MICHIGAN
ROSS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Working Paper

The Power of Presence: Strategic Response to Displayed Emotions in Negotiations

Shirli Kopelman
Stephen M. Ross School of Business
at the University of Michigan

Ilan Gewurz
Attorney and Management Consultant

Vera Sacharin
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Power of Presence:

Strategic Response to Displayed Emotions in Negotiations

Shirli Kopelman
University of Michigan
Ross School of Business
701 Tappan Street, Office D3267
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1234
Tel: (734) 936-2767
Fax: (734) 764-3146
e-mail: shirli@bus.umich.edu

Ilan G. Gewurz
Attorney and Management Consultant
e-mail: ilan@gewurz.org

Vera Sacharin
University of Michigan
Department of Psychology
e-mail: vsachari@umich.edu

Abstract

This chapter extends the literature on the strategic display of emotions (Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006) and investigates how negotiators can optimize both their relational and economic outcomes through strategic responses to displayed emotions. First, we consider what information can be gained from observing the emotional display of someone during the negotiating process. Next we review what the negotiation literature suggests someone should do when faced with an individual displaying emotion—both positive and negative. We conclude by suggesting that future research needs to account for both the behavioral strategy a negotiator employs and the personal qualities of the negotiator. We suggest that the recommendations in the literature overemphasize strategic tactics and underemphasize the person employing those tactics. We argue that the success or failure of a strategic response to displayed emotions during the negotiating process pivots on the negotiator's ability to balance strategic tactics with his or her authentic presence.

The Power of Presence:

Strategic Response to Displayed Emotions in Negotiations

Negotiators constantly manage emotions. They manage their own emotions—both those they experience and those they display—as well as the emotions displayed by others. Emotions experienced by a negotiator during the negotiating process may be integral to the given task or merely the result of an unrelated event where the emotional impact has spilled over to the current situation (Lerner & Keltner, 2000). Such integral and incidental emotions may emerge unintentionally and be displayed mindlessly. Alternatively, negotiators may consciously adjust their emotional display to serve their objectives, by amplifying or suppressing an authentically experienced emotion, or altogether feigning a desired emotion (Hochschild, 1983; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991). Emotions are considered authentic when internally experienced and externally displayed emotions align (Coté, 2005). A growing body of empirical literature has documented how displays of emotion influence both financial and relational outcomes in negotiations (for a review see Barry, Fulmer, & Goates, 2006). However, the empirical literature has not addressed the choices negotiators face when responding to emotions displayed by other individuals.

Whether integral or incidental, subconscious or mindful, authentic or feigned, emotions that have a strategic impact on the negotiation process and outcome—*strategic emotions*—can be advantageous or counter-productive to the individual displaying the emotions (Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006). Strategic display of positive emotion helps the development of reciprocal long-term relationships in potentially integrative settings and increases the likelihood of closing a favorable deal in distributive settings. While pounding one's fist on the table and displaying discontent and anger might lead someone to make concessions during the negotiating

process (e.g., Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991; Sinaceur & Neale, 2005; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004a), the display may boomerang. For example, displayed anger may increase the likelihood of a spiteful response and thereby reduce the likelihood that an offer will be accepted (e.g., Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006; Pillutla & Murnighan, 1996). Skilled negotiators must consider not only their own strategic display of emotions, but also how to strategically respond to the emotions displayed by others.

This chapter extends the research on the *strategic display* of emotions during the negotiating process and investigates how negotiators can optimize both relational and economic outcomes through *strategic response* to displayed emotions. First, we consider what information can be gained from observing the emotional display of another individual during negotiations. Next we review what the negotiation literature suggests one should do when faced with someone displaying emotion—either positive or negative. We conclude by suggesting that future research needs to account for both the behavioral strategy a negotiator adopts and the personal qualities of the negotiator. We suggest that the recommendations in the literature overemphasize strategic tactics and underemphasize the person employing those tactics. We argue that the success or failure of a strategic response to displayed emotions during the negotiating process pivots on the responding negotiator's ability to balance strategic tactics with his or her authentic presence.

Emotional Displays as a Source of Information

Prior to responding, a negotiator can gain a number of important insights by observing and identifying the emotional displays of the other parties. Emotions are defined as relatively short-lived affective episodes. In contrast, moods are more general, stable, and diffuse and are either triggered by an identifiable event or brought on as a means to achieve an aspired end[1]

---

[1] Due to the relative paucity of research on emotions in negotiation, we review both the literature on emotions and the literature on mood as it relates to the topics discussed.

(e.g., Barry, 1999; Schwarz & Clore, 1996). The ability to recognize both positive and negative displays of emotion in social interactions is considered an evolutionary adaptive human characteristic (Ekman, 1993), which can have strategic implications for negotiators during the negotiation process. Research suggests that people across cultures recognize six basic facial displays of emotions: anger, disgust, fear, sadness, surprise, and happiness (Ekman, Friesen, & Ellsworth, 1972). In order to strategically respond to displayed emotions during the negotiating process, it is important to identify the emotions people display during negotiations, along with understanding what information they convey.

A growing body of empirical research has documented the influence of emotions on negotiation outcomes (e.g., Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, & Raia, 1997; Baron, 1990; Barry, 1999; Carnevale & Isen, 1986; Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006; Kopelman & Rosette, 2007; Kumar, 1997; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991; Sinaceur & Neale, 2005; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988; Thompson, Nadler, & Kim, 1999; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004a, 2004b). Although negotiators may experience and display mixed emotions during the negotiation process (Larsen, McGraw, & Cacioppo, 2001; Peters, Burraston, & Mertz, 2004), the negotiation literature has predominantly focused on singular emotional displays and drawn a relatively sharp distinction between positive and negative emotion, especially anger and happiness. Displayed emotion can provide insights about how an individual cognitively processes information, what the individual thinks about the situation, and the social relationships that develop between negotiators during the negotiating process.

How an Emotional Negotiator Cognitively Processes Information

How negotiators think has implications for both the negotiation process and the outcome. Emotions influence what information a negotiator will cognitively attend to, what is perceived as

important, and how much thought is exerted on a given task.

