Group Decis Negot (2008) 17:65–77
DOI 10.1007/s10726-007-9087-5

Cultural variation in response to strategic emotions in negotiations

Shirli Kopelman · Ashleigh Shelby Rosette

Published online: 27 July 2007

Abstract This research examined how culture influences the effectiveness of the strategic displays of emotions in negotiations. We predicted that in cross-cultural negotiation settings, East Asian negotiators who highly regarded cultural values that are consistent with communicating respect as humility and deference would be more likely to accept an offer from an opposing party who displayed positive as opposed to negative emotion. With a sample of East Asian MBA students, the results of Study 1 confirmed this prediction. Study 2 results replicated this finding with a sample of Hong Kong executive managers and also found they were less likely to accept an offer from a negotiator displaying negative emotion than Israeli executive managers who did not hold humility and deference in such high regard. Implications for strategic display of emotions in cross-cultural settings are discussed.

Keywords Emotion · Affect · Culture · Negotiation · Strategy · Decision making · Ultimatum bargaining · Distributive gains · Saving face

1 Introduction

Displayed emotions significantly influence negotiation tactics, negotiation processes, and, perhaps most important, negotiated outcomes. In recent years, the study of emotions in interdependent decision-making settings has garnered increased attention from negotiation researchers (see Barry et al. 2006 for a review). In our previous research (Kopelman et al. 2006), we focused on the display of emotions as a deliberate negotiation strategy and showed that, in an ultimatum setting, negotiators who intentionally displayed positive emotions were

S. Kopelman (✉)
Ross School of Business, University of Michigan, 701 Tappan Street,
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1234, USA
e-mail: shirli@bus.umich.edu

A. S. Rosette
Fuqua School of Business, Duke University, One Towerview Rd., Box 90120, Durham,
NC 27708-0120, USA
e-mail: arosette@duke.edu

more likely to reach an agreement than were negotiators who purposely displayed negative emotions. Consistent with much of the existing research on emotions and negotiations, our theory and hypotheses centered on the norms, values, and behaviors that are most common to negotiators from the United States. While it is important to understand how U.S. negotiators interpret emotion-laden behaviors of other U.S. negotiators, it is equally important to understand how cultural backgrounds and interpretation of displayed emotion may impact negotiated outcomes. Thus, the purpose of the current research was to build on our previous findings and to investigate how negotiators from different cultures interpret the emotions displayed by U.S. negotiators and to examine how these interpretations may influence the negotiated outcomes.

We hypothesize that when displayed emotions are used as a deliberate negotiation tactic, there must be a good fit between the emotions displayed by the focal negotiator and the cultural values held by the opposing party. If an emotional display violates cultural norms, it may damage the social relationship and decrease the likelihood of a negotiated agreement because cultural values and norms provide a context for interpreting emotional display during negotiations. Whereas a positive display of emotion may lead to effective outcomes when communicating with negotiators who value accord and harmony, negative displayed emotion may be more important when communicating with negotiators who expect to engage in arduous haggling. In this paper, we examine the impact of strategic displays of both positive and negative emotion in cross-cultural negotiation contexts.

2 Strategic display of emotion in negotiations

We conceptualize strategic display of emotion as emotion intentionally expressed by the focal negotiator to attain a desired outcome. Whether the strategic display of emotion represents emotion psychologically experienced at the moment (i.e., the negotiator strategically "harnesses felt emotions," perhaps exaggerating them) or whether it represents deliberately feigned emotion (i.e., the negotiator "wears an emotional mask" hiding experienced emotions), skilled negotiators may intentionally adjust their emotional display in a desired direction by either amplifying or suppressing their expressed emotion (Hochschild 1983; Levenson 1994). Although the display of emotion may be more difficult (DePaulo et al. 2003) in some situations (e.g., when a negotiator displaying emotion believes he is being unethically deceptive), recent research has demonstrated that negotiators can convincingly display both positive and negative emotion, and that these emotions influence negotiation outcomes (Kopelman et al. 2006; Sinaceur and Tiedens 2006).

Consistent with the social psychology literature that suggests that positive affect leads to better decisions and improved consequences for social actors (see Isen 1987 for a review), positive affect during negotiations has been shown to increase cooperative tactics (Forgas 1998) and generate higher individual and joint gains (Baron 1990; Carnevale and Isen 1986).[1] Furthermore, strategically displayed positive emotion has been shown to increase the likelihood of a future business relationship between parties subsequent to a dispute (Kopelman et al. 2006). Possible explanations for why negotiators in a positive mood are more effective include higher creativity (Carnevale and Isen 1986), setting higher goals (Baron 1990), and focusing on the interests of both parties (Kopelman et al. 2005). Interestingly, positive affect of powerful negotiators predicts negotiators' trust for each other and whether they reach integrative outcomes (Anderon and Thompson 2005). With respect to distributive tactics, negotiators displaying positive emotion are both more likely to close a

[1] Affect is considered a superordinate category that includes both emotion and mood (Barry and Oliver 1996).

deal in an ultimatum setting and gain concessions on price from the other party (Kopelman et al. 2006).

