

The Practitioner–Researcher Divide in Psychological Negotiation Research: Current State and Future Perspective

Joachim Hüffmeier, Stefan Krumm, and Guido Hertel

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Münster, Germany

Keywords

negotiation, practitioner–researcher divide, knowledge transfer, knowledge production.

Correspondence

Joachim Hüffmeier, Institute of Psychology, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Fliednerstrasse 21, 48149 Münster, Germany; e-mail: hueffmeier@uni-muenster.de.

Abstract

This conceptual paper discusses the extent to which psychological negotiation research suffers from a practitioner–researcher divide. We conclude from an analysis of the various activities that negotiation researchers engage in, that this research has its strengths in the knowledge transfer domain, but is not yet sufficiently tuned to produce practically relevant knowledge. Based on this analysis, indicators are developed that help to monitor the progress of psychological negotiation research in producing such knowledge. Among the suggested indicators are the balance between real-world phenomena and theory-driven research questions, the amount and continuity of direct communication between practitioners and researchers, and the relative number of studies that validate laboratory findings through the inclusion of multiple dependent variables as a standard approach. Further indicators focus on the relative amount of replication studies with professional negotiators, in field studies, and under situational conditions that are both practically relevant and challenging.

In 2001, the president of the International Association for Conflict Management (IACM) who is one of the most respected scholars in the field of negotiation research summarized his view of IACM and its role as perhaps the most active and productive association of specialized negotiation and conflict scholars. He stated:

This view of IACM, one I believe I share with many members, implies that society should not expect too much immediate input from IACM. Rather, it should expect input in the long run, and in a more diffuse way, when our research articles and books communicate our new and combined insights about conflict. However, for this distal and diffuse input to be useful we also should ask the right questions. We need to focus our research on those aspects of

conflict that are truly important and meaningful, not only in our research laboratories, but also in the outside world (...) (De Dreu, 2001; p. 2).

Although other scholars disagreed with this perspective (e.g., Pinkley, 2006), De Dreu is certainly to be commended for his modest—and probably realistic—stance. The IACM could, however, be taken as a part for the whole field of negotiation research. In this case, De Dreu's views could be perceived as a *symptom* for the state of negotiation research as an applied research domain. And, although the accumulation of scientific knowledge admittedly takes time, it then seems as if there is a divide between practitioners and researchers in psychological negotiation research (cf. Moore & Murnighan, 1999).

In this manuscript, we first explore in which respects psychological negotiation research might face a practitioner–researcher divide. Thereby, we focus on the negotiation researchers' part in creating the divide. Along the usual proceedings of a typical project in psychological negotiation research (i.e., identification of the research question, choice of the time horizon of the planned research program, selection of the research sample, operationalization and/or measurement of the independent variables, etc.), we then propose a set of indicators that may help to monitor the development of the divide in the future.

The Practitioner–Researcher Divide in Psychological Negotiation Research

Researchers repeatedly complain that there is a noticeable and harmful gap between the two worlds of practitioners and researchers and that this gap exists “(...) in nearly every field where there is a separation between those who conduct research and those who are in a position to implement research findings” (Rynes, Giluk, & Brown, 2007, p. 987; cf. Rogers, 1995; Straus, Richardson, Glasziou, & Haynes, 2005). Among other things, this gap prevents the transfer of empirically tested practices that could improve productivity and profitability of individuals and organizations (e.g., Johns, 1993; Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000).

The potential gap between practitioners and researchers can be assessed from the two perspectives of knowledge transfer and knowledge production (Shapiro, Kirkman, & Courtney, 2007). The *knowledge transfer problem* centers on challenges of localization, communication, and application of knowledge that is in principal practically relevant. This challenge has also been referred to as “lost in translation,” and it “(...) may be solved by more effective translation of management research into publications, frameworks, and tools that managers can use in their work” (Shapiro et al., 2007; p. 249). In contrast, the *knowledge production problem* describes the perception of practitioners (e.g., business managers, politicians, school teachers, etc.) that scientific research is not relevant and artificial. This problem has been referred to as “lost before translation” (Shapiro et al., 2007), and it “(...) may be solved by more collaborative joint research efforts between management scholars and practicing managers” (Shapiro et al., 2007; p. 249; see also Moore & Murnighan, 1999). To analyze the current relationship of

practitioners and researchers in the negotiation domain, we thus seek to assess both, the knowledge transfer and the knowledge production problem perspectives.

