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ABSTRACT

Even though there is a reliance on applying cultural dimensions and creativity when solving problems related to practices in business and communications, there is a scarcity of research about the influence of culture and creativity on contemporary negotiation practice. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected through globalisation, we need to thoroughly understand how and why integrative solutions and cultural understanding influence bargaining, both local and international in scope. This thesis examines the relationship between individualistic and collectivistic cultural dimensions, individual creativity levels, ethical conduct, and negotiation behaviours. The findings provide business negotiators and conflict resolution professionals with information on how best to prepare for and face the challenges that arise in contemporary bargaining.

Three main research questions are identified: (RQ1) how does creativity influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation? (RQ2) How does culture influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation? (RQ3) Through the lens of facework negotiation theory, does the relationship differ between creativity and negotiation behaviours across cultures?

The conceptual framework of this thesis is based on face negotiation theory. More specifically, a 13-category facework typology was used to assess the negotiation behaviours. A staged negotiation simulation design in three phases was set in place to obtain the data. The two-party negotiation simulation was video-taped and analysed on the basis of the facework categories. Surveys were conducted pre- and post-negotiation and analysed for the purpose of determining cultural dimensions, creativity levels, and perceived ethical behaviours. The unit of analysis in this study was the negotiation pairs. A total of 22 participants, comprising 11 pairs, took part in the study. The participants were recruited on a voluntary basis in a postgraduate negotiation class at the School of Management, Queensland University of Technology.

The key results from this analysis show that the highly creative negotiators adopted noticeably more integrative behaviours than the low creative negotiators. However, the analysis also
shows that the high creative participants were perceived to be more untrustworthy and unethical than the low creative participants. No significant relationships between cultural dimensions and negotiation behaviours were detected.

The findings imply that there should be an increased emphasis on creativity training for negotiators striving to build integrative solutions, and an increased emphasis on understanding how cultural research has evolved from being perceived as a static to a dynamic structure. This thesis further explores the degree to which these behaviours are imperative for developing competencies within contemporary negotiation practice. The limitations of the thesis as a whole are discussed.

Keywords: creativity, cross-cultural, negotiation behaviours, integrative, distributive, facework.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Due to the increasing and rapid extent of globalisation, negotiators face a variety of obstacles when bargaining with counterparts from cultures different from their own (Lewicki, Barry & Saunders, 2010; Salacuse, 1988). The fundamental notion of negotiating across borders is therefore important to investigate to increase effectiveness within trade, mergers and acquisitions, and foreign direct investment. Thus, as the world of commerce rapidly becomes more interconnected, there is a need for developing viable integrative solutions around the bargaining table (Lewicki et al., 2010). This thesis looks at factors that affect negotiation behaviours and outcomes; specifically creativity and cultural values. This chapter outlines the research background and problem statement, discusses the significance and aims of this thesis, and concludes with a brief description of the purpose of the remaining chapters.

1.1 Problem statement

Historically, business negotiation studies have overtly focused on a distributive division of agenda items, and limited research exists that thoroughly explores how integrative strategies are implemented (Bartos, 1995), or how an integrative framework is applied in an international and cross-cultural setting (Adair, 2003; Cai, Drake & Wilson, 2000). Although significant research emphasises the notion that various cultures communicate in different manners (Hofstede, 2004; Kvidal, 2008), there has been little research into how culture affects negotiation tactics on an individual behavioural level.

Preceding studies argue that, to become more integrative and to find common solutions to common dilemmas, the aspect of generating alternatives should serve at the forefront (Fisher, Patton & Ury, 1991; Gunia, Thompson & Wang, 2010). In order to do so, the notion of creativity is a central aspect to investigate in relation to negotiation. Recent empirical evidence shows that highly creative negotiators have a greater ability to create more viable alternatives (De Pauw, Neetling & Venter,
2011; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008), thus, they are inclined to create the synergies sought for sound integrative solutions.

Little research has investigated the actual behaviours that influence the direction of the bargaining events. As these negotiations are inherently interpersonal (Boarini, LaslieR&Robin, 2009), a holistic analysis of body language, face behaviours, culture, and creativity is imperative. Current literature has overtly ignored the issue of examining processes and behaviour on this level, thus this study will investigate how these fundamental factors influence both negotiation behaviour and outcomes.

This thesis strives to develop the knowledge base of contemporary negotiation practice, through both investigating culture on the individual level, and analysing the impact that creative individuals have on bargaining behaviours and strategies. In addition, as diverse cultures perceive ethical conduct differently, this study examines how ethics influences negotiation tactics across cultures. In essence, this study examines the identified gap between culture, creativity and ethics in a contemporary negotiation setting. The underlying intention is to aid practitioners, such as expatriates, diplomats or international business professionals, in their efforts to understand which factors serve as imperative antecedents for bargaining in the global scene.

In summary, this thesis aims to answer the following research questions:

*RQ1: How does creativity influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation?*

*RQ2: How does culture influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation?*

*RQ3: Through the lens of facework negotiation theory, does the relationship between creativity and negotiation behaviours differ across cultures?*

**1.2 Overview of the study**

This thesis addresses the influences of creativity and culture on contemporary negotiation practices. In investigating this issue, the behaviour of pairs of negotiators on an individual level are the unit of analysis. The study attempts to screen and assess behaviour across three different phases.
This process aids the first key objective of examining how creativity influences an individual’s negotiation behaviours (used tactics) and negotiation outcomes.

First, a screening process was undertaken with 40 volunteer participants. This process assessed participants’ creativity and cultural values. This was done to construct negotiation pairs, establish dichotomous levels, and control for major variables, such as culture.

The negotiation simulation was the key practice within this study. This identified the practical implications of low and high creative individuals, and individualistic and collectivistic cultural dimensions. Moreover, the simulation case was based on a real-life business scenario that enabled the participants to focus on succinct factual information, as well as the opportunity to elaborate on any wider objectives they could generate from the core agenda items.

To capture the bargaining simulation, documentary video recording was used. The observational mode of documentary research was applied, as it is consistent with the realist paradigm enabling the researcher to analyse negotiation behaviours as they occur, and draw conclusions based on an established theoretical framework within the respective field.

In determining how these established constructs influence the bargaining event, this study draws from face negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). More specifically, a 13-category facework typology is used to rate and further explain the actual behaviours utilized by each of the participants (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). This framework is specifically suitable for this methodology as it enables a more direct and actual assessment of behaviours, as opposed to relying on participants’ perceptions of lived experiences. In addition, the facework categories are developed to capture implicit communication through body language, as well as key factors of negotiation such as distributive, integrative and compromising behaviours. These categories aid the second main objective of this thesis, which is to establish, through the lens of facework negotiation theory, whether the relationship between creativity and negotiation behaviours differs across cultures.

In addition, the notion of ethical conduct is prevalent in contemporary global negotiations. To evaluate ethical behaviour, both parties assessed their counterparts in relation to key unethical tactics that can potentially be utilized throughout any given negotiation. This was assessed through survey
constructs presented to each participant after the negotiation event. This further aids understanding of which negotiation tactics are perceived as unethical in the contemporary negotiation climate.

1.3 Significance of the study

This study of negotiation is important on several levels. The use of various bargaining tactics can severely affect outcomes of a contract (Garrett, 2005), and thus the future practice of an entity and its influence on society. On the international scene, these behaviours and strategies become exaggerated due to the differences in local business norms and practices, which often create conflict between the parties (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998). As a result, how a negotiator behaves during the bargaining process will affect the outcome. Depending on the strategies being implemented, the negotiation can either create a positive outcome for either party, or result in deadlock and frustration. However, there is a scarcity of research examining how negotiators resolve issues when deadlock occurs. Some literature suggests that cultural understanding and integrative measures aid the process of resolution (Bartos, 1995; Hofstede, 2004), but there is little research on how this is achieved. By the same token, as significant as most of these cultural and strategic measures and strategies are, they are mostly treated as alternatives, not imperatives.

It is important for negotiators to develop skills in areas that can enhance their performance when bargaining globally (Lewicki et al., 2010). One aspect is to exercise control over basic human behaviour and negotiation strategies, another is to thoroughly understand the counterparts and their true interests. This must be done through proper cultural planning and training in areas that will help all parties in generating sound alternatives (Hofstede, 2004; Lewicki et al., 2010).

This thesis addresses these bargaining dilemmas in several areas. The main outcome of these findings communicates a better understanding of the underlying cultural and strategic factors that may emerge and create potential barriers while negotiating. It is widely argued that it is important to view any negotiation event through interest based and integrative perspectives in order to create joint gains (Bartos, 1995; Fisher et al., 1991; Gunia et al., 2010). However, little research has focused on the antecedents for integrative behaviours, which in turn can move the negotiation in a positive direction. This study proposes that creativity, and consequently creative training, can potentially solve
international business conflicts through enhancing integrative solutions. This study addresses this problem through a mixed-method methodology that encapsulates the key variables influencing negotiations. This is done by undertaking both quantitative measurements, and a qualitative examination of how creativity and culture influence the negotiation process.

This study identifies the traits a negotiator possesses that can positively influence their own and their counterpart’s decision making process. In addition, it proposes that an innovative methodology and analysis, using simulation and documentary analysis to unpack individuals’ negotiation behaviours, can better capture the negotiation process.

1.4 Outline of thesis structure

The relevant literature on negotiation is discussed in Chapter 2. This spans from the early history of the field (McKersie, 1965; Pareto, 1935) to contemporary empirical findings (De Dreu, Kleef & Pietroni, 2008; Fisher et al., 1991). This literature establishes the key constructs and theories of the field, which have derived from authors researching union bargaining in the early stages of industrialisation. The literature review discusses negotiation behaviour from a distributive and integrative perspective. As a consequence of the international emphasis of this thesis, there is an in-depth review of key empirical findings pertaining to cross-cultural negotiation. This underpins and permeates the theories of face negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998), and the emergent framework of a facework typology. As this thesis examines whether generating alternatives underpins integrative strategies, there is an emphasis on discussing this notion throughout this chapter. In addition, recent empirical studies on the influence of creativity on negotiation behaviour and outcomes are addressed.

Chapter 3 defines and explains the overall research paradigm and methodology of the project. This chapter justifies the research design and choice of participants. This is addressed on the basis of methodological fit between the research question, paradigm, theories and contribution to the management sciences (Edmondson & McManus, 2007). The methods chapter also addresses the overarching ethical considerations for the project. In addition, this chapter presents all survey constructs utilized in this thesis and, where appropriate, basic results from the screening procedures.
Chapter 4 sets out the results and key findings of the study. The findings are examined through the lens of the facework typology (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001), applied to analyse the documentary footage of the negotiation simulation. The data includes the rated scores of all participants, as well as categorical explanations for the facework categories. These are analysed separately in relation to creativity and culture. Second, an analysis and explanation of the ethical survey is presented. Identified and rated behaviours are discussed using the respective facework framework and leading theories derived from the literature.

In Chapter 5 conclusions of the key findings of this thesis are presented, as well as their implications for future practice. This chapter draws links between previous literature and theories to explain how these particular results influence the field of practice. This chapter includes general commentary and limitations of the study as a whole.

1.5 Conclusion

This chapter presented the key objectives of this thesis. The chapter identified the overarching problems associated with contemporary negotiation. The two main research questions were posed based on the gap in the extant negotiation literature. Further, an overview of the study as a whole was presented, encompassing the choice of methodology and theoretical framework. The significance and implications of the study were discussed in light of the potential influences of creativity, ethics and cultural influences on negotiation. Lastly, a synopsis of the key objectives was put forth for each major chapter of the thesis.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter investigates the literature on negotiation. It covers the common characteristics, strategies and consequences of negotiation behaviours, pursuant to elaborating a critical view of how they are currently being studied and implemented in real-life scenarios. Second, the chapter reviews the literature from the cross-cultural communication research. This is reviewed in light of globalisation and the challenges occurring when negotiating across borders. Third, literature on creativity and how it influences negotiation behaviour and outcomes is analysed. In addition, as the dilemmas of ethical conduct and manipulation are ever present in contemporary bargaining, they are identified to build the logical framework that guides the study as a whole.

2.2 Negotiation and its significance

Business negotiation has seen increased interest in academic research and increased practice in professional circles (Grobe, 2010; Kramer & Staw, 2005; Wheeler, 2008). This renewed interest relates to the notion that negotiation is a ubiquitous form of social interaction in modern society (Olekalns, 2002), and is a key tool for individuals wanting to reach optimal business solutions (Thompson, 1990). In commerce it is central in organisational behaviour and international trade (Heffernan, 2004; Pillutla, 2006), serving as an imperative feature for resolving relational disagreements (Lewicki, Litterer, Minton & Saunders, 1994).

When two or more parties with partially conflicting interests strive to develop common solutions, they are embarking on a negotiation (Miesing & Pavur, 2008). Partially conflicting interests establish that the parties have motives for both cooperation and conflict. Often the parties can agree that a union of common interests can create synergy, and they will cooperate to develop a strategy and bargaining model to realise potential gains (Billings-Yun, 2010). For example, two or more entities may have the opportunity to cooperate to provide goods and services for a large customer, but not to do so constructively if it is conducted in a separate manner. As such, working together in a collaborative manner will generate positive results. This is a frequently identified dilemma in trade,
mergers and acquisitions where integrative solutions are developed if it is impossible for one single company to provide all services to customers; for example, where one company provides technical competence and the other financial capability (Buckley & Ghauri, 2002). Even though the parties agree that they can create these synergies, many differences may emerge about the relative values of the respective organisations and their qualifications for conducting a job. These relative values generate disputes (Guasco & Robinson, 2007). A fundamental challenge in negotiation is therefore to identify the significance of both cooperation and conflict, and further, to establish strategies that will manage both elements (Daft & Marcic, 2010).

2.3 Negotiation strategies

There are two major strategies in negotiation: (1) distributive and (2) integrative (Lewicki et al., 1994; Sawang, Waterhouse, Keast & Brown, 2011). The notion that bargaining is a common process between parties with partially contradictory interests entails a tension between the actual case and the human relationships involved (Daft & Marcic, 2010; Reece, 2011). The parties’ interests pertaining to the case at hand are the focus, but the actual bargaining process is interpersonal between people and groups (Boarini et al., 2009). How one handles these relationships, relevant to the point of contact, the approach to the bargaining incident and the degree of information exchange is critical for how the parties manage to keep a focus on the core parameters (Fox, 2009; Van Zandt, 1997).

2.3.1 Distributive negotiation

The traditional literature describes negotiation as an event occurring as several parties communicate to organise the effective allocation of resources (Thompson, 1990). This approach is typically viewed in the light of the ‘fixed-pie’ distribution (Buddress, 1997), which emphasises that there are a limited number of ways to distribute goods or settle disputes within any given area of interest. The distributive approach to negotiation relates to how the parties concerned divide the different elements between them and maintain a stringent focus on their own objectives (Ochs & Roth, 1989). The historical concept of distributive bargaining is based on the notion that the interests of the parties are negatively correlated (Barry & Friedman, 1998). From that, an increase in the value
of one party’s outcome is associated with a corresponding decrease in the value of the other party’s outcome (McKersie, 1965). In this type of negotiation event, the respective participants have a stipulated bottom-line figure, which they will not move from for the sake of accomplishing a deal (Raiffa, 1982).

However, the purely distributive notion is not endorsed by Roger Fisher and William Ury, the influential authors on negotiation (see Schermerhorn, 2009). In their seminal publication ‘Getting to Yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in’, these authors elaborated on why an integrative approach is far superior (Fisher et al., 1991). Their work incited a paradigm shift within negotiation research and practice, where an integrative and principled framework for bargaining came into fruition (Agrawal & Kool, 2006). Key points in this framework include: separating people from the problem, focusing on interests rather than positions, generating a variety of possibilities before deciding what to do, basing results on an objective standard, and creating an environment that will not hinder future relations (Fisher et al., 1991). This approach, deemed principled negotiation, went beyond the standard integrative approach and has therefore seen extensive interest and utilisation since its development in the Harvard Negotiation Project (Fisher et al., 1991; Lens, 2004; Schermerhorn, 2009). The ongoing research project, initially developed in Harvard University Law School in the mid-1980s, has been instrumental in developing interest based bargaining. It was initiated as a support mechanism for the negotiation process using alternative dispute resolution tools. The project’s aim is to continuously develop principles for use both on a local and international level.

### 2.3.2 Integrative negotiation

The integrative approach to negotiation is based on outcomes being reached that provide high levels of satisfaction for all parties. This is achieved by ensuring that none of the parties concerned suffers a major loss, with the entire negotiation process being based on this fundamental objective (Pareto, 1935). Recent literature on integrative negotiation has stated that the actors involved need to be skilled in creating successful paths to a positive outcome (Ashcroft, 2004; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008). The two concepts fundamental to understanding this process are that participants must first create as much value as possible for the other party and themselves, and then claim as much value as
possible for themselves. Many sources use the terminology ‘win-win’, but since all parties rarely get exactly what they want, there are trade-offs (Watkins, 2005). This serves as the backdrop to the concept of integrative negotiation, which can produce sound outcomes when utilised by skilled practitioners (Bartos, 1995).

An integrative negotiation approach ‘considers the interests of all parties – the goal is an outcome that is based on the merits of individual claims, and that serves each party’s desires as much as possible’ (Schermerhorn, 2009, p. 16). However, to effectively deal with the challenges associated with integrative relational negotiation and case specificity, a methodical negotiator needs to thoroughly analyse the bargaining situation, develop an overall strategy, and implement tactics in accordance with the former elements (Bertram, 2000).

Negotiation is characterised as an event that occurs when individuals cannot reach optimal solutions without the participation of others (Fisher, Patton & Ury, 1991; Gunia & Thompson, 2010; Lewicki, Barry & Saunders, 2010). As such, research pertaining to this area has derived from many fields of study; however, the main emphasis lies in communication and the role it performs when two or more parties have conflicting interests (De Dreu, Weingart & Kwon, 2000). Communication is experienced differently when it occurs through different channels. Negotiation traditionally occurs face-to-face (Lewicki et al., 2010), but with the rapid emergence of both technology and globalisation, new challenges have arisen (Meunier, 2007) that pertain to ‘global flows of human resources, money, products, and media’ (Kvidal, 2008, p. 1). As there are many barriers to reaching goals and building sound relationships through negotiation, alternatives and novel ways of reaching agreement need to be created (Bazerman, Curhan, Moore & Valley, 2000; Winkler, 2006). Flexibility is needed when creating alternatives within the negotiation process; if both parties are too unyielding in their goals and outcomes, a standstill might occur (Pienaar & Spoelstra, 1999). The joint creation of alternatives helps to establish a universal culture in which one party can approach the other (Gunia et al., 2010). Moreover, as the respective parties may disagree, bridging their differences and creating alternatives by utilising similarities will consequently create value (Pienaar & Spoelstra, 1999). In essence, the notion of creating value stems from integrative negotiation, which promotes alternative ways of attacking problems (Fisher et al., 1991; Lewicki et al., 2010), and differs from the traditional
distributive approach in that it strives to find solutions for all parties involved (Polzer, 1996). The quintessential reason for applying this approach to negotiation is to generate value and enable all parties to reach their objectives (Bartos, 1995; Hooper & Newlands, 2009). This is done through a process of recognising alternative uses of assets or finding distinct and original ways of using available resources (Lax & Sebenius, 1986). Value creation can be accomplished in many different ways and as a result, identifying core factors of the process is important (Ogilvie & Simms, 2008). This is done by accepting that negotiators do not always see all issues as equally important and that by exploring compatibility through communicating different concerns, the parties can unlock the conundrum of value creation (Guasco & Robinson, 2007; Lewicki et al., 2010). Most studies assert that, in this context, value is created by taking advantage of common ground, diminishing conflicts, and building long-term business relationships (Follet, 1940; Lewicki & Haim, 2006; McGinn & Keros, 2002).

2.3.3 Mixed strategy: No one size fits all

Delving into the current literature, there are several key points of difference pertaining to negotiation behaviour and outcomes. It is well-established that negotiation strategies may comprise distributive and integrative settlement characteristics; by the same token, both of these elements may surface during any given bargaining process (Bartos, 1995; Gunia et al., 2010). In previous empirical studies (Barry & Friedman, 1998), there has been a focus on the negotiators’ characteristics in distributive bargaining, finding that agreeableness is a major liability in this type of negotiation. Historically, this approach to negotiation has been pervasive (Bartos, 1995).

Following the initial treatment on negotiation, McKersie (1966) coined the term ‘mixed motive’ bargaining. This study claimed that although distributive and integrative strategies are inherently different in scope and characteristics (McKersie, 1965), a mixed approach to the negotiation process will generate the most beneficial outcomes. This approach is viable when negotiations have ‘significant elements of conflict and considerable potential for integration’ (McKersie, 1966, p. 384). McKersie’s main claim, which is based on self-reported accounts of
bargaining, is that the mixed agenda applies the integrative perspective from both sides to increase mutual gain, and then applies a distributive strategy to claim those gains.

Fells (1998) investigated McKersie’s stated difficulties and the potential of the mixed agenda theory in a study of a management-union negotiation. Fells used ethnographic observation of the actual bargaining and interviews with participants after the event. Fells’ empirical qualitative analysis provided support for McKersie’s claims that few bargaining situations have only one consistent strategy. Fells stated that a purely distributive-integrative approach is rooted in a false dichotomy; thus negotiations are never purely distributive or purely integrative. Fells’ study’s findings supported this notion with evidence showing the presence of both strategies, but one strategy was emphasised by one party to a greater extent depending on the various stages of the bargaining. Fells identified two elements necessary for successful mixed bargaining – building long-term relationships and having multiple agendas. In turn, the research suggested that the bargaining process itself is flexible enough to allow alternative stances to surface and that few agenda items were stringently classified by the parties as joint gain (integrative) or zero-sum (distributive). This was an important finding in relation to the practical implications of the early research (Follet, 1940; McKersie, 1965; 1966) as it built on specific theory through practical discovery. Fells’ study was beneficial in generating results on strategy and its implementation, but it did not focus on dilemmas occurring with deadlocks, transitions or on sharing new gains. These were claimed by Fells to be better studied on a behavioural level, analysing the complex dynamics of the overall process.

### 2.3.4 Negotiation tactics

Individuals who employ a distributive approach may use one of these following tactics in their negotiation: misrepresentation, threats/deceptions, withholding information, and using power (Fells, 2009). These tactics are commonly known to be the finer detail actions of the higher order constructs of integrative, distributive, mixed and principled negotiation strategies respectively (Fells, 2009; Lewicki et al., 2010).

*Misrepresentations* are identified as expressing a higher reservation point than the actual position. This can give the opponent a different perception of the party than is the reality. However,
this does not necessarily cause significant consequences during the latter phases of the negotiation process since the opponent is not tricked into something of which he or she is not aware. However, if these misrepresentations are outright falsehoods, for example in relation to imperatives such as property rights or union rules, they are clearly unethical. This creates a clear distinction between strategy and ethics (Fleury & Volkema, 2002; Reilly, 2009).

**Threats and deceptions** often happen in a manner that yields short-term gain. Even though deceptive behaviour can seem to allow a party to gain the upper hand at the outset of the bargaining process, an adverse effect is that one can lose the respect of the other party, which will hinder any future cooperation (Benoliel, 2011). Utilising threats may also result in loss of respect, especially if the party is not stringent in its actions. Hence, if threats are used explicitly, the party must follow up the momentum created if the opponent does not adapt to the situation (Bolt & Houbo, 2002).

**Information** is the element that traditionally generates most ethical dilemmas (Fells, 2009; Guasco & Robinson, 2007). An example is hiding information from the other party. Most authors agree that honesty is an imperative factor in negotiation (Fisher et al., 1991; Guasco & Robinson, 2007; Lewicki & Haim, 2006). What they mean is that the parties should not project falsehoods or withhold information, even if their opponents have not specifically requested it. It is simpler to communicate the truth, since there is no risk of confusing it with falsehood or of making unplanned revelations. However, certain literature has stated the opposite: that bargaining mandates dishonesty (Byrnes, 1987), particularly in relation to short-term gains and for the sake of avoiding one’s own exploitation (Guasco & Robinson, 2007).

**Manipulation** is an aspect that encompasses the notion of getting the counterpart to react according to one’s own parameters, without their awareness. Whether this is an unethical tactic has been widely discussed; either way it should be assessed for each individual incident (Honeyman & Schneider, 2006; Sunshine, 1990). By the same token, it can generate an unethical attitude that may be seen as trivialising. Many techniques are available within the category of manipulation (Nieuwmeijer, 1992). A common tactic is to divide the negotiation into smaller pieces, which the counterpart must agree to before entering into the next stage of the process. With this approach, one party will have a good perspective of the negotiation as a whole, while the opposing party is unable to
determine the overall direction the bargaining is taking. ‘Divide and conquer’ is a manipulative effect that can be paramount when taking advantage of internal disagreements (Auer, 1993). Various forms of role-plays are also common and entail one party acting in a different manner than they would in real life; a common tactic is the ‘good-cop-bad-cop’ routine (Auer, 1993).

Power is another central issue in ethical dilemmas. Power is the ability to influence the other party and shape their positions to fit your own parameters. Power often serves as an underlying factor in the relationship between the negotiating parties, either through concrete advantages before negotiations commence – for example if one party owes the other a favour – or through one party having higher social authority than the other (Fells, 2009). However, power is first and foremost associated with winning concessions, and not necessarily integrative measures. Developing power is dependent on several elements, including knowledge of interests and procedures, good relations, developing alternatives and understanding consequences, common solutions that show an interest for the other parties’ interests, legitimisation of the deal-making process, and believability of the ultimatums put forward (Fells, 2009).