Display of negative emotion also can be an effective negotiation strategy. Sinaceur and Tiedens (2006) found that the strategic display of anger was effective in extracting value in face-to-face negotiations, but only when the other party perceived his own alternatives to be weak. Likewise, in an experimental design where a negotiator received a computer mediated text message from the opponent, negotiators who had low power made larger concessions when they believed they faced an angry versus happy negotiator (Van Kleef et al. 2004a). Thus, a relatively powerful negotiator who convincingly displays anger may be able to position the distributive negotiation outcomes in his favor.

Although display of negative emotion can be advantageous during negotiations, there are risks to displaying negative emotion as a negotiation tactic. Given that emotions are contagious (Hatfield et al. 1993), convincing displays of anger could, for example, generate a retaliatory response from the other party that leads to a conflict spiral (Ury et al. 1988), as well as lower joint gains (Allred et al. 1997). For instance, insulting offers that generate negative affect are rejected in certain ultimatum bargaining settings (Pillutla and Murnighan 1996). Interestingly, although due to emotional contagion, expression of anger often lowers the resolution rate in mediation, it has been shown not to hinder settlements when respondents are especially vulnerable (Friedman et al. 2004).

There are several mechanisms by which strategically displayed emotion, whether positive or negative, may impact the social interaction between negotiators. First, displayed emotion may convey information and influence strategic information gathering and processing (Van Kleef et al. 2004b). Second, displayed emotions may serve as a means of persuasion (e.g. Forgas 2001) and thus may constitute a manipulative negotiation tactic that leads the other party to respond in a manner that otherwise would not have been a first choice. Either as a form of information exchange or as a manipulative tactic, if emotional display violates cultural values and norms, the strategy may not only be ineffective, but if it damages the social relationship, it may also be counter-productive to the negotiation process and outcomes.

3 Culture and strategic display of emotions

Culture consists of interrelated patterns or dimensions which come together to form a unique social identity shared by a minimum of two or more people (Deutsch 1973). It is the unique configuration of a social groups' values and norms that set it apart from other social groups and impacts negotiation processes and outcomes (Brett 2001; Lytle et al. 1995). Values refer to what a person considers important, whereas norms refer to what is considered appropriate behavior (Katz and Kahn 1978). Values and norms provide insight into the choices made by cultural group members (Abelson 1981; Fiske and Taylor 1991) and influence negotiators' cognitions, emotions, motivations (Markus and Kitayama 1991), and strategy (Barry 1999). Specifically, because of values and norms, people from different cultures negotiate differently (Brett 2001;Leung and Tjosfold 1998; Morrison et al. 1994). As such, cultural values and norms shape implicit theories invoked in negotiations (Gelfand and Dyer 2000) and may influence a negotiator's response to strategically displayed emotions.

Face is one cultural dimension that is likely to be important when evaluating displayed emotions during negotiations. Face is a multi-faceted term, and its meaning is inextricably linked to culture and social relationships. Ting-Toomey (1988) defined face as the interaction between the consideration one party offers to another party and the sense of self-respect made known by both parties. In its simplest form, face involves how people think others see

them in social situations and is an inherent communication of respect. Perhaps one of the most familiar terms when considering face in cross-cultural contexts is the idea of "saving face," which means to be respectful in public. Across different cultures, face is associated with concerns such as respect, honor, and reputation (Oetzel et al. 2001). The concept of face includes the aspect of social image presented to others, such that people who value face or want to "save face" want the respect of others because others' respect validates their own self-worth; whereas disrespect or losing face invalidates it. Understanding the cultural concept of face is central to self-presentation and evaluation of individual-level behavior in social exchanges (Earley 2001).

Saving face or losing face has different levels of importance depending on the culture. Although face is not inconsequential to people from individualist societies, it seems to be a central cultural value to people from collectivist cultures (Oetzel et al. 2001). Whether in collectivist cultures such as Hong Kong or Japan, or individualist cultures such as the U.S. (Brett 2001), respect is the driving mechanism that underlies the face construct. Respect is defined as the level of esteem for another individual based on one's own values (Cronin 2004). Just as saving face and losing face have differing levels of cultural importance, the communication of respect also varies among cultures. Although there is great heterogeneity in the norms and values held by individuals residing in East Asian countries, the communication of respect is largely consistent and occurs through humility in social interactions, deference to authority, and minimal (if any) disagreement (Hofstede 1980; Schwartz 1994). Accordingly, displayed emotions of arrogance, direct confrontation, and open arguments or quarrels communicate disrespect. We posit that positive displayed emotion may play a critical role for East Asian negotiators because positive emotion is consistent with the way in which they typically communicate respect. In Study 1, we investigated whether this predicted congruence influenced negotiation outcomes.