The Knowledge Transfer Problem

With respect to the first perspective, several indicators show that negotiation researchers successfully transmit their findings and insights to the public domain. First, negotiation courses are the most frequently chosen classes beyond the core requirements in United States business schools (Thompson & Leonardelli, 2004b; Thompson, Wang, & Gunia, 2010). As a consequence, many future executives start or get back to their jobs with relatively sound and recent scientific knowledge about negotiation. Second, there is a lively exchange in the scientific community on how to teach negotiation successfully, which is reflected in numerous publications and special issues in different scientific journals as for instance *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* (Olekalns & Brett, 2008), *The International Journal of Conflict Management* (Friedman, 2002), or *Negotiation Journal* (Honeyman, Cohen, & De Palo, 2009). Third, several negotiation scholars have written excellent practitioner-oriented books that translate scientific knowledge into real-world settings (e.g., Lewicki, Saunders, Minton, & Barry, 2009; Thompson, 2008). Fourth, regular practitioner-oriented publications like “*Negotiation*” by the Program on Negotiation at Harvard or the *Negotiation Journal* actively facilitate the transmission of scientific knowledge on negotiation to the public domain. Thus, negotiation researchers spend considerable effort to translate their findings and knowledge to the public domain, and they also reflect about how to successfully design this transfer (cf. Friedman, 2002; Honeyman et al., 2009; Olekalns & Brett, 2008).

The Knowledge Production Problem

With regard to the second perspective, however, indicators are not that positive when compared with the first perspective. In general, assessing the degree how far psychological negotiation research is actually tuned to generate practically relevant knowledge without neglecting methodological rigor (cf. Anderson, Herriot, & Hodgkinson, 2001) can be done in several ways, among them are (a) the extent to which central theoretical work on negotiations stimulates empirical research, (b) the degree to which meta-analyses produce and secure practically relevant knowledge, and (c) the number of robustness tests on central findings of psychological negotiation research.

Research Stimulated by Classic Theoretical Work

The research endeavors instigated by classic theoretical work such as the book “Getting to Yes” (Fisher & Ury, 1981) represent an initial strategy for assessing the practitioner–researcher divide in the production of negotiation knowledge. This assessment signals that the divide may have decreased somewhat over the last decades. The huge bestselling success of “Getting to Yes” may indeed have initially indicated a rather pronounced divide, because it was successful and quickly perceived as the standard lecture in the

negotiation domain although many of its key concepts were not empirically investigated by the time the book was published. These concepts were, however, intuitively plausible and convincing to professional and scholar audiences alike. Following the book's publication, various research programs started to investigate whether its key concepts can be confirmed by empirical laboratory and—less frequently—case study research. The related research endeavors reflect negotiation researchers' need to empirically confirm the concepts that were both at the core of their object of study and easily accessible to a wide professional and lay audience. Although the investigation of the different concepts momentarily resides in different stages, and some of these concepts await further in-depth laboratory investigation, a decent number of the concepts could be confirmed, for instance the importance of focusing on interests instead of positions, or the important role of the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA; cf. Thompson & Leonardelli, 2004a). From the perspective of knowledge production, the general motion to empirically investigate and confirm the book's key concepts can be considered successful in producing practically relevant knowledge about negotiations.

Inspection of Meta-Analyses

Analyzing the primary studies that are aggregated in meta-analyses is possibly well suited, further strategy to assess the magnitude of the knowledge production problem as meta-analyses may lend themselves well to change common convictions and practices (cf. Le, Oh, Shaffer, & Schmidt, 2007). Meta-analyses tend to represent reliable and well-replicated findings because they commonly cover one broad research question. Moreover, meta-analytic insights may be relatively stable across different conditions and usually initial boundary conditions are also identified. Accordingly, meta-analyses might be an ideal starting point for the production of practically relevant knowledge by replicating their main findings in subsequent laboratory and field studies with samples of negotiating professionals.