First, during the negotiation process, negotiators interpret information differently depending upon whether the information is congruent or incongruent with the emotion the negotiator is experiencing. Information which is congruent with the emotion will be processed more effectively. For example, sad negotiators will perceive arguments with a sad tone as more persuasive than arguments with an angry tone, because sad emotions are congruent with their current personal reality (DeSteno, Petty, Rucker, Wegener, & Braverman, 2004). Furthermore, they will identify sadness congruent words faster in a lexical decision task (Niedenthal, Halberstadt, & Setterlund, 1997). Likewise, a negotiator experiencing positive emotion is more likely to notice and remember positive information, and may even interpret ambiguous information in a positive light (Bower, 1991; Forgas, 1995; Forgas & Bower, 1987).

When experiencing positive as opposed to negative emotion during negotiations, negotiators may think and process information more broadly. Breadth of thought refers to what one sees as possible, the number of perceived alternatives, and level of creativity. From an evolutionary perspective, negative emotion is theoretically linked to narrowing in on specific behavioral options, which is necessary for survival in life-or-death situations (Tooby & Cosmides, 1990), whereas behaviors associated with positive emotion are relatively vague and underspecified. Positive emotion is more likely to occur when people feel safe and satiated (Fredrickson & Levenson, 1998; Frijda, 1986). Consequently, negotiators experiencing negative emotion such as anger or disgust are likely to focus narrowly on information that relates to the source of the emotion (Daly, 1991). This reduces the negotiator's ability to think broadly and generates a wide range of solution-oriented options, which may lead angry negotiators to achieve lower joint gains (Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, & Raia, 1997). In contrast, positive emotion

increases breadth of thought, creativity, flexibility in ideas, innovative problem solving (Fredrickson & Levenson, 1998; Fredrickson, 2001; Isen, 1987; Isen, Daubman, & Nowicki, 1987), more integrative offers in negotiations, and better joint outcomes (Carnevale & Isen, 1986).

Finally, emotions influence not only *breadth* of thought, but the *depth* of thought; that is, how much cognitive effort is exerted on processing the current task. According to Tiedens and Linton (2001), the degree to which a situation is perceived with high certainty is particularly important for understanding how deep or superficial information is processed. Both anger and happiness are considered high-certainty emotions (e.g., Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003). Thus, despite their differing valence, both anger and happiness lead to (Forgas, 1992) stereotypical information processing that relies on heuristics and scripts (Bodenhausen, Sheppard, & Kramer, 1994; Forgas, 1992; Tiedens, 2001). Information that is processed when one is in a happy mood is not necessarily worse than under a neutral mood but merely more script-driven, which under some circumstances can also be beneficial (e.g., in multi-tasking situations where cognitive resources are limited; Bless, Clore, Schwarz, & Golisano, 1996; Forgas, 1998; Forgas & Fiedler, 1996). In contrast to anger and happiness, sadness is a low-certainty emotion, which can lead to more careful information processing (Bless, Clore, Schwarz, & Golisano, 1996; Forgas & Fiedler, 1996). It is interesting to note that both angry and happy negotiators may process information more deeply during negotiations if aroused and motivated by the need to repair or maintain their mood (Wegener & Petty, 1994).

What an Emotional Negotiator Thinks About the Situation

Emotional display provides information to observers, not only about the processing of information, but about the content of the emotional negotiator's thinking. According to appraisal

theories (e.g., Frijda, 1986; Roseman, 1984; Scherer, 1984; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985), emotions result from immediate evaluations of a given situation. Thus, an emotional display signals information about how someone is interpreting a situation. It is interesting to note that similar appraisals occur whether emotional displays are experimentally manipulated or naturally expressed (Keltner, Ellsworth, & Edwards, 1993), which suggests that feigned emotional display can lead to similar appraisals as authentic emotional display (Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004b). Emotions can be differentiated along several appraisal dimensions, such as *responsibility*, *control*, and *urgency*, (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003). For example, anger, sadness, and happiness differ with regard to whom the emotional negotiator holds responsible for the situation, how much personal control they feel, and whether they experience a sense of urgency to act.

Anger, which is an especially common and potent emotion during negotiations, has been the focus of more research than other negative emotions (e.g., Allred, 1999 Sinaceur & Neale, 2005; Van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004a, 2004b). Research suggests that angry people have a tendency to blame others (Quigley & Tedeschi, 1996) and are likely to attribute higher responsibility to other parties when situations are ambiguous and open to interpretation (Keltner, Ellsworth, & Edwards, 1993). Disregarding the original source of their anger, they tend to evaluate others in a more negative light (DeSteno, Dasgupta, Bartlett, & Cajdric, 2004) and view these individuals as less trustworthy than those who are happy or sad (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005). Furthermore, angry negotiators may have a strong desire to take action against others (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000), which may lead them to take punitive actions against those who may not be the source of their anger (Goldberg, Lerner, & Tetlock, 1999; Lerner, Goldberg, & Tetlock, 1998). Anger is also associated with a sense of personal control and high certainty

about the course of events (Frijda, Kuipers, & ter Schure, 1989; Lerner & Keltner, 2001). Studies show that angry negotiators are more likely to engage in risk-seeking choices (Lerner & Keltner, 2001) during negotiations, have a tendency to behave optimistically about the likelihood of future positive events, and perceive less risk of future negative events (Lerner, Gonzalez, Small, & Fischhoff, 2003; Lerner & Keltner, 2000). In negotiations, angry negotiators are more likely to reject ultimatum offers (Pillutla & Murnighan, 1996), use competitive strategies (Forgas, 1998), and are likely to over-retaliate (Allred, 1999; Daly, 1991).

According to the Appraisal Tendency Framework (e.g., Lerner & Keltner, 2000), emotions experienced in one situation can lead to appraisal tendencies that carry over to novel situations and shape subsequent decision making. For example, the propensity for risk-seeking can carry over to subsequent but unrelated situations (Lerner, Gonzalez, Small, & Fischhoff, 2003) and is mediated by appraisals of control and certainty (Lerner & Keltner, 2001). In negotiations, displays of anger can signal that a negotiator is adamant about his/her position (Daly, 1991). Furthermore, a negotiator may have learned based on experience that displays of anger lead the responding party to make concessions—*the squeaky wheel often gets the grease* (Singelis, 1998); and these experiences may reinforce the negotiator's display of negative emotion.