4 Study 1

East Asian negotiators attune to variation in displayed emotion because they consider emotional control to be an important part of business transactions (Sanchez-Burks et al. 2000; Sanchez-Burks 2005). Previous research has shown that cultural factors influence ideal affect more than actual affect (Tsai et al. 2006). Although they may not differ with regard to how they actually feel, they may idealize positive affect because humility and deference to authority are more congruent with being kind, friendly, and polite (displays of positive emotion) than with being angry and rude (displays of negative emotion). Positive displayed emotion may help facilitate the communication of respect during the negotiation process which can lead to an enhanced social relationship and a better negotiated outcome (Drolet and Morris 2000; McGinn and Keros 2002; Moore et al. 1999). Hence, we hypothesize that East Asian negotiators who value respect as humility and deference will be more likely to accept an offer proposed by a U.S. negotiator who strategically displays positive emotion than a U.S. negotiator who strategically displays negative emotion. This hypothesis was tested in Study 1.

4.1 Methods

4.1.1 Participants

Twenty-eight East Asian MBA students (22 men, 6 women) enrolled in a global MBA program in the U.S. participated in a 4-h negotiation workshop. The MBA program

began with a three-month introductory session held in Japan, China, and Korea; however, the remainder of the program was conducted in a business school located in the Midwestern U.S. The average age of the participants was 31.52 years ($SD = 4.19$ years). Eighteen participants were Japanese, four were Korean, three were Thai, two were Chinese, and one was Taiwanese. Participants were randomly assigned to the two experimental conditions by a web-based survey through which the entire negotiation task was conducted. The study consisted of a single factor (emotion: positive, negative) between subject design.

4.1.2 Task, procedure, and measures

Prior to the 4-h negotiation workshop participants were asked to complete an online questionnaire and a simulated negotiation exercise. The questionnaire measured their cultural values and was completed before the participants took part in the simulated exercise. The simulation involved an ultimatum bargaining situation in which the focal party (proposer) presented the recipient (target) with a take-it-or-leave-it offer, which the target could either accept or reject. In the simulation, participants were asked to assume the role of the target negotiator, a person getting married in a few months. The background information provided details about a catering service under consideration for their upcoming wedding. The business manager of the catering company had given them a good faith estimate of $14,000 several months ago to provide catering service for their wedding reception. The background information also mentioned an alternative catering company that would be available on their wedding date. However, participants were told that they had not had direct contact with that company, nor did they fully trust the person who recommended it. Finally, participants were told that they would soon meet with the business manager of the preferred catering company to finalize the financial arrangements. The "meeting" with the business manager was conducted by randomly presenting participants with one of two videos of a professional actress acting as the business manager. The actress presented the same informational content in both videos: positive (Video 1) or negative (Video 2). The actress was a Caucasian American woman in her early thirties.

The videos served as the experimental manipulation. In Video 1, the business manager in a friendly tone, smiled often, nodded her head in agreement, and appeared cordial and inviting. In Video 2, the business manager spoke antagonistically, appeared intimidating and irritated. Prior research has demonstrated that these videos effectively manipulated positive and negative emotions (Kopelman et al. 2006).

In both emotional conditions, the business manager explained that the price of the reception had increased from $14,000 to $16,995 due to market price fluctuations since the estimate was presented. The business manager ended the meeting by stating that another couple was interested in the same date, indicating that if the participant did not sign the contract immediately this option would no longer be available. After viewing the video, participants viewed a form that looked like the actual business contract in the video. The contract asked them to either accept or reject the proposed $16,995 invoice. Because all target negotiators received an objectively equivalent offer that only differed in the strategic emotional approach displayed by the business manager, differences in outcomes could be attributed to the strategic emotional display. After participants made their decision, they were asked to complete a post-questionnaire labeled as a "Customer Satisfaction" survey. The task was later debriefed during the 4-hour negotiation workshop.

4.1.3 Measures

Cultural values. We used questions from the online pre-questionnaire that included Schwartz's survey of values (1994) to assess if the participants were likely to value respect as humility and deference. According to Schwartz, conformity refers to the restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms. Tradition refers to the respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture provides the self. Schwartz's measures for tradition and conformity served as proxy measures for valuing respect as humility and deference. Items for conformity included politeness, self discipline, honoring of parents, and obedience (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.74$). Items for tradition included respect for tradition, moderate, humble, accepting, and helpful (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.79$). Items were measured on a 9-point Likert-type scale anchored by –1 (opposed to my values) and 7 (of supreme importance). We did not center the participants' score on each separate item around the average rating as recommended by Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) because we compared the East Asian negotiators' rating of tradition and conformity to the mid-point benchmark of the cultural values scale (3). A high score on each of the measures suggested that the participants valued respect as behaviors that are akin to tradition and conformity as described by Schwartz (1994), such as humility in social interactions and deference to authority. Conformity and tradition were significantly correlated ($r = 0.76, p = 0.01$).