Conflict can occur when using these tactics, which is imperative to resolve. There are several principles available to guide the conflict resolution process, such as: power, rights, interests, dissolution and avoidance (Rout, 2007). Many of these are identified as principles of bargaining in former sections, but they also serve as imperatives in conflict resolution. With the use of power, rights or interests one can confront the actual conflict (Fells, 2009; Rout, 2007). When using dissolution or avoidance, however, one circumvents the conflict (Rout, 2007). Further, there are several healthy ways to confront a conflict. For example, with the use of power one can authorise strikes, manipulation, and distributive bargaining; while with the use of rights, one can use the law, rules, or norms (Fells, 2009).

Since these tactics can provoke standstills or deadlocks, a healthy approach towards the opposing party must be established. As difficult counterparts can be unpleasant, unethical, aggressive, unwilling to follow the rules and can make unreasonable demands or threats, it can become difficult for negotiators to convey their points effectively (Benoliel, 2011; Bolt & Houbo, 2002). Certain counterparts may not be interested in bargaining at all. These are deemed freeloaders or stallers.
(Richardson, 1987). In certain marketplaces there is legislation to resolve this, but usually in private enterprise the parties concerned must employ tactics to manage these dilemmas.

To do so, the negotiator must try to understand the motivation behind the actions of the counterpart and identify the bargaining zone (Bazerman & Neale, 1993). It is important from the outset to establish how serious the opponent is and to try to reveal their tactics. For instance, ‘studying the frequency of communication can reveal the tactics negotiators are emphasising and the overall effects that tactics have on outcomes – negotiation sequences capture the social dynamics of the negotiation and reveal the cue and response pattern embedded in the negotiators’ communications’ (Brett & Gelfand, 2004, p. 139). It is also necessary to establish why the opposing party acts the way they do. Often issues of nervousness or personality come into play (Blake, Leahy & Taylor, 1996). However, if one believes that the counterpart does not have a tactic, letting them express their frustration may aid the situation as well as uncovering their weak points (Carrell & Heavrin, 2004). Another tactic for understanding the real cause of an opponent’s behaviour is to ask questions with a known response, in order to assess the credibility of the opponent’s answer (Asherman & Asherman, 2001).

It is easy to begin a frontal attack with a difficult opponent. However, this may be counterproductive and agitate the opponent further. Despite this, it is imperative not to give in to the opponent’s behaviour, since this not only means the loss of one’s position of power, but also will be perceived by the opponent as gaining the upper hand (Fells, 2009). This can have an adverse effect on the whole bargaining process with the counterpart repeatedly taking advantage.

### 2.4 Negotiation as conflict resolution

Although a literature base has been established, the focus has primarily been on distributive negotiation practice and the contradictory theories involved in separating behaviours and strategies (Agrawal & Kool, 2006; Kersten, 2001). Recent studies have outlined reasons for this (Bazerman et al., 2000), ranging from the lack of clarity of the characteristics of the integrative process and issues pertaining to procedure, through to the lack of a theoretical framework due to the limitations of previous research (Agrawal & Kool, 2006; Bazerman et al., 2000). Issues concerning the
implementation of the framework have been pivotal, together with categorising and refining operational integrative solutions within a relational negotiation approach (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). However, as far back as when negotiation was first studied in relation to labour bargaining (Follet, 1940; McKersie, 1965), there have been issues pertaining to such elements of the subject under research; ranging from the process as a whole, through to integration of interests and end goals, and to when the various elements are applicable.

Follet’s (1940) early but influential work on bargaining suggested three ways of dealing with conflict: domination, compromise and integration. Domination is the easiest way of dealing with conflict in the short-term; however, it is not a viable approach for dealing with future conflicts and ensuring the longevity of relationships. The reason for this is apparent through the inconsistency and breakdown in negotiations after World War One, where disharmony was created. The compromising approach initially derived from union tactics (Follet, 1940). It is commonly perceived as both sides giving up some parameters in order to continue collaborating. However, examples of misuse of this approach are identified through misrepresentation. For example, parties often ask for more than what is expected to achieve above their own sought-after baseline. Integration asserts that desires from both parties are respected and solutions are found where neither side has to sacrifice anything. Compromise ‘does not create, it deals with what already exists; integration creates something new’ (Follet, 1940, p. 35). Furthermore, Follet argued that, in this context, conflict can and should be exploited as a motivator for constructing new solutions. However, in advocating integration, Follet also recognised that integration requires high levels of intelligence, sound perceptiveness, and most importantly, brilliant inventiveness. Little attention is devoted to how to implement or construct a model for utilization of such a strategy. The overall suggestion is that the conflict resolution process must become interpersonal, striving to understand the circular motion and creativity that pertains to human interaction (Follet, 1940). This notion permeates more contemporary research, such as the Harvard Negotiation Project (Fisher et al., 1991). Therefore, this work is considered influential in the sense that Follet described and aided the foundation of integrative and ‘real-interest’ based bargaining.

McKersie (1965) approached bargaining and conflict in a similar manner, but differed on various points. McKersie suggested four key processes of negotiations: distributive, attitudinal,
internal, and integrative bargaining, and set forth an explicit and elaborate model for the first time in bargaining literature. Similar to Follet’s (1940) work, McKersie also identified a broad body of obstacles to integrative conflict resolution, identifying several sub-processes that occur in a bargaining event when different payoff structures are apparent. These deal with the contrast between the issues, which are related to the fixed total objective, and problems, which are agenda items that can be used to create rather than diminish alternatives. In similar fashion to Follet’s early work, McKersie’s assertions of integration obstacles were similar, but he further refined the processes that constitute a framework. This is apparent through the claim that a problem is considered

an agenda item for which the parties would assign the same preference ordering to all possible outcomes and about which the two parties would be equally concerned - for an issue the interests of the two parties are diametrically opposed; for a problem the interests are identical or completely coincidental (McKersie, 1965, p. 127).

In establishing the integrative model, McKersie identified several key tactics that should be used. These are important to identify as they influence later research on this topic (Bartos, 1995; Bazerman et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 1991; Lewicki et al., 2010). Identifying the problem serves as an imperative. McKersie (1965) stated this should be done by both parties where they identify items that singularly or in combination have integrative possibilities. This is underpinned by several sub-processes such as: timing of negotiations, the agenda, and how the agenda is presented. This can only be established through Follet’s (1940) notion that the first step towards integration is to bring differences into the open.

Further, searching for alternative solutions is a central element. Integration requires more, rather than fewer, alternate solutions for mutual consideration. This is done by implementing several processes: advanced notice of negotiation time, preliminary discussions, establishing a sequence of agenda items, and general orientation. All of which, McKersie (1965) stated, are founded upon flexibility and creativity by both parties, whilst allowing the status quo to be challenged. The last point for implementing the integrative strategy is to select the best mutual alternative. However, this does entail the challenges of time limits and creating a dialogue that constructively assesses all alternatives. Tactics proposed are: reporting of respective utility functions, combining and dividing
proposals, conditions to facilitate the steps, information and language. These must all be founded on a shared trust by all parties.

As identified, this early work from McKersie approached bargaining through several rational opinions. This created, arguably for the first time in negotiation literature, an in-depth description of sub-processes. These are processes based on relational dilemmas, as well as case specificity. However, while these processes are logically explained from a theoretical point of view, they are not based on empirical evidence. Both Follet’s (1940) and McKersie’s (1965) work was based on personal reports from dilemmas pertaining to union bargaining, hence, little objective empirical evidence is apparent. Further, there was limited attention given to more complex multi-party negotiations, or bargaining in different industries, or in an international arena. Thus, issues of culture, international trade, alternative dispute resolution, and business formation were largely overlooked. By the same token, both these publications contributed to the nascent negotiation literature and were instrumental in founding later empirical studies.

2.5 Disparity in negotiation research methods

Researchers adopt a variety of methodological approaches to investigating negotiation, such as the use of experimental methods. A recent study by Choi (2010) attempted to investigate behaviour in transitions and shared views through an experiment. The author investigated the effect of shared metacognition (shared and active control of thinking processes) on a bargaining event. The experiment was designed to manipulate whether the sides knew that their counterpart had a comparable view of the negotiation assignment; for example, if there was mutual understanding and expectations about the outcomes of the agenda items. The findings showed that having common metacognition was positive for collaboration, for better insights into the counterpart’s values, and for higher satisfaction levels with both the process and outcome.

This also proved to be the case in different circumstances where the parties’ specific items and incentives were mixed. Choi (2010) proposed that negotiators can take advantage by increased common understanding of the bargaining event and by openly communicating this understanding before commencing the negotiation event. Thus, Choi’s (2010) study produced valuable outcomes
pertaining to better understanding the sub-processes and antecedents initially identified by McKersie (1965), through the use of experimental procedure.

However, this investigation as with many other similar experimental studies (Cai & Donahue, 1997; Chevalier, 2009; Merkin, 2006; Oetzel, 2001) failed to elaborate on how these shared views (in this case termed metacognition) have an impact on the actual bargaining event. As established, both integrative and mixed bargaining strategies are heavily influenced by the approach taken to the agenda and potential for mutual gain. Choi’s (2010) study laid out the premise for shared views and cooperation – it was a staged experimental environment – but this does not necessarily translate into a real event because negotiators do not unequivocally enter into bargaining having similar views, a feature that was emphasised beforehand to all parties in this research project.

In a similar vein Giacomantonio, De Dreu, Shalvi, Sliigte and Leder (2010), adopted a post-positivist experimental paradigm in their bargaining research. They examined how construal levels, also explained as common understandings, and common motivation influence negotiators’ behaviours in the decision making process. Giacomantonio et al. (2010) predicted, on the basis of the former established theories, that under high levels of mutual understanding the negotiators’ behaviour is formed through the social motivation they endorse, related to being either concerned with both parties’ outcome or just their own. This study comprised two experiments using game theory and face-to-face negotiation. Both studies supported their increased value-behaviour hypothesis, which indicated that more socially adaptive participants were more collaborative, whilst the participants concerned only with their own stakes were more competitive under high rather than low levels of mutual understanding.

Giacomantonio et al. (2010) added to the notion that individuals who are self-interested also tend to take a short-term perspective on bargaining. The reason their counterparts were more yielding and collaborative stems from their view of the agenda items from a long-term orientation, which inherently facilitates more integrative behaviour. The practical implications from these two studies are relevant in furthering the notion of integrative strategies. Face-to-face behaviours show tendencies for more social individuals to render new alternatives and create a sustainable collaborative environment.
Moreover, the empirical findings build on the initial points pertaining to the integrative behaviours where building future relations is claimed to be a cornerstone (Fisher et al., 1991).

Since a typical business negotiation inherently deals with many different individuals, all of whom have different stakes, there are intrinsic behaviour traits that need to be addressed and accommodated (Steele & Aronson, 1995). This creates an incentive to find common ground and to cooperate. Consequently, the negotiation can take a new direction and move towards the facilitation of new ideas (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999), potentially building longevity in business relationships between the respective parties. From this emerging theoretical notion, it is viable to create a ‘bigger pie’ and settlement disputes can potentially reach optimal levels (Fisher et al., 1991; Lewicki et al., 2010), with settlement entailing alternatives that were not previously obvious to the parties concerned.

Many factors contribute to the integrative aspects of negotiation (Sawang et al., 2011), but there is little literature examining the techniques for approaching the issues associated with this contemporary business dilemma. The common perception is that the notion of creating alternatives and value lies at the forefront of this approach to reach sound outcomes that cater to the needs of all participants involved (Bazerman et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 1991; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008). This thesis addresses these discrepancies in negotiation research by directly observing the behaviours and strategies that negotiators take when faced with intricate problems.

2.6 Negotiation across cultures

With the growing significance of international trade and globalisation, there is a need to understand and tackle dilemmas that arise during negotiations that include individuals from a diverse range of cultures (Bird & Stevens, 2003). Different cultures derive from a set of collective beliefs that function within a social system developed over many generations, and are perceived to be the norm for the individuals within it (Bar-Tal, 2000). Different societies comprise a range of different institutions, and culture is the way people identify with and communicate within and between these institutions and derive meaning from them.

‘Cultural literacy’ refers to a wide-ranging understanding of this meaning-making system and of the respective culture itself. As such, cultural literacy necessitates a thorough understanding of the
host culture of the individual with whom one is bargaining (Garrett, 2005). The dimensions involved in understanding culture as meaning systems are always associated with the culture in which they are a part, and these systems are a part of the framework that supports the culture as a whole (Lewis, 2002).

As a consequence of the wide range of different dimensions on the global scene, culture has a major impact on modern-day business. International negotiators must now take into account several dissimilar premises at one time when taking part in a bargaining event (Hofstede, 2004). These are the negotiator’s own culture of origin, the culture in which they operate, and that of the other party.

Intercultural communication is becoming more important because of increased peaceful contact between countries via trade, and greater cultural diversity within countries. However, it is also due to increasing levels of hostile contact between sovereign states, often instigated by communication breakdown (Eunson, 2008). As such, globalisation ‘presents both challenges and opportunities to the construction and negotiation of cultural identities’ (Kvidal, 2008, p.56).

2.6.1 National culture and negotiation

The notion of what is acceptable in negotiation varies in relation to the environment and the culture surrounding the negotiations (Fleury & Volkema, 2002). This is the case not only for local bargaining within a nation, but also in a broader perspective in which different countries have their own religious and normative backgrounds. These aspects permeate the utilisation of different tactics. To investigate this, Fleury and Volkema (2002) surveyed 72 negotiators from Brazil and 70 negotiators from the United States, from a diverse spectrum of industries. The survey comprised five factors pertaining to bargaining behaviour. The main findings pertaining to cultural differences in conflict were observed in one specific behavioural type: manipulation through exaggerating opening demands. The participants from the United States indicated a greater likelihood of using this behaviour than their Brazilian counterpart when the negotiation was considered important or the opponent had a good reputation. United States negotiators were also more likely to make promises they could not keep when faced with a stringent time deadline. This research therefore not only
represents cross-national bargaining characteristics, but builds on the theory that different tactics are influenced by both culture and case specific variables.

In a similar fashion, Adair et al. (2004) investigated the role of information on joint gains in intercultural negotiations. This study took a broader view and incorporated six different cultures: France, Russia, Japan, Hong Kong, Brazil and the United States. The United States was anomalous in that it was the only country exhibiting high levels of individualism. Adair et al. (2004) hypothesised that U.S. negotiators would be more likely to use direct information sharing strategies than the other five. An experimental negotiation simulation was undertaken, in conjunction with a pre-test cultural survey, and a post-test survey on the goals reached. The beneficial finding in this study was that both the United States and Japan were able to produce high levels of joint gains, irrespective of their dissimilar cultural backgrounds. This study shows that there are different paths and tactics available for joint gains that are not necessarily culturally bound. The U.S. negotiators used a lot of direct information exchange and probing questions on most agenda items. The Japanese negotiators used more indirect information exchange and persuasion with a medium amount of questions. As such, the Japanese prioritised information exchanges through tactics relevant to their potential trade-offs, and were wary of using too much direct communication.

It is vital to understand these cultural dimensions in relation to bargaining settlements. However, this field of research has seen some criticism, especially of the work of Hofstede, whose critics point out that one consequence of these theories is that culture may be perceived as static and unchanging over time (Bardhan & Weaver, 2010). It has been suggested that instead of framing a country’s culture as homogenous, an alternative approach is to view it as heterogeneous and dynamic. Certain authors state that this should be done at the level of individual behaviour (Fang & Gehart, 2005). Hofstede’s (1980) initial study did in fact measure culture on an individual level, however, the results were collated and generalised to dimensions on a country level. Other consequences related to these dimensions are that they can generate preconceptions and prejudice (Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Zerbe, 2006). Quantitative empirical data of this sort is prone to criticism due to biases and misinterpretation. Hofstede (1984; 2004) claimed that if research can reduce the uncertainty factor of
interpretation by over 51 per cent, the studies are justifiable because they reinforce major inferences from the cultural dimensions in the respective society.

However, one of the most pervasive criticisms of late deals with the established cultural dimensions and the notion of ecological fallacy. The concept of ecological fallacy was first introduced by Robinson (1950) and pertains to drawing conclusions based on correlations from aggregated data onto the individual level, or vice versa: making inferences from individual scores onto national culture (Hofstede, Bond & Luk, 1993). Hofstede et al. (1993) claimed that a possible consequence of this fallacy is that data collected at the ecological level is more likely to be regarded with suspicion than data collected from individuals. Further, a major limitation of many cross-cultural studies is that they have used ‘country’ as the independent variable, and then interpreted this as equivalent to ‘culture’. It is problematic when ‘country’ or ‘nation’ is used interchangeably with cultural values (Sawang, Goh & Oei, 2006). This thesis therefore focuses on cultural values, instead of country of origin, in order to examine the relationship between cultures and negotiation behaviours.

Moreover, the survey instrument employed in this study is effective in identifying the respective value types, as has been previously supported by a vast sample size throughout various cultures globally (Schwartz, 1992). Moreover, it is widely used for similar cohorts and is beneficial for this project due to language and specificity thereof (Chiu et al., 2007). Additionally, this instrument and the setting were utilized to circumvent the common fallacies in cross-cultural research, such as ecological and instrument equivalence. As such, this etic (culture free) instrument is free from the constraints of the emic (culture bound) instruments, which are only applicable to measuring dimensions within a single society (Wilson, 2010).

Further, although concern about measurement and analysis is apparent, these constructs must still be viewed as fundamental structures in the societies where people become socialised. Since these are basic values that people are introduced to during their formative years, culture may be viewed as a process that is perpetually changing, albeit over long periods of time. Therefore, investigating and understanding culture not only on a national, but also on an individual level should be considered integral to the methodology required for successful international bargaining. This thesis addresses these concerns by building on the research of intercultural negotiation by asserting that outcomes may
be variously influenced by culture. In addition, it is possible that cultures that exert maximized joint gains use a mixed strategy of direct and indirect information sharing strategies.

2.6.2 Cultural values and negotiation

Cultural values refer to shared beliefs of members from a particular society that influence the way of life (Sawang et al., 2006). Therefore, cultural values can influence an individual’s thoughts and behaviours. It is expected that individuals of different cultures would vary in their negotiation behaviours.

Individualism vs. collectivism

The seminal author on cultural research, Hofstede (2004) provided several dimensions to explain cultural values. The notion of individualism versus collectivism, first identified by Hofstede (1984), and subsequently investigated by Harris (2007) and Schwartz (1990; 1996), refers to the degree to which a person defines their character according to group or individual and private values. Both concepts have positive and negative connotations. In an individualistic culture, individual decisions are perceived as superior. Hence, incentives are often given to individuals. In these cultures the media is an essential source of information (Hofstede, 2004). Conversely, in a collectivist culture group decision-making is sought; incentives are given to promote working in groups, and hence the social network is the main source of information.

Moreover, the reason the individualist-collectivist (IC) constructs were established to be the pillars for the cultural examination in this study stems back to the fact that the construct is widely used in academic studies and has been deemed the single most important dimension for assessing cultural diversity in social science (Triandis, 1985). Further, it is useful as a general factor for differentiating between cultural groups and the dichotomous way in which they communicate (Niles, 1998). This research is based on extensive empirical data from all over the world, thus it has validity in terms of identifying individuals and their relationships to groups in their respective societies (Niles, 1998). The construct is also essential for determining the goal orientation of the participants, thus, it is highly relevant as a variable that could potentially influence negotiation behaviour.
However, it is not an expectation of this study to find that one individual is purely associated with one type of cultural dimension, but merely establish what emphasis the respective participant laid on one cultural orientation (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk & Gelfand, 1995). The individualist-collectivist construct is the broadest and most established dimension (Niles, 1998), hence, a natural choice for the negotiation simulation of this study.

**Power distance**

Hofstede (2004) asserted that power distance is a central dimension. Power distance refers to dissimilar solutions to the essential problem of human inequality. In high power distance environments, organisations are hierarchical; staff fear disagreeing with supervisors, and supervisors tend to have an authoritarian decision-making approach. This notion has been broadened to look at cultures, investigating attitudes to power in education, society and the workplace (Eunson, 2008). The main outcomes put forth from this research are that social inequality, including varying relationships with authority, occur across all industries and elements of society (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). Thus, Hofstede’s dimensions are suitable for studying the distribution of power in that they are empirically tested on a global stratum; however, researchers should be aware that there is no single way of partitioning the cross-cultural spectrum (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011).

From these established dimensions it is inferred that in cross-cultural encounters, such as negotiations, individuals from high power distance cultures will prefer to work with negotiators or principals of high status rather than delegates (Hofstede, 2004). Further, people from collectivist cultures prefer to build rapport over an extended period of time. People from highly individualistic cultures may attempt to resolve conflicts by using power, while individuals from collectivist cultures are more likely to resolve conflicts through compromise and consensus (Eunson, 2008). However, individual behaviour is often culturally inconsistent and can be overridden by personality traits.

Vieregge and Quick (2011) investigated how power distance influences negotiation in different cultures. Their study surveyed seventeen different nationalities and found that, consistent with Hofstede’s dimensions, cultures with high power distance accept high degrees of inequality within society and support a hierarchical distribution of power, both inside and outside of professional
settings (Vieregge & Quick, 2011). Cultures with low power distance scores, such as Germany and the United States, tend to utilize more persuasive techniques and compromise, in turn assuming that both parties have equal negotiation power. However, the survey results generated valuable insight into how culture changes over generations. Findings suggested that negotiation behaviour changes between generations in most Asian cultures, as the younger generation approach decision making in a different manner. As the traditional literature emphasises that Western negotiators should focus on building relationships with Eastern culture, the younger collectivist negotiators surveyed in Vieregge and Quick’s (2011) project exhibited more willingness towards technical problem solving rather than relational. No generational changes between individualistic cultures were detected. Hence, the practical implications drawn from this study are important in two ways: individualistic negotiators should emphasise the preparation of technical negotiations for the future, but keep in mind that the dominant generation of collectivist bargainers still prevail; thus, the traditional relation of power distance is still relevant for contemporary negotiations (Vieregge & Quick, 2011). However, this study supports the criticism of Hofstede’s power dimensions and modern cultural research that national culture is not static (Bardhan & Weaver, 2010), but perpetually evolving and changing over time (Kanousi, 2005; Kueh & Voon, 2007; Yoo & Donthu, 2002).

**High vs. low context**

In addition to these dimensions, Hall’s (1976) context model is pervasive. ‘High context’ refers to a culture in which the context of communication is as significant as the actual message, whereas ‘low context’ describes a culture in which the context of the communication is not as central as the communicated message itself. Communication and culture are therefore both context-related. If the context is tangible and can be measured it will differ from situation to situation and from one culture to another. Thus, Hall (1976) argued that cultures can be assumed to be either low or high context. These two dimensions make it feasible to create a spectrum of context and to categorise cultures according to where they are placed within this spectrum. However, these different dimensions are not necessarily viewed in a separate manner. In relation to Hofstede’s (2004) models, high context cultures tend to assert higher collectivism than individualism, are likely to have higher rather than
lower power distances, and to have an inclination towards long-term rather than short-term orientations (Eunson, 2008).

Richardson and Smith (2007) empirically tested these assumptions between two nationalities widely established as dichotomous in relation to power distance levels, Japan and the United States. Their survey, comprising 150 participants equally distributed between the two nations, after a refinement of the low/high context scale, supported the assumptions of key cultural researchers that: Japanese (collectivist) scored higher on the scale than the U.S (individualistic) participants. However, they also identified a small effect size that indicates other factors are also highly influential. Instead of categorizing Japan as a high context culture and the U.S. as a low context culture as traditionally described, the notion of context and culture should be used with relativity to describe one synergistic dimension of cultures, i.e., where the dimensions suffuse one another (Richardson & Smith, 2007). As such, research into the respective scale supports replicating the test with other samples to validate the construct of cultural dimensions in this regard.

Adair (2003) implemented a mixed approach in determining communication styles in relation to cultural context and negotiation. The study set out to identify the difference in effectiveness between same and mixed-culture negotiations. Ninety-three low context dyads and 101 high context dyads were studied separately, whilst 48 were of mixed cultural context dyads. The study used country of origin as proxy for determining low and high context culture. A negotiation simulation was set in place where the communication was transcribed and coded. Not only did the result show support for Hall’s (1976) theories, but it also revealed indirect integrative communication from the purely high context dyads, and direct integrative communication from low and mixed context dyads. Thus, Adair’s (2004) findings showed that better joint gain outcomes are produced within low and mixed context dyads. Although the results from this study are not surprising, it was a vital discovery in regards to the early work of Hall (1976), which did not assess integrative behaviour in the context of negotiation. In the process, communication differences were established that generated the framework for new research.

Further, high and low context cultures diverge in relation to: non-verbal communication, individual versus group decision-making and obligation, time orientation, utilisation of documents for
reaching contract agreements, and the need to implicitly or explicitly clarify understandings (Hall, 1976). As a result of these differences, cross-cultural practice and proficiency in communication requires negotiators to be creative. Creating sound cross-cultural negotiation practices should ensure greater realisation of bargaining outcomes in an increasingly globalised and multicultural world.

**Particularistic vs. universalist cultures**

Other vital cultural dimensions identified in the literature are ‘particularistic’ and ‘universalist’ cultures (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998). These cultural dimensions are primarily founded upon the dichotomous relationship between rules and relationships. At one end of the spectrum there is an obligation to follow standards that are universally agreed upon. At the other end, one encounters particular obligations to familiar people. Universalistic, or rule-based, behaviour leans towards abstraction. Particularistic judgments emphasise the exceptional nature of current circumstances no matter what the rules demand. This is identified as the relationalist approach (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998). As a result, negotiators from different societies will tend to think of each other as corrupt and unethical, since their views do not coincide with their normative backgrounds.