In contrast to negative emotion, a happy negotiator feels relatively certain about the course of events during the negotiation process, feels in control, and may feel personal responsibility for the outcome (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003). Thus, with respect to appraisals of control and to some extent certainty, happiness is similar to anger. It differs, however, with respect to the tendency to take action in that a happy negotiator would not attribute responsibility of the situation to others and may therefore sense little urgency for change. A happy negotiator

also is less likely to take high risks (Isen & Patrick, 1983). Although there is no sense of urgent action, a happy negotiator is likely to engage in prosocial helping behavior (Batson, 1990; Batson, Coke, Chard, Smith, & Taliaferro, 1979). In negotiations, happy negotiators are more likely to share information and have an increased preference for and adoption of cooperative negotiation strategies (Baron, 1990; Forgas, 1998), which are associated with value creation and better joint outcomes (Carnevale & Isen, 1986).

Insights about how negotiators appraise situations with respect to personal responsibility, control, and certainty thus can help devise a different strategic response to displayed emotions, which might be very different in the case of negative versus positive emotion.

How Do Emotional Displays Influence Interpersonal Dynamics?

Emotional display not only provides information about how and what the other party thinks and feels during the negotiating process, but also impacts the social relationship between negotiating parties. Negotiators unconsciously mimic and synchronize behavioral expressions of emotion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1992), such that a smile will likely generate a smile in the other party. Likewise, negative emotion in one negotiator is usually responded to by negative emotion in another negotiator. Thus, one negotiator's emotion may reciprocally influence others' experienced and displayed emotion, whether or not the respective negotiators are mindful of these emotions—their own or others'. Such emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1992) naturally occurs whether displayed emotion is authentic or feigned.

Emotional contagion impacts the rapport between negotiators, as well as the likelihood of developing a productive long-term relationship. Good rapport is essential in negotiations since it predicts mutual cooperation (Drolet & Morris, 2000). Experts suggest that "the first thing negotiators should address during the information exchange stage is the mood or atmosphere at

the table—the rapport between the negotiators," (Shell, 2006, p. 140). In fact, it may be even more beneficial to establish rapport before negotiators actually meet. One of the central functions of the pre-negotiation period is to address the emotional and psychological barriers that impede official negotiations and create an atmosphere of common understanding (Gewurz, 2000). During the negotiation, inappropriate expression of emotion—whether negative or positive—can destroy trust (Adler, Rosen, & Silverstein, 1998) and harm rapport. Negotiators will consider emotional display as appropriate depending on their cultural background (Kopelman & Rosette 2007; Rafaeli & Ravid, 2005) and the given professional context of the negotiation (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988).

In professional settings, display of negative emotion is often considered inappropriate; negotiators who display such emotion risk harming rapport during the negotiating process. Because negotiators often have biased perceptions of who instigated a conflict (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997; Sillars, 1981), often blaming the other party and retaliating in response, conflict spirals are likely to emerge (Ury, Brett, & Goldberg, 1988). Displayed anger can lead to negative spirals or vicious cycles (Kumar, 1997) such that rapport is harmed and trust destroyed. Consequently, displayed anger may decrease negotiators' willingness to work together in the future (Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, & Raia, 1997).

Displayed happiness in contrast to anger can be beneficial for rapport because positive mood is associated with initiating conversations (Batson, Coke, Chard, Smith, & Taliaferro, 1979) and a preference for collaboration over avoidance (Baron, 1990). In negotiations, the display of positive emotion is associated with better rapport, as well as lower rates of impasse (Drolet & Morris, 2000; Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006; Moore, Kurtzberg, Thompson, & Morris, 1999; Thompson, Nadler, & Kim, 1999). Cooperative behavior increases trust

(Weingart et al., 1993), and trust is instrumental in enabling future interactions (Crosby, Evans, & Cowles, 1990). In fact, negotiators who strategically display positive emotion are more likely to include in their agreements provisions for future business relationships that increase joint outcomes (Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006).

Tactics for Strategically Responding to Emotional Display

Recognizing an emotional display and understanding its likely influence on the emotional party's mindset, appraisal of the situation, and the potential interpersonal dynamics can help a negotiator devise a strategic response that will optimize both the relational and economic negotiation outcomes. However, responding to displays of emotion during negotiations is a complex and dynamic process. Noting this, Adler, Rosen, and Silverstein (1998) followed their recommendations for how to deal with emotions with the following disclaimer: "In some situations, the best course of action may well be to do the opposite of what we counsel. Because of the complexity of life and human interaction, the only rule that works in all instances is 'it depends.'" Despite this complexity, the negotiation literature has produced an array of strategic advice for responding to emotional display during the negotiation process.

Responding to Negative Emotional Displays

The most common advice for strategic response to negative emotion offered within the negotiation literature is: "Whether you're negotiating with someone who is dangerously angry or only mildly annoying, the same skills are helpful in getting the results you want. Find out what your opponent wants... If you're successful, you can turn your adversaries into your partners," (Hackley, 2004, p. 5; Ury, 1993). There are numerous ways to achieve this objective: allowing the other party to vent their emotion, taking a break in the process in order to cool down, shifting the focus toward non-emotional interest-based discussion, or going "into" the negative emotion

in order for the party to recognize the unproductive consequences and shift their behavior. Regardless of the tactic, there is essentially one basic premise at the core of all these approaches. The underlying assumption is that in order to reach optimal outcomes, negotiators must overcome, one way or another, negative emotion (e.g., Fisher & Shapiro, 2005). This is premised on the assumption that positive emotion tends to enhance negotiators' ability to develop trust, expand the pie, and build long-term relationships, whereas negative emotion is generally seen as a barrier.

One approach for getting past unproductive negative displays of emotion is to get the underlying issues out into the open. The idea is that once negotiators vent hostility and tension, an interest-based solution is more likely to evolve, because "allowing the other party such a catharsis will clear the air and may permit negotiators to return to a calmer pace," (Lewicki, Saunders, & Minton, 1999, p. 415). For example, the literature on conflict management and conflict resolution suggests that hostility may diminish significantly if an individual's anger, resentment, and frustration are vented in front of the blamed party (Ury, Brett, & Goldberg, 1993). Research on procedural justice indicates that having a chance to express their disappointment often helps people take a significant step forward in the healing process (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The effectiveness of venting can be increased if the blamed party acknowledges the validity of these emotions or offers an apology (Goldberg, Green, & Sander, 1987). Ury, Brett, and Goldberg (1993) suggest that properly designed negotiations can structurally incorporate venting as a stage before actively engaging in other conflict management efforts.