Emotional display. Questions included in the post-questionnaire survey ascertained whether the emotional content of the video was successfully perceived by the participants. This served as a manipulation check. Participants used a Likert-type scale anchored by 1 (not at all) and 5 (very much) to evaluate the extent to which the manager was positive or negative. A composite score for positive emotional display included three items: friendly, nice, and considerate (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.80$). A composite score for negative emotional display included four items: aggressive, angry, annoyed, and irritated (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.75$).

Outcome measures. The dependent variable was the participant's decision to either accept or reject the offer made by the business manager. The acceptance or rejection of the offer was a dichotomous variable.

4.2 Results

4.2.1 Sampling check

The mid-point for the Likert-type scale used to assess tradition and conformity was 3 [i.e., the halfway point between −1 (opposed to my values) and 7 (of supreme importance)]. Thus, we used this value as a benchmark to assess the importance of the tradition and conformity values to the participants in the study. As expected, the mean scores on conformity ($M = 4.35$, SD = 1.17; $t(1, 26) = 5.99$, $p < 0.001$) and tradition ($M = 3.52$, SD = 1.28; $t(1, 26) = 2.10$, $p < 0.05$) were significantly higher than the midpoint of the scale for the East Asian negotiators in our sample. These high scores suggest that these cultural values were of some importance to participants in the study.

4.2.2 Manipulation check

The results of a MANOVA that included positive and negative composite measures as dependent variables showed that the manipulation of positive and negative display of emotion was effective. Participants in the positive display condition ($M = 3.17$, SD = 0.63) felt that the manager was more positive than did participants in the negative display condition ($M = 2.50$,

SD = 0.51; $F(1, 26) = 42.29$, $p < 0.001$), and that participants in the negative display condition ($M = 3.59$, SD = 0.70) felt that the manager was more negative than did participants in the positive display condition ($M = 1.70$, SD = 0.48; $F(1, 26) = 21.77$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, the East Asian negotiators in the sample identified a U.S. manager's positive and negative emotional display.

4.2.3 Negotiation outcomes

We hypothesized that the East Asian negotiators in the sample would be more likely to accept a proposal from a positive negotiator than a negative negotiator. This hypothesis was confirmed. East Asian negotiators were more likely to accept a proposal from a positive negotiator (35.5%) than a negative negotiator (0%, $\chi^2(1, N = 28) = 4.94$, $p = 0.026$). In fact, not one of the East Asian negotiators accepted the offer put forth by the negative negotiator.

4.3 Discussion

The findings of this study provide support for our prediction that East Asian negotiators would be more likely to accept an offer presented by a U.S. negotiator who displayed positive emotions than a U.S. negotiator who displayed negative emotions. In fact, not a single negotiator who received an offer from the U.S. negotiator who displayed negative emotions chose to accept the offer. This suggests that for East Asian negotiators, their cultural value of respect as humility and deference may not be particularly compatible with the display of negative emotions in an ultimatum bargaining setting. Study 2 was designed to replicate this finding and compare the responses of East Asian negotiators who value respect as humility and deference to the responses of negotiators from cultures that communicate more directly. We hypothesize that negotiators who do not hold humility and deference in such high regard may be less sensitive to the display of negative emotions in business contexts.

5 Study 2

The objective of Study 2 was to try to better understand the effect of strategically displayed emotion during the negotiating process. The study compared the reactions of negotiators from Hong Kong to a proposal made by a U.S. negotiator who displayed positive or negative emotions with the reaction of Israeli negotiators. Unlike many East Asian negotiators who may value respect as deference and humility, Israeli negotiators generally do not shy away from direct confrontation and actually may expect the display of negative emotions during negotiations (Brett 2001). In fact, research has shown that in Israel, the display of negative emotions is routine and customary and is anticipated in a wide array of professional settings (Rafaeli and Ravid 2005, unpublished manuscript). Although mutual respect is important, respect is not always reflected by a concern for face.

To the contrary, a culture of *dugri* (straight talk) is common in Israel (Katriel 1986). *Dugri* speech is straightforward, bold, assertive, and sincere and rests on the belief that frankness is conducive to group longevity (Erez and Earley 1993). In a study comparing Israeli and American managers, Shamir and Melnick (2002) note that to an outsider, the tendency of Israelis to talk *Dugri* can be perceived as representing impoliteness, rudeness, or even aggressive behavior. In contrast, Israelis "sometimes perceived the American tendency to refrain from direct and candid speech as hypocritical or 'phony"' (p. 223). Thus, in Israeli culture,

it is normative to engage in blunt confrontation, argue, and at times raise one's voice as the conversation and negotiations ensue. Accordingly, if Israelis value disagreement, when negative emotions are displayed by the opposing party, Israeli negotiators are not likely to view this as a sign of disrespect, but as a signal that the opposing party is concerned and is passionately engaged in the task.