French, Zeiss and Scherer (2001) examined this dichotomy between two differing cultures; France and the United States. At the outset, a case study was provided to the 24 participants (twelve from each country) pertaining to ethical dilemmas to be negotiated over. The binary alternatives were then rated post discussion. The participants were analysed through qualitative behavioural analysis from audio-tape recordings. The U.S. participants negotiated according to the stereotype of Hampden-Turner and Trompenaar’s (1998) universalist dimension by presenting arguments to defend their own position. However, in instances when they were pressured by their French counterpart to find alternative solutions, a subtle change was observed in their characteristics. The U.S. negotiator then started to acknowledge communitarian obligations, and moved away from the stringent individualistic behaviour previously adopted. This change of attitude identified by French, Zeiss and Scherer (2001) was also identified by Hampden-Turner and Trompenaar (1998), with universalists often tending to change behaviour due to the underlying notion of pragmatism pertaining to this cultural dimension.
Conversely, the French only used pragmatism when a more communitarian and particularistic agenda item benefited from this approach. The main findings showed that the universalists were more concerned with their own position and the process of obtaining objectives, whilst the particularistics were mostly concerned with the objectives of the specific case. As a result, this study confirmed the notion that particularistic culture is highly situational, while a universalist culture is rule bound. However, bridging differences in this case pertaining to ethical dilemmas is also driven by the community with which the two parties associate themselves. Both the situation and the community influences negotiators if there is progress and solutions to be gained, regardless of cultural dimension (French, Zeiss & Scherer, 2001).

Snejina and Hutchings (2006) also investigated two differing cultures through the universalist-particularistic lens. They put forth theoretical propositions regarding knowledge sharing in China and Russia, arguing that there are important national cultural similarities and differences between the two nations that influence individual knowledge-sharing behaviour in both Chinese and Russian institutions. The main claim was that collectivism and particularistic relationships between the two cultures guide intensive social relations among constituents, which facilitate knowledge sharing between group members in both countries’ institutions. The main findings showed that although the two countries exhibit similar particularistic cultures, this varies to degrees within each nation, which influences knowledge sharing. The practical implication observed in this case is that although two countries have similar dimensions within this context, specific characteristics underlie this that relate to a self-interest motive or group-interest motive (Snejina & Hutchings, 2006). This can be observed within collectivistic and particularistic societies.

Furthermore, agreement is increasing among researchers that universalism is an aspect of the modernisation of more complex and industrialised societies (Castaneda & Ramirez, 1974; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998; Turner, 1990). Particularism is considered to be a facet of smaller rural societies in which everyone is known individually (Gupta & Sharma, 2006; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998). However, universalism is seldom used to the exclusion of particularism; rather it shapes the first principles in the development of a moral rationale (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998). A serious danger for universalist cultures is that the significance of the relationship is often
overlooked when negotiating with more particularistic cultures. When negotiators operate internationally, there is an almost inevitable move towards universalist ways of communicating and thinking. Some areas in which these dilemmas may surface relate to the writing of contracts, timing of meetings, roles of senior staff and evaluation of the bargaining event, as well as rewards. The weighty contract is a pragmatic underpinning in universalist cultures; negotiation puts the parties on notice that any breach will possibly be expensive and that assurances must be kept. However, in particularistic cultures, negotiators will be more prone to develop relationships over time and the signing of a physical contract is seldom rushed (Gupta & Sharma, 2006; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998).

2.7 Exploring intercultural negotiation through Face Negotiation Theory (FNT)

Facework typology has been used in empirical sociological studies for decades (Manstead & Semin, 1983; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). The term ‘facework’ stems from a description of self-image relevant to social attributes. It has been used in various fields including sociology, linguistics, psychology and, more recently, in investigations of negotiation and communication. The notion of saving or preserving face is the central dilemma investigated in relation to communication between cultures (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). Furthermore, facework ‘is the public image of an individual or group, what their society sees and evaluates based on cultural norms and values’ (Katre, Orngreen & Yammiyavar, 2010, p. 49). As such, this typology can be differentiated from other communication frameworks in that it is highly interpersonal and suitable for measuring values at the level of individual behaviour.

Initially, facework has been used to investigate the flow of interactions in the maintenance of an expressive order; a perspective that uncovers the possibility that social interactions may contain events that in some way threaten an individual’s definition of self and of the situation (Manstead & Semin, 1983). Goffman (1955) argued that this is underpinned by the notion of ‘embarrassment’ and that this has two sets of implications. Preventative practice is used to pre-empt the occurrence of such situations, and corrective practice is used if such an incident occurs. Avoidance behaviour prevents threats to face, and escape behaviour strives to reconstruct social equilibrium (Goffman, 1955). Goffman (1967) further developed the notion of defending or protecting threats, along with the term
pride, which is based on collectivistic ideas of saving face in relation to society. This in turn is underpinned by honour, and saving face by using dignity, tact and diplomacy, while leaving facts unstated (Goffman, 1967). Early criticism of this empirical framework asserted that it is difficult to comprehend as a scientific enterprise due to the difficulties of establishing the validity of its elements, which are based on establishing inferences from the choice of words with connotations in ordinary life (Strodbeck, 1970).

2.7.1 Previous studies using FNT

Different studies have investigated facework using both experimental and non-experimental methodologies. Consistent with Goffman’s (1955) paradigm, Gross and Stone (1964) utilised a qualitative non-experimental method to analyse the content of embarrassing episodes, which they categorised into three elements: identity, poise, and maintenance of confidence. These all have implicit and explicit defensive practices attached to them and are required for normal social interaction (Gross & Stone, 1964). Manstead and Semin (1983) argued that, for this reason, analysis of recollections of embarrassing incidents explains social behaviour and provides empirical support for Goffman’s framework. Early interpersonal facework studies of experimental art (Brown, 1968; Brown & Garland, 1971; Garland & Brown, 1972) have drawn on Goffman’s theories and associated them with bargaining, due to the negotiator’s concern with avoiding losing face in front of his or her counterpart. Brown (1968) stated that in this context face is split between face-saving and face-restoration. Further, Brown’s (1970) experimental studies have generated some interesting results. Brown (1970) used two experiments to determine if earlier facework research on interpersonal bargaining could be extended to explain behaviour following an experimentally induced embarrassment. The empirical data supported this hypothesis, as participants performing a more embarrassing task believing their opponents were ignorant of the potential rewards sacrificed significantly more than participants under other conditions (Brown, 1970). Thus, the facework model has produced constructive results and is deemed valuable as it ‘helps us to analyse and comprehend human behaviour in many kinds of social interaction’ (Manstead & Semin, 1983, p. 69).
Following these empirical findings, Brown and Levinson (1987) developed the politeness theory. Both positive-face and negative-face deal with social interaction. Positive face asserts that the individual seeks social approval and inclusion, while negative face asserts that the individual is reliant on his or her independence of character to thrive in the social interaction (Brown and Levinson, 1987). These notions permeate cross-cultural communication. A common consensus related to the culture is that people display regular styles across diverse conflict situations in different societies (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 2004). These conflict styles are adopted in people’s formative years through their primary socialisation within their respective cultures and thus they are intrinsic values (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). As a result, different face orientations are derived from different cultures. In individualistic cultures there is high utilisation of self-defence, domination, and competitiveness, while collectivist cultures tend to adopt integrative and compromising conflict styles (Chua & Gudykunst, 1987; Trubisky, Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991). To capture these values, Ting-Toomey (1991; 1998) coined the term face negotiation theory. This framework aids the process of explaining how these ubiquitous cultural dimensions influence not only communication, but also the various conflict styles (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 1984).

Several studies have tested this framework. An early study examined the relationship between face maintenance dimensions and conflict styles in several collectivistic countries and the United States, an individualistic society (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). In this study, a questionnaire was distributed to 965 respondents. The cultural dimensions were based on the participants’ native cultures; facework was drawn from Baxter’s (1984) measurement and interpersonal conflict styles and adopted from Rahim (1983). The results, based on quantitative data analysis, raised several points for further investigation. In addition to confirming the hypothesis that different cultural dimensions influence both self-face and other-face concerns, individualistic individuals tended to use higher degrees of dominating conflict styles than collectivistic individuals, who were more obliging during the conflicts. The study asserted that overall ‘facework predicts conflict style better than conflict style predicts facework’ (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991, p. 291). This also confirmed that the dimension of self-face correlates with a dominant style, while other-face correlates with the avoiding, compromising, and integrating styles. An integrative style is underpinned by the imperative of the mutual-face
dimension, which was utilised to a greater extent by the participants from Taiwan, a collectivist society, who tended to strive to find creative solutions catering to all parties (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). While this study generated valuable results from the nascent theory of face negotiation, it explained little of the actual face behaviour that occurs in a bargaining event, and thus did not produce any results on how conflict styles influence the implementation of strategy.

To further this conceptual refinement Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) have introduced a facework model for intercultural competence training. This refinement provided several important points for consideration during preparation for a bargaining event. First, Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) emphasised the differences between the dimensions of mindfulness and mindlessness. They proposed that, because creative individuals cultivate curiosity and interest in their immediate relationships and examine problems from as many viewpoints as possible (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Langer, 1997), they are most likely to embrace the facework of mindfulness. In contrast, routine thinkers are more likely to adopt the facework of mindlessness (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). This argument informed the creative exercises and training promoted by the authors, where students were made aware of the implicit behavioural issues pertaining to the mindfulness dimension and how they could influence the interaction skills needed for bargaining (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

Their study also made an important point in relation to both the integrative and the compromising styles. Previous studies asserted that different cultures refer to integration and compromise in different ways linguistically (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Hence, the underlying meaning and tone associated with these terms, as well as their implementation, differs greatly. Collectivist cultures view the notion of integration on a relational level where collaboration is followed by concession. However, individualistic cultures tend to search for substantiated solutions, followed by full closure (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Further, since face negotiation is an inherently complex interaction between the parties concerned, one conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that more direct methods are necessary for investigating these aspects of bargaining events.
2.7.2 Facework coding challenge

A range of studies have used the facework framework. Cai and Donohue (1997) used facework to investigate if culture has a global influence on negotiation practices or if culture solely influences communication in a more distinguished manner. Their study compared and contrasted two perspectives of the influence of culture on negotiation behaviour. The first perspective presumes that culture is a prevailing force, and the other perspective argues that culture combined with other aspects of interaction jointly influence negotiation behaviour. The authors used a quantitative coding structure of negotiation transcripts from negotiations between the collectivist culture of 30 Taiwanese participants and the individualist culture of 30 American participants. The findings in this study suggested that a combination of culture and interaction characterises the process of facework in negotiations. In addition, results showed a tendency for the case specific factors of interaction being a more dominant influence than cultural values in the overall use of facework (Cai and Donohue, 1997). Although these are significant findings, several issues can be observed. It did not thoroughly discuss the implications for understanding culture on communication in a direct facial way. It relied solely on typed transcripts analysed after the negotiation event, thus no inferences could be made about how implicit communication, for example, body language or various social settings, influenced the negotiations.

Merkin (2006) approached facework and culture in a more specific manner. This study examined whether Hofstede’s dimensions of uncertainty avoidance are a significant predictor to understanding differences in various countries. The survey between six countries comprising 658 participants in Chile, Hong Kong, Israel, Japan, Sweden and the United States, was completed after participants had read a case study representing a face threatening situation. The study used the theoretical knowledge from Hofstede’s (1984) early work to explore uncertainty avoidance in facework. The quantitative analysis of the surveys supported their main hypothesis, revealing that uncertainty avoidance influences ritualistic, harmonious, and aggressive facework strategies in an embarrassing behaviour. The research therefore confirmed that this particular cultural dimension is a significant influence on facework communication strategies.
The positive implication drawn from this study is that it showed evidence for one of Hofstede’s central cultural dimensions being correlated with both facework and cross-cultural communication. However, this investigation has the same problem as that observed within Cai and Donohue’s (1997) work in that it used post-reported analysis of a communication event, when examining broad and evolving factors such as culture and communication. The self-reported data has grave limitations in relation to facework because the participants were not actually observed carrying out the behaviours they were associating and concurrently reporting from the case.

Oetzel, Garcia and Ting-Toomey (2008) addressed these fallacies in facework behaviour. The study, which built on and adopted the same paradigm and methodology as Oetzel’s (2001) earlier research, recognized that the direct relationship of culture and face concerns to facework behaviour has limited empirical justification. This study investigated the relationship between self, other, and mutual face concerns and facework strategies in four different cultures: United States, Germany, Japan and China. In similar fashion to Cai and Donohue (1997) and Merkin (2006), the study used post-hoc analysis of recalled accounts from conflict situations. The survey, comprising 768 participants, equally distributed amidst the four cultures, involved self-reports about the participants’ attitudes and conflict behaviours in conflict situations. The main results were that other-face is associated with remaining calm, keeping discussion private, giving in, pretending positively and expressing emotion negatively. Self-face is associated strongly with defending positively. Mutual-face is associated strongly and negatively with aggression (Oetzel et al., 2008).

However, this study differentiated itself by identifying that there is a clear relationship between face concern and facework, yet little empirical support was found to establish a relationship to culture. The results showed some association between facework strategies and culture, but these were pan-cultural and did not arise on an individual level of behaviour; hence, the author’s suggestion that cultural training might be an element for consideration in preparing for cross-cultural negotiations, is somewhat vague. Although identifying some discrepancies across cultures, the study leaves room for further advancement on how facework can be used as framework in improving cross-cultural communication and relationships. As such, the findings help validate facework theory; as an instrument, however, it does little to promote alternative methodology and analysis. A natural
conclusion to draw from this research is that utilization of observational methods in conflict situations can generate valuable insight, and build on face negotiation theory.

Many previous empirical studies have generated valuable results by building on Ting-Toomey’s (1988) original theory. However, these have been quantitative in nature and primarily based on self-report surveys, and laboratory experiments; thus, they are overly complex and not necessarily translatable (Cai & Donahue, 1997; Chevalier, 2009; Merkin, 2006; Oetzel, 2001; Oetzel, Garcia & Ting-Toomey, 2008). Facework has been shown to be a difficult framework to code (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001), therefore a more direct approach to the empirical methodology is sought.

The videotaped interaction method (Sillars, 1991) is one technique among other ethnographic methodologies that has been recommended to gain a deeper ‘net-meaning’ of face (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). However, to the best of this author’s knowledge, no study has employed this technique in business negotiation research. This thesis, for the first time, adopts the videotaped interaction method for negotiation process observation in a business context. Rackham supported this notion, stating that ‘very few studies have investigated what actually goes on face-to-face during a negotiation’ (Rackham, 1980, p. 341). Rackham (1980) proposed that negotiators do not let researchers observe them work, as well as pointing to the lack of sound methodology and techniques. He goes on to suggest that observation is a simple and extremely effective tool for investigating negotiation. Rackham conducted a study in several phases using behavioural observation methods; tape-recorded interviews were conducted with negotiators before the negotiation event, in order to understand their planning process. Next, as the negotiation was conducted, frequencies of certain behaviours used by both parties during the negotiation process were counted, utilising behavioural analysis methods. Skilled negotiators showed marked differences in their face-to-face behaviour compared to average negotiators, with certain behaviours and strategies detected more frequently than others. Thus, the use of this tangible methodology has produced constructive results on how negotiators conduct themselves.
2.8 Ethical conduct in negotiation

In contemporary business practice the ability to identify and handle complex ethical dilemmas has become increasingly important (Kline, 2010). Ethical conduct and the measure of ethicality as a construct of its own is receiving attention both in academia and in professional research (Jeffrey, 2010), and has fuelled practices such as sustainability and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Ethics is the largely applied social standard for accepted behaviour in particular situations (Lewicki et al., 2010). As such, ethicality differs from individuals’ morality, and strives to both explain and set standards for how interpersonal relationships should be carried out and maintained.

This permeates into this thesis’ core field of examination, namely the interpersonal interactions occurring throughout negotiations. Applying ethical conduct in a negotiation setting can be an elusive task. There are no clear lines that define if a bargaining tactic is ethical or not. On a broad scale, positive and negative emotion management influence ethical behaviour in negotiation (Smithey, Fulmer, Bruce & Long, 2009), but it is not within the scope of this thesis to adopt such a general approach to the ethical research component. As a result, this thesis is specifically dealing with common characteristics of ethics in bargaining, which the literature refers to as ‘ethically ambiguous tactics’ (Fells, 2009; Lewicki et al., 2010). This terminology refers to ethical tactics as tools that may or may not be improper, depending on the situational context and the individual’s ethical reasoning (Lewicki et al., 2010). However, at its core ethics is concerned with standards of truth telling and to which degree a negotiation party is willing to disclose and convey honest information.

Volkema (2001) claimed that hiding information, such as bottom line figures, is one of the most prevalent tactics used, and this is often followed by exaggerating an opening offer (highballing). Even though these are deemed unethical based on the level of dishonesty, the tactics have in fact become so common within distributive bargaining strategy that they have become accepted as a norm (Fells, 2009; Volkema, 2001). It is an imperative discourse between ethical conduct in a negotiation environment and in society in general, where this type of behaviour is largely deemed unacceptable. These types of tactics are, on the one hand, tacitly agreed on being the rules of a negotiation event, but still considered to be unethical in terms of the broader definition of ethicality (Lewicki et al., 2010).
A scale which captures these unethical tactics has been developed in a study by Robinson, Lewicki and Donahue (2000). The four significant factors from this study, based on the SINS scale (Self-reported Inappropriate Negotiation Strategies) were utilized for this investigation and encompassed the unethical tactics of: traditional competitive bargaining, attacking an opponent, misrepresentation, and making false promises. The Robinson et al. (2000) study used these scales as an instrument to measure unethical behavior in a negotiation through a self-reported survey, in which 756 MBA students took part in an experiment based on a negotiation simulation. Results indicated that participants who endorsed traditional competitive behavior were more likely to utilize a broad spectrum of unethical tactics. This study also revealed that the endorsement of the unethical tactics was influenced by nationality, years of work experience, and major in a University undergraduate degree. In addition, a key point from the study showed that the willingness to endorse less ethical tactics did not directly relate to actual negotiation performance. Further information on this scale and its relevance to this thesis is explained in Chapter 3.

2.9 Negotiation and creativity

Many definitions of creativity appear throughout the existing literature. However, it is most commonly described as the notion of producing suitable ideas relating to some form of human activity (Meusburger, Funke, & Wunder, 2009). Creativity has been explored within a wide range of disciplines and is commonly perceived to have positive implications, whether in relation to contemporary business practice (Gogatz & Mondejar, 2005) or in academic environments (Runco, 2007). Further, Abel (2009) explored the word ‘creativity’ and its subsequent meaning, claiming that no one can capture the full extent of the terminology, stating that this is elusive and sought after in modern society. Moreover, Abel’s (2009) study observed that there are several key distinctions within the field of creativity, incorporating creativity as novelty, creativity as genuine, or creativity as radical, all of which proclaim different phases of ideas, ranging from the arbitrary to the fundamentally new, that can be implemented. Furthermore, the phrase ‘creative thinking abilities’
derives from historical literature describing the broad range of mental capacities presumed to be brought into play when individuals attain highly creative achievements (Torrance, 1966).

2.9.1 Previous studies in creativity

The literature on creativity identifies that creativity, in any aspect of its utilisation, is based on a multidimensional theory. This notion is supported by Guilford (1959), who identified four vital facets of creativity: fluency, the number of different ideas generated; flexibility, the number of different categories of ideas present; originality, the rarity of each idea produced; and elaboration, the addition of relevant detail. Previous studies (Murdoch & Puccio, 1999; Murdoch, Mance & Puccio, 2010) and fieldwork (De Pauw, Neetling & Venter, 2010) have found these concepts to be integrated. However, these assumptions are underpinned by two central elements, uniqueness and productiveness, which have generated valuable insights in creativity testing since the early stages of research in this area (Wallach & Kogan, 1966).

Murdoch et al. (2010) claimed that all these elements combined will ‘improve your ability to think in original ways, which is often needed to get the breakthrough necessary to handle open-ended problems’ (p. 60). They drew from Torrance’s (1966; 2004) empirical research, which comprised of a longitudinal study examining divergent thinking skills (creative elaboration of ideas). The study assessed the thinking abilities of school-age children and two decades later examined their accomplishment levels as adults, and found that divergent thinking is significantly correlated with creative accomplishment. Murdoch et al. subsequently drew from empirical data investigating this notion in a professional setting. Zaccaro, Mumford, Connelly, Marks and Gilbert’s (2000) study showed that divergent thinking abilities amongst 1,800 professionals had a positive correlation with complex problem-solving skills. In practical terms, this means a higher ability to produce more diverse options to challenges and create opportunities (Zaccaro et al., 2000).
2.9.2 A relationship between creativity and negotiation behaviours

Other researchers examined whether there is a relationship between creativity and negotiation behaviours. De Pauw, Neetling and Venter (2011) investigated creative individuals in relation to bilateral negotiation. Their study examined if negotiators with highly creative characteristics achieve better outcomes in a bargaining context with integrative potential. Seventy participants took part in a two-party negotiation, comprising 35 pairs. De Pauw, Neetling and Venter (2011) presumed that creativity was positively correlated with both economic and relational outcomes. Their study took place in two phases. The first was a self report survey assessing creativity. The second was a negotiation simulation followed by a post-negotiation survey assessing economic and relational outcomes. Their findings, based on quantitative analysis, indicated that there was no correlation between creativity and economic outcomes. However, relational negotiation outcomes from both parties were negatively correlated with creativity, thus did not confirm the hypothesis of a significant positive relationship. The authors proposed that future research should identify which aspects of creativity are crucial for negotiators, as well as encompass situational variables.

As such, De Pauw et al.’s (2011) study expanded understanding of the relationship between creativity and negotiation outcomes, but did not explain how creativity influences bargaining strategy or behaviour during the course of negotiations. This is a key facet because both communication styles and creativity are intangible items not necessarily captured well in self-reported instruments. These instruments are beneficial as indicators to behaviour; however, examination of actual behaviour is a more rigorous approach. While De Pauw et al.’s (2011) study identified a relationship; it did not offer practical suggestions about how to assess the relationship during a bargaining event. The study confirmed that individuals differ in creative thinking abilities, but this does not explain if creative behaviour can significantly influence certain negotiation strategies, or if it is a characteristic that can be developed over time.

As noted in the literature, the idea of creativity is socially constructed. It is a common perception that social interactions instigate creative thinking (Madjar, Oldham & Pratt, 2002), and that individuals that develop close, ongoing relationships enhance their ability to be creative (Ogilvie & Simms, 2008). In turn, this can produce new social forms and institutional arrangements to allow the
construction of new ways of overcoming dilemmas (Runco, 2004). This lays the foundation for investigating the element of creativity in relation to integrative negotiation.

A substantial body of literature describes the concept of subliminal creativity in negotiation (Frankel, 1998; Polzer, 1996; Spector, 1995). Polzer (1996) investigated this in light of individual and team negotiators. The study compared the two differing negotiating structures – individual and team. The theoretical notion is that, although team negotiators can be impeded by their structure in terms of internal cooperation and trust, there are advantages as greater numbers of people can create more new ideas. This value creation stems from having multiple perspectives on the same agenda items. These theories were experimentally tested by comparing the perceptions and outcomes of intergroup (team vs. team), inter-individual (individual vs. individual) and mixed teams (team vs. individual). The key findings showed that in mixed bargaining simulations, teams outperformed individual opponents and were perceived to have more power and better ability to create new ideas for resolutions. The same highly creative teams also showed tendencies for better integrative outcomes. Although this study was mainly concerned with investigating the different structures influencing negotiation outcomes, it proved highly beneficial in addressing the often perceived subliminal aspect of the process. There is agreement in the literature that creativity, implemented correctly, can be used to enhance the bargaining power of the respective party (Zaccaro et al., 2000). As this research implies that creativity is enhanced through multiple perspectives, it is viable to conclude that this is not only applicable to team negotiators, but on an individual level if there is awareness of the potential benefits (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Langer, 1997).

In furthering the notion of creativity and negotiation, Spector (1995) addressed the issue of resolutions when reaching deadlock. The main concern is to get failed negotiations back on track towards peaceful conclusions. Spector suggested that creativity heuristics, namely using creativity as a reasoning tool, could restore effectiveness of stalled negotiations. More specifically, the study used the fundamental construct of creativity: analogical reasoning is ‘the inferential process by which a resemblance, similarity, or correspondence, perceived between two or more things in some respect, suggest that they will probably agree in other ways as well’ (Spector, 1995, p. 87). This thinking
pattern is claimed to aid negotiators in reframing their conflict and in generating alternative solutions, potentially moving from a stalled bargaining process.

To test this, Spector (1995) used an experimental simulation design comprising 36 international negotiators. The negotiators were subject to statistical analysis of audio tape recordings of the simulation. The findings of this research project suggested that negotiators utilizing analogical reasoning enhance flexibility in the bargaining process, which in turn facilitates agreements. This research expanded on the notion of creativity in the bargaining process, and built on the earlier science that addresses flexibility (Guilford, 1959; Torrance, 1966). It also progressed the idea of alternative methodology in relation to bargaining and creativity. Although audio recordings are not a new method of analysing communication, in Spector’s case it proved viable for addressing the sub-processes of bargaining.

However, while Spector’s (1995) study produced sound insights and confirmed that creativity can get negotiations back on track from deadlock, it did not explain what positive results, if any, the parties achieved. As such, it did not provide any insight into the content of the negotiation results. Simply getting the process back on track in a more effective manner than would traditional tactics does not infer that creativity is able to yield valuable or substantiated outcomes for both parties. It does succeed, however, in establishing that creativity can aid in reframing the problems, thus functioning as an adjustment mechanism during the negotiation process.

Similarly, Frankel (1998) used a series of experiments to investigate creativity in negotiations. The author’s premise was based on what happens in a case where negotiators have the capability to use monetary value to expand the set of possible proposals. The experiments were set in place with two aims to see if side payments increase the potential for creative behaviour. The overall results showed that one negotiator’s creative behaviours are highly transferable and influence the other parties. With side payments, creativity influences the size of the bargaining pie but not its division. Without side payments, creativity and new ideas influence the division and distribution of outcomes. However, as generating ideas in this context makes an agreement more likely building on Polzer’s (1996) assertions it is also likely to diminish the stances taken by the other party. As a result, creative behaviour can produce an excessive amount of solutions, but is dependent on integrative
behaviour for acceptance and implementation. Since considerable literature exists claiming that creativity has a positive effect on many aspects of business (Gogatz & Mondejar, 2005; Hall, 1996; Ramus, 2001), this thesis attempts to establish whether there is a positive correlation between creativity and negotiation in modern-day business practice.