In January 2011, the psychological data base PsycInfo registered 12 meta-analyses in the domain of negotiation research. Although most of these analyses provide comprehensible and clear results that are of potential interest for practitioners, all of them also reflect problematic features of the aggregated primary studies that seem to compromise their practical applicability. To better illustrate this point, we randomly drew six of these 12 meta-analyses and analyzed some features of the primary studies and the meta-analyses (see Table 1). Among other things, we conducted a general screening of the negotiation literature and literature searches based on PsycInfo and Web of Science to examine to what extent meta-analytic findings were further pursued either in follow-up laboratory studies with professional negotiators or in field studies.

An initial result of our analysis is that meta-analyses almost exclusively include laboratory studies because field studies are relatively rare in this domain (see the third column of Table 1; cf. Stuhlmacher & Walters, 1999). Second, (published) studies that replicate these aggregated laboratory findings in subsequent field studies to secure the external validity of its findings are also quite rare (see the fifth column of Table 1). This is true even though the published meta-analyses on laboratory work conclude with clear-cut

Table 1
 Overview of the Six Randomly Chosen Meta-Analyses in View of Included Field Studies, Samples of Negotiation Professionals, and Direct Replications

Meta-analysis	Number of manuscripts included	Percentage of field studies included	Percentage of manuscripts with a sample of professionals	Number of direct follow-up field studies	Number of direct follow-up laboratory studies with a sample of professionals
Halpert, Stuhlmacher, Crenshaw, Litcher, and Bortel (2010)	74	0	4%*	0	0
Swaab and Swaab (2009)	9	0	22%	0	0
Stuhlmacher, Citera, and Willis (2007)	43	0	7%	0	0
Stuhlmacher and Citera (2005)	38	0	0% of the effect sizes for hostile behavior as the dependent variable†	0	0
Zetik and Stuhlmacher (2002)	22	0	5% for profits as the dependent variable	0	0
Allen, Donohue, and Stewart (1990)	28	4	4% of the effect sizes‡	0	0
			8%		

Notes. *We restricted our analysis of the percentage of studies with included samples of professionals to publicly accessible journal articles and book chapters. The percentages given in the table thus do not include other types of contributions like conference presentations, unpublished studies, or unpublished master and doctoral theses. We have no reason to assume that these types of manuscripts are more likely to contain professional samples.

†When the authors of the meta-analyses indicated a certain percentage of either manuscripts or effect sizes involving professional negotiators in their manuscripts, we report the respective values here without coding and computing those percentages again.

results. A typical example is a meta-analysis conducted on the effects of goal setting in negotiations by Zetik and Stuhlmacher (2002). After demonstrating that specific and challenging goals have a strong and positive effect on individual profits in a negotiation, the authors concluded that there is an urgent need to conduct field research to ensure the external validity of the goal-setting mechanism established in their analysis. By today, unfortunately, no field study has been published that sought to follow up on this meta-analysis (cf. the fifth column of Table 1). Besides providing compelling evidence of the practical relevance of the findings, such field studies are also important as goal setting may not only have positive but also adverse consequences across time in more complex settings (cf. Ordonez, Schweitzer, Galinsky, & Bazerman, 2009, for a general review).

Third, the random sample of meta-analyses we focus on is mostly restricted to student samples because of features of the primary studies (see the fourth column of Table 1). When studies with negotiation professionals are included in meta-analyses, their proportion is rather small. When comparing the number of studies using undergraduate samples and those using either samples of full-time and part-time MBA students or professionals (e.g., managers, civil servants, real-estate agents, etc.) in our sample of meta-analyses, the percentages of undergraduate samples are between 70% and 88% (cf. Table 2). Additionally, it is not clear whether the remaining fraction of participants can in fact be considered professional negotiators. Our nonrepresentative analysis does not seem to be unduly biased when looking at the broader field of negotiation research including the sociological, industrial relations, and management literatures. While the distribution of primary studies with undergraduate and professional samples in the broad negotiation research field seems to be generally comparable, the respective numbers may be a bit more evenly distributed than in the psychological literature (cf. Bendersky & McGinn, 2010).