For venting mechanisms to be effective, that is, to avoid falling into a trap of emotional contagion and vicious cycles, negotiators must be able to remain unaffected by an individual's display of negative emotion. In order to do so, negotiators can learn from the experience of

mediators who are trained to do just that. To this end, a mediator's ability to anticipate anger is extremely valuable. When interviewed about how mediators handle anger, Larry Susskind explained that he actually expects an emotional blow up and plans around it: "I expect it to happen. I expect someone to blow up, even though blowing up at their ally is stupid, but they'll do it anyway," (Forester, 1997, p. 350). Furthermore, mediators often absorb and deflect negative emotion: "The person will be glad you did it [let them vent], because they'll be the first to tell you that emotion overwhelmed logic at the time. They won't say it that way, but that's what happens. They'll say, 'The guy just ticked me off.' I expect that," (Forester, 1997, p. 350). Thus, the emotional individual may appreciate the opportunity to vent, but it is important to carefully allow the person to subsequently save face.

Perhaps, as neutral third parties, it is easier for mediators to provide a stage for display of negative emotion because the emotion typically is not targeted at them. Nonetheless, like a mediator, a negotiator directly confronted with a display of anger might imagine that the other person's anger is targeted at someone else, incidental to the current negotiation. Negotiators are sometimes coached to imagine an angry opponent is yelling at the wall behind them, not at them. Such metaphors or idioms like "let it slide off you, like water off a duck's back" help negotiators deflect anger that may or may not be targeted at them. Thompson (2005) noted that it is important not to react instinctively or behave defensively, no matter how misinformed or wrong one believes the other party to be. Instinct-based responses may lead to negative emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1992) and escalation of conflict, whereas a more mindful and emotionally incongruent response could be more constructive. A negotiator also may need to strategically repeat his or her response. Because angry negotiators process information both in a superficial manner and in a mood-congruent fashion, as discussed earlier, it

may take several statements until what is being said actually penetrates so that it can be heard in a neutral and well-intended way.

Although in some situations verbal venting may be productive, Carver and colleagues (1989) caution that venting is not the best way to move beyond the displayed negative emotion. Focusing on the negative could serve to highlight the barriers to resolution, thus resulting in additional obstacles in the negotiating process. Whether after venting or in its place, taking breaks in the process is another approach suggested for dealing with disruptive emotions in order to help parties reflect on their behavior. In negotiations between management and union, *cooling-off* periods are sometimes institutionally incorporated into agreements to help avert costly strikes (Ury, 1993). Likewise, in interpersonal conflict, cues can be adopted to signal that one party needs a 'time-out.' "In the Noel Coward play *Private Lives*, a bickering couple agrees that whenever an argument threatens to get out of control, one person will shout 'Solomon Isaacs,' which will bring all conversation to a halt for five minutes while each tries to calm down," (Ury, Brett, & Goldberg, 1993, p. 55). Eventually, rather than result in a cooling off period, the signal itself may have instantaneous calming effects or even transform into a cue for comic relief since it provides a mirror to how childlike the argument might seem to an outside observer. Indeed, the use of humor, whether a witty remark or a joke that brings on laughter, can be another way to reduce tension during negotiations.

Whereas venting and breaks may keep the displayed negative emotion from derailing the negotiation process, the negotiation literature suggests that what will ultimately propel the process forward toward an optimal resolution is understanding the other party's core concerns and "underlying interests." Thus, when the displayed negative emotion is perceived to be "the problem," Fisher, Ury, and Patten (1991) would advise that it is necessary to separate the person

from the problem in order to shift from positional negotiations to interest-based negotiations. Separating the person from the problem, as well as the emotion from the issue, allows negotiators to show respect, understanding, and empathy for the displayed emotion without giving in or making unnecessary concessions. It also transitions a negative negotiation process back to a more even-toned and rational process of information-exchange that can be leveraged to find win-win solutions.

In their comprehensive framework for dealing with emotions in negotiations, Fisher and Shapiro (2005) suggest expressing appreciation for the core concern underlying the expressed emotions in order to get at each party's underlying interests. "Rather than getting caught up in every emotion you and others are feeling, turn your attention to what generates these emotions," (p. 15). First and foremost, feeling appreciated is an important need that can be addressed by understanding the other party's point of view, finding merit in what another individual thinks, feels, or does. It is important to communicate one's understanding of the issue a negotiator identified through words or actions. For example, "It sounds like you feel worried that if you sell your shares of stock, your relationships with other members of the board would be damaged" demonstrates understanding and can be followed by showing that the negotiator sees merit in the person's reasoning. "I can appreciate your concern, especially given that you want to keep working in this industry," (Fisher & Shapiro, 2005, p. 33).

Fisher and Shapiro (2005) point out that it is important to appreciate the emotional concern negotiators display; that is, address the concern, not the emotion. Addressing the core concerns will help stimulate positive emotion and overcome negative emotion:

The difference between having a core concern ignored or met can be as important as having your nose underwater or above it. If, for example, you are unappreciated or

unaffiliated, you may feel as if you are drowning, alone, ignored, and unable to breathe.

Your emotions respond, and you are prone to adversarial behavior. On the other hand, if

you feel appreciated or affiliated, it is as if you are swimming with your head above

water. You can easily look around, and are free to decide what to do and where to go.

Your positive emotions are there with you, and, as a result, you are prone to cooperate, to

think creatively, and to be trustworthy (pp. 17-18).

According to Fisher and Shapiro (2005), there are four concerns that stimulate emotions and

must be appreciated: affiliation, autonomy, status, and role. The relationship between expressing

appreciation and achieving results in negotiations is straightforward. If unappreciated,

negotiators feel worse; if properly appreciated, they feel better. Fisher and Shapiro suggested that

if affiliation is properly built, autonomy respected, status acknowledged, and a fulfilling role is

chosen, then positive emotion will be stimulated and better agreements negotiated.