Further, as it is important to examine whether there is room for improvement in contemporary negotiation practice by moving from distributive to integrative relational processes (Curhan et al., 2006), this study explores the influence that creative individuals have on a negotiation event. The key reason for examining this topic in a behavioural and social-psychological light stems from the belief that individuals are more creative in a social environment than in isolation (Madjar et al., 2002), hence negotiation events provide an invaluable context for addressing this question.

Creativity is central to solving intricate problems pertaining to negotiation. Frankel (1998, p. 49), states that ‘creativity has an important role in labour-management negotiations, as well as in international disputes, where much effort is devoted to finding a formula to which each side can agree’. Hence, this thesis seeks ways to identify and utilise creativity by approaching the issue of value creation in the context of sound relational negotiation processes. Here, creativity can be seen as a potential tool, especially during the integrative negotiation process in a cross-cultural setting, since it appears to be a latent construct during the negotiation process. Thus, the effect creative participants have on negotiation outcomes should be better researched (De Pauw et al., 2010).

As established, creativity and the notion of generating ideas has been explored as a premeditated factor in previous negotiation research (Frankel, 1998; Polzer, 1996; Spector, 1995), however, its direct effect on relational negotiation outcomes is inadequately researched. Although there is limited empirical data, research has shown a clear link between creative behaviour and successful negotiation outcomes (De Pauw et al., 2011; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008), yet there is very little research focusing solely on creative individuals and relational negotiation behaviour during cross-cultural bargaining.

Although previous empirical studies have attempted to solve some of the difficulties surrounding successful negotiation outcomes (De Pauw et al., 2011; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008), there has been an overt focus on economic issues that has ignored the subliminal social concerns deriving
from globalisation and the internationalisation of the marketplace. These facets of international relations are vital in regard to relational negotiation outcomes, since it is predicted that this form of social behaviour will increase on a global scale in the future (Graham & Requejo, 2008). With the intricacies that this adds to the process of negotiation, it is vital to investigate the different aspects of this field, as creativity is expected to serve as a key element in negotiation practice in the future. The main aim of this thesis is to investigate and expand these research findings in the field of business negotiation. The proposed positive effect that creative individuals exert on contemporary negotiation events will be examined, and the approach of utilising creative behaviour and striving for integrative negotiation outcomes in order to achieve constructive outcomes will be assessed. This thesis contributes to solving the dilemmas implicit into the constructs of face negotiation theory, and consequently, will generate results that can be usefully incorporated into business practice by managers, negotiators and other constituents of organisations. The research questions that this thesis aims to answer are:

**RQ1:** How does creativity influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation?

It is also the aim of this thesis to explore how individualistic and collectivistic cultural dimensions influence the participant’s facework typology and ethical behaviour. Thus, the second question posed reads:

**RQ2:** How does culture influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation?

As established in earlier sections, the notions of creativity and integrative behaviour have become central elements in achieving optimal solutions through bargaining. This is evident within the facework literature (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998), which supports the premise that creativity is a valuable antecedent to sound bargaining outcomes. In turn, this leads to the research into creativity in relation to face negotiation theory. An additional research question to be asked is:

**RQ3:** Through the lens of facework negotiation theory, does the relationship between creativity and negotiation behaviours differ across cultures?
2.10 Conclusion

In this literature review, several fields relevant to the overall research questions of this thesis were examined. These included the topics of negotiation behaviour and strategy, cross-cultural communication, face negotiation theory and creativity. Further, this review elaborated on the idea that the utilisation of different bargaining behaviours and strategies entails consequences that require ethical consideration. In addition, culture was found to have an influence on negotiation, due to the rapid emergence of globalisation. However, this aspect requires further investigation at an individual level. The personality trait of creativity was established to be a potential asset for negotiators when striving for successful outcomes. The philosophy and implementation of the research method is described in the following section.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the research methodology adopted for this research project. The first section describes and justifies the research paradigm of the thesis, followed by an overview of the project’s overall design. The sections set out to establish how and why the data collection was conducted, whilst taking into account imperative ethical considerations. This is followed by a description of the participants and their relevance to this particular study. Each phase of the data collection process is described in detail. This includes all questionnaire constructs utilized, the approach taken for the qualitative data gathering, and concurrent analysis of both the respective methods. The reliability and validity of this study is subsequently accounted for. As such, this chapter strives to defend the overall method of inquiry in relation to previous empirical studies and established theoretical frameworks.

3.2 Research paradigm

Establishing a sound methodology is imperative as it assists researchers with the practical choices for gathering empirical data. In constructing a viable method, the selection of an investigation procedure that holds a methodological fit between the research question, theory and overall design is fundamental (Edmondson & McManus, 2007). This procedure lends itself to choosing a method that can best illuminate the little researched and implicit issues pertaining to contemporary negotiation behaviour (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007).

This thesis adopts a realist research paradigm that utilizes both a qualitative and quantitative approach to investigate the relationship and behaviour between actors in a two-party negotiation event. As such, explanatory knowledge was sought (Easton, 1998) because of the complex behavioural phenomenon occurring within the negotiation environment (Schneider & Honeyman, 2006). This approach relies on traditional realist philosophy that has elements of both positivism and constructivism, however serves as a middle ground between the two (Klenke, 2008).
As a realist qualitative researcher, I subscribe to stringent reliability and validity; however, I apply a more convergent and interpretive mode to the research problem, in comparison to the positivist approaches that traditionally have suffused business management and social sciences (Burns & Burns, 2008). Being situated in this part of the spectrum, I utilize both inductive and deductive approaches for studying the topic.

Through this approach I recognize the potential to not only systematically identify and track outcomes, but the context and milieu in which mechanisms are triggered and the effect of interventions set in place by my part as a researcher (Kazi, 2003). As such, both atypical and quintessential negotiator characteristics are identified in this chapter, relative to the overall purpose of the thesis, its procedure, and the unit of analysis for the project’s empirical material.

3.3 Research design

This thesis employed a qualitative research design to observe and describe the behaviour of participants in a two-party negotiation simulation. Questionnaires served as complementary instruments to establish participant groups for the qualitative component. The mixed method data collection strategy was set in place to investigate the relationship between creativity, culture, ethics, and negotiation behaviour.

At the outset, pre-negotiation questionnaires identified creative traits, cultural dimensions, and demographic information. A second post-negotiation questionnaire measured ethical behaviour, individual satisfaction of the simulation, and manipulation check questions (assessing how participants viewed the simulation to real-world experiences). Qualitative documentary analysis substantiated the relationships between the measured constructs of the surveyed dimensions. This qualitative analysis was also conducted to describe and further investigate the behaviour amongst participants during the negotiations.

Further, this mixed method approach used temporal ordering for the three different data collection stages, however, was mainly informed by descriptive phenomenology. These descriptions were guided by facework typology coding.
3.4 Participants

The current study employed a total number of 40 volunteer participants, all postgraduate students of the Negotiating Across Borders coursework unit at the School of Management, Queensland University of Technology. These 40 participants were subsequently screened for high/low creative traits, forming negotiation pairs of two individuals per dyad. Only participants identified as having high or low creativity were included in the participant group. The measures used to determine high and low creativity are outlined later in this chapter in section 3.5.1.1. As a result, there were 22 participants included in this study. These participants were from diverse cultural backgrounds, representing 13 different countries with 32 per cent having lived for more than two years permanently in a foreign country and 48 per cent living overseas for over one year. The average age was 26.1 years old and 72 per cent were female. All participants held a University Bachelor degree, and were currently undertaking postgraduate qualifications. Ninety one per cent of the participants reported recent work experience, 64 per cent of which were within a business.

This student sample yielded valuable insights to the study on several levels. As this study was based on the theory of globalisation, this cross-cultural sample allowed an analysis of how differing cultures influence negotiation scenarios (Tung, 2008).

Moreover, as similar postgraduate student samples have been used to investigate negotiation styles and cultural issues in the past, extant literature often lends support to the generalizability of the emergent findings (Bello, 2009). Recent empirical evidence concluded that postgraduate students that have been introduced to negotiation theory and frameworks are not significantly outperformed by professional negotiators and are therefore viable research participants (Schwartz, 2011).

3.5 Research process

This research design had three stages: stage 1: pre-negotiation; stage 2: negotiation simulation; and stage 3: post-negotiation. In the first stage, all the participants were introduced to the research project and interested participants were provided with an information sheet and ethical consent form. Participants completed questionnaires to determine their score on a number of
variables, such as creativity. For stage two, participants grouped into high or low creativity teams participated in a negotiation simulation that was video recorded. On conclusion of the negotiation, participants completed another questionnaire reflecting on their perceptions of the other parties’ behaviour during the negotiation. In stage three, the video recordings were analysed to ascertain the participants’ negotiation behaviours.

3.5.1 Stage 1: Pre-negotiation

At the outset, QUT ethical approval was obtained to allow the researcher to approach students enrolled in the Negotiation Across Borders class and ask for their participation. This adhered with the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Behaviour (2007). Participants were informed that this research was independent of their coursework requirements by my co-supervisor. The unit’s coordinator, who was one of my supervisors, was not provided with access to any participant data until after the students’ grades were approved at faculty level.

One of the key ethical considerations of this research pertained to informed consent (Bell & Ilgen, 2001). All participants in this study were required to sign the relevant participation forms, and the project catered for all participants’ informed consent by communicating all facets of the research study in an elaborate manner. Students were not coerced into participating in this research project. Furthermore, the information obtained from the individuals remains confidential and protected from disclosure, by submitting the data after the end of the project to the Information Technology Services department at Queensland University of Technology and the new consolidated platform (estore) providing tiered storage (Baker et al., 2010). During the first stage, participants were given a questionnaire to identify their creativity and cultural values (information on these measures can be found in Appendix A). Each participant was classified into a high or low creative group according to their creativity scores.

3.5.1.1 Creativity. Creativity questions were used to create groups on the basis of low and high creativity levels. This drew from the items that measured how well a participant could come up with a high quantity of answers, and how well they could create distinctive solutions for common
problems. These creative solutions were imperative and served as an antecedent for effective negotiation (Ogilvie & Simms, 2009). Therefore, the essential aspects of evaluating creativity levels were productivity and uniqueness/originality of answers (Runco, 2004).

Moreover, the items served as a central element in aggregating the participant’s solutions into groupings, e.g., one low and one high creative group. This research viewed and explored a group’s ability to solve intricate conflicts by identifying participants’ creative ideas on an individual basis, and fostering a social climate that expanded knowledge and encouraged thinking along new lines (Taggar, 2002).

The ten-item open-ended questionnaire was derived from a conventional and stringent creativity-battery developed by Wallach and Kogan (1966). This set of items was particularly suitable for the international cohort in relation to both the condensed language and practical time-limit. The open-ended questionnaire was as follows.

Item 1 – Instances

1. Name all the round things you can think of.

2. Name all the things you can think of that make noise.

Item 2 – Alternate Uses

1. Tell me all the different ways you could use a newspaper.

2. Tell me all the different ways you could use a knife.

Item 3 – Similarities

1. Tell me all the ways in which a potato and carrot are alike.

2. Tell me all the ways in which a cat and a mouse are alike.

Item 4 – Pattern Meanings (2 images)

1. Name all the things you associate with the following image.
Item 5 – Line meanings (2 images)

1. Name all the things you associate with the following image.

Consistent with the scoring and concurrent analysis of Wallach and Kogan (1966), a master list of responses for each of the ten items was created. One list was created on the basis of creative productiveness, and one concurrent list on the basis of uniqueness. The answers were ranked into different categories. This was put in alphabetical order. As many of the answers were alike, for example “dollar” and “coins”, an often observed similarity in relation to round objects; there was necessary judgment to be made in relation to functional equivalence. This would then not be rated as a unique answer, but count as a productive score. An independent coder was utilized to compare and contrast the measures to determine a unique answer. This was vital for establishing coder reliability in creativity score analysis (Till, 2009). The results were consistent throughout, with common denominators recognized between both coders for the most part. In the cases where uniqueness was disputed, a rated number was subtracted from the participant’s total in that respective category.

Each of the items was recognized from their assigned number, as such, unique responses represented a single binary digit, while common (productive) responses had several digits representing them. After all of the answers were charted, the scores were added for each of the participants. This produced a productivity rating of all the items combined for each participant, and an added uniqueness rating for each of the participants.

Both scores were kept separately from each of the individual surveys. This helped to determine the highly creative participants and group them. As such, a participant was deemed highly creative on the basis of scoring above the mean on both uniqueness and productivity categories. These groupings allowed the study to directly compare groups in the negotiation exercise.

In this thesis, an average uniqueness score was 6.7, with SD = 4.1 and the average productivity score was 34.1 with SD = 16.4. The participants were classified based on scores below or above these means in each of the two categories. A participant who scored above the mean on each of the two categories was deemed ‘high creative’ and one who scored below the mean in both categories.
was considered ‘low creative’. Any participant scoring above the mean in only one category was considered ‘medium creative’. However, as this study was interested in investigating the influence of the high/low creative dichotomy on negotiation behaviour, participants falling outside this parameter were excluded from the ongoing analysis. As a result, 11 participants were classified as high creative, 11 participants classified as low creative, while 18 participants were excluded from the continuing study due to medium levels of creativity. Eleven pairs were formed containing one individual identified as highly creative and one with low creativity.

3.5.1.2 Cultural values. These scales were constructed from 22 items pertaining to the measures of collectivist and individualist cultural dimensions. The format for measuring culture on a personality level was reliant on various communication styles (Hofstede, 2004), deriving from latent factors of the society in which the respective participants associated themselves with. The scale was designed to measure what has often been described as the main characteristics between eastern and western communication styles (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2003). Key items were set in place pertaining to creativity, tradition, family security, and protecting public image. Participants were asked to rate how they value the respective items in relation to their own life and self-concept, concurrently taking into account how these values affect their own actions and behaviour.

This measurement involved evaluation of the negotiators’ inherent communication styles and the potential difference in perceived skills for achieving sound bargaining outcomes. The scale ranged from zero to seven (0 = not important, 7 = very important). The items were taken from a larger survey developed by Schwartz (1992) originally consisting of 56 items, however, this was made case specific for this study. The 22 items utilized in this study are as follows:

1. Family security  
2. Respect for tradition  
3. Social order  
4. Clean  
5. Moderate

12. Wisdom  
13. Devout  
14. Reciprocation of favours  
15. Self-discipline  
16. Creativity
In this thesis, an average individualistic score was 5.49, with SD = 0.80, and an average collectivistic score was 5.44, with SD = 0.68. Internal reliability measured with Cronbach alpha was of ample standard, at values ranging from 0.77 to 0.86 for the respective constructs. The participants were classified based on scores below or above the means. This entailed individualists being classified on the basis of scoring above the mean for that respective dimension, and concurrently below the mean for the collectivist dimension. Collectivists were classified on the basis of scoring above the mean on that particular dimension, whilst concurrently scoring below the individualist mean. As a result 19 individuals were classified as collectivistic respondents, and 21 individuals were classified as individualistic respondents. However, pursuant to the high/low creative duality, 18 of these participants were excluded from the present study. Further information is specified in the following section.

3.5.2 Stage 2: Negotiation simulation

In determining the composition of the negotiation pairs, several aspects were emphasised. First, they were established on the basis of low and high scores from the creativity test. It was also in the interest of this study to use homogenous cultures in the majority of the respective simulations. This was done to address the cultural dimensions on an individual level, and to observe whether the creative traits exhibited a significant influence regardless of cultural background. However, where differing cultures occurred, it would additionally control for the different communication styles.

Based on the creative test set forth, the 18 participants exhibiting medium creativity were excluded from the ongoing study. The participants were then paired based on their creativity scores.
derived in stage one. As a result, a low creative individual was paired with a high creative individual. 

Full partitions can be found in Table 1.

Table 1: A summary of participant’s characteristics for each negotiation simulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Creativity level person 1</th>
<th>Cultural value person 1</th>
<th>Creativity level person 2</th>
<th>Cultural value person 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Collectivist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked to perform a negotiation simulation based on a provided business scenario from the Australian mining industry. There was no time limitation for the negotiations and the duration, from start to finish, ranged from forty-five minutes to four hours. Each negotiation pair performed in a private room. A researcher set up a video camera in each room and the negotiation was recorded without the researcher’s presence.

In stage two of this study the negotiation pairs served as the basic unit of analysis, with each party being associated with groups pertaining to differing creativity levels, ethical behaviour and cultural dimensions. These pairs consisted of one individual representing one party in a traditional two-party negotiation practice. The parties represented two different entities: one local and one global, and the negotiation simulation incorporated commonly identified features and dilemmas when negotiating contract terms and conditions in mining (Rinehart, 1992; Zimmermann, 2009).

The bargaining pertained to disputes set in the town of Weipa, located on the Cape York Peninsula of Australia. The simulation comprised conflicts around the desired start date, cost of job, time frame, lease of land, and use of indigenous local labour. One party represented Rio Tinto Alcan (RTA) a subsidiary of Rio Tinto Group, and the counterpart represented the local business Returning and Ripping (R&R).
The prerogative of RTA was consistent with deal making for big corporations. At the outset, the company had contracted R&R for rehabilitation of land that had been mined for aluminium ore (bauxite). RTA had several other projects under development but needed to maintain and develop the relationship with the indigenous peoples, a factor reliant on the appropriate treatment of the current site.

R&R, on the other hand, had other parameters of concern pertaining to weather and the project’s overall time-frame. As their counterpart wanted to finalize the project in the shortest possible time-frame (6 months) they were pressured to find practical solutions on various levels throughout their supply chain. Being a local company, R&R knew the land and the workforce more profoundly and had different concerns than RTA and different ideas of how to effectively conduct the rehabilitation.

3.5.3 Stage 3: Post-negotiation

After participants completed the negotiation simulation, each one was asked to complete the post-negotiation questionnaire. This questionnaire asked individuals to rate their perceptions of their own and their negotiation partner’s ethical behaviour during the negotiation and asked for an assessment of satisfaction with the negotiation process and outcomes. In addition, a manipulation check question was put in place to determine how the constituents perceived the simulation in relation to the real world. The questionnaire in its entirety can be found in Appendix B.

3.5.3.1 Ethical tactics.

The ethical tactics items were constructed to measure the ethical behaviour perceived by the counterpart immediately after the conclusion of the negotiation. A vital element for measuring ethical tactics in relation to bargaining performance is to assess to what extent certain tactics are endorsed, and to what extent they are successful in reaching the objective of the respective party (Greenhalgh, 2001). Therefore, this measurement was central when assessing the willingness of the negotiator to employ unethical tactics, and to assess that in relation to overall satisfaction with both the procedure and end results. This construct was able to measure the individuals’ morality and principles
throughout the negotiation simulation, and served as a key element for creating dyads between the other constructs.

Further, the items measured traditional bargaining behaviour such as hardball and tough verbal communication; however, they are commonly perceived as regular tactics in contemporary negotiations (Lewicki & Haim, 2006). It was vital to assess more extreme behaviour such as outright lying, threats, and attacking the opponent views and standpoints.

The 13-item survey derived from the SINS Scoring Key developed by Robinson, Lewicki and Donahue (2000). The four latent constructs measured in this survey were: traditional competitive bargaining, attacking an opponent, misrepresentation, and making false promises. The measurements were adjusted for the specific data collection of this thesis. As a result, the survey deviated from the original (Robinson et al., 2001) in that it asked about the utilization of the respective tactics for both the participant and their negotiation partner. The results were then averaged between the two responses. The reason for applying both measurements for each participant was to compare the discrepancy between self-perception and perception of others. As several sources in the literature claimed that ethics is based on both the situational context and the individual’s ethical reasoning (Fells, 2009; Lewicki et al., 2010), this approach strived to diminish the ambiguity of ethics in negotiation by measuring perception of self and the other as a control mechanism based on objectivity. Findings are presented in Chapter 4. The range of the scales is from zero to six (0 = never, 6 = always). The items used for this study construct are as follows.

*How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use these tactics?*

1. Promise that good things will happen to your opponent if he/she gives you what you want, even if you know that you can’t (or won’t) deliver these things when the other’s cooperation is obtained.

2. Intentionally misrepresent information to your opponent in order to strengthen your negotiating arguments or position.

3. Threaten to make your opponent look weak or foolish in front of other people whom he/she is accountable, even if you know that you won’t actually carry out the threat.
4. Intentionally misrepresent the nature of negotiations to your opponent in order to protect delicate discussions that have occurred.

5. Make an opening demand that is far greater than what you really hope to settle for.

6. Convey a false impression that you are in absolutely no hurry to come to a negotiation agreement, thereby trying to put time pressure on your opponent to concede quickly.

7. In return for concessions from your opponent now, offer to make future concessions which you know you will not follow through on.

8. Threaten to talk directly to the people whom your opponent knows, or is accountable to, and threaten to tell them things that will undermine their confidence in your opponent’s negotiation outcome.

9. Deny the validity of information which your opponent has that weakens your negotiating position, even though that information is true and valid.

10. Intentionally misrepresent the progress of negotiations to your opponent in order to make to make your own position appear stronger.

11. Threaten your opponent that he/she may lose his/her position in this negotiation.

12. Guarantee that you will uphold the settlement reached, although you know that you will likely violate the agreement later.

13. Make an opening demand so high/low that it seriously undermines your opponent’s confidence in his/her ability to negotiate a satisfactory settlement.

3.5.3.2 Negotiation satisfaction. To determine how satisfied each of the participants was with the negotiation simulation, three questions were posed to assess the process, outcome, and overall satisfaction. The items, ranging from zero to seven (0 = most dissatisfied, 7 = most satisfied), were adopted from Robinson, Lewicki and Donahue (2000):

How would you rate your satisfaction in relation to...

a) Process during your negotiation

b) Outcomes of your negotiation

c) Overall satisfaction about this negotiation
3.6 Analysis procedure

This section will discuss the analysis methods which were used in this research paper. This thesis employed mixed method, qualitative and quantitative approaches. Stage 1 and Stage 3 involved quantitative approach (i.e. survey) and Stage 2 involved behavioural analysis, using qualitative approach.

3.6.1 Stage 1 and Stage 3 survey analyses

All the survey measures were analysed using SPSS18.0. Descriptive analysis, t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to identify group differences. In stage one, t-test and descriptive analysis determined the mean between high and low creative individuals, and collectivistic and individualistic participants. On the basis of these results, the groups were established prior to the negotiation simulation. In stage three, after the negotiation simulation, t-test and descriptive analysis determined high and low ethical behaviour based on ratings from the negotiation counterpart. Further, t-test and ANOVA established group dyads on the basis of the measured constructs.

3.6.2 Stage 2 negotiation video analysis

Documentary analysis of recorded documentary footage of the two-party negotiation practice was used to unpack the various negotiation behaviours. The justification for using recorded documentary footage as opposed to oral transcripts was not only to analyse verbal communication and identify key aspects of the respective case, but also to explore non-verbal communication, body language, and other relational approaches undertaken by the constituents. This type of analysis allows a researcher to observe the negotiation event in a holistic light, from start to finish, rather than relying only on certain aspects of it.

Before identifying the proper technique of documentary research, investigations into the various styles were conducted to create the ‘fit’ for my respective method and paradigm. In the literature there are six broadly established modes for researchers to employ. Nichols (1991) identified these to be: expository, poetic, observational, participatory, reflexive and performative. All of which
exhibit various styles in relation to how the research unfolds, the production value, and how the observed participants are being analysed and portrayed (Jones, 2005).

In contemporary documentary research and production, expository and performative modes have been especially ubiquitous. Expository mode strives to move away from the subjectivity found through, for example, the poetic and performative approaches, employing objective, but still rhetorical narration often overlaying historical moving images and pictures (Swender, 2009). This method has been very popular for conveying information and communicating to large audiences through mass media. However, a major fallacy of this mode is observed in relation to this study, where evidentiary editing nonetheless construes the elements of investigation in a subjective direction (Nichols, 1991; Nichols, 2010). This approach emphasises the need for reorganisation of clips in order to make an argument. Therefore, this method is not consistent with the realist paradigm adhered to in this thesis.

In contrast to this approach, the performative mode has in recent times gained increased exposure and utilization, where the researchers are often involved and can be viewed on screen engaging with the participants under the loop (Jones, 2005). This cinéma vérité ethos (Arthur, 2007) is consistent with communicating the subjectivity of both the documentary researcher and the respective participants. It is also very similar in nature to the participatory mode, where the researcher aims to produce and construct truths that are evident to a general audience (Nichols, 1991). However, as both of these omnipresent and popular techniques are observed to be profoundly interactive and personal (Saunders, 2010), they have been deemed controversial. They are criticised of being politically motivated and, in later decades, for being motivated by profit (Nichols, 2010). Arguably, this is an influential factor that reduces the capacity to objectively convey the participant(s) under investigation, and therefore not a suitable technique for this study.

As such, the main facets of these techniques rely strongly on the approach to the case investigated and can be viewed from performative subjectivity to a more objective expository approach. As the documentary genre has become widespread due to audio-visual technological advancements, there has been an increased interest in the social value obtained through utilizing the various techniques (Nichols, 2010; Rich, 2006). As I was mainly interested in understanding the implicit issues pertaining to contemporary negotiation behaviour viewed through the realist paradigm,
I needed to employ a technique that could best analyse the features and gaps identified in the literature. With these conditions it was evident that the observational mode of documentary footage was most suitable.

Consistent with the ideals of the realist paradigm, the observational mode relies heavily on the principle of truth and the notion of utilizing current technology in that regard (Bruzzi, 2006). The mode is effective in differentiating itself from other techniques on the basis of being employed simply to observe (Hill, 2005; Nichols, 1991). Although similar characteristics are found in the reflexive mode (Nichols, 2010); observational technique entails no narration, no visual effects, and more importantly no inferences onto the participants from myself, as the researcher. Moreover, the mode does not allow editing, but capitalises on the notion of an often-sought premise in qualitative explorations, where the researcher and a potential audience is a ‘fly on the wall’. This has previously been a barrier for many research projects striving for applied etic anthropology strategies (Walle, 2001).