Thus, whereas positive displayed emotions may lead to effective outcomes when dealing with negotiators who value respect as humility and deference, negative displayed emotions may be more effective when communicating with negotiators who exhibit respect by engaging in intense task conflict while attempting to reach an agreement. Based on these cultural differences, we hypothesize that negotiators from Hong Kong, a culture which values face and respect that is communicated through humility and deference, will be less likely than negotiators from Israel, a culture who does not hold humility and deference in such high regard, to accept an offer proposed by a U.S. negotiator displaying negative emotion.

5.1 Methods

5.1.1 Participants

Seventy-six executive MBA students (56 men, 20 women) from Hong-Kong (42) and Israel (34) participated in the study as part of a negotiation course. Expatriates from other countries who participated in the course were excluded from the study. The average age of the participants was 38.26 years ($SD = 5.39$). The study consisted of a two (emotional display: positive, negative) by two (national culture: Hong Kong, Israel) between-subject factorial design.

5.1.2 Task, procedure, and measures

Approximately 4 weeks prior to participating in the study, study participants completed a pre-questionnaire to assess their cultural values. During the course they completed the same task as described in Study 1; however, it was a pen-and-paper task. Participants were randomly assigned to different rooms where they viewed the positive or negative video. Afterwards, participants were given a form that looked like the actual business contract in the video, which asked them to accept the proposed invoice. After participants had made their decision, they were asked to complete a brief version of the "Customer Satisfaction" survey. They were debriefed in the following class session. The emotional display variable (manipulation check) and the outcome variable (accept or reject) were similar to the variables described in Study 1.

Just as in Study 1, tradition and conformity measures from Schwartz's (1994) survey of values were used to assess the way in which the participants communicated respect. We hypothesized that the participants from Hong Kong would attain higher scores on these two measures than would the Israeli participants. A higher score would indicate that they were more likely to value respect as deference and humility, whereas a lower score would suggest that these values are less important. In addition, because these two sample populations may utilize these cultural value scales differently, we centered the participant's score on each separate item around the average rating provided by each participant as recommended by Schwartz and Sagiv (1995). Thus, a more positive score would suggest that conformity or tradition was valued more than the average cultural value rating provided by the participant, whereas a more negative score would suggest that conformity or tradition was less valued. Conformity and tradition were significantly correlated ($r = 0.41$, $p = 0.01$).

5.2 Results

5.2.1 Manipulation check

The manipulations were effective. On a Likert-like scale anchored by the values 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*), participants in the positive emotion display condition ($M = 5.10$, SD = 1.74) felt that the manager displayed more positive emotions than did participants in the negative emotion display condition ($M = 1.30$, SD = 0.46; $F(1, 70) = 153.79$, $p < 0.001$). Similarly, participants in the negative display condition ($M = 5.35$, SD = 2.25) felt that the manager displayed more negative emotions than did the participants in the positive display condition ($M = 3.83$, SD = 1.91; $F(1,68) = 9.25$, $p < 0.01$). In addition, there were no significant differences noted between the Hong Kong and Israeli negotiators in the positive and negative emotion display conditions.

5.2.2 Cultural values

The participants differed on the cultural values in the predicted direction. Hong Kong negotiators ($M = 0.06$, SD = 0.65) valued conformity more so than did Israeli negotiators ($M = -0.27$, SD = 0.77; $F(1,74) = 4.00$, $p < 0.05$. Similarly, Hong Kong negotiators ($M = -1.29$, *SD*=1.04) valued tradition more so than did Israeli negotiators ($M = -1.99$, SD = 1.04, $p < 0.01$). These differences in cultural values suggest that the Hong Kong and Israeli negotiators valued humility and deference differently. These analyses demonstrate that the samples reflect the cultural differences upon which our hypotheses were based.

5.3 Reactions to the ultimatum

We hypothesized that the Hong Kong negotiators would be more likely to accept a proposal from a negotiator displaying positive emotion than a negotiator displaying negative emotion. Consistent with Study 1 findings, this hypothesis was confirmed. Hong Kong negotiators were more likely to accept a proposal from a negotiator displaying positive emotion (71%) than a negotiator displaying negative emotion (14%, $\chi^2(1, N = 42) = 12.21$, $p < 0.001$). We further hypothesized that Hong Kong negotiators would be less likely than Israeli negotiators to accept an offer from a negotiator displaying negative emotion. This hypothesis was also confirmed. Hong Kong negotiators (14%) were less likely than Israeli negotiators (50%, $\chi^2(1, N = 33) = 4.6$, $p < 0.05$) to accept an offer tendered by a negotiator displaying negative emotion. In addition, although no hypotheses were made about the reaction of Israeli negotiators to proposals made by a negotiator displaying positive emotion, 57% of Israeli negotiators accepted the offer proposed by the negotiator displaying positive emotions. Interestingly, Israeli negotiators were not as sensitive to the differences in emotional displays as were the Hong Kong negotiators. They were as likely to accept a deal whether the U.S. negotiator displayed positive (57%) or negative (50%) emotions ($\chi^2(1, N = 33) = 0.17$, ns).