Thus, improving each party's understanding of the other's perspective through enhanced

communication and establishing a common ground on which the parties can find a basis for

agreement can help to rebuild trust between parties and enhance the desirability of the creative

options and opportunities to create value for both parties. According to Lewicki, Saunders, and

Minton (1999), once tension has been reduced and the de-escalation of hostility has been

managed, it is critical to control the number and size of issues in the negotiation so that new

issues are not added. This includes dividing large issues into smaller, more manageable ones to

contain the negotiation and proceed toward resolution of the underlying interests. Thompson

(2005) suggested a series of specific steps for repairing trust that could help when responding to

a display of negative emotion. These steps include suggesting a personal meeting, placing the

focus on the relationship, apologizing, letting the other party vent, not getting defensive, asking

for clarifying information, testing for understanding, formulating a plan acceptable to both sides, thinking about ways to prevent the problem in the future, and doing a relationship check. Once these issues have been addressed, one can then return to the content of the negotiation itself.

The *breakthrough* approach (Ury, 1993) is a philosophically different and counter-intuitive approach to get beyond the barrier of negative emotion by encouraging their display. This approach resembles *paradoxical therapy* (Weeks, 1991) in that it gets past the displayed emotion, not by avoiding or venting it, but rather by allowing the other party to go further into it. Instead of confronting the displayed behavior, a negotiator encourages the other party to delve deeper into the source of the negative emotion and explore the path that would result from engaging it. Although risky, making the consequences of the displayed behavior feel tangible, concrete, and explicit is intended to lead the individual to see the extremity of his or her own behavior and/or position and to lead them to take the first step in a different direction. Once the other party initiates a move that will help break through and circumvent the issue at hand, the responding negotiator joins this path. Ury's breakthrough approach includes a five-step process for responding to displayed negative emotion: (1) Don't react—go to the balcony; (2) Disarm them—step to their side; (3) Change the game—don't reject, reframe; (4) Make it easy for them to say yes—build them a golden bridge; and (5) Make it hard to say no—bring them to their senses, not their knees. This approach sees obstacles set by another party as challenges that can be engaged, addressed, and transformed into a favorable negotiating environment.

The breakthrough approach may be successful because it generates even stronger negative emotion than that originally expressed by an individual, thus highlighting the unproductive nature of the extreme emotion and motivating a paradigm change in strategy. This was among the strategies adopted by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter in 1978 during the

Camp David talks between Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister

Menachem Begin. When negotiations appeared to be at a devastating impasse, Carter

strategically led Begin to "the abyss," generating extremely strong emotions by personalizing the

stakes. Sadat and Begin were offered a token gift—a photo of the three leaders autographed by

Carter. Begin received one for each of his grandchildren. As Begin looked down at the photo and

saw his granddaughter's name "he [Begin] spoke it aloud, and then looked at each photograph

individually, repeating the name of each grandchild I [Carter] had written on it. His lips

trembled, and tears welled up in his eyes… We were both emotional as we talked quietly for a

few minutes about grandchildren and about war," (Carter, 1982, p. 399). The displayed emotion

in this case was associated with the bleak prospects that would result from an impasse, and

provided a personal angle that purportedly strengthened Begin's motivation to overcome the

obstacles and reach a future-oriented peace accord. Thus, displayed negative emotion can

actually play a constructive role when channeled in the appropriate manner. An interesting

empirical question is whether certain negative emotions, such as sadness, guilt, or anger, are

better leveraged in a paradoxical breakthrough response tactic.

 Regardless of the approach taken—whether one allows the other party to vent, takes a

break in the process, tries to shift the discussion away from an emotion-based focus or face it

straight on—it is important that the negotiator fully listens to other individuals. Active listening

(Rogers, 1961) can help facilitate the negotiation process. To actively listen, one is advised to

focus on showing attention verbally and non-verbally, to encourage the other individual to

continue, and to use restatement and paraphrasing to show understanding. A negotiator should

express empathy in order to connect with both the words the other individual is using and the

emotions and mindset that are reflected in their choice of language; and then use probes to draw

the person out further and synchronize interaction (Yukl, 1990). Responses may include: "You see the facts this way," "You feel strongly about this point," and "I can see that if you saw things this way, you would feel threatened and upset by what I have said," (Lewicki, Saunders, & Minton, 1999, pp. 415-416).

In this way, displayed negative emotion that is integral to the negotiation process can be embraced, or at least acknowledged. Listening openly to someone express negative emotion "does not mean liking them or even agreeing with them, but it does mean acknowledging that you understand their [expressed] viewpoint," (Hackley, 2004, p. 5; Ury, 1993). Even if one does not agree with what another is saying, one might try to reflect on how they would react had they been in the other person's shoes. Engaging in perspective taking (Drolet, Larrick, & Morris, 1998; Galinsky & Ku, 2004) or trying a role reversal can help engender a feeling during the negotiation process that emotions are being acknowledged, which may help shift the dynamic to one conducive to achieving a negotiated agreement.

Responding to Positive Emotional Displays

The prescriptive negotiation literature generally suggests that positive emotion is linked with interest-based solutions and therefore should be embraced to enhance optimal agreements. Happiness, for example, is associated with cooperative tactics and creativity that can generate higher joint gains (e.g., Carnevale & Isen, 1986). However, as discussed earlier, the empirical literature on decision making cautions that this may not always be the case. For example, happiness is associated with superficial processing of information and thus can be counterproductive when deep processing is necessary to reach a beneficial agreement. If it leads to heuristic behavior associated with a fixed pie perception, or if it leads negotiators to set less ambitious goals and *satisfice*—be satisfied with less (Simon, 1955)—display of positive emotion

can actually be detrimental to negotiations.

If so, how should a negotiator strategically respond when another expresses joy, happiness, and pleasure? The basic assumption in the negotiation literature is that only negative emotion is problematic and serves as an obstacle to successful negotiations. It also indirectly suggests that positive emotion indicates that the underlying concerns of the other party have been addressed. For example, of the elements addressed by Fisher and Shapiro (2005), it would seem that affiliation has been properly established, autonomy respected, status acknowledged, and a fulfilling role has been chosen. And therefore beneficial agreements are likely to follow. However, empirical research suggests that in some situations where these core concerns are met, such as when negotiating in the context of close relationships (McGinn, 2006), negotiators may be less focused on expanding the pie because they are focused more on dividing resources equally (Messick, 1993; Thompson & DeHarpport, 1998). Their need to avoid relationship conflict (Jehn, 1995) may lead them to make a priori concessions and miss opportunities to discover task-level differences in priorities that could be leveraged to expand the pie.