Documentary analysis is about more than merely observing the participants in a linear fashion. It is about the ability a researcher has in using technological advancements, in this case digital imagery, to dissect behaviour and strategies into various elements and controllably synthesize this back into a holistic view. This methodology gave a more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Moreover, the analytical approach to documentaries can be compared to a two-way communication (Foss & Littlejohn, 2009), where the researcher asks questions of the visuals and strives to answer them through terminology and perspectives mobilised throughout the analysis. This type of communication served as an imperative in my analysis of the negotiations as I asked questions in relation to bargaining theories and previous empirical material, and answered them through the observed negotiation exercise and basic framework from the literature.

Moreover, the content of documentaries can be explored in numerous ways. In my investigation I inquired about issues that can be led by an interrogative pronoun of asking: what are the characteristics of this negotiation party, its subgroup, and its behaviour? This was then substantiated with predisposition inquiries of ‘how does creativity influence individuals in the
negotiations?’ and ‘how does creativity influence ethical behaviour during negotiations?’ This is followed by asking ‘does creativity and negotiation behaviour differ across cultures?’

From that, it is important to figure out which parts of the phenomenon one should focus on, so it is possible to answer these research questions. In some instances, a sole quantitative statistical approach is suitable for this type of dilemma and in other cases a qualitative approach. Some events lend themselves to a mixed method perspective. In simple terms, this project took advantage of both, with the main emphasis being on the qualitative approach.

Further, to get a deeper understanding of the negotiating parties, a holistic analysis of all the bargaining pairs was interpreted and understood in relation to each other and the case. Negotiations are incidents influenced by milieu, personality, culture and to some extent historical contexts (Bazerman et al., 2000; Thompson et al., 2010). As such, the qualitative approach was beneficial as the research is exploratory, descriptive and is concerned with analysing processes between individuals and groups (Miles & Huberman, 1999). I was interested in interpreting the interconnections between the participants in the negotiation exercise.

To acquire the holistic impressions sought from the negotiations I emphasized several factors. As established, the constituency exhibited various cultural dimensions and differing levels of creative behaviour, consequently their personality characteristics came into play. With a sole focus on quantitative methodology the analysis would have been unsuited to communicate the complexity of the negotiation exercise (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Many interesting phenomena throughout a bargaining event cannot be quantified easily, and to unfold more of these features, the qualitative approach was more productive at both discovering and reconstructing patterns via the discourse (Li, 1999). When I still chose to incorporate a supplementary quantitative examination, it was on the basis that it gives an insightful structure to the palpable dimensions consistent with most contemporary negotiation practices.

Furthermore, my approach to the problem of investigation is consistent with contemporary business management science criterions (Hurmerinta-Peltomäki & Nummela, 2006). The analysis of documentary video is legitimatized through the notion that the international cohort exhibit apparent and differing values emerging from globalisation (Brett et al., 1998). These are facets this instrument
captures. Another reason the approach is credible, is the use of the video footage that aids in
dissecting a seldom researched phenomenon. To my knowledge, no qualitative research project has
undertaken an analogous investigation between the creative construct and integrative/distributive
negotiation behaviour.

3.6.2.1 Coding the negotiation videos

Establishing a framework for both distributive and integrative bargaining strategies is often
perceived to be a difficult and elusive task (Druckman, 1999). There is a perceived lack of conceptual
clarity, especially pertaining to integrative strategies, and the notion that negotiation scenarios are
driven by the case specificity of various agendas and environments (Agrawal & Kool, 2006). Many of
the nascent frameworks have not been subjected to empirical evaluation (Druckman, 1999), therefore,
this study used an well-established 13 category facework typology instrument as a basic qualitative
rating framework for observed behaviour. However, this instrument only served as an indicator to the
various behaviours and tactics used by the respective participants. As such, the facework dimensions
were rated inductively, controlled for and confirmed by an independent coder. These features were
then described on the basis of theories identified in the literature. These indications were essential in
providing the foundation for the qualitative analysis. Moreover, this instrument of typology facework
was beneficial as it is closely related to the concept of the conflict resolution style inherent in all
negotiations (Rahim, 1992).

The items were taken from the study of Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2001), which originated
from an aggregate of items from Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, Yokochi, Masumoto and Takai (2000). The
approach to the rating was two-fold. First, all participants were rated on the frequency-count
(occurrences) in which they engaged in the certain behaviours. This was assessed on a scale from zero
to ten. The range was suitable for assessing the frequency-counts as none of the participants were
observed to employ any facework category more than ten times during any of the simulations. The
results were then scaled down, using ratio analysis, to a six-point rating scale for presentation
purposes. For example, the frequency-count of nine and ten was presented as six in the results section.
The range of the latter presentation scale is from one to six (1 = never, 6 = always). The facework
items are as follows:

1. Third party – seeking an outside party to help resolve the conflict;
2. Apologizing for behaviour;
3. Expressing how one is feeling;
4. Defending – standing up for one’s opinions and persuading others to accept these opinions;
5. Private discussion – avoiding a public confrontation;
6. Giving in – accommodating the other’s wishes;
7. Remaining calm during the conflict;
8. Integrating – behaviours used to join together perspectives of the parties;
9. Pretending that the conflict does not exist;
10. Consider the other – listening to the other person to demonstrate respect for him or her;
11. Direct/passive aggression;
12. Avoiding the person or the issue;
13. Compromising points in order to resolve the issue (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001, p. 200).

3.6.2.2 Reliability and validity

The believability of the analysed qualitative material is not first and foremost about
standardized measurements and objective results. However, my own method of choice in relation to
reliability and validity is evaluated below.

3.6.2.3 Reliability relates to the dependability and quality of the data collection, its treatment
and analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1999). In relation to the quantitative component of this research,
internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) was generated from the quantitative data. The Cronbach alpha
of each scale ranging from 0.77 to 0.86 (cultural dimensions), and 0.67 to 0.87 (ethical behaviour),
indicates good internal reliability measures (Allen & Bennett, 2010). To demand reliability from
qualitative studies is problematic, because traditionally this method does not have the same precise
measurement tools found in statistics (Morse et al., 2002). However, any observation contains errors of measurement which cannot be solved by merely ignoring them (Feldt & Brennan, 1989). As such, the most important instrument within qualitative research is the researchers themselves (Morse et al., 2002).

In relation to the documented negotiations, my main method was qualitative behavioural analysis, where I cannot fulfil the literary requirements of reliability. The observed negotiations were polysemic in the sense they conveyed both implicit and explicit traits of the participants, and were interpreted in various ways. It is inherently not viable to interpret one characteristic as the correct one, in this type of study. An example of this relates back to ethics and culture; where the participants are observed to exhibit different traits; however, to state that one culture or ethical conduct is superior to the other is a fallacy. They are respectively different. Instead my interpretations were reasonable in relation to the methodology and thereby not constant and definitive.

Every researcher is prone to be influenced by outlying factors such as attitudes, world-view and upbringing, often deriving from their own respective culture (Hall, 1974; Thomson & Walker, 2010). As a result, different researchers are prone to making different judgements based on the same material. However, it was the strength of this study that it analyses human interaction in a close-up manner, and compares each of the negotiation pairs and the subgroups. In doing so, unique perspectives of the occurrence were made available, something not possible in a single construct study. Each negotiation interaction was double blind coded to confirm the reliability of coding. Differences in coding were discussed between the coders and an agreement reached. This occurred on seven occasions. The negotiation pairs were also complimentary to each other, where analysing one pair in relation to the subgroup expanded the knowledge of the others. This was done through identifying and forming common bargaining characteristics between the pairs, which did in turn strengthen the overall assumptions made from the qualitative inquiry. Additionally, a strong point is that this projects’ analysis relied on contemporary and leading negotiation theory, which derives from well-tested methods of analysis.
3.6.2.4 Validity is an element of validation that derives from the notion of relevance and verification of the data and analysis in relation to the research question. The term is very broad and extensive, hence no single definition can cover it precisely (Bradbury & Reason, 2001; Seale, 1999). It strives to encompass that the instrument measures what it is designed to measure, if it is relevant to theory, and that the analysis is thoroughly conducted. In general terms, one can state that quantitative methods have a superior strength of holding high validity. However, a qualitative analysis will bring the researcher closer towards the core of the theoretical framework, consequently reaching a higher level of definitional validity (Chilton, 1999).

This project’s main aim was to study the behaviour in a two-party negotiation, through the theoretical lens of negotiation strategy. In recognizing that, many features were already established through the chosen literature. Thus, it was relevant to ask questions about the methodology more concretely through the assertion, based on Bartos’ (1995) claims, that the distributive negotiation process consists primarily of concession making, whilst the integrative includes concession and criterions of mutually profitable alternatives. These concepts then served as pinpoints in analysing the respective documentary footage of the bargaining exercise. The question of validity became more reliant on these theories and its relevance to the project’s research question. This is a fair assumption, as negotiation researchers agree on most of these criteria on the basis of precedent empirical analysis (Barry & Friedman, 1998; De Dreu et al., 2000; Lewicki et al., 2010; Thompson, 1990). Thus, this study explored the negotiations through established theories, and strived to build upon the field. The work of seminal authors on negotiation, Roger Fisher, Roy Lewicki and Stella Ting-Toomey, served to inform the research on face behaviours, integrative strategies, and ethical decision making. The overall research question assures an investigation into negotiation behaviours, ethical conduct, and integrative solutions. As such, it is credible to investigate what and how the respective negotiation parties utilize Fisher’s, Ting-Toomey’s and Lewicki’s strategies, as a result this study was able to increase its ability for definitional validity.
3.7 Conclusion

This chapter identified the prevailing research paradigm, described the participants’ characteristics and outlined the three stages of the mixed methods approach taken for the research. In summary, a justification was set forth for utilizing qualitative method as the main data collection strategy. This method is consistent with the overall objective of the thesis, which is to thoroughly describe and identify negotiation behaviour in relation to creativity, culture, and ethics.

The latter part of the chapter addressed issues of validity and reliability. It was recognized that qualitative inquiry uses different criteria than quantitative methods in regards to these elements, and was therefore justified on that basis. This was assessed through definitional validity and the theoretical framework, whilst accounting for internal reliability of the complimentary quantitative measurements. As a result, this study expects to achieve an in-depth analysis of the negotiation behaviours via the chosen methodology. The following chapter provides and analyses the results from this research.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present research findings identified from the qualitative and quantitative analyses. The focal results are related to the documentary video analysis using the observational mode. These results are created on the basis of preliminary statistical analysis presented in Chapter 3. I used the survey to assess individual creativeness levels and then formed negotiation pairs (high vs. low creative negotiators in each pair). The pairs undertook a video recorded negotiation exercise; these recordings were viewed and participant’s behaviours were double-coded using facework theory. Further, the survey was used to evaluate individuals’ cultural values, which may have an impact on how individuals behave. Observing these dyads allowed me to determine how differing cultures approach negotiations dilemmas and adopt strategies. Finally, each participant’s negotiation behaviour was evaluated in relation to ethical behaviour by his/her negotiation partner.

4.2 Facework behaviours between high and low creative negotiators

The following table is based on the grouping process of the low and high creative participants. This was set in place to create a wide division between the two groups in order to detect and assess differences in negotiation behaviour. Similar to the scoring and analysis of Wallach and Kogan (1966), a master list of the participant’s responses was generated. The first list was created to assess productiveness, and the second to assess uniqueness. The cut-off, based on the mean, for productiveness was 34.1 and for uniqueness it was 6.7. This cut-off was used to classify individuals into high and low productiveness and uniqueness. The participants were categorized on scores lower or higher than the means in each of the two measures. As a result, high creative participants scored above the mean on each of the two categories, and low creative participants scored below the mean in both categories. The participants that scored above the mean in only one of the categories were treated as ‘medium creative’. The latter group was excluded, as it is in the interest of this study to only
investigate the dichotomous low/high creativity relationship. Table 2 displays each pair’s (low and high creativity respectively) rated scores on all facework categories.

There are 13 facework behaviours (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001, p. 200) which include:

- Third party – seeking an outside party to help;
- Apologising for behaviour;
- Expressing how one is feeling;
- Defending – standing up for one’s opinions;
- Private discussion – avoiding public confrontation;
- Giving in - accommodating the other’s wishes;
- Remaining calm during the conflict;
- Integrating - behaviours used to join perspectives;
- Pretending that the conflict does not exist;
- Consider the other - listening to the other person;
- Direct/passive aggression;
- Avoiding the person or the issue; and
- Compromising points to resolve the issue.

Furthermore, this instrument served as an indicator to the respective behaviours and strategies used by the negotiators. Hence, the facework categories were rated inductively, controlled for by an independent coder to maintain inter-coder reliability. These behaviours were then described using, negotiation theory identified in the literature as a foundation. These observations, based on the documentary video analysis, were essential in providing the groundwork for this qualitative analysis. The instrument of facework typology was also advantageous as it closely pertains to the theory of conflict resolution style, which is intrinsic throughout all negotiations (Rahim, 1992). The rated behaviours are further discussed in detail in the subsequent section.
Table 2: Frequency of facework behaviours comparing the high and low creative participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACEWORK BEHAVIOURS:</th>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>Pair 2</th>
<th>Pair 3</th>
<th>Pair 4</th>
<th>Pair 5</th>
<th>Pair 6</th>
<th>Pair 7</th>
<th>Pair 8</th>
<th>Pair 9</th>
<th>Pair 10</th>
<th>Pair 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>HC1</td>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>HC2</td>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>HC3</td>
<td>LC4</td>
<td>HC4</td>
<td>LC5</td>
<td>HC5</td>
<td>LC6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Third party – seeking an outside party to help;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apologising for behaviour;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expressing how one is feeling;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Defending – standing up for one’s opinions;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private discussion - avoiding public confrontation;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Giving in - accommodating the other’s wishes;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Remaining calm during the conflict;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Integrating - behaviours used to join perspectives;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pretending that the conflict does not exist;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consider the other - listening to the other person;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Direct/passive aggression;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Avoiding the person or the issue;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Compromising points to resolve the issue;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LC = Low creativity, and HC = High creativity, based on creativity measures formerly described. The frequency (number of times the behaviour was observed) of displayed behaviours are illustrated in Table 1 as 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often 5 = very often and 6 = always.
4.3 An analysis of facework behaviours among high and low creative negotiators

1. Third party – seeking an outside party to help resolve the conflict.

In this negotiation simulation, seeking outside help pertained to getting information from external sources such as: using a computer and the internet, getting advice from academic staff present, using textbook material for solutions, or referring to certain agenda items being outsourced and solved by a third party mediator/consultant.

The facework coding in this instance showed that this behaviour was not prevalent amongst the negotiators. Among low creativity negotiators, three of the eleven low creativity negotiators used the third party tactic to try and resolve the situation, which occurred between two and three times per low creative negotiator. For the high creativity group, four negotiators implemented this behaviour, but not to a significant level occurring twice in the majority of instances. Seeking third party assistance was therefore an uncommon behaviour amongst both high and low creativity negotiators. This behaviour did not occur at a higher rate within any particular creativity group, and was mostly observed to be mutual between the parties.

Behavioural example:

LC4 was pressured and informed HC4 that he was not confident in the cost breakdown of training local labour, and consequently asked, ‘Should I ask the tutor if this will be extra cost for us in relation to materials?’ HC4 agreed, and both negotiators consequently left the room to consult with the teaching staff for several minutes.

Seeking outside help, often in the form of a third party mediator, is a well-established strategy when striving to solve disputes that have reached gridlock in negotiations (Raiffa et al., 2002). However, it was not widely used in this simulation. A possible explanation is that the use of outside help is most often associated with conflicts in which there is a lot to gain and lose for both parties, as well as where there are relationship factors influencing the bargaining process (Raiffa et al., 2002). As
such, a third party is often hired to create an objective view of the conflict, which will not impair these interpersonal relations.

In this negotiation simulation, the participants were students and arguably did not have a lot invested in the negotiations, other than retaining the practical experience and skills (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Being in a safe classroom environment with tutors at their aid added to the low risk context; they did not need to rely heavily on professional external mediation in order to reach an agreement. The downfall of this type of environment is that although the students had great benefits and were stimulated by the practice, they also had the opportunity to ‘act irresponsibly’ (Venkatesh et al., 2003), which can explain the lack of emphasis on certain actions in this respective simulation. Thus, the need for the majority of the participants to finish the negotiations in a timely manner without implementing a broader set of tools and options was observed in this simulation.

2. Apologizing for behaviour.

Apologetic behaviour was associated with expressing apology over actions either verbally spoken or expressed via body language. None of the participants undertook this behaviour, i.e., this was rated ‘never’ throughout all of the negotiations. This was an unexpected finding of the negotiation simulation analysis. Although there was some observed behaviour that could be considered rude or out of place in some instances, no apologetic behaviour was expressed directly or indirectly by the participants. It was also an unexpected finding in regards to the literature on negotiation.

Various forms of apologising are suitable when striving to keep the tenor at a reasonable level, in times when either breakdowns have occurred or there are high emotions (Steele & Beasor, 1999). Even though both these aspects did occur during these bargaining simulations – and there were some situations where it was appropriate to voice an apology in relation to problems or misunderstandings – this did not happen. As this cohort also had a group bargaining in the latter part of the semester, it is presumed that applying some apologetic behaviour could help establish some benefits for future relations, however, this did not occur. This was probably due to the fact that they were not dependent on their own performance and reputation as an individual, but as a part of a larger
entity, which resulted in the lack of apologetic behaviour. Low risk context (Venkatesh et al., 2003) also applied with this category, as there was no need for the negotiators to get overly engaged, thus, no disputes occurred where apologies were necessary.

3. Expressing how one is feeling.

The negotiators’ expressions of feelings were assessed in this category through both body language and explicitly voicing their emotions. Amongst the low creativity negotiators, three of the eleven low creativity negotiators expressed their feelings, but not frequently – for example, once or twice during the simulation. For the high creativity group, an equal proportion was observed; as only three of the eleven exhibited this behaviour and those three used it rarely (on average twice).

Behavioural example:

Most examples of this behaviour pertained to body language, which was apparent, for example, when HC4 in several stages of the bargaining with LC4 shook her head, and waved her arms arguing the case that the weather was unpredictable saying, ‘Do you have any point, it’s Queensland man, rain come at anytime so I can’t give any clarity for that’.

As the emotions and expressions behind the negotiators’ words inevitably mediate their impact on the counterpart (Aquilar & Gallucio, 2008), the lack of emphasis of this behaviour is surprising. It is vital for successful negotiators to be assertive in communicating both their agenda items and how they feel about them in order to reach optimal solutions (Aquilar & Gallucio, 2008). However, with this cohort little emphasis was put on self-disclosure, especially around the emotional part. This could be explained through the lack of negotiation experience amongst this group of participants. Perhaps they had not developed the skills necessary to identify what feelings to express, as well as to identify and understand how the counterpart’s feelings were influencing the bargaining.
4. Defending – standing up for one’s opinions and persuading others to accept these opinions.

This was the first identified category to exhibit key points of difference between high and low creative negotiators. It was assessed on the basis of each participant’s ability to present and reiterate a viable agenda item in a sincere manner, consequently getting their counterpart to agree to incorporate their view into the negotiation and move forward. There is an array of persuasive strategies available for negotiators (Reardon, 2004), and it was observed that the high creative group implemented several of these. This ranged from taking responsibility and voicing that they would do jobs that were designated for the counterpart, to getting the other party to comply through expressing the positive qualities about the measures they proposed. There was also some emphasis placed on altruism, for example, by communicating how well their proposals coincided with both companies’ reputation on environmental concerns and for hiring and helping local labour. However, the most prevalent tactic was through being assertive and making stringent demands of their intentions (Reardon, 2004).

In the majority of the pairs there was an identified trend towards the highly creative group being more assertive with their agenda items, and using their ability to both generate alternatives and defend this to a higher degree than their low creative counterpart.

All eight of the eleven negotiation pairs (pair numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10) exhibited the pattern of high creative participants defending their opinion to a higher degree than the low creative ones. The high creative participants emphasised this behaviour on average at five times, while the low creative participants used this tactic on average three times. However, two pairs, six and eleven, were identified to exhibit the opposite traits where the low creative used the tactics six times and the high creative two to three times during their bargaining simulation.
Behavioural example:

Among the high creative group, HC5 attempted to defend the position on the time-frame, claiming that, ‘Six months is better for you because it reduces your payments, for me the cost will rise, and I also think that to do this job in six months the reputation of Rio Tinto as well as for us and for the community as a whole, six months will be a little bit too short to do the job properly. So maybe we can look at how we can stretch out that time-frame... We can come in for intervals, three six month intervals, instead of one time, to do the job properly’.

Similarly, HC8 assertively defended their time-frame agenda by stating ‘I am afraid we can’t because we need more people and to do it in six months will affect the quality, and also for the six months it will affect our budget and it can’t be done perfectly... For this reason we initially agreed to finish this job in one year because the indigenous people need to be trained. This is just for basics; we now need 18 months to finish the job’.

Why did high creative participants defend their opinion to a higher degree than the low creative? This is possibly explained by viewing their behaviour through the latent constructs of this particular category. Ting-Toomey et al. (2000) defined this category as being firm in demands and not giving in, defending the position, not admitting to being wrong and insisting to being right. Applying that framework to all the negotiation pairs, it is observed to be consistent that the high creative negotiators meet these objectives, however, differences in characteristics in both HC6 and HC11 were detected. Although they strived to defend their position to a certain degree, they were not observed to adhere to the latent construct of being ‘firm in demands and not giving in’. This notion is further emphasised when viewing their scores on another facework item, namely category six: ‘giving in – accommodating the other’s wishes’. In this category, both show a score of ‘often’ (HC6) and ‘very often’ (HC11), as opposed to their counterpart scoring ‘never’ (LC6 & LC11). This indicates that there is a tendency for these two categories to hold a negative and polar relationship.

Furthermore, these behaviours coincide with Lewicki et al.’s (2010) theory on defensiveness, which claimed that this behaviour does not allow the negotiators to accept information at face value,
but to look for deeper meanings and reasons, which was the case in the majority of the high creative constituency. For example, HC5 repeatedly defended her positions on the duration of the job through probing, *Why is there a time-frame on this, on this job... because we agreed on one year, so there has to be a reason*.

However, Lewicki et al. (2010) claimed that defensiveness also comprises deception and withholding information from the opponent. Although some deceptive behaviour occurred, the latter point of withholding information was not observed to be the case within this high creative group. Instead they adhered to defending their interests through sharing information and encouraging reciprocity (Brett, Lytle & Shapiro, 1998), and making multiple offers at the same time, which are established tactics to elicit information from the other negotiator (Lewicki et al., 2010).

5. Private discussion – avoiding a public confrontation.

In this negotiation simulation, the category of keeping the discussion private was assessed on the basis of the ability of the parties not to pause during the bargaining for the purposes of sharing information or progress with fellow students, staff and lecturers, or publishing case specific items online through blogs or forums. All the participants kept the information and progress reports private and were deemed to ‘always’ avoid public confrontation.

This behaviour is likely explained by the facts that the participants were instructed to solve the negotiation case only by using the information provided to them, and the negotiation occurred in the confines of a classroom. There is also an element of low risk context in the sense that the participants did not have a lot invested in the actual bargaining (Venkatesh et al., 2003), hence they did not feel the need to express case specific agenda items to the outside world. In actual industry specific bargaining, there is often a need for one party to express both their views and progress to the public in order to get feedback from certain demographics or to undermine the counterpart (Susskind, Levy & Thomas-Larmer, 2000), however, the reduced personal stake of this respective negotiation simulation did not warrant such tactics.
6. Giving in – accommodating the other’s wishes.

‘Giving in’ in this study refers to the negotiators allowing the other party’s wishes to prevail in order to progress the bargaining. This was assessed on the basis of the degree they were willing to give up their own stance, as well as their willingness to create a dialogue around the counterpart’s interests. Although this behaviour was not prevalent, the majority of low creative participants showed a higher degree of willingness to accommodate the other parties’ wishes. This was apparent in seven of the eleven bargaining pairs (1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10) in the simulation. These behaviours occurred on average three times per low creative negotiator, and one time with the high creative negotiator in this specific group. Conversely, three of the eleven pairs showed the opposite structure, i.e., the high creative negotiator emphasised this to a slightly larger extent than the low creative. These behaviours occurred on average four times per high creative negotiator, and one time with the low creative negotiator in this observed group.

Behavioural example:

When confronted by HC8 on cost and hiring of local labour, LC8 initially was not willing to hire local people and wanted the job to be done in six months, however, gave in to the other party midway and stated, ‘OK we can hire the indigenous people and finish the whole construction. Your company is the most reputable, but our company need to focus on lease of land and cost and it will be more expensive in one year, but OK we decide to do it in one year’.

The low creative negotiators employed this behaviour more than the high creative negotiators. It is apparent that the characteristics of the low creative group fit with the face theory of giving in, i.e., Ting-Toomey et al.’s (2000) latent constructs of ‘backing down to solve the problem’, ‘agreeing with the other person to solve issues’ and ‘accepting whatever the other person said’. All of these behaviours were present in the way the low creative negotiators conducted themselves, and as such, are deemed an avoidance facework.
However, concessions made to the other party did not necessarily yield any concession or more favourable outcomes to the negotiator who used it. The use of this backing down behaviour did, however, contribute to moving the negotiation process forward. This is consistent with Fisher et al.’s (1991) theory on giving in. These authors also claimed that although the notion of giving in during a bargaining event can on some occasions buy friendship, it will most likely communicate that the party can be ‘taken for a ride’.

In the present study this was often the case. As the high creative group would overtly generate alternatives that would benefit their overall negotiation agenda, there was pressure on the low creative group to both respond to and include these alternatives. However, this often resulted in them giving in and accepting the premise put forward by their counterpart. Thus, it had an adverse effect on the low creative groups’ concessions, as their opponent successfully expanded the objectives in a manner that ultimately benefited themselves due to a lack of understanding of the relevance of the new agenda items by the low creative group.