Of course, student samples are specific in many respects (cf. Arnett, 2008; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010; Sears, 1986), thus restricting the generalizability of this body of work (e.g., Diener, 2006; Dalton, Todor, & Owen, 1987; Watson & Hoffmann, 1996; but see also Bazerman & Neale, 1992; Northcraft & Neale, 1987). Therefore, the rare replications of meta-analytically condensed laboratory findings with nonstudent samples inside and outside the laboratory are a significant problem for the production of practically useful knowledge (see the fifth and sixth column of Table 1).

Availability of Robustness Tests

Analyzing the extent to which established findings are intended to be challenged in terms of their robustness may be a third strategy to assess the relative size of the knowledge production problem in psychological negotiation research. Today, many central findings seem to be more often replicated in rather similar and thus uncritical conditions instead of challenging settings (cf. Rozin, 2009). A higher number of studies that test the robustness—and thus indirectly the practical relevance—of central negotiation research findings would indicate a narrower practitioner–researcher divide in this respect. Candidates for such challenging conditions are varying time perspectives (e.g., one-shot vs. repeated negotiations), different types of counterparts (e.g., counterparts

Table 2
 Overview of the Six Randomly Chosen Meta-Analyses in View of the Included Samples

Meta-analysis	Number of manuscripts included	Number of manuscripts with exclusively or predominantly undergraduate samples	Number of manuscripts with exclusively or predominantly full-time MBA students	Number of manuscripts with exclusively or predominantly part-time MBA students	Number of manuscripts with negotiation professionals	Minimum percentage of studies using undergraduate studies*
Halpert et al. (2010)	74	45	14†	2	3	70
Swaab and Swaab (2009)	9	7	0	0	2	78
Stuhlmacher et al. (2007)	43	23	3	0	1	85
Stuhlmacher and Citera (2005)	38	20	2	0	2	83
Zetik and Stuhlmacher (2002)	22	11	3	0	0	79
Allen et al. (1990)	28	23	1	0	2	88

Notes. *Possibly, the percentage given in the seventh column underestimates the “true percentage” of studies using undergraduate samples. As in our previous analysis (cf. Table 1), we do not analyze conference presentations, unpublished studies, or unpublished master and doctoral theses, and it is possible that these unpublished studies contain differentially more studies with undergraduate than with professional samples.

†We restricted our analysis again to publicly accessible journal articles and book chapters as well as to unambiguous descriptions of the samples. The numbers given in the table thus do not include other types of contributions like conference presentations, unpublished studies, or unpublished master and doctoral theses. Thus, the numbers given in the third to sixth column do not always add up to the number given in the first column.

assigned to the same vs. another level of the manipulated independent variables), different communication contexts (e.g., face-to-face vs. computer-mediated studies), different types of negotiations (e.g., distributive vs. integrative negotiations), and the use of different dependent variables (e.g., economic vs. socio-emotional outcomes),¹ etc.