5.4 Discussion

Consistent with our Study 1 findings, East Asian negotiators were more likely to accept an offer from a U.S. negotiator who displayed positive rather than negative emotions in an ultimatum bargaining setting. This finding suggests that for East Asian negotiators a display of positive emotions may be more compatible with their cultural values. In addition, when presented with an offer from a negative negotiator, the Hong Kong negotiators' acceptance

rate was significantly lower than the acceptance rate of the Israeli negotiators. Unlike the Hong Kong negotiators, the Israeli negotiators were just as likely to accept an offer from a positive U.S. negotiator as a negative U.S. negotiator. Given that the Israeli negotiators valued humility and deference less than the Hong Kong negotiators, the display of emotion may not have been "entangled" with a communication of respect. Accordingly, the Israeli negotiators may have been just as comfortable receiving information from a negative negotiator as a positive negotiator.

6 General discussion

Taken together, the findings of Studies 1 and 2 suggest that negotiators who hold differing cultural values may interpret the strategic display of emotions quite differently, and these distinct interpretations may influence negotiated outcomes. This research contributes to the negotiation literature on emotions by recognizing that although the expression and recognition of displayed emotion may be somewhat universal (Ekman 1972), the ability for strategic displayed emotions to impact the negotiation process and outcomes may vary by culture. The East Asian and Israeli negotiators in the samples successfully differentiated and identified strategically displayed positive and negative emotion as portrayed by a U.S. negotiator; however, the findings suggest that their reactions to these displays may have been influenced by cultural values and norms. Positive displayed emotion may be especially important when communicating with negotiators from East Asian cultures who value face and consider respect to include humility and deference because positive displayed emotion appears to be consistent with these cultural values. In addition, negative displayed emotion seems to be inconsistent with what is normative or expected by the East Asian negotiators in these two studies.

In contrast, negative displayed emotion does not appear to be incongruent with the values and norms of the Israeli negotiators. For Israeli negotiators, face appears to have been less of a concern; to the contrary, "saying it as it is" or being "in your face" — a culture of *dugri* .(Katriel 1986; Rafaeli and Ravid 2005, unpublished manuscript; Shamir and Melnick 2002) — may have legitimized the public display of negative emotion. This may help to explain why these negotiators were not particularly averse to closing a deal with a negotiator who displayed negative emotion. Understanding the cultural context in which emotions are displayed is important for strategically implementing them.

A contextual model of culture, such as the model recommended by Gelfand and Dyer (2000) that considers other situational and dispositional factors, may help illuminate the psychological mechanisms that moderate and mediate the effect of displayed emotions on negotiation processes and outcomes. For example, the East Asian negotiators who faced a U.S. negotiator strategically displaying negative emotion may have felt they were being mistreated or were not respected, but this interpretation may not have been shared by Israeli negotiators facing the same negotiator. When displaying emotion as a deliberate negotiation tactic, there should be a good fit between the emotions displayed by the focal negotiator and the cultural values that are held by the target negotiator. Future research is necessary to better understand how culture interacts with psychological factors and impacts the effect of emotional display during negotiations.

This research has several limitations. First, although the use of a professional actor displaying emotions in a video offered experimental control, this methodology created a unilateral display of emotion that introduced several boundary conditions. Participants were constrained in their ability to reciprocally influence the target negotiator. Given the ultimatum setting,

they were also constrained in the role of responder, and their range of responses was limited to a dichotomous decision of accept or reject. Furthermore, the display of emotion was culturally constrained because the actor in all conditions was from the U.S. Thus, the experiment simulated an inter-cultural negotiation exchange, and responses to emotional display may differ in an intra-cultural group setting. Likewise, the context of the negotiation, closing a deal with a wedding caterer, could have an effect on findings. Finally, the U.S. negotiator was female and gender effects may also play out differently in distinct cultures and in inter- versus intra-cultural settings. Despite these methodological limitations, this research suggests that it is important to examine strategic display of emotion during negotiations in the context of cultural values and norms.