A potential explanation is that the act of giving in, or giving too much credit to the other party, can be used as a measure for getting the other party involved in the disputes. Hence, it can aid the process of giving the counterpart a personal stake. However, the downfall of the tactic, as observed on many occasions amongst the low creative group, is that it became hard to regain the credit or concessions for themselves (Fells, 2009; Fisher et al., 1991). In turn, it only gave substantive merit to one of the latent constructs, which was agreeing in order to solve the issue, consequently pushing the bargaining process forward.

7. Remaining calm during the conflict.

Remaining calm was assessed through the participants’ ability to stay calm at the negotiation table and not leave the room (excluding restroom breaks etc.), raise their voices, or use any aggressive physical behaviour. The majority of participants were in the category rated ‘always’ stay calm, however, there were four participants deemed slightly lower in their capacity to remain calm. In the low creative group, nine of eleven negotiators always stayed completely calm during the bargaining. Two of the low creative participants were rated lower, but not significantly: they showed one or two
incidents of not remaining completely calm. Nine out of the eleven high creative participants were always calm throughout the bargaining simulation. Two of the highly creatives were rated slightly lower, but not to an ample degree: for example, one or two incidents of not exhibiting calm behaviour.

**Behavioural example:**

LC4 argued the case for cost of labour and HC4 responded to her arguments by raising her voice and waving her arms, making the point that, ‘I don’t want to take a risk with my workers, neither your workers if I am hiring them, and it will be a big problem if it’s in six months’.

The reasons for the lower ratings in the ability to stay calm referred to instances where some participants either left the bargaining table or raised their voice to overpower their counterpart when the discussion got heated. However, this was not extreme in any of the incidents, thus, no explicit case of disrupting the negotiation event as a whole was detected.

The limited extent of participants losing their temper was expected when drawing from the literature. Clegg (2001) stated that staying calm is one of the most applied tactics of use, and even if the counterpart is being unreasonable, ‘staying calm’ will help the negotiator lower the temper in a heated situation. Moreover, adopting this behaviour will let the respective negotiator appear to be in the right, even if this is not the case (Clegg, 2001), an element observed throughout this negotiation simulation. Another key point of staying calm is that the negotiator will most likely not say things they will regret and have to apologise for (Clegg, 2001), and this was observed to be the case with this cohort, also evident in category two ‘apologizing for behaviour’ which was rated never to occur. However, this category must also be viewed in light of culture, which is discussed in the subsequent section.

8. **Integrating – behaviours used to join together perspectives of the parties.**

This category was a key point of difference between the low and high creative groups. Several themes emerged in analysing this category beyond the basic notion of explicitly expressing a willingness create joint alternatives, which is a fundamental feature (Fisher et al., 1991; Gunia et al.,
This relates to numerous sub-factors of integrative behaviour. In this category the majority of highly creative individuals utilized more integrative approaches, whilst the low creative negotiators showed a tendency to adopt more distributive measures. The majority of highly creative participants were rated as using the various integrative behaviours on average five times, and the low creative participants used it on average three times.

Ten of the eleven pairs (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) represented the structure where the high creative individuals adopted an integrative approach more frequently than their counterpart. One pair (number 4) was observed to hold the opposite structure where the low creative individual tended to negotiate more integratively (five times) than the high creative individual (three times).

What this intimates is that although the high creative group used more integrative measures on average, the low creative group often emulated these measures, albeit to a less significant degree putting more emphasis on the distributive approach. Moreover, this is consistent with the reciprocity principle in negotiation which asserts that one party will often adopt a position observed from the other (Brett et al., 1998). For example, several studies have shown that it is easy to adapt to one type of behaviour if one sees the counterpart using this strategy from the outset (Asherman & Asherman, 2001; Brett et al., 1998). The reason these adapted behaviours occur is that the negotiators often initiate a certain type of communication and the counterpart responds with the same communication; concurrently the first negotiator continues in a self-consistent manner with the communication. This reciprocity behaviour becomes a large element of the negotiation and can be difficult to break out of, or steer into a new direction for the parties (Brett et al., 1998). In this bargaining simulation this was mostly observed to be a positive element, particularly in regards to generating alternatives and striving to communicate how to approach future relations.

One of the dominant and emergent themes of the integrative strategies was the ‘focus on building future relations’, which was identified at certain stages in the majority of the negotiations, albeit not by both of the respective parties in all cases. This aspect of the disputes did, however, overtly serve as a common denominator amid the highly creative group. This is consistent with Lewicki et al.’s (2010) characteristics of future value, which is underpinned by exploring both common and different interests to create value for strong and lasting agreements. Without fail the
individuals with highly creative characteristics emphasised this measure. The case at hand, consisting of contract mining dilemmas between RTA and R&R, often drove the parties to an impasse, and the highly creative participants exhibited an enhanced practice of stressing future value. This was evident especially around two of the bargaining points, namely conducting future work projects in the same region, and the notion of leveraging cost in relation to the current project onto the next project. In addition, it was identified that the tactic of focusing on future value was instrumental in keeping the negotiation process going in a constructive and positive direction (Benoliel, 2011; Fisher et al., 1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC6 put an emphasis on the future relations, proposing that, ‘Just for the first time we could train the local people, and the next time we would use less time and lower cost on our future jobs. Training is just for the first time... So maybe RTA can have some jobs and people from R&amp;R in the future?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, the less creative often emphasised viewing the case as a single occurrence, which is according to Lewicki et al. (2010), a distributive characteristic. This was evident in the low creative participants’ behaviour surrounding the elementary items of the case. Frequently, the participants of the opposite group utilized a tactic by means of one point to downplay the rest, and concurrently strived to simplify intricate multi-level problems. Examples of this behaviour related particularly to issues of cost and the time-frame of the project. As the two issues were inherently intertwined and reliant on each other for reaching successful outcomes, low creative negotiators often simplified this into a single dilemma with disregard for other factors. This was observed as an approach to making the case at hand very linear in fashion with a stringent opening and ending frame, leaving little room for future cooperation between the parties.

Another theme that emerged was the emphasis on ‘separating people from the problem’, which is a relational approach often used by the highly creative group. In analysing the issues in the case, too many of the low creative negotiators were unable to stay on track and address vital points
when confronted by a new dilemma. The common traits of the highly creative group in this instance were consistent with Fisher et al.’s (1991), integrative and interest based framework, to objectively strive for alternative solutions. This objectivity encompasses behaviours that move away from personal concession in the disputes.

On the other side, the low creative group focused on maximizing their own value and this was often observed as a quintessential goal of a more distributive negotiation strategy (Lewicki et al., 2010). However, in this study the notion of maximizing own values was often observed to be counterproductive when applied by the low creative group. The main emphasis the low creative participants laid on maximizing their own values and stakes, was to reinforce their time-frame and economic standpoint. This did not always produce successful results. The main examples of this tactic’s adverse effect in this negotiation event were that as they communicated to the counterpart that the resources were scarce, even though this was not factually sound, new points would arise which were not readily accounted for. This approach also generated some confrontational behaviour. This led to a standstill in bargaining, acting as a barrier rather than a buffer for the generation of new alternatives.

Behavioural example:

After the bargaining started to waiver in an unconstructive manner, HC3 sat back on his chair and in a calm tone of voice claimed that, ‘I understand where you are coming from. And I understand what you are saying in regards to the lease. What the lease does not take into consideration is the actual time on the ground, and the ability of all our people to operate and maximize efficiencies... Because you would be taking an 18 month lease it would worth us considering doing some additional work for you, for the land that we are jointly trying to re-develop. We could increase our contribution to the area.’

The integrative notion of ‘focusing on interest – not positions’ exhibits the negotiators’ true intentions and overall goals with the conflict (Billings-Yun, 2010; Fisher et al., 1991). This aspect of
integrative negotiation was prevalent as it moved the bargaining toward a relational approach, which led to more openness across the bargaining table (De Dreu et al., 2000; Lewicki et al., 2010). The highly creative group emphasised this interest-based approach and advocated the notion. As many concerns of the case related to external factors, these participants communicated their interest in a more elaborate way than their counterparts. Examples of this related especially to the issues of indigenous labour, time-frame, environmental concerns, as well as the interest of future collaboration, a point which permeates the first theme addressed in this respective category. Interests were voiced through a more altruistic approach from the creative negotiators, who showed a willingness to strive for more self-disclosure and openness to their respective standpoints. They often illustrated this by incorporating both sides’ positions, and then applied the positions to the common interest of both parties, often asking probing questions to evoke the opponent’s interests.

Conversely, competiveness was a fundamental approach associated with the low creative group. Although little direct aggressiveness was observed, many different competitive traits were detected. Furthermore, this group was often observed to hold a competitive mindset, a key facet of distributive behaviour (Barry & Friedman, 1998), but more importantly also expected this from their counterpart. This contradictory paradigm often led to discontent amongst the parties. As the low creative group mostly adhered to distributive behaviours they also used tactics of constantly referring back to their target points in a very assertive manner. This did not mean they did not compromise, as they were observed adhering with the notion of give-and-take within basic parameters, however, low creative individuals would always strive for extreme measures only to settle for less, albeit consistently within their own boundaries. One of the most predominant tactics of this was hardball (Lewicki et al., 2010). This was frequently observed within the party’s bargaining-range, relating to assertive behaviours, making a firm opening bid and latter walk-away point. From this they established their bargaining range and competed solely on that basis. This was often counterproductive as the case had many other facets which would not have been resolved, if some integrative measure were not introduced.
Behavioural example

In an effort to move the negotiation to a more interest based direction, and to counteract very assertive manners, HC 5 posed several question to probe the true interest of the counterpart, asking, ‘So, it is in your interest to finish the job in a shorter time-frame because of the seasons? Any particular season you are worried about?’

Furthermore, ‘generate many alternatives’ is an aspect related closely to the creative and integrative construct (Bazerman et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 1991; Winkler, 2006). The overlaying evidence seen in relation to this case comes from instances where both parties are stalled and exhibit frustration, observed through passive aggressiveness and negative body language, only to notice that the negotiation is being buffered in a positive direction by the creative participants through elaborating and putting forth new ideas.

This was often observed in relation to the wider objectives of the event (Fisher et al., 1991), and the notion of viewing the dilemmas through the opportunity cost framework. Where the low creative negotiators provided little concession in relation to new alternatives in most cases, which sometimes drove the dispute into a deadlock, the opposite was observed from the corresponding high creative person. This was a central point and one of the main differences observed in the bargaining event as a whole. When reaching a deadlock, most highly creative negotiators exhibited a far superior ability to create not only solutions from their own platform of ideas, but also to reach out to their counterpart and incorporate these issues into a holistic approach. The reciprocity principle of negotiation (Brett et al., 1998) also surfaced in this realm, as the low creative counterpart strived to build on the newly proposed ideas, thus the negotiation as a whole moved in an integrative direction. These alternatives became ubiquitous in the sense that they all correlated with creative behaviour, and signified the highly creative group’s utilization of a broad approach to solving the problems, for example, proposing agenda items to be added to the total sum which were not explicit within the case study provided to them as a guideline at the outset. In addition, it was often observed that the reciprocity principle worked in the high creative group’s favour not necessarily because of all their
alternatives, but because they were first to introduce these alternatives, which in turn influenced their opponentsto emulate their behaviour in the latter phases of the negotiation.

A key point of difference between the groups was the notion that the low creative participants through numerous phases, particularly the early stages, showed an ‘unwillingness to accept and build on new alternatives’, which is in essence failing to understand proposals made by the opponent and the positive effect these have on the negotiation as a whole (Pienaar & Spoelstra, 1999). This led to the common mistake amongst the low creative group, which was the often observed behaviour of failing to acknowledge all vital information that would lead to new alternatives and mutual advantage (Fisher et al., 1991). In many instances this derived from not accepting value creation or accepting incentives put forward about future projects, enhanced social reputation of the entities, and gains from training the local labour force. Although the highly creative group put these probabilities on the bargaining table, the low creative negotiators were often steadfast in the win/lose dichotomy, until their counterpart generated enough sound alternatives and shifted the negotiation in a new direction. It was then that the low creative participants started to accept and emulate some of these alternatives.

**Behavioural example:**

A negotiation impasse was reached and HC3 strived to implement several alternatives in a short time-frame, stating that, ‘I agree with you, but I don’t think we will meet our wider objectives should we do it. One of these wider objectives is getting the indigenous people around the community to participate. They will be the eventual inheritors of this land as per the lease agreement; there would many benefits for us to give them the skills they require. If nothing, it is great public relations and you would get a lot out of seeing some good press in relation to the environmental issues as well. I think if we were to launch a joint publicity campaign, getting some good press for us, even if it takes a little bit longer, it would be excellent for both parties... At this stage I would suggest we will need to do a proper feasibility in terms of training as well. We need to look at what areas of skills we will be passing over to the indigenous, what they are going to be doing with the land. What are they going to do with reclaiming? We need to break all that down.’
Moreover, ‘results based objectivity’ was an interest based factor (Fisher et al., 1991; Lewicki et al., 2010) that must be viewed in light of both the documentary video analysis and the end agreement signed by both parties. The majority of all negotiators approached this factor, regardless of low creative or high creative status, in a favourable light and demonstrated an adherence to the notion of objectivity throughout the negotiation simulation. Even though various strategies were used during the negotiations, and sometimes the dialogue was construed as heated verbal communication, both parties showed a tendency towards agreeableness and going over the points in an objective manner at the end. This was most often done by consulting their counterparts and by reiterating the key agenda items by asking questions to confirm agreements previously reached verbally.

**Behavioural example:**

At the end of the simulation LC6 drafted a list of key objectives and asked, ‘So we said we fulfil the quota, so you have certain per centage of indigenous people working for you, and a certain per centage of your own people? I’ll just write we fulfil the quota of indigenous people then. So do you think we should add and address this as R&R employees? OK, we will sign it’.

Similarly, HC5 invited LC5 to go over the key points at the final stages and reaffirmed if they ‘agree on a time-frame of 18 months, in six month blocks? This will be before and after the wet season. Thus, work will be in this duration. What else did we agree on? That R&R will use their own staff and they will employ indigenous people’.

---

9. Pretending that the conflict does not exist.

This category was assessed on the basis of the participants repeatedly avoiding an imperative issue and pretending there was no conflict around key agenda items, often playing cool and pretending not to be hurt by opponent’s actions (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). Throughout the documentary analysis this was not observed to be a common factor that came into play, however, in the cases where it did, it mostly pertained to dismissing the issue of cost and pretending that it was not
a key element of the conflict, which in fact was not the case. This was often done in order to achieve
the suitable time-frame.

Behavioural example:

LC6 pretended that the dilemma of cost was irrelevant to the negotiation case in order to gain
an upper hand on his six-month sought after time-frame, which saw him consistently argue that, ‘Yeah
but we want to finish earlier and really don’t care about cost. It’s not a problem to fill the indigenous
quota, but we want to finish as soon as possible’ (six-months).

Four negotiation pairs (1, 6, 8, and 9) displayed similar patterns: where the low creative
negotiator used the tactic on average three times and the high creative negotiator never used it. The
remaining seven pairs (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, and 11) showed no tendencies for employing the respective
tactic. Furthermore, it was apparent through the negotiations that provided evidence of conflict
avoidance tendencies, that this repeated behaviour did not aid the relationship between the two
parties. This is an element that is supported by Fisher et al.’s (1991) theory of appeasement, through
the notion that it does not work in an actual negotiation, as well as making it hard to deal with future
differences.

Although this current thesis is based on a one-off negotiation simulation, the opposing party
(highly creative participants) exhibited frustration when they repeatedly witnessed dismissals of key
conflicts. Hence, a conclusion can be drawn that future relations would potentially be hurt, as they left
this particular bargaining event dissatisfied on many levels, as all agenda items were not resolved.

When these types of issues occur it can often result in differences in judgement about the
future (Lewicki et al., 2010), both pertaining to the actual value of an item, as well as the value of the
relationship (Fisher et al., 1991). Moreover, in this case there was a tendency to create a skewed
emphasis on certain items (such as cost vs. time), making it difficult at stages for both parties to find
compatibility, which is the key to unlocking the dilemma of value creation (Lewicki et al., 2010).
10. Consider the other – listening to the other person to demonstrate respect for him or her.

This category was assessed by examining how the negotiators acted throughout the event. If a party showed disrespect by not letting the counterpart finish their sentences or engaged in behaviour outside the norm of a professional negotiation event, this would influence the rating in a negative manner.

The majority of the participants were deemed to be ‘always’ respectful to their negotiation partner. However, some instances were observed where a participant was disrespectful and unprofessional. This behaviour pertained mostly to the low creative participants. Three negotiation pairs (6, 9, and 11) displayed the pattern of the low creative negotiator, being less considerate than the high creative and exhibiting an average of three incidents of inconsiderate behaviour, while the opponent never exhibited this behaviour. However, one pair (number 4) showed the opposite, namely that the high creative on two incidents was less considerate. The remaining seven pairs (1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10) were all on par and very considerate of the other party.

Behavioural example:

Some overtly assertive and avoidant behaviour was used by LC6 stating, ‘Yeah but that’s your cost training, we just want to do the job. We just want the shortest time-frame so, do you need more time?’ (LC6 leaves the bargaining table not willing to listen and create dialogue around the issues).

Viewing this in light of Ting-Toomey et al.’s (2000) latent constructs of this category, it is apparent that the low creative negotiators did not always adhere to all the respective items such as ‘[trying] not to hurt the other person’, ‘[listening] to the other party to show respect’, and ‘[considering] the other’s feelings’. On the occasions where inconsiderate behaviour was detected this often pertained to the latter two items, which was apparent when negotiators either left the room, or were unwilling to create dialogue around the issue, which they knew could be important for the opposing party.
Further, the low creative participants who showed inconsiderate behaviour did not create any dialogue around the counterpart’s expectations. This is a vital point, as explained by Fisher et al. (1991), because considerate behaviour will have an effect on the future relationship with the opponent. This relates to the reputation of the party and will avoid the notion of viewing the counterpart as ‘the enemy’ (Fisher et al., 1991).

Further, lack of respect in bargaining can result in emotions such as anger, which can in turn lead to inaccurate judgments of the stakes. This means the more self-centred an individual is during bargaining, the more they reduce the possibilities of joint gains (Ghauri & Usunier, 2003). This is consistent with the findings in this facework category, where the low creative negotiators at times showed disrespectful behaviour, and new alternatives were not readily put forth and discussed in a constructive manner as a consequence of that behaviour.

11. Direct/passive aggression.

This category was coded based on two elements. First, whether there was any direct physical or verbal aggression used by the parties; and second, whether there was any body language signifying passive aggression. Body language was determined passive aggressive if the negotiator crossed their arms, sat back on the chair and stopped talking, made rude and sarcastic comments, or simply ignored the other person over long periods of time. In this study little direct aggression was observed, but several instances of passive aggressive behaviour were detected. Passive aggressive behaviour did not occur at a higher rate amongst either low or high creative individuals. It was mostly observed to occur when a deadlock was triggered, and one of the parties would sit back on their seat crossing their arms and looking away from the table, not wanting to communicate as openly as in earlier stages. It was also observed in changes to tone of voice when certain agenda items were not readily agreed in the direction sought for one of the parties.

Among low creativity negotiators, eight out of eleven people displayed this behaviour. Eight of the low creativity negotiators used the passive aggressive tactic to resolve the situation, but only sporadically, for example, between one and two times during the whole simulation. Among the high
creativity negotiators, four out of the eleven people displayed this behaviour, but again sporadically only one to two times per negotiation simulation.

**Behavioural example:**

HC6 was constantly obstructed and shut down in her arguments by LC6; in response HC6 often sat back on her chair and remained quiet for long periods of time. This was often followed by looking away when the counterpart spoke, or focusing on the case sheet rather than the conversation.

Although some literature argues that there are appropriate times to use aggressive energies to wield agenda items in your own favour (Fisher et al., 1991; Robinson, 1986), in most instances there are few observed benefits from this behaviour (Lewicki et al., 2010). In this present negotiation simulation there were no observed indications of positive influences from passive aggressive behaviour; it mostly was spurred by not being able to resolve conflict and in response to rude behaviour. The result was long deadlocks on various agenda items.

12. *Avoiding the person or the issue.*

This category was analysed in light of the previous category ‘9: Pretending that the conflict does not exist’. It was observed that several negotiators tried to avoid certain issues either by fault or as a part of their strategy. In cases where avoidance was detected this mostly related to the issue of cost, albeit ratings for this behaviour were relatively low as they occurred from two to three times where apparent.

Four bargaining simulation pairs (number 1, 6, 8, and 9) displayed similar patterns: the low creative individuals emphasised the avoidance behaviour (on average three times) more than the high creative individuals, which never used it. The remaining seven bargaining simulation pairs (number 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, and 11) showed no use of the respective tactic.
Behavioural example:

HC1 tried to integrate several issues around the time-frame and HC1 responded by trying to avoid the issue while shaking her head, claiming, ‘Eighteen months is too long... I know it’s cheaper but it’s a long time, time is money, so I don’t agree.’ LC1 then looked down onto her sheet and looked at her computer for a long period of time. LC1 did not maintain eye contact with HC1 and tried to move to another agenda item.

In rating and analysing this particular category, it became clear that this is a problematic element of this facework typology (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001, p. 200) due to the integral similarities of behaviour in ‘category 12’ and ‘category 9’. ‘Pretending that the conflict does not exist’ is inherently linked with ‘avoiding an issue’; because an ‘issue’ around a negotiation table usually leads into the conflict, which is the central reason for negotiations to be set in place (Miesing & Pavur, 2008).

It then becomes important to address whether ‘avoiding the person’ should be a separate category, because it deals more with the interpersonal side of the category than the respective agenda items. Moreover, even if ‘avoiding the person’ is to be established as its own rating category, it would be – particularly in an individual two-party negotiation – an arbitrary form of measurement, as overtly using this tactic would result in the negotiator breaking off the bargaining process permanently. In turn, it would not be suitable for behavioural assessment of the ongoing dynamics between the two parties.

Drawing from observations in this negotiation simulation, should such a category be implemented into the facework’s overall framework, it should be refined to encompass a link between tangible and intangible (Lewicki et al., 2010), trigger measurements and interpersonal dimensions reflecting psychological behaviours of the negotiators. Tangible measures relate to issues of cost and terms of agreement, while intangible measures are based on relationships and psychological motivations (Lewicki et al., 2010). The current category does not work well because it does not assess and differentiate if it is a tangible (case specific parameter) or an intangible (relationship) correlation,
and to what degree this correlation influences the avoidance behaviour. However, this would in turn be difficult to measure from an independent coder point of view, and would probably be better suited as a self-reported survey item where the individuals themselves could rate the degree of animosity experienced towards their counterpart that resulted in them avoiding the person or leaving the premises.

13. Compromising points in order to resolve the issue.

The category of ‘compromise’ was assessed in relation to the willingness of one party to give away any agenda item and allow concession to exceed a certain point in favour of their counterpart, whilst still holding onto and not going under the baseline of their own parameters (i.e., work within the low and high cut-off points of their own agenda items). Thus, this category differs from facework category number six ‘giving in’, which sees the respective parties totally give up an agenda item in favour of their counterpart (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000).

Most of the parties exerted a fairly high level of compromise throughout all the negotiation simulations, and only in one instance was this observed as ‘never’ the case. This category is also one of the most significant differentials between the low and high creative groups. In particular, the high creative groups most often utilized this measure as a part of their overall strategy, which means that they applied compromising behaviours on average more than five times during the course of the bargaining simulation. However, the difference between the two behaviours was not large, as the low creative group adopted this behaviour on average three times during the respective simulation.

Furthermore, nine negotiation pairs (number 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) displayed similar patterns where the high creative negotiator employed more compromising behaviour, whilst the low creative negotiator used it less. In the remaining two out of the eleven pairs, the individuals used the same amount of compromising behaviour as their counterparts (three and four times respectively); hence no differences are noted.

While the high creative group was most often willing to compromise on several agenda items, to build on those compromises and to strive to integrate, the low creative emphasised the fixed-pie paradigm. The ‘fixed-pie approach’ expresses a practice whereby a dispute can only be resolved by
viewing the total sum of any goods and services as static (Lewicki et al., 2010). This negotiation impasse was ubiquitous throughout the low creative group, and they often treated the issues as cut-and-dried (Ochs & Roth, 1989). Although the group was identified as making both concessions and compromises, both of these aspects were often unnecessary. This is due to the fact that the negotiation case offered many viable options for solutions that would lead to reaching mutual agreement by expanding the pie. Therefore many of the low creative individual’s attempts to arbitrarily down play cost in relation to time-frame, or vice versa, did not elevate both parties’ decision-making process to a constructive level.

Another common denominator amid the low creative group was that as they offered their own concessions, they would often not recognize the relevance of their counterpart’s positions and interests, which is an important element of integrative strategies (Fisher et al., 1991). This practice was widespread throughout and could be viewed in relation to economic and external factors of the environment and use of local labour. The participants would acknowledge that the factors, however, would fail to incorporate resolutions into the end results as main categories of agreement, for example, if one issue was raised, it served as a restrictive factor for the others.

**Behavioural example:**

HC3 initially proposed a shorter time-frame, however, was willing to compromise if alternative measures were included in the final contract, claiming that, ‘We are happy to do the 18 months for the length of the project, provided there is only 12 months of the indigenous labour... Yes, we would also be happy to put in a performance clause on our end, that should you not be happy with the work for the 18 months we would only charge for the initial 12 month tender. Thus, reflecting our commitment to you guys and any future projects’.

As observed through this behavioural example, the high creativity group were willing to compromise on both tangible (terms of agreement) and intangible (future relations) measures (Lewicki et al., 2010). From a tangible viewpoint these negotiators allowed compromises to occur on
time, cost, and performance, but also emphasised the need to look fair or honourable for future relations, which is also consistent with Ting-Toomey et al.’s (2000) face-saving theory. From an intangible point of view, the high creative group often expressed a willingness to build on their relationship by emphasising commitment and loyalty to the project. This underscores Lewicki et al.’s (2010) theory of the strong influence and importance of both tangible and intangible managerial elements in creating sound bargaining procedures.

