41)	(0.44)		(0.48)	(0.44)	
Study program: Engineering	0.27	0.18	0.08	0.11	0.13	0.46
	(0.44)	(0.37)		(0.31)	(0.37)	
Study program: Natural sciences	0.10	0.11	0.69	0.09	0.08	0.64
	(0.29)	(0.29)		(0.29)	(0.29)	
Study program: Economics and business	0.30	0.32	0.63	0.25	0.22	0.51
	(0.46)	(0.44)		(0.43)	(0.44)	
N. of obs.	261	119	380	232	119	351

Balancing Stage 2: Assignment to Potential Teammates

	Males assigned to			Females as		
	Male potential teammate	Female potential teammate	<i>p</i> -value both equal	Female potential teammate	Male potential teammate	<i>p</i> -value both equal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A-level GPA	2.75	2.68	0.28	2.75	2.78	0.59
	(0.62)	(0.62)		(0.59)	(0.62)	
Top-tier high school	0.83	0.81	0.63	0.80	0.84	0.43
	(0.38)	(0.38)		(0.40)	(0.38)	
Age	22.43	22.82	0.24	22.48	22.82	0.26
	(3.12)	(3.06)		(2.95)	(3.06)	
Foreign nationality	0.03	0.02	0.31	0.03	0.01	0.28
· ·	(0.18)	(0.11)		(0.16)	(0.11)	
Master level	0.24	0.28	0.32	0.18	0.21	0.54
	(0.43)	(0.43)		(0.39)	(0.43)	
Arts and humanities	0.23	0.20	0.58	0.32	0.32	1.00
	(0.42)	(0.44)		(0.47)	(0.44)	
Engineering	0.25	0.24	0.77	0.11	0.12	0.66
	(0.43)	(0.38)		(0.31)	(0.38)	
Natural sciences	0.10	0.10	0.76	0.06	0.11	0.09
	(0.29)	(0.31)		(0.23)	(0.31)	
Econ. and business	0.29	0.31	0.62	0.24	0.24	0.89
	(0.46)	(0.45)		(0.43)	(0.45)	
N. of obs.	189	191	380	157	194	351

Communication Beliefs: Past Exposure

	Belief about:							
	Positivity		Cooperativeness		Likeability		Belief index	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Female (β_1)	0.059	0.051	-0.060	-0.000	0.057	0.059	0.022	0.054
	(0.051)	(0.067)	(0.050)	(0.060)	(0.067)	(0.089)	(0.078)	(0.102)
Mixed team (β_2)	0.132***	0.121^{*}	0.090^{*}	0.177^{**}	0.052	0.054	0.151^{*}	0.199^{*}
	(0.044)	(0.064)	(0.053)	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.105)	(0.077)	(0.108)
Female \times Mixed team (β_3)		0.022		-0.179*		-0.005		-0.098
		(0.108)		(0.100)		(0.155)		(0.168)
N. of obs.	731	731	731	731	731	731	731	731
Mean dep. var. all-male	4.45	4.45	4.49	4.49	4.07	4.07	-0.00	-0.00
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$		0.073		-0.179		0.054		-0.044
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.371		0.033		0.642		0.732
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$		0.144		-0.002		0.049		0.100
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)		0.057		0.975		0.634		0.402
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.523	0.909	0.582	0.996	0.635	0.927	0.785	0.587
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.016	0.285	0.320	0.073	0.471	0.960	0.110	0.149
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)		0.995		0.294		1.000		0.759



Communication Beliefs: Past Exposure and Partner's Gender

	Belief about:							
	Positivity		Cooperativeness		Likeability		Belief index	
	Females (1)	Males (2)	Females (3)	Males (4)	Females (5)	Males (6)	Females (7)	Males (8)
Female partner 2nd stage (β_1)	0.315*** (0.081)	0.153 (0.093)	0.355*** (0.074)	0.033 (0.089)	0.346*** (0.126)	0.154 (0.124)	0.544*** (0.128)	0.173 (0.144)
Mixed team 1st stage (β_2)	0.218* (0.113)	0.187* (0.099)	0.179 (0.116)	0.188* (0.104)	0.006 (0.136)	0.043 (0.143)	0.232 (0.176)	0.237 (0.158)
Female partner 2nd stage \times Mixed team 1st stage (β_3)	-0.227 (0.141)	-0.104 (0.146)	-0.435*** (0.154)	0.002 (0.153)	-0.034 (0.192)	0.093 (0.200)	-0.404* (0.229)	-0.015 (0.227)
N. of obs.	351	380	351	380	351	380	351	380
Mean dep. var. gender-homogenous teams	4.48	4.45	4.48	4.49	4.09	4.07	0.02	-0.00
Subject-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
$\beta_4 \coloneqq \beta_1 + \beta_3$	0.089	0.049	-0.079	0.034	0.312	0.248	0.140	0.158
$\beta_4 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.437	0.671	0.556	0.772	0.025	0.126	0.452	0.374
$\beta_5 \coloneqq \beta_2 + \beta_3$	-0.009	0.083	-0.256	0.190	-0.028	0.137	-0.172	0.222
$\beta_5 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value)	0.919	0.385	0.009	0.068	0.853	0.342	0.267	0.150
$\beta_1 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.011	0.567	0.000	0.995	0.139	0.774	0.000	0.369
$\beta_2 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.447	0.453	0.588	0.481	0.999	0.996	0.445	0.398
$\beta_3 = 0$ (<i>p</i> -value MHT)	0.563	0.973	0.086	0.988	0.998	0.996	0.296	0.953

Gender Gap in Number of Turns Over Time