Whether culture is conceptualized at the national or organizational level, norms for what is considered appropriate behavior in distinct situations needs to be considered. With the tide of research in many areas of management focusing on emotion, mood, and social relationships (e.g. Barry et al. 2006; McGinn 2006), the movement away from models exclusively focusing on cognitive factors presents uncharted territory for the research scholar. It also has implications for managers negotiating globally who will need to distinguish between general negotiation strategies and those tactics that are culturally specific. For example, our findings suggest that a U.S. negotiator experiencing frustration, anger, or impatience should be careful when expressing these negative emotions to an East Asian business partner, especially in a one-shot deal when a relationship has not yet been developed. In contrast, when negotiating with an Israeli business associate, a U.S. manager should anticipate that conflict in Israeli culture is more normative than in the U.S. and it is not considered to be disrespectful when associates argue and engage in a lively back and forth exchange. That is, in Israeli culture, there may be a clear and obvious distinction between task conflict and relationship conflict. Knowledge of the cultural values and norms of the other party is important to attain prior to a negotiation; however, recent research on culture and negotiations cautions negotiators from over-adjusting negotiation behavior to accommodate expected cultural differences (Adair et al. 2005). Our research suggests that when negotiators display emotions, they must consider how these emotions will be interpreted by the other party and whether cultural values and norms will play a role in influencing the other party's emotions and subsequent negotiation behaviors.

Acknowledgments We would like to thank the participants of the International Association of Conflict Management Conference in Seville in 2005 and the Affect and Emotions in Organizational Behavior Meeting in Rotterdam in 2005. We would also like to thank Lilach Sagiv, Jeffrey Sanchez-Burks, Leigh Thompson, as well as our colleagues from our respective departments for feedback on earlier versions of this paper. Finally, we would like to thank our research assistants Esther Hin Wai Wu, Reid Spearin, and Akshaya Varghese.

References

Abelson RP (1981) Psychological status of the script concept. Am Psychol 36(7): 715–729

Adair WL, Taylor MS, Tinsley C (2005) U.S. and Japanese schemas for inter-cultural negotiation: A tale of overadjustment? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Conflict Management Division. Honolulu, Hawaii

Allred KG, Mallozzi JS, Matsui F, Raia CP (1997) The influence of anger and compassion on negotiation performance. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 70(3): 175–187

Anderon C, Thompson LL (2005) Affect from the top down: how powerful individuals' positive affect shapes negotiations. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 95(2): 125–139

Baron (1990) Environmentally induced positive affect: its impact on self-efficacy, task performance, negotiation, and conflict. J Appl Soc Psychol 20(5): 368–384

Barry B, Fulmer IS, Goates N (2006) Bargaining with feeling: emotionality in and around negotiation. In: Thompson LL (ed) Neotiation theory and research. Psychosocial Press, New York
Barry B (1999) The tactical use of emotion in negotiation. In: Bies RJ, Lewicki RJ (eds) Research in negotiation in organization (Vol. 7). JAI Press, Stamford, CT, pp. 93–121
Barry B, Oliver RL (1996) Affect in dyadic negotiation: a model and propositions. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 67(2): 127–143
Brett JM (2001) Negotiating globally. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco
Carnevale PJ, Isen AM (1986) The influence of positive affect and visual access on the discovery of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 37(1): 1–13
Cronin MA (2004) The effect of respect on interdependent work. Carnegie Mellon University.
DePaulo BM, Lindsay JJ, Malone BE, Muhlenbruck L, Charlton K, Cooper H (2003) Cues to deception. Psychol Bull 129(1): 74–118
Deutsch M (1973) The resolution of conflict. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT
Drolet A, Morris MW (2000) Rapport in conflict resolution: accounting for how face-to-face contact fosters mutual cooperation in mixed-motive conflicts. J Exp Soc Psychol 36(1): 26–50
Earley PC (2001) Understanding social motivation from an interpersonal perspecive: Organizational face theory. In: Ernez M, Kleinbeck U, Thierry H (eds) Work motivation in the context of a gloalizing economy. Lawerence Erlbaum Associates publishers, Marwah, NJ
Ekman P (1972) Universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. In: Cole J (ed) Nebraska symposium on motivation 1971. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln
Erez M, Earley CP (1993) Culture, self-identity, and work. Oxford University Press, New York
Fiske ST, Taylor SE (1991) Social cognition, 2nd edn. McGraw-Hill, New York
Forgas JP (1998) On feeling good and getting your way: mood effects on negotiator cognition and bargaining strategies. J Pers Soc Psychol 74(3): 565–577
Forgas JP (2001) On being moody but influential: the role of affect in social influence strategies. In: Forgas JP, Williams KD (eds) Social influence: direct and indirect processes, vol 21. Psychology Press, New York
Friedman R, Anderson C, Brett J, Olekalns M, Goates N, Lisco CC (2004) The positive and negative effects of anger on dispute resolution: evidence from electronically mediated disputes. J Appl Psychol 89(2): 369–376
Gelfand MJ, Dyer N (2000) A cultural perspective on negotiation: progress, pitfalls, and prospects. Appl Psychol 49(1): 62–99
Hatfield E, Cacioppo JT, Rapson RL (1993) Emotional contagion. Curr Dir Psychol Sci 2(3): 96–99
Hochschild AR (1983) The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling. University of California Press, Berkeley
Hofstede G (1980) Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values. Sage, Newbury Park, CA
Isen AM (1987) Positive affect, cognitive processes, and social behavior. In: Berkowitz L (ed) Advances in experimental social psychology, vol 20. Academic Press, San Diego, CA
Katriel T (1986) Talking straight: Dugri speech in Israeli sabra culture. Cambridge University Press, New York
Katz D, Kahn RL (1978) The social psychology of organizations, 2nd edn. John Wiley & Sons, New York
Kopelman S, Waugh C, Fredrickson B (2005) Positive emotions and interdependent outcomes in business relationships: implications for broaden and build theory and negotiations strategy. Symposium on Emotion in Social Conflict: Recent Developments and New Insights. International Association of Conflict Management (IACM), Seville, Spain
Kopelman S, Rosette AS, Thompson L (2006) The three faces of Eve: strategic displays of positive, negative, and neutral emotions in negotiations. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 99(1): 81–101
Leung K, Tjosfold D (1998) Conflict management in the Asia Pacific: assumptions and approaches in diverse cultures. John Wiley & Sons, Singapore
Levenson RW (1994) Emotional control: variations and consequences. In: Ekman P, Davidson RJ (eds) The nature of emotion. Oxford University Press, New York
Lytle AM, Brett JM, Barsness ZI, Tinsley CH, Janssens M (1995) A paradigm for confirmatory cross-cultural research in organizational behavior. In: Cummings LL, Staw FM (eds) Research in organizational behavior, vol 17. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT
Markus HR, Kitayama S (1991) Culture and the self: implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychol Rev 98(2): 224–253
McGinn KL (2006) Relationships and negotiations in context. In: Thompson LL (ed) Negotiation theory and research. Psychosocial Press, New York