Whereas with negative emotion a negotiator affected by emotional contagion may get angry and walk away from a good deal, a negotiator facing positive emotion may be too eager to accept a deal and thus leave value on the table. Indeed, research has demonstrated that negotiators' willingness to pay is higher when they face a negotiator strategically displaying positive emotion, in contrast to a neutral or negative counterpart (Kopelman, Rosette, & Thompson, 2006). Another instance where positive emotion conveys suboptimal outcomes is if one sees the other party gloating toward the end of the negotiation (Thompson, Valley, & Kramer, 1995) or if the other party immediately accepts an initial offer, the negotiator may experience a sinking feeling commonly associated with the *winner's curse*, (Akerlof, 1970;

Neale & Bazerman, 1991). Such a bittersweet feeling of success can leave one feeling unhappy with an agreement they may otherwise have been satisfied with. In Ury's (1993) terminology, one may need to go to the balcony and assess the situation before succumbing to it. It is usually not too late to reopen the discussion and explore alternative configurations of a deal to ensure a *fair* distribution of a truly expanded pie. One may need to creatively craft a face-saving statement that enables both parties to reengage in the negotiation process. Thus, positive emotion is not always associated with optimal economic and relational negotiation outcomes.

We suggest that a strategic response to displayed positive emotion need not undermine the positive emotional tone of the negotiations. To leverage positive emotion, a negotiator could simultaneously respond by: (a) reciprocating the positive emotion with the goal of building the relationship, acknowledging common goals, communicating trust, and building assurances that a win-win solution can be found; and (b) accompany this relational reciprocity with diagnostic questions that ensure the positive emotional display is leveraged toward value creation, rather than heuristic thinking and avoidance of task-conflict.

Discussion

The negotiation literature suggests an array of coherent and insightful approaches on how to strategically respond to displayed emotions during the negotiation process. Despite the fact that there has been relatively little empirical testing, experienced mediators and skilled negotiators have found these techniques to be useful for strategically responding to emotionally charged negotiating processes. Strategic responses such as venting and cooling-off periods and addressing core concerns often appear to move beyond negative emotion to achieve more collaborative and successful win-win negotiated outcomes and direct positive emotion toward constructive information exchange and mutually beneficial outcomes.

Although the recommendations in the negotiation literature provide useful insights on the negotiation process, they fall short of explaining why these strategies are likely to work in some circumstances but not others. For example, one can imagine that even the intuitive advice to express understanding for the other party and find merit in their point of view, as suggested by Fisher and Shapiro (2005), can result in increased animosity rather than a constructive process. More specifically, saying something like: "It sounds like you are frustrated that we haven't yet come to an agreement. Given how much time you've invested in this new draft, I can understand why you feel like that," (Fisher & Shapiro, 2005, p. 153) does not necessarily result in the desired outcome of overcoming negative emotion. Instead, the emotional negotiator may feel patronized and respond with even more aggression: "You have no idea what is really going on for me, you are just trying to be manipulative."

A broader theoretical framework than offered in the current negotiation literature is necessary to understand such boundary conditions. We suggest that there is something else at play within the negotiation process, which accounts for why these tactics are sometimes successful and at other times fall far short; it is not only about what strategies are employed but about the person employing the strategy. The recommendations in the literature provide many tactical suggestions for what a negotiator should do when faced with an emotional individual and underemphasize the internal reality of the person employing those tactics. That is, the underlying mechanism driving the success or failure of a strategic response to an emotional display may have as much to do with the state of being of the responder during the response to the display of emotion as it do with the tactic used.

To be effective at responding to both negative and positive displayed emotions, a negotiator needs to balance the attention paid to the self and other parties. Focusing exclusively

on his or her own emotional experience, a negotiator can be swept away with emotional contagion during negotiations, and thus be unable to effectively address another individual's emotional response in a constructive manner. However, focusing all one's attention on what to do about someone who is displaying either positive or negative emotion can come across as tactical, disingenuous, and even patronizing. There is a balance to strike between focusing on one's own internal state of being and the external behaviors and language being expressed by others during negotiations.

We suggest that the success or failure of a strategic response to displayed emotions pivots on striking this balance through a negotiator's *authentic presence*. Presence is not an easy concept to define. According to Kahn (1992, p. 322), psychological presence means being fully there as when "people feel and are attentive, connected, integrated and focused in their role." In a recent book, Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, and Flowers (2005, pp. 13-14) explain how their thinking about presence evolved. "We first thought of presence as being fully conscious and aware in the present moment. Then we began to appreciate presence as deep listening…we came to see the importance of letting go... Ultimately, we came to see all these aspects of presence as leading to a state of 'letting come,' of consciously participating..." Likewise, Halpern and Lubar (2003, pp. 3-4) discuss theater actors who describe stage presence as "the ability to connect authentically with the thoughts and feelings of others." Yet, paradoxically, these authors stress that "presence comes from *within*. It begins with an inner state which leads to a series of external behaviors." We suggest that existing within this paradox of focusing fully on both self and other is *authentic presence*, which enables a negotiator to respond to displayed emotions in an effective manner.

In this state of authentic presence, the strategic tactics of the responder are a natural

expression of the negotiator during the negotiating process. Authentic presence is a mechanism

that drives the success or failure to strategic responses to emotional displays. There are, for

example, people in whose presence it is difficult to be angry. Being in their company feels like

looking into a mirror and noticing how unproductive perhaps even silly, childish or

melodramatic, one's expression of emotion may be without feeling patronized or feeling the need

to be defensive. It has the effect of deflating negative consequences of the displayed emotion and

re-orienting negotiators back to the task at hand. It is this quality of being fully there for the self

and the other—authentic presence that we can all strive to develop—that may enable the

successful adoption of the strategic tactics suggested in the negotiation literature.

References

Adler, R. S., Rosen, B., & Silverstein, E. M. (1998). Emotions in negotiation: How to manage fear and anger. Negotiation Journal, 14(2), 161-179.

Akerlof, G. (1970). The market for lemons: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 84, 388-500.

Allred, K. G. (1999). Anger and retaliation: Toward an understanding of impassioned conflict in organizations. In R. J. Bies, R. J. Lewicki, & B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organizations (Vol. 7, pp. 27-58). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Allred, K. G., Mallozzi, J. S., Matsui, F., & Raia, C. P. (1997). The influence of anger and compassion on negotiation performance. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 70(3), 175-187.