Although Lewicki et al. (2010) claimed that a truly creative negotiator does not need to compromise due to sharing in the number of generated alternatives, in this study compromise was frequently observed amongst the highly creative group. However, an important note must be made in that regard: as previously mentioned there was not a significant difference in the extent of compromising behaviour between the two groups. Thus, there was an adherence to meeting in the middle, even when the new alternatives were put forth and discussed. As such, this compromising category, seen in light of category eight of ‘integrating’ reaffirms the notion that ‘compromise does not create, it deals with what already exists; integration creates something new’ (Follet, 1940, p. 35). This can be further explained by the tendency of the low creative group (facework category 12) to sometimes dismiss issues; consequently the alternatives generated by the high creative group may have been fewer, and not treated as imperatives to be included as a central agenda item.

In summary, this section has analysed all of the 13 facework categories in regards to the low and high creative groups. In each category the rated scores of the negotiation simulation pairs has been presented and the observations of the behaviours were detailed. These behaviours were viewed on the basis of established negotiation literature and theories. Key differentials between the pairs and groups were analysed to better understand the influence of the dichotomous relationship between the low and high creative participants. Further, the following section will explain in detail how the previously established cultural dimensions influenced the bargaining strategies within the same constituency. Each facework category will be analysed in regards to the collectivist and individualistic participants.
Table 3 lays out the differences in cultural dimensions and facework behaviours. The participants were paired on the basis of two dimensions and assessed through survey constructs, namely individualistic and collectivistic respectively. The cut-off score for the individualistic dimension was 5.49, and the collectivistic dimension score was 5.44. The participants were classified based on scores below or above the means. This entailed individualists being classified on the basis of scoring above the mean for the individualist construct, and below the mean for the collectivist construct. Collectivists were categorised on the basis of scoring above the mean on the collectivist construct, while also scoring below the individualist construct mean. As a result, 13 individuals were classified as collectivistic respondents, and nine individuals were classified as individualistic respondents. Participants were also paired based on creativity level, so there was high and low creative participants in each pair. However, participants were not allocated based on their cultural values. Therefore, there were some pairs where both participants were collectivistic individuals and vice versa. Also, there were some pairs where one participant was individualistic and another was collectivistic and vice versa. Table 3 lays out each pairs rated cultural dimensions (on an individual level) and their rated facework scores. The behaviours are further discussed in the following section.
Table 3: Frequency of facework behaviours comparing the individualistic and collectivist participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACEWORK behaviours</th>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>Pair 2</th>
<th>Pair 3</th>
<th>Pair 4</th>
<th>Pair 5</th>
<th>Pair 6</th>
<th>Pair 7</th>
<th>Pair 8</th>
<th>Pair 9</th>
<th>Pair 10</th>
<th>Pair 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Third party – seeking an outside party to help;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apologising for behaviour;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expressing how one is feeling;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Defending – standing up for one’s opinions;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private discussion - avoiding public confrontation;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Giving in - accommodating the other’s wishes;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Remaining calm during the conflict;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Integrating - behaviours used to join perspectives;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pretending that the conflict does not exist;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consider the other - listening to the other person;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Direct/passive aggression;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Avoiding the person or the issue;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Compromising points to resolve the issue;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: C = Collectivist, and I = Individualist, based on cultural dimension measurements formerly described. The frequency (number of times the behaviour was observed) of displayed behaviour are illustrated in Table 2 as 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = very often and 6 = always.
4.5 Facework categories and culture analysis

1. Third party – seeking an outside party to help resolve the conflict.

   Across all participants, this category was rated from ‘never’ to ‘sometimes’; thus, it was not a significant and influential behaviour amongst the participants. Among the collectivist negotiators, ten out of thirteen individuals did not seek help from the outside. Three collectivist negotiators used this tactic at some point (on average twice) during the bargaining process. Conversely, four out of the nine individualistic negotiators did not use this tactic. Five individualistic negotiators used the tactic on the odd occasion during the simulation (on average twice). In the cases where external help was sought, it mostly related to getting basic information clarification from lecturers; however, there were no cultural differences in the propensity to use this behaviour.

   Behavioural example:

   I5 expressed frustration over the progress of the negotiation stating, ‘So that your job? ... I am quite confused... do you mind if I go out to consult them? But you have to stay here.’

   Based on established literature, this finding is unexpected. Individualistic and collectivistic cultures have different approaches to seeking help in conflict situations (Karabenick & Newman, 2006). The individualistic norms at the cultural level discourage displays of incompetence and dependence, thus persons associated with this culture are motivated by individual achievement first and foremost. As a result, individualistic negotiators see outside help as undesirable and are less likely to request external assistance when problems arise (Karabenick & Newman, 2006). This is apparent throughout the respective bargaining simulations.

   However the discrepancy between these findings and cultural theory arose in regards to the collectivist cultural dimension. In general, the collectivist person works to satisfy the expectations of others, and emphasises interdependence and collaboration between peoples (Karabenick & Newman, 2006). An individual’s need for achievement is often small, and there is a need to promote the success of the team or group. As a result, appearing to be incompetent and dependent is not a great concern in
the collectivist culture (Karabenick & Newman, 2006). Therefore, it is presumed that the collectivist negotiator will apply help seeking behaviour at a higher rate than the individualist negotiator. This was not observed to be the case within this study. A possible explanation for this can be that the participants were from a younger generation and had spent considerable time in western and individualist societies, thus, had adapted to the culture (Bardhan & Weaver, 2010; Fang & Gehart, 2005). This could have influenced the mentality of emphasising independence as opposed to interdependence, as this study did expect, on the basis of theory, to see the most help seeking behaviour amongst this constituency.

2. Apologizing for behaviour.

This category was rated ‘never’ throughout this negotiation simulation. Hence, no inferences can be made on either cultural group. It has previously been discussed that the avoidance of this behaviour is due to the low risk context these participants had to the respective negotiation simulation (Venkatesh et al., 2003). However, another explanation could be due to the way that different cultures express apologies, and this could be the reason that no observations was made.

Some collectivist cultures have no word to express an apology, but they are merely a pursuit for forgiveness from someone who has been wronged (Cohen, 1997). This is inherently different from the individualistic approach, in which the apology is stringently framed as an action taken by the apologizer (Cohen, 1997). As such, this particular facework category is problematic for cultural assessment when used through the definition of Ting-Toomey et al. (2000), which framed an apology through three latent factors: ‘saying you’re sorry’, ‘asking for forgiveness’ and ‘[admitting] to making a mistake’. All of these are explicit verbal communications, thus, they do not incorporate the more elusive behaviour of pursuing forgiveness that is the approach taken by many collectivists (Cohen, 2007).
3. Expressing how one is feeling.

Expressing feelings was not a prevalent behaviour throughout this negotiation simulation. However, although not strongly emphasised by all constituents, it did occur at a higher rate amongst the individualistic negotiators. In all, five out of the nine individualist negotiators did not exhibit this behaviour. Four individualist negotiators put a minor emphasis on this behaviour and used it twice. In contrast, only two of the thirteen collectivist negotiators twice expressed their feelings, whilst eleven persons did not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When asked how she was feeling, I4 responded, ‘I am not doing that good. I don’t want to share anything with you... I need six months of contingency time’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most unexpected observation in this category stems from the observation that there was not a greater difference between the two cultural groups; in particular, that the individualistic negotiators did not exert this behaviour to a higher extent. Drawing from the literature (Brett & Gelfand, 2004; Hofstede, 2004), one would expect far more expressive and emotional behaviours from the individualistic negotiators as this cultural dimension is deemed to have a higher frequency and intensity of emotions than the collectivists. Conversely, this category confirms that the collectivists tend to consider emotions in negotiations as irrelevant (Brett & Gelfand, 2004), and adhere to compartmentalizing both task and socio-emotional dimensions of the conflict (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Thus, the observation that participants do not explicitly express feelings is supported by these collectivist bargainers, consistent with established theory.

4. Defending – standing up for one’s opinions and persuading others to accept these opinions.

As established, this category was highly utilized amongst the negotiators, and was in the majority of cases rated from ‘sometimes’ to ‘always’. However, in analysing this point in relation to individualistic and collectivistic cultural backgrounds, no significant difference between the two was
observed. It was observed that the nine individualist negotiators were rated on average to utilize this behaviour five times, contrary to the thirteen collectivist negotiators who used this behaviour four times. Hence, no distinctly different behavioural patterns were observed between the groups or pairs.

**Behavioural example:**

I2 was pressured on the agenda item of time-frame, arguing that, ‘We wouldn’t have submitted the tender if we couldn’t do it, but I don’t think we could do it to the best of Rio Tinto and our abilities. It would be a rushed job and I think going on about what I was talking about in terms of publicity, it won’t look good for anyone involved if we were to go in and do a half-way job, half-way train the workers, and for instance the media would get a hold of it and claim that we can’t even look after our mines’.

The analysis from this category was therefore surprising in relation to the dichotomy between individualists and collectivists. Well-established theories from the literature state that individualists often express their personal rights and minimize the respect-deference distance via information-based communication (Brett & Gelfand, 2004; Gudykunst, 2003; Hofstede, 2004), which was in fact observed in this respective negotiation simulation. However, the same theory states that collectivists try to maximize respect in a social interaction that includes not overtly defending their position or vocally standing up for their opinions. However, this was not the case with this cohort. As observed within this study, the notion of defending and voicing opinions was not culturally bound, but correlated better to the individuals’ creativity and how it influenced the dynamics and progress of the bargaining as a whole.

This does not discredit the theory of how different cultural dimensions influence defensive behaviour, but merely indicates that other personality and interpersonal factors are more relevant to a negotiation procedure than the cultural background of the constituents. It also supports criticism of many cultural theories, which claim that culture is not a construct that should be categorised as homogenous and static, but merely as heterogeneous and dynamic (Bardhan & Weaver, 2010).
fact that this cohort of negotiators were from various cultural backgrounds and a young age group (majority collectivists and average age 26) indicates that culture is an evolving construct that changes over time through generations (Kanousi, 2005; Kueh & Voon, 2007; Yoo & Donthu, 2002). Furthermore, it can also be explained by the fact that the majority of the collectivist participants (sixty per cent) had spent over two years in Australia, hence had adapted to the individualistic cultural traits that were apparent in this simulation.

5. Private discussion – avoiding a public confrontation.

Both cultural groups ‘always’ avoided public confrontation. Hence, no inferences are made in regards to culture and avoiding confrontation. Although the low risk context is accounted for in this study (Venkatesh et al., 2003), there were expectations for the individualistic negotiator to use and express more need for media attention and/or pursue some strategy that included either online publications or consulting. Generally, individualist negotiators are prepared for some public confrontation and adversarial discourse, whilst the collectivist negotiator is often non-adversarial, indirect and keeps meetings and information private (Goldman, 1994). To avoid delayed decision making, the more individualistic negotiator applies these strategies and are willing to use more tools to speed the process, often disclosing information to outside sources such as the press, in order to put pressure on the counterpart. However, in this study the individualistic negotiators did not see the need for such measures, most likely due to the academic nature of the negotiations.

6. Giving in – accommodating the other’s wishes.

This behaviour was not prevalent in this negotiation simulation, for example, it was rarely rated as often (four times) or higher. In the incidents where it did occur there was no cultural difference between the individualist and collectivist negotiators. On an average, both the thirteen collectivist and nine individualistic negotiators gave in twice and no different patterns between the groups or the pairs was observed within this facework category.
Behavioural example:

Il gave in on his time-frame objective of a contract less than one year after being pushed on several issues by his counterpart, responding, ‘We will do the project over 18 months,’ and later emphasised the need to work around wet seasons and using local labour.

As such, these findings were not surprising. Giving in is universally associated with ‘giving face’, the manner in which a negotiator gives up an agenda item consequently also affecting their interpersonal positions (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). No specific culture is associated strongly with giving in because of the fear of losing face. The collectivists worry that giving in can lead to their group being seen in a negative light with decreased authority, while the individualistic negotiator worries about preserving his or her own image, which they rely on for reputation and individual status (Reardon, 2004). Thus, it was an expected finding that there were few discrepancies between the two groups in this facework behaviour.

7. Remaining calm during the conflict.

Few incidents of disrupting the peace around the bargaining table were detected. In cases where it did occur, and the participant scored lower than ‘always’, i.e., six times, it was evenly distributed between individualist and collectivists across the two cultural dimensions. Seven out of the nine individualistic participants always stayed calm throughout the negotiation. Two individualistic participants showed tendencies of vaguely being disrupting in character, often by raising their voice and using expressing body language such as waving their arms, where it occurred twice during the course of the negotiation simulation. Eleven of the thirteen collectivist participants always stayed calm during the negotiation. Two collectivist participants used behaviour that vaguely disrupted the process, but only rarely, i.e., once or twice, during the negotiation simulation.
Behavioural example:

I4 became frustrated over cost, raising her voice and waving her arms, stating, ‘I have to pay $400K, it is not acceptable for me actually’.

Most collectivist negotiators view not remaining calm and rude expressive behaviour as ‘face threats’ while individualistic negotiators view threats to their credibility as ‘face threats’ (Gudykunst, 1993). As a result, individualist negotiators were expected to use this behaviour more than the collectivist negotiators in this study because this group generally does not treat rude behaviour as a real threat, that is; if it is not rooted in a systematic attack on their personal credibility. However, this did not occur often as a general behaviour, or as behaviour with a leaning towards one specific cultural group. The low risk context, due to the academic and safe setting (Venkatesh et al., 2003), is again a plausible factor for this, because if the negotiators had more personal stake in the agenda items, they would arguably use stronger means in order to reach their true interests.

8. Integrating – behaviours used to join together perspectives of the parties.

There was a broad span of measures and emphases on this facework category. There were significant differences between the creativity groups. However, little differentiation is observed based on the cultural dimensions, for example, on average these groups emphasised this behaviour evenly, hence no inferences can be made on the influence of culture in integrative behaviour in this study. On average both the thirteen collectivist and nine individualist negotiators used this behaviour three times.
Behavioural example:

I2 attempted to incorporate several elements into the bargaining, when the counterpart was specific on a single agenda item, claiming that, ‘The thing about getting the right people is that it will take longer... normally... In a perfect world we will have 18 months, but I understand the time pressure is on Rio Tinto in particular, you guys are looking at expanding your operations, which is excellent. We would like to be a part of that and at Returning & Ripping we would like to consider any future projects as well; we are not about just getting in and out’.

These ratings were an unexpected element in this study. Prior research has indicated that collectivist negotiators have better capabilities for integration (Adair, 2003; Cai, Drake & Wilson, 2000), yet this was not observed to be the case within this respective negotiation simulation. Further, comparing this category to the creativity construct – which indicated that the high creative group placed more emphasis on integrative behaviour – cultural dimensions were not significant across the distributive-integrative dichotomy. Thus, there are tendencies for other interpersonal and personality traits to influence integrative behaviour to a larger extent than culture.

9. Pretending that the conflict does not exist.

Dismissing or pretending a conflict did not exist occurred rarely throughout this negotiation simulation. In incidents where it was present it was rated from ‘rarely’ to ‘often’, i.e., one to four times. There was a small tendency for a collectivist negotiator to use this more than the individualists. Three collectivist negotiators emphasised this tactic to a certain degree (between two to three times) throughout their bargaining simulation. One individualistic negotiator used this tactic once during the simulation. This behaviour was observed mostly in relation to dismissing cost on various agenda items.
Behavioural example:

After circling around most of the issues pertaining to pricing, C1 asked, ‘Is the cost of land included? I think it is an extra fee’.

This finding is consistent with previous empirical findings of the category (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001), which shows that collectivist cultures use avoidance behaviour and pretend that the conflict does not exist throughout the negotiation process far more than the individualists, who are more prone to employing direct-confronting behaviours. However, the low frequency of use (two to three times amongst the collectivist that used the tactic) is most likely explained through the low risk context of the bargaining simulation (Venkatesh et al., 2003), and that the students felt the need to get through the agenda items at a quicker pace than in a actual professional negotiation setting. Therefore, the majority of participants most likely felt the need to get all the key agenda items out in the open in order to resolve them and move forward.

10. Consider the other – listening to the other person to demonstrate respect for him or her.

Most negotiators showed mutual respect for one another throughout this simulation. In instances where rude behaviour was detected it was not significant enough to dramatically change the direction of the negotiation. No difference in this behaviour was detected between the cultural groups. Six out of nine individualistic negotiators show the highest amounts of consideration for their counterparts. Three individualistic negotiators showed slightly lower scores due to some instances of inconsiderate behaviours, and this did occur on average twice amongst this constituency. Ten out of the thirteen collectivist negotiators showed a high amount of consideration for their counterpart. Three collectivist negotiators engaged in some form of inconsiderate behaviour, observed on average twice amongst this constituency.
Based on the literature it was expected that the collectivist negotiators would not engage in any inconsiderate behaviour. Collectivist cultures are generally opposed to disruptive behaviour because of the focus on maintaining harmony throughout negotiations, a value highly protected by the collectivist (Brett, 2007). This differs from the individualistic mind-frame of action oriented and solution focused communication behaviours (Brett, 2007). Individualists are more prone to inconsiderate behaviours due to the frequent disregard of relational factors in order to reach a solution (Brett, 2007). Moreover, collectivists often avoid disrespectful behaviours out of their concern for not only their own party, but the whole constituency, a factor apparent in this bargaining simulation.

11. Direct/passive aggression.

No direct aggressiveness was detected throughout these negotiations. In cases where passive aggressiveness was detected it was usually indicated by sitting back on the chair or through rapid changes in body language; however, this did not occur at a higher rate between any of the cultural dimensions assessed in this study. Six out of thirteen collectivist negotiators showed no sign of passive aggressive behaviour, and seven collectivist negotiators showed some minor behaviour of passive aggression, for example, on average twice during the negotiation. Five out of nine individualist negotiators showed no tendency for aggressive behaviour, whilst four individualist participants showed some tendency towards passive aggression, for example, on average twice.
Behavioural example:

One party (C7) was pressured on various agenda items and cut eye contact with the counterpart, sat back on the chair and looked around the room, taking several long breaks before asking, ‘So you only want six months, with disregard to cost?’

While individualistic negotiators tend to use assertive and borderline direct aggressive behaviour when communicating, collectivist negotiators are more prone to passive and indirect aggressiveness (Verderber, Verderber & Sellnow, 2010). This behaviour is also linked with avoiding and obliging behaviour due to the notion that the collectivist does not want to directly disrupt the harmony (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). The collectivist is more inclined to use passive aggressive behaviour to wield the bargaining direction into the desired path, while still striving to maintain good relations with the opposing party. As such, it is an unexpected find that some individualistic negotiators engaged in this behaviour and did not use any direct aggressive behaviour, albeit assertive behaviour was detected.

12. Avoiding the person or the issue.

Little evidence of avoiding the issues or persons was present in this study. In cases where this did occur it mainly related to cost, which is also apparent in category 9. The problematic coding structure of this category was addressed in the earlier section on creativity. There were no significant differences between cultural dimensions in this category; ten out of thirteen collectivist negotiators did not use this behaviour. Three collectivist negotiators used the tactic between one to three times. Conversely, eight out of nine individualistic negotiators did not use this tactic whilst one individualist negotiator was observed to use this tactic once.

Based on the literature, individualistic cultures tend to prefer avoiding issues more than collectivist cultures (Murawski & Spencer, 2011). As such, collectivists will employ this behaviour as it can help with avoiding disintegration of an ongoing relationship, a factor which is imperative within
this culture (Ghauri & Usunier, 2003). Although not a prevalent behaviour in this bargaining simulation, there was a small tendency of collectivist negotiators to use this tactic.

13. Compromising points in order to resolve the issue.

Compromise was a ubiquitous behaviour in most negotiations during this study. This behaviour was also a point of difference between the cultural dimensions. In the cases where this behaviour was strong, for example, rated ‘often’ (four times) or more, there was a clear tendency for the collectivist negotiator to adhere strongly to this behaviour. Although the individualistic negotiators applied this to the bargaining progress, the emphasis was not as consistent as the collectivist group of negotiators. Thirteen collectivists put a strong emphasis on this behaviour and used it on average four times to rapidly move the negotiation forward. In contrast, the nine individualistic negotiators did not engage as strongly in this behaviour, with an average of three times during the course of the bargaining simulation.

Behavioural example:

C2 was pressured on time-frame, but compromised to do the job in a suitable manner for the counterpart by giving them the chance to monitor the work and then proposing, ‘OK, so now you are thinking maybe we do it in one year, and you check our work frequently... maybe at the end we can offer you an extra 10 or 20 days for the final check’.

Furthermore, the analysis and outcome of this category must be viewed in light of the intricate nature of compromise itself, and how different cultures traditionally set to engage in it. Previous studies indicated that collectivist negotiators have a lower preference for compromise and a stronger preference for avoidance than individualistic negotiators (Ghauri & Usunier, 2003). Collectivist negotiators often avoid compromise because it can constitute a departure from a company-backed consensus (Reardon, 2004). As such, meeting in the middle can be seen as rejecting their colleagues’ opinion in order to reach an agreement, which in turn can see them lose face and
authority in the future. Conversely, some individualists engage in compromise only in phases in a negotiation where deadlock has occurred, whereas other individualists use this behaviour as a token sign of flexibility that is underpinned by pride (Reardon, 2004).

Therefore, assessing this behaviour against these cultural dimensions is elusive and generalisations are difficult to make. In this study, it was observed that collectivists adhered slightly more to compromise, and there are numerous reasons for this to have occurred. The most prominent is that of trust (Ghauri & Usunier, 2003), which is important within this cultural dimension as it influences decision making and makes collectivists more likely to adopt compromising behaviour. The underlying issue influencing trust is that future relations are implicitly and explicitly proposed, and this in turn triggers this behaviour to surface. Again, this reaffirms conflict avoidance, in this instance through overtly compromising in order to maintain the interpersonal relationship.

4.6. Cultural values and creativeness

In this study there was an observed tendency for the high creative and collectivist negotiator to exhibit compromising behaviours to a larger degree than the low creative and individualistic negotiators. This is consistent with the literature that claims that collectivism places more emphasis on interpersonal harmony than accomplishing tasks, thus compromising styles are more likely to occur in collectivist cultures than others (London & Sessa, 1999). It is also inherently different to individualism which is presumed to be more brash, controlling and direct in negotiation style (London & Sessa, 1999). Moreover, this observed relationship is further explained by the notion that highly creative and collectivist individuals have a stringent focus on close ongoing relational approaches in negotiations, which are central elements for value creation and integration (Madjar, Oldham & Pratt, 2002; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008). This relationship is consistent with recent theory and hypotheses that propose that highly creative negotiators tend to focus on integrative behaviours and relational outcomes to a larger extent (De Pauw, Neetling & Venter, 2011).

Another observed relationship was the tendency for the low creative and collectivist negotiator to pretend that a conflict did not exist, apparent at a slightly larger degree than the high creative individualist negotiators. Even though this behaviour was rare within both groups, it was
rated in three individuals from one to three times within the collectivist/low creative dyad, as opposed to only one time with one individual in the individualist/high creative dyad. This indicates a weak relationship.

However, this weak relationship and low rating can be explained by the low risk context and the fact that it was a one-off negotiation event (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Nonetheless, the observation is consistent with the theory of collectivist negotiators avoiding conflict in order to maintain interpersonal and harmonious relationships (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). It is also consistent with the theory of low creative participants having less capacity for generating and including alternatives, as this is inherently linked with high creative behaviours (De Pauw, 2011; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008). Thus, it is apparent from this study that there is a tendency for some collectivist and low creative negotiators not to succumb to recognized conflicts, but merely to use the avoidance tactic by pretending that the conflict does not exist. This differs in particular with the high creative negotiators’ behaviour of compromising in order to integrate both parties’ interests. However, it is a discrepancy within the collectivist group as a whole, which did in fact use more compromising and inclusive behaviour (as rated in category thirteen), than the individualist participants. Again, the low frequency observed of persons exhibiting this behaviour must be noted as a possible explanation for this discrepancy within the collectivist group.

4.7 Ethical behaviour between high and low creative negotiators

This study used four constructs to measure the ethical effect in relation to bargaining tactics. As mentioned in Chapter 3, participants were rated by their negotiation partners in relation to their behaviours during the negotiation. The variables were: traditional competitive bargaining, attacking opponent’s network, false promises, and misrepresentation. Independent tests were conducted to analyse any significant correlation between these measures. Further, the t-test suggested a correlation between the highly creative group and low ethical behaviour, and between low creativity group and high ethical behaviour.
Table 4: Comparisons (*t* Test) for ethical behaviour by low and high creativity levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low creative</th>
<th></th>
<th>High creative</th>
<th></th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional competitive bargaining</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacking opponent</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False promises</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresentation</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 11 low creative participants, n = 11 high creative participants. The respective values represent how the participants rated their counterparts. *p < .01; **p < .001

As evident from Table 4, all four of the latent constructs measuring direct unethical behaviour indicated that the low creative participants were perceived to use less unethical tactics within this cohort of negotiators. High creative participants (*M* = 2.56, *SD* = 1.22) were perceived as significantly more unethical within the factor of ‘traditional competitive bargaining’ than the low creative participants (*M* = 2.35, *SD* = 1.47). Second, the high creative participants (*M* = 1.52, *SD* = 1.50) were perceived to significantly attack the opponent at a higher rate than the low creative participants (*M* = 1.19, *SD* = 1.61). Third, the high creative negotiators (*M* = 2.58, *SD* = 1.08) were perceived by their counterparts, the low creative negotiators (*M* = 2.16, *SD* = 1.46), to make false promises at a higher frequency. The fourth factor showed the tendency of the high creative negotiators (*M* = 2.35, *SD* = 1.38) to use misrepresentation more than the low creative negotiators (*M* = 1.97, *SD* = 1.64).