McGinn KL, Keros AT (2002) Improvisation and the logic of exchange in socially embedded transactions. Adm Sci Quart 47(3): 442–473
Moore DA, Kurtzberg TR, Thompson LL, Morris MW (1999) Long and short routes to success in electronically mediated negotiations: group affiliations and good vibrations. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 77(1): 22–43
Morrison T, Conaway WA, Borden GA (1994) Hong Kong. In: Kiss, bow, or shake hands. Adams Media Corporation, Holbrook, MA
Oetzel J, Ting-Toomey S, Masumoto T, Yokochi Y, Pan X, Takai J et al (2001) Face and facework in conflict: a cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. Commun Monogr 68(3): 235–258
Pillutla MM, Murnighan JK (1996) Unfairness, anger, and spite: emotional rejections of ultimatum offers. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process 68(3): 208–224
Sanchez-Burks J, Nisbett R E, Ybarra O (2000) Cultural styles, relationship schemas, and prejudice against out-groups. J Pers Soc Psychol 79(2): 174–189
Sanchez-Burks J (2005) Protestant relational ideology: the cognitive underpinnings and organizational implications of an American anomaly. In: Kramer R, Staw B (eds) Research in organizational behavior: an annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews, vol 26. pp 267–308, Elsevier Science/JAI Press
Schwartz SH (1994) Beyond individualism/collectivism: new cultural dimensions of values. In: Kim U et al (eds) Individualism and collectivism: theory, method, and applications. Cross-cultural research and methodology series, vol 18. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA
Schwartz SH, Sagiv L (1995) Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. J Cross-Cult Psychol 26(1): 92–116
Shamir B, Melnick Y (2002) Boundary permeability as a cultural dimension: a study of cross cultural working relations between Americans and Israelis in high-tech organizations. Int J Cross Cult Manage 2: 219–238
Sinaceur M, Tiedens LZ (2006) Get mad and get more than even: when and why anger expression is effective in negotiations. J Exp Soc Psychol 42(3): 314–322
Ting-Toomey S (1988) Intercultural conflict styles: a face-negotiation theory. In: Kim Y, Gudykunst W (eds) Theories in intercultural communication. Sage, Newbury Park, CA
Tsai JL, Knutson B, Fung HH (2006) Cultural variation in affect valuation. J Pers Soc Psychol 90(2): 288–307
Ury WL, Brett JM, Goldberg SB (1988) Getting disputes resolved: Designing systems to cut the costs of conflict. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco
Van Kleef GA, De Dreu CKW, Manstead ASR (2004) The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. J Pers Soc Psychol 86: 57–76
Van Kleef GA, De Dreu CKW, Manstead ASR (2004) The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. J Pers Soc Psychol 87(4): 510–528