Baron, R. A. (1990). Environmentally induced positive affect: Its impact on self-efficacy, task performance, negotiation, and conflict. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 20(5), 368-384.

Barry, B. (1999). The tactical use of emotion in negotiation. In R. J. Bies, & R. J. Lewicki (Eds.), Research in negotiation in organizations (Vol. 7, pp. 93-121). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Barry, B., Fulmer, I. S., & Goates, N. (2006). Bargaining with Feeling: Emotionality in and Around Negotiation. In L. L. Thompson (Ed.), Negotiation theory and research. (pp. 99-127): Psychosocial Press.

Batson, C. D. (1990). Affect and altruism. In B. S. Moore & A. M. Isen (Eds.), Affect and social behavior (pp. 89-125). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Batson, C. D., Coke, J. S., Chard, F., Smith, D., & Taliaferro, A. (1979). Generality of the "Glow of Goodwill": Effects of mood on helping and information acquisition. Social Psychology Quarterly, 42(2), 176-179.

Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bless, H., Clore, G. L., Schwarz, N., & Golisano, V. (1996). Mood and the use of scripts: Does a happy mood really lead to mindlessness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(4), 665-679.

Bodenhausen, G. V., Sheppard, L. A., & Kramer, G. P. (1994). Negative affect and social judgment: The differential impact of anger and sadness. European Journal of Social Psychology, 24(1), 45-62.

Bower, G. H. (1991). Mood congruity of social judgments. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), Emotion and social judgments (pp. 31-54). Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Carnevale, P. J., & Isen, A. M. (1986). The influence of positive affect and visual access on the discovery of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 37(1), 1-13.

Carter, J. (1982). Keeping faith: memoirs of a president. New York: Bantam Books.

Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A

theoretically based approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(2), 267-283.

Coté, S. (2005). A social interaction model of the effects of emotion regulation on work strain. Academy of Management Review, 30(3), 509-530.

Daly, J. P. (1991). The effects of anger on negotiations over mergers and acquisitions. Negotiation Journal, 7(1), 31-39.

DeSteno, D., Dasgupta, N., Bartlett, M. Y., & Cajdric, A. (2004). Prejudice from thin air: The effect of emotion on automatic intergroup attitudes. Psychological Science, 15(5), 319-324.

DeSteno, D., Petty, R. E., Rucker, D. D., Wegener, D. T., & Braverman, J. (2004). Discrete emotions and persuasion: The role of emotion-induced expectancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86(1), 43-56.

Drolet, A., Larrick, R., & Morris, M. W. (1998). Thinking of others: How perspective taking changes negotiators' aspirations and fairness perceptions as a function of negotiator relationships. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 20(1), 23-31.

Drolet, A., & Morris, M. W. (2000). Rapport in conflict resolution: Accounting for how face-to-face contact fosters mutual cooperation in mixed-motive conflicts. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36(1), 26-50.

Dunn, J. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion on trust. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88(5), 736-748.

Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. American Psychologist, 48(4), 384-392.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & Ellsworth, P. (1972). Emotion in the human face: guidelines for research and an integration of findings. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Ellsworth, P. C., & Scherer, K. R. (2003). Appraisal processes in emotion. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer, & H. Goldsmith (Eds.), Handbook of affective sciences (pp. 572-595). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fisher, R., & Shapiro, D. (2005). Beyond Reason: Using Your Emotions As You Negotiate. New York: Viking Press.

Fisher, R., Ury, W. L., & Patton, B. (1991). Getting to yes: negotiating agreement without giving in. New York: Penguin Books.

Forester, J. (1997). Lawrence Susskind: Activist mediation and public disputes. In D. M. Kolb (Ed.), When Talk works: profiles of mediators. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Forgas, J. P. (1992). On mood and peculiar people: Affect and person typicality in impression formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62(5), 863-875.

Forgas, J. P. (1995). Mood and judgment: The affect infusion model (AIM). Psychological Bulletin, 117(1), 39-66.

Forgas, J. P. (1998). On feeling good and getting your way: Mood effects on negotiator cognition and bargaining strategies. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74(3), 565-577.

Forgas, J. P., & Bower, G. H. (1987). Mood effects on person-perception judgments. Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 53(1), 53-60.

Forgas, J. P., & Fiedler, K. (1996). Us and them: Mood effects on intergroup discrimination. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 70(1), 28-40.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. American Psychologist, 56, 218-226.

Fredrickson, B. L., & Levenson, R. W. (1998). Positive emotions speed recovery from the cardiovascular sequelae of negative emotions. Cognition and Emotion, 12(2), 191-220.

Frijda, N. H. (1986). The emotions. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Frijda, N. H., Kuipers, P., & ter Schure, E. (1989). Relations among emotion, appraisal, and emotional action readiness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(2), 212-228.

Galinsky, A. D., & Ku, G. (2004). The effects of perspective-taking on prejudice: The moderating role of self-evaluation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30(5), 594-604.

Gewurz, I. G. (2000). Transition from conflict: The importance of pre-negotiations in the Oslo peace process. Israel Affairs, 6(3-4), 177-199.

Goldberg, J. H., Lerner, J. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Rage and reason: The psychology of the intuitive prosecutor. European Journal of Social Psychology, 29(5), 781-795.

Goldberg, S. B., Green, E. D., & Sander, F. E. A. (1987). Saying you're sorry. Negotiation Journal, 3(3), 221-224.

Hackley, S. (2004). When life gives you lemons: how to deal with difficult people. Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation (NO411C), 3-5.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1992). Primitive emotional contagion. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), Emotion and social behavior. review of personality and social psychology (Vol. 14, pp. 151-177). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Isen, A. M. (1987). Positive affect, cognitive processes, and social behavior. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 20, pp. 203-253). New York: Academic Press.

Isen, A. M., Daubman, K. A., & Nowicki, G. P. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 52(6), 1122-1131.

Isen, A. M., & Patrick, R. (1983). The effect of positive feelings on risk taking: When the chips are down. Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 31(2), 194-202.

Jehn, K. A. (1995). A mulitmethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, 40, 256-282.

Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. Human Relations, 45(4), 321-349.