Therefore, by emphasising more integrative measures, the high creativity group was perceived in an unethical light by their opponent. Although the unethical tactics were perceived to be frequently employed, the rationale behind them was not necessarily intended to be unethical. No evidence of explicit unethical behaviour came to surface in the documentary analysis. This alludes to the notion that the highly creative integrative negotiators felt the unethical undertone of their strategy was an unavoidable necessity in trying to achieve alternate solutions pursuant to their own negotiation model. As the integrative strategy may often be perceived as harmless, this overall bargaining paradigm calls for such behaviour when striving for common and virtuous consequences for both parties. Further, this study observed a tendency towards the low creative negotiators as being
perceived as possessing higher ethical behaviour than their counterpart, emphasising the distributive measures.

Although these findings are not controversial in relation to the literature on ethical conduct in bargaining, they emphasise the need for continuing to ask the type of questions raised by Lewicki et al., (2010): should integrative bargaining be promoted based on ethical arguments? Should distributive bargaining automatically be deemed unethical? The answers to these questions clearly need more empirical investigation.

In this study, the facework analysis showed a tendency for the high creative negotiators to use integrative behaviour to a larger extent than the low creative negotiators. Also, distributive bargaining was perceived in a more ethical light than integrative, which goes against the traditional notion that the interest based and integrative approach is superior on all fronts, including ethical conduct (Fisher et al., 1991). However, these results show that unethical behaviour is not necessarily rationalised, as previously indicated by the dichotomous terms of distributive and integrative (Schermbrucker, 1994), and they also give more credence to the notion that negotiators rarely use one specific strategy throughout the process. A good example is the fact that the high creative participants, who were deemed to emphasize far more integrative behaviours, were rated as using more traditional and unethical competitive behaviours by their counterparts. However, this is more in line with the traditional notion of the distributive strategy (Fisher et al., 1991; Lewicki et al., 2010). Thus, in this simulation it is possible that the low creative negotiators, emphasising the distributive strategy, perceived the opposing parties’ attempt to generate alternatives and focus on future relations as competitive, based on false promises and misrepresentations.

### 4.8 Ethical behaviour between collectivistic and individualistic negotiators

Table 5 shows the relationship between the latent constructs of the ethical survey measured onto individualistic and collectivistic cultures. The four factors were analysed using t-tests to determine if there was a significant difference between the perceptions of ethical conduct by either of the two cultural dimensions established in this study.
Table 5: Comparisons (t Test) ethical behaviour by collectivist and individualist cultural dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Collectivist</th>
<th>Individualist</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional competitive bargaining</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacking opponent</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False promises</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresentation</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 11 collectivist participants, n = 11 individualist participants. The respective values represent how the participants rated their counterparts.

* p < .01. **p < .001.

Within the factor of traditional competitive bargaining, individualist participants (M = 5.93, SD = 0.76) were perceived by the collectivists as slightly more unethical than the collectivist participants (M = 5.76, SD = 0.91). Second, the individualist participants (M = 5.40, SD = 0.69) were perceived by the collectivists to attack the opponent at a lower rate (M = 5.46, SD = 0.68), but not significantly. Third, the individualist negotiators (M = 5.80, SD = 1.03) were perceived by their counterparts, the collectivist negotiators (M = 5.57, SD = 1.21), to make false promises at a higher rate. The last factor showed a perception of propensity for the individualist negotiators (M = 5.68, SD = 0.80) to use misrepresentation to a higher extent than the low creative negotiators (M = 5.46, SD = 0.95).

Furthermore, this analysis shows that three latent factors (traditional competitive bargaining, false promises, and misrepresentation) from the ethical survey indicated that the individualist negotiator was perceived by their counterparts as more ethical; however, this was a weak correlation due to the small difference in mean and standard deviation. The ‘attacking opponent’ factor showed inclinations of being perceived to be applied more by the individualist as an unethical behaviour, however, this is a small correlation and not significant.

These findings are consistent with contemporary literature on ethics and culture (Hall, 1976; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaar, 1998; Lewicki et al., 2010). Ethical conduct is in fact an elusive term because morality is different according to the society in which one operates. Therefore, it was not expected to see any significant leaning towards one cultural group and a specific ethical behaviour.
in this present study. This was confirmed by the statistical analysis. However, it also showed a small
tendency for the individualistic group to be perceived in a more ethical way. This is inconsistent with
some theories because, as Clegg (2006) argued, a contextual influence to unethical behaviour is the
notion of decision frames directly impacting strategies. As such, individualistic cultures are more
prone to the ‘fixed pie’ bias than collectivist cultures, which are inherently competitive (Brett &
Gelfand, 2004), and is often perceived with negative connotations as being unethical (Rearden, 2011).

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter focused on analysing and presenting the main findings from the qualitative
documentary data. The negotiation simulations were analysed through a 13-category facework
typology. This facework typology was applied to both the creativity construct as well as the cultural
dimensions of the participants. This chapter identified each point of difference between each construct
and elaborated on how these behaviours affected the negotiation process. This was also discussed in
relation to relevant literature and theoretical framework. In addition, the statistical results from the
ethical conduct survey were analysed and interpreted. This survey measured the perceptions of the
negotiation partners’ ethical behaviour.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This thesis set out to investigate the influence of creativity and culture on business negotiations. Findings from the literature suggest that creativity is a suitable antecedent for reaching integrative solutions in bargaining (De Pauw et al., 2011; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008), making it a key area of study in this project. Further, various sources have established theories pertaining to culture and how it influences communication styles (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998; Hofstede, 2004), but limited research exists on how this influences actual negotiation behaviours. This study therefore set out to investigate how culture could potentially influence an individual’s choice of strategy during a bargaining event.

As a result of approaching these dilemmas from a realist research paradigm, face negotiation theory (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000) was applied to rate negotiation behaviours. These ratings pertained to the video-taped two-party negotiation simulation set in place. The 22 participants were divided into pair groups and negotiated over a case relating to the Australian mining industry. They were divided into the groups on the basis of their measured creativity and cultural scores, which comprised low vs. high creative levels, and collectivist vs. individualist cultural dimensions. After their negotiation simulation an ethical conduct survey was completed to assess how the differing behaviours were perceived by the opponent.

To investigate the documentary video analysis, a 13-category facework typology was applied (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). Each category was then rated by the main researcher and an independent coder. The results were elaborated on from a theoretical point of view.

Key findings from this analysis are presented in this chapter. These findings will be addressed on the basis of previous empirical studies. The results are viewed in light of preceding hypotheses, general bargaining theory, and methodology. Limitations of this present study are also discussed in this chapter.
5.2 Conclusions about research questions

Three main research questions were asked in this thesis. The first question was ‘how does creativity influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation?’ This question was raised due to recent empirical data suggesting a correlation between the creativity construct and differing strategies adopted by the negotiators (De Pauw et al., 2011; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008).

The first key observation in regard to creativity was its influence on defensive behaviour. There were several strategies available for the participants pertaining to defensive behaviour, and the high creative group implemented many of these at a higher frequency than the low creative group. These strategies spanned: taking responsibility for several agenda items; at the same time striving to get the other party to comply with their offers; emphasising altruism; and communicating alternatives in relation to external opportunities. The most common defensive behaviour, however, was assertiveness through directly communicating the need for both parties to adhere to their proposals. As such, the high creative group was more vocal on their agenda items, and defended them to a higher extent than the low creative participants.

This is consistent with the facework theory on defensive behaviour, which is being firm in demands and not giving in, defending the position, not admitting to being wrong and insisting to being right (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). This is reliable with the high creative group of bargainers as the majority met these objectives.

These behaviours coincide with established theory on defensive behaviour, which claims that defensive negotiators do not accept information at face value but look for underlying reasons why a proposal is offered. This was observed in this study amongst the majority of the high creative participants (Lewicki et al., 2010). The inconsistency in discourse from these observed behaviours with prominent theory is that defensiveness is claimed to encompass various degrees of deception, often through withholding information from the rival party (Lewicki et al., 2010). In this study minimal amounts of deceptive behaviour were observed, and withholding information was not a prevalent tactic amid the high creative group.

Furthermore, it was observed that the dichotomy between distributive and integrative behaviours was affected by levels of creativity. This was an essential difference between the low and
high creative groups. Several behaviours and overarching strategies materialized throughout the analysis – observed through the element of compliance by the high creative participants’ willingness to create joint alternatives, consistent with interest based and integrative theory (Fisher et al., 1991; Gunia et al., 2010). This pertains to various aspects of integrative negotiation. It was observed that the high creative group regularly used more integrative strategies, and the low creative group often followed these behaviours, but placed more emphasis on distributive strategies.

One of the central integrative strategies implemented by the high creative negotiators was an emphasis on building future relations, which was observed in the majority of the negotiation simulations. The high creative group used this strategy by investigating universal and dissimilar positions to create joint gains. As the bargaining case often drove the parties into gridlock, the highly creative negotiators emphasised future value between both parties. However, the low creative group approach was often underpinned by competiveness. There was no direct aggressiveness detected throughout this simulation; however, numerous competitive tactics were consistent with distributive behaviour (Barry & Friedman, 1998).

In addition, the ability to generate many alternatives related strongly to the highly creative participants’ overall strategy (Fisher et al., 1991; Winkler, 2006). This was a frequent practice observed when widening the objectives of the negotiation agendas. Conversely, the low creative negotiators would often give little dispensation to new alternatives, driving the bargaining into several deadlocks. This was an essential factor and one of the major distinctions between the low and high creative groups within the bargaining simulation. When deadlocks occurred, the highly creative participants often showed a better approach to creating alternatives; however, they did in turn strive to include the opposing parties’ issues.

Another key aspect observed in relation to the integrative behaviours was that reciprocity theory was apparent (Brett et al., 1998). The low creative negotiators would often endeavour to build on proposed agenda items set by the high creative negotiators, and the bargaining consequently moved towards an integrative course. The proposals then became more rapid, showing the highly creative group using an expansive strategy thus being able to incorporate elements into the case at a higher rate.
However, this led to widespread faults amid the low creative negotiators, frequently observed through their behaviours of failing to recognize imperative information that could lead to mutual advantage. This derived from not complying with joint value creation or accepting encouragement put forward by the high creative negotiators about future projects. Even though the highly creative negotiators laid out various probabilities, it was observed that the low creative negotiators were often unwavering in their ‘fixed pie’ paradigm. However, this paradigm was only upheld until the high creative negotiator generated enough viable options to move the compromise in a different direction.

Compromising behaviour was assessed and found to be another key point of difference between the low/high creative groups. This was observed when one party had the ability to give away any outlined case item and agree to concessions for their opponent. Although the majority of the negotiators showed significant levels of compromise, there was a difference between the groups using this respective tactic and a noteworthy difference in the bargaining simulations. This was seen especially via the observation that the high creative negotiators frequently used this behaviour as part of their overall strategy, thus applied it at a higher rate, and the low creative negotiators were often unwilling to give agenda items and ‘meet in the middle’.

Another discovery in relation to the low and high creative dichotomy was the perception of ethical behaviour. In this study, ethical behaviour was measured through a four factor survey construct. The analysis found that across all factors, the high creative participants were perceived to be more unethical than the low creative participants. This finding is interesting as it is apparent throughout this bargaining simulation that distributive negotiators were perceived in a more ethical way than the integrative, which does not coincide with conventional belief that the integrative and principled strategy is viewed altogether in a more favourable light (Fisher et al., 1991). The results indicate that unethical behaviour is not automatically explained, as previously claimed, by the distributive and integrative duality (Schermerhorn, 1994). Moreover, these findings are consistent with the most recent empirical publication on creativity and personality, which claims that creativity is an imperative factor for certain positions in organisations and societies, but that creative individuals are morally flexible (Gino & Ariely, 2011). This implies that there is a ‘dark side’ of creativity shown by the established correlation between creative original thinkers and dishonest behaviours in the
study. This explains part of the reason why the high creative and integrative negotiators were perceived in this light by their counterparts, as their capability for generating alternatives was often perceived as not reliable, but based on dishonesty.

The second and third research questions asked, ‘How does culture influence an individual’s facework and ethical behaviours in negotiation?’ And, ‘Through the lens of facework negotiation theory, does the relationship between creativity and negotiation differ across cultures?’ Throughout the documentary video analysis it was apparent that these questions were more intricate in nature, thus more complex to answer.

In this negotiation simulation there was an observed propensity for the high creative and collectivist participants to use the compromising tactic more than the low creative and individualistic participants. This correlation is explained by the concept that the highly creative and collectivist individuals place rigorous attention on relationships, a fundamental aspect for joint gains and integrative measures (Madjar, Oldham & Pratt, 2002; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008). Moreover, the correlation is consistent with the literature claiming that highly creative negotiators are inclined to emphasise integrative strategies, taking into account interpersonal relationships (De Pauw et al., 2011).

In addition, a correlation was established that the low creative collectivist negotiators pretended that a conflict did not exist at a higher degree than the high creative individualist negotiators. However this behaviour was uncommon within both dyads; it was apparent in only four negotiation pairs altogether. This correlation is small and insignificant.

In summary, this thesis’ research questions provided evidence that the creative construct influences negotiation behaviour to a larger degree than the cultural dimensions. As observed through the rated facework behaviours, high creative individuals tended to negotiate with more emphasis on compromising and integrative strategies than the low creative negotiators; however, in the same bargaining situation they would also defend their interests to a higher degree. Individualist negotiators showed slightly higher rates of expressing how they were feeling during the bargaining simulations, whilst collectivist negotiators pretended that the conflict did not exist and compromised at a slightly higher rate.
5.3 Conclusions about the research problem and implications for theory

The main research problem of this thesis was to explain how creativity and culture influence bargaining behaviours. Initially the thesis developed a hypothesis, based on previous empirical data, which posed the idea that creativity and culture would directly influence negotiation outcomes. However, as the majority of negotiation research is outcome-based, founded on stringent experimental data (based mostly on self-reported measures with a disregard to the actual process), with incremental findings, this research problem was approached from a more objective realist point of view. Therefore, based on the framework of facework typology, it was more viable to analyse negotiation behaviour from the objective point of view due to the established face behaviours in the literature.

The method and analysis was consequently based on a mixed methods approach. The results build on prior theory on several levels. First, they build on Ting-Toomey and Oetzel’s (2000) 13-category facework behaviours by expanding the knowledge base of category eight ‘integrative behaviour’. This category did not distinguish how and what type of behaviours influence the direction of bargaining. This study expanded on this category by establishing that several integrative behaviours were associated with high creative negotiators, and on the contrary, that low creative negotiators applied a distributive strategy. Further, these behaviours were underpinned by showing that integrative behaviour comprises: a focus on building future relations, separating people from the problem, focusing on interests – not positions, and the generation of many alternatives. These were all apparent throughout the negotiation and closely associated with the majority of high creative participants. These behaviours are also consistent with established theories of integrative behaviour (Fisher et al. 1991; Lewicki et al., 2010). This study also found that rating and analysing category twelve is a problematic part of applying the facework structure, because behaviours associated with both category twelve and category nine are similar. ‘Pretending that the conflict does not exist’ overlaps with ‘avoiding an issue’, as issues and conflicts are based on similar facets in bargaining (Miesing & Pavur, 2008). It is therefore suggested that ‘avoiding the person’ should be a split into its own category, which focuses on the relational side rather than mixing it with explicit agenda items.
As such, it would be better suited as a behavioural measurement of the continuing dynamics between negotiation parties.

Moreover, this study builds on previous empirical studies on creativity and negotiation (De Pauw et al., 2011; Ogilvie & Simms, 2008), by focusing on describing and framing the types of behaviours that are apparent during a bargaining event, rather than solely focusing on certain dependent variables. As these previous studies on creativity and negotiation have largely ignored the actual situational processes, this study aimed to fully describe the process and the respective behaviours that it encompasses. Previous studies have also ignored the consequences that creative behaviour has on interpersonal relations throughout the bargaining period. The present study investigated this in terms of ethical conduct and controlled for adverse affects. This was clearly observed to be unfavourable for the highly creative participants who were perceived to be untrustworthy and dishonest due to the variety of integrative behaviours implemented. This does not directly confirm that creative or integrative behaviour is in fact unethical, but it gives credibility to recent studies showing that there are negative consequences for highly creative individuals in organisational life (Gino & Ariely, 2011).

5.4 Implications for policy and practice

As a result of this study’s findings, it is proposed that cultural planning and creative training is essential for contemporary negotiation practitioners. Traditional literature emphasises that cultural planning is essential when communicating and negotiating across borders, as well as in organisations with employees of diverse cultural backgrounds (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998; Hofstede, 2004). However, what this thesis makes apparent is that traditional cultural theories are relevant only as indicators of how different cultures negotiate. This study measured culture on an individual level (with a well-tested global and culture-free empirical instrument), however, few differences emerged between the two dimensions. There are many possible explanations for this, but it does give credibility to cultural theories critics, mainly stating that culture is not a static or homogenous construct (Bardhan & Weaver, 2010). It is more likely to be dynamic and heterogeneous (Kanousi, 2005; Kueh & Voon, 2007; Yoo & Donthu, 2002), which fits with the results of this thesis. The idea
that this cohort of culturally diverse negotiators were presumed to act in one way, but actually acted in contrast to set theories, supports the theory that culture is in fact evolving. Further research is required to establish why this may be the case, but their youth and expatriate experience are likely factors.

Furthermore, as the most prevalent results show that creativity influences negotiation behaviour, it is viable to promote the idea that creativity training should be conducted for negotiators that want to reach integrative measures. As such, training individuals to be more creative will help them generate more ideas, view common problems in an objective way, and focus on interests rather subjective positions in bargaining. As previous empirical research suggests that creative training will aid the fluency and flexibility of negotiators (Ogilvie & Simms, 2008), new training modules in creativity should encompass aspects that focus on how to implement these creative skills in an ethical and sincere manner. As these results and recent empirical data suggest, creative individuals are more prone to dishonest behaviour and this must be included in the modules of creative training.

However, a range of difficulties are associated with highly complex and creative solutions. Although creative training could alleviate some of the complexity through aiding the process of creating alternatives, negotiators must be aware that, combined with others, this factor will yield positive results. Von Stamm (2008) claimed that it is the combination of the elements of knowledge, information and creativity that should be the aim of research. This must further be enhanced by an emphasis of both individual and team working skills (Von Stamm, 2008). However, as creativity alone should not be viewed as the sole factor for researching the negotiation environment, negotiators’ adaptive skills are central. Kozicki (2005) claimed that in today’s business climate competitiveness comes from many sides, thus, understanding and having knowledge about a broad spectrum of human behaviour is imperative both during and after a negotiation event. These elements should therefore be included as foundations for future research.

5.5 Limitations

Although this study generated useful insights, it was subject to several limitations. The study was conducted in a class room setting with students; as such, it was not in a real world negotiation setting. However, all participants held tertiary bachelor qualifications, and were at time of data
collection undertaking postgraduate qualifications. Ninety-one per cent of the negotiators reported recent work experience, sixty-four per cent of which was within a commercial enterprise. While acknowledging this limitation, recent empirical findings show student samples are able to generate important insights; as this study was based on the theory of globalisation, this intercultural cohort allowed analysis of the effect of differing cultures on bargaining strategies (Tung, 2008). Additionally, comparable postgraduate student samples have been utilized to examine bargaining strategies and cultural issues previously. Existing literature gives support to the external validity of these types of findings (Bello, 2009). Also, recent empirical data concludes that postgraduate students that have been introduced to negotiation theory and literature (which was the case with this cohort) are not significantly outperformed by skilled negotiators, thus deemed viable research participants in this field of practice (Schwartz, 2011). In addition, the post-negotiation survey revealed that 70 per cent of the participants felt the simulation was close to a real business negotiation, and 78 per cent were satisfied with the negotiation process and outcome.

In this thesis there was also a time limitation, or lack thereof, set for the negotiation simulations. The participants did not get any specific time-frame that they had to uphold. As a result, this influenced the frequency ratings of the observed facework behaviours. Future studies could potentially control for this by either setting a specific length that the participants must adhere to, or alternatively calculate the percentage for behaviours deriving from the frequency (count) to time (length) ratio.

Another limitation was the negotiation case. The case at hand was realistic and modelled after real life scenarios; however, it did not have enough complexity to evoke certain cultural behaviours. It gave an opportunity to be creative, however did not emphasise the international aspects such as broader value chain, global stakeholders, and conflicting belief systems.

The main limitation pertains to being unable to replicate the study. To ensure internal validity, every study needs to be tested, in particular where there are new and unorthodox approaches to the methodology, which was the case with this thesis. A replicated study would have further tested the behaviours of the constituents, as well as tested the facework typology for reliability in a different setting, potentially with a larger sample size.
5.6 Implications for future research

Future research should unravel how differing creativity levels influence efficacy of the various behaviours and outcomes by establishing set universal indicators to measure them. In addition, a comparison study should be implemented to investigate group negotiation in relation to culture and creativity. This could generate valuable insights, as different cultures are prone to act differently based on the respective dimension with which they are associated. This relates especially to in-group authority and face-saving behaviours (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1998; Hofstede, 2004; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2000). This could aid practitioners in fully understanding the effectiveness of groups on bargaining outcomes.

Moreover, future research should investigate a broader set of personality indicators. Due to the significant findings of the creativity construct, one can presume that other personality traits, such as motivation or extraversion, may also influence negotiation behaviour in a dichotomous way. Therefore, these should be measured in parallel with other variables.

5.7 Conclusion

This concluding chapter recapped the basic framework of this thesis. The key most important results derived from both the quantitative and qualitative analyses were presented and discussed in light of established theory from the negotiation literature. Further, the implications of these findings in the respective field of negotiation theory were provided. Limitations of the study were presented and elements for expansion of the research framework and further practice identified. Future research proposals were briefly described to provide guidance as to how later studies can build on this methodology and results.
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Appendix A: Creativity survey

Student Number: __________

1. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability (the answers may be in bullet-point or essay format). You have 15 minutes to complete Part 1 of the survey.

Form A:

Item 1 – Instances

3. Name all the round things you can think of.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

4. Name all the things you can think of that make noise.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Item 2 – Alternate Uses

3. Tell me all the different ways you could use a newspaper.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

4. Tell me all the different ways you could use a knife.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
Item 3 – Similarities

3. Tell me all the ways in which a potato and carrot are alike.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

4. Tell me all the ways in which a cat and a mouse are alike.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Item 4 – Pattern Meanings

2. Name all the things you associate with the following image:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

2. Name all the things you associate with the following image:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
Item 5 – Line meanings

2. Name all the things you associate with the following image:

![Image 1](image1.png)

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

3. Name all the things you associate with the following image:

![Image 2](image2.png)

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
2. Rate how important each of the following values is in YOUR life. When you answer these questions, think about how important each of these values is in YOUR self-concept, how much the value influences YOUR goals, aspirations, beliefs, and actions.

*Value Rating 0 not important ←------- → 7 very important*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enjoying life</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pleasure</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An exciting life</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preserving my public image</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. National security</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A varied life</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Broad-minded</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Curious</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wisdom</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Creativity</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self-discipline</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Social order</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Honest</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Forgiving</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Honouring of parents and elders</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Demographic Information:**

1. Age: ________

2. Gender: ________

3. Nationality:

   a) Where were you born? ________

   b) Where was your father born? ________

   c) Where was your mother born? ________

4. Have you ever lived in countries other than your home country?

   a) If yes, which country have you lived in for the longest? ________

   b) For how long? ________

5. Work experience:

   a) What jobs have you worked in previously? (Please indicate whether the position was **full-time** or **part-time** and for how long you worked there):

      __________________________________________________________

      __________________________________________________________

      __________________________________________________________

      __________________________________________________________

      __________________________________________________________
b) What is your current working experience? (Please indicate whether the position is full-time or part-time and for how long you worked there):

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Appendix B: Manipulation check and ethical behavioural survey

Student Number: __________

Part 1:

**Question 1** Rating 0 not at all ↔ 7 extremely close

To what extent do you feel that today’s negotiation situation is close to a real business negotiation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2** Rating 1 most dissatisfied ↔ 7 most satisfied

How would you rate your satisfaction in relation to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Process during your negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Outcomes of your negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Overall satisfaction about this negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2:

Considering your negotiation performance that has just finished, how often did YOU and YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use the following tactics?

For each item below, enter a number from 0 to 6 based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Promise that good things will happen to your opponent if he/she gives you what you want, even if you know that you can’t (or won’t) deliver these things when the other’s cooperation is obtained.

   *How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___*

2. Intentionally misrepresent information to your opponent in order to strengthen your negotiating arguments or position.

   *How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___*

3. Threaten to make your opponent look weak or foolish in front of other people whom he/she is accountable, even if you know that you won’t actually carry out the threat.

   *How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___*
4. Intentionally misrepresent the nature of negotiations to your opponent in order to protect delicate discussions that have occurred.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

5. Make an opening demand that is far greater than what you really hope to settle for.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

6. Convey a false impression that you are in absolutely no hurry to come to a negotiation agreement, thereby trying to put time pressure on your opponent to concede quickly.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

7. In return for concessions from your opponent now, offer to make future concessions which you know you will not follow through on.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

8. Threaten to talk directly to the people whom your opponent knows, or is accountable to, and threaten to tell them things that will undermine their confidence in your opponent’s negotiation outcome.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

9. Deny the validity of information which your opponent has that weakens your negotiating position, even though that information is true and valid.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

10. Intentionally misrepresent the progress of negotiations to your opponent in order to make your own position appear stronger.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

11. Threaten your opponent that he/she may lose his/her position in this negotiation.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

12. Guarantee that you will uphold the settlement reached, although you know that you will likely violate the agreement later.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic? ___

13. Gain information about an opponent’s negotiating position by trying to talk to one of the opponent’s friend to gain confidential information about this negotiation.

How often did YOU use this tactic? ___ How often did YOUR NEGOTIATION PARTNER use this tactic?