Keltner, D., Ellsworth, P. C., & Edwards, K. (1993). Beyond simple pessimism: Effects of

sadness and anger on social perception. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 64(5), 740-752.

Kopelman, S., Rosette, A. S., & Thompson, L. (2006). The three faces of Eve: Strategic displays of positive, negative, and neutral emotions in negotiations. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99(1), 81-101.

Kopelman, S., & Rosette, A. S. (2007). Cultural variation in response to strategic display of emotions during negotiations. Ross School of Business Working Paper.

Kumar, R. (1997). The role of affect in negotiations: An integrative overview. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33(1), 84-100.

Larsen, J. T., McGraw, A. P., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2001). Can people feel happy and sad at the same time? Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality & Social Psychology, 81(4), 684-696.

Lerner, J. S., Goldberg, J. H., & Tetlock, P. E. (1998). Sober second thought: The effects of accountability, anger, and authoritarianism on attributions of responsibility. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24(6), 563-574.

Lerner, J. S., Gonzalez, R. M., Small, D. A., & Fischhoff, B. (2003). Effects of fear and anger on perceived risks of terrorism: A national field experiment. Psychological Science, 14(2), 144-150.

Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgment and choice. Cognition & Emotion, 14(4), 473 - 493.

Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81(1), 146-159.

Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Minton, J. W. (1999). Negotiation (3rd Ed.), Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The social psychology of procedural justice. New York: Plenum Press.

Lubar, K., & Halpern, B. L. (2003). Leadership presence: Dramatic techniques to reach out, motivate and inspire. New York: Gotham Books.

Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(4), 602-616.

McGinn K L (2006) Relationships and negotiations in context. In: Thompson L L (ed) Negotiation theory and research. Psychosocial Press.

Messick, D. M. (1993). Equality as a decision heuristic. In B. A. Mellers & B. Jonathan (Eds.), Psychological perspectives on justice: Theory and applications. Cambridge series on judgment and decision making (pp. 11-31). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moore, D. A., Kurtzberg, T. R., Thompson, L. L., & Morris, M. W. (1999). Long and short routes to success in electronically mediated negotiations: Group affiliations and good vibrations. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 77(1), 22-43.

Neale, M., & Bazerman, M. (1991). Cognition and rationality in negotiation. New York: Free

Press.

Niedenthal, P. M., Halberstadt, J. B., & Setterlund, M. B. (1997). Being happy and seeing 'happy': Emotional state mediates visual word recognition. Cognition & Emotion, 11(4), 403-432.

Peters, E. M., Burraston, B., & Mertz, C. K. (2004). An emotion-based model of risk perception and stigma susceptibility: Cognitive appraisals of emotion, affective reactivity, worldviews, and risk perceptions in the generation of technological stigma. Risk Analysis, 24(5), 1349-1367.

Pillutla, M. M., & Murnighan, J. K. (1996). Unfairness, anger, and spite: Emotional rejections of ultimatum offers. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 68(3), 208-224.

Quigley, B. M., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1996). Mediating effects of blame attributions on feelings of anger. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22(12), 1280-1288.

Rafaeli, A., & Ravid, S. (2005). The costs and consequences of customer anger for customer service employees. Unpublished manuscript.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1991). Emotional contrast strategies as means of social influence: Lessons from criminal interrogators and bill collectors. Academy of Management Journal, 34(4), 749-775.

Rogers, C. R. (1961). On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Roseman, I. J. (1984). Cognitive determinants of emotion: A structural theory. Review of Personality & Social Psychology, 5, 11-36.

Scherer, K. R. (1984). Emotion as a multicomponent process: A model and some cross-cultural data. Review of Personality & Social Psychology, 5, 37-63.

Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1996). Feelings and phenomenal experiences. In E. Higgins & A. Kruglanski (Eds.), Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles (pp. 433-465). New York: Guilford Press.

Senge, P., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2005). Presence: Exploring profound change in people, organizations, and society. London: Nicholas Brealey

Shell, R. G. (2006). Bargaining for advantage: Negotiation strategies for reasonable people (2nd Ed.), New York: Penguin Books.

Sillars, A. L. (1981). Communication and attributions in interpersonal conflict. Unpublished Dissertation/Thesis, ProQuest Information & Learning.

Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69, 118.

Sinaceur, M., & Neale, M. A. (2005). Not all threats are created equal: How implicitness and timing affect the effectiveness of threats in negotiations. Group Decision and Negotiation, 14(1), 63-85.

Singelis, T. M. (1998). Teaching about culture, ethnicity & diversity: Exercises and planned activities. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 48(4), 813-838.

Sutton, R. I., & Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. Academy of Management Journal, 31(3), 461-487.

Thompson, L. (2005). The Mind and heart of the negotiator (3rd Ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Thompson, L., & DeHarpport, T. (1998). Relationships, goal incompatibility, and communal orientation in negotiations. Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 20(1), 33-44.

Thompson, L., Nadler, J., & Kim, P. H. (1999). Some like it hot: The case for the emotional negotiator. In L. L. Thompson & J. M. Levine (Eds.), Shared cognition in organizations: The management of knowledge (pp. 139-161). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Thompson, L., Valley, K. L., & Kramer, R. M. (1995). The bittersweet feeling of success: An examination of social perception in negotiation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31(6), 467-492.

Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). The effect of anger on the hostile inferences of aggressive and nonaggressive people: Specific emotions, cognitive processing, and chronic accessibility. Motivation & Emotion, 25(3), 233-251.

Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1990). The past explains the present: Emotion adaptations and the structure of ancestral environments. Ethology and Sociobiology, 11, 375-424.

Ury, W. L. (1993). Getting past no: Negotiating your way from confrontation to cooperation. New York: Bantam Books.

Ury, W. L., Brett, J. M., & Goldberg, S. B. (1988). Getting disputes resolved: Designing systems to cut the costs of conflict. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ury, W. L., Brett, J. M., & Goldberg, S. B. (1993). Getting disputes resolved: Designing systems to cut the costs of conflict. Cambridge, MA: PON Books.

Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004a). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86, 57-76.

Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004b). The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87(4), 510-528.

Weeks, G. R. (1991). Promoting change through paradoxical therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1994). Mood management across affective states: The hedonic contingency hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66(6), 1034-1048.

Yukl, G. (1990). Skills for managers and leaders: Text, cases, and exercises. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.