Although notable exceptions certainly exist (e.g., Curhan, Elfenbein, & Kilduff, 2009; Harinck, De Dreu, & Van Vianen, 2000; Van Kleef, De Dreu, Pietroni, & Manstead, 2006), it seems that many primary studies are replicated within very similar contexts (cf. Rozin, 2009). We will illustrate our concern by providing two examples of rather prominent findings, which are for instance featured in the most recent review of the negotiation literature in the *Annual Review of Psychology* (Thompson et al., 2010). The first example refers to research on gender differences in negotiations as one of the most investigated research questions in the field (cf. Bowles, Babcock, & McGinn, 2005) which is mostly accomplished using cross-sectional study designs. Although this research has made important progress especially in the last decade, the temporal stability of such gender differences thus is still unclear. This question of stability is not trivial because all types of implications (e.g., interventions, training, theory building, etc.) are severely affected by this. As a second example, research on the effect of first anchors in negotiations (e.g., Chertkoff & Conley, 1967; Galinsky & Mussweiler, 2001; Yukl, 1974) suggested for quite some time that making the first offer in distributive negotiations provides a negotiator with a substantial advantage in the ultimate negotiation outcomes. This perspective was also confirmed by a meta-analysis (Orr & Guthrie, 2006). However, a slight variation in the sample (trained instead of untrained students) and time perspective (repeated instead of one-shot negotiations) led to a very different pattern of results (Cotter & Henley, 2008). While the negotiator who made the first offer in a series of 10 negotiations was more successful in the first round of negotiation than the negotiator who made the counteroffer (i.e., the second offer), this pattern was reversed in all of the following nine negotiations, resulting in an overall advantage for counteroffers rather than first offers (cf. Cotter & Henley, 2008). A low degree of challenging situational variation—and thus of robustness tests—in laboratory research may spuriously lead to the assumption that the primary findings are stable and reliable over widely varying circumstances.

Conclusion on the Current Size of the Divide

The amount of currently published work in negotiation research focusing on practically useful knowledge and the transfer of this knowledge to the public domain reveal a mixed picture. On the one hand, negotiation research seems to be tuned to produce practically useful knowledge, for instance by empirically confirming the postulates of its most popular and best sold book (cf. Fisher & Ury, 1981). Beyond this research,

¹Although previous research (e.g., Curhan, Elfenbein, & Xu, 2006; Thompson, 1990a) uses the terms “social-psychological outcomes” or “subjective value”, we prefer the term “socio-emotional outcomes” when referring to noneconomic negotiation outcomes such as feelings about the instrumental outcome, the self, the negotiation process, or the relationship between the negotiating parties. This terminology is predominantly used in other research. It should thus probably be more intuitively understandable.

however, negotiation research would benefit from additional work that secures the robustness, external validity, and generalizability of its findings. More precisely, field studies and studies with negotiation professionals are desirable that replicate established meta-analytical findings generated in the laboratory. The currently low number of such work is not only a potential problem in terms of scientific insight, but also in terms of acceptance of these insights from practitioners (cf. Moore & Murnighan, 1999). Moreover, potentially important primary findings from laboratory research are not sufficiently tested for stability and external validity because the circumstances under which these findings were initially demonstrated are indeed not yet varied sufficiently. In contrast to the knowledge production gap, work on the transfer of negotiation research to the relevant target audiences seems to be in a much better shape. Negotiation scholars teach a large number of prospective and present business executives and the broader interested public by providing numerous negotiation classes, successful practitioner-oriented books, periodicals, and journals. Using the suggested indicators, our analysis thus reveals a more pronounced practitioner–researcher divide in the knowledge production process. We will therefore focus on potential indicators that might help to monitor the process of producing theoretically sound and practically relevant negotiation knowledge in the remainder of this article.

Assessing to what Extent Psychological Negotiation Research Produces Practically Relevant Knowledge

In the following, we propose indicators of the state of psychological negotiation research in its quest to produce practically relevant knowledge. While doing so, we are aware that negotiation scholars do strive to produce practically relevant knowledge, but are also subject to institutional pressures, constraints and incentive structures that influence and coin the universe of conducted and published research. Previous research directly focused on these institutional pressures and argued that political action should be taken to change them (e.g., Anderson et al., 2001). Nevertheless, we argue that the possible actions to be taken in the research and political domain need to be accompanied by indicators of their success.

To delineate our indicators, we use the following eight steps of a typical negotiation research project: Identifying the research question, choosing the time horizon for the research program, selecting the research sample, operationalizing the independent variables, choosing the negotiation task, determining the time horizon of the single studies, choosing the dependent variables, and conducting follow-up studies. Neither the steps nor the derived indicators are necessarily exhaustive, but the selected steps are conceived as providing critical information about the state of psychological negotiation research.

Indicator 1: Practical Problems and Scientific Theories Commonly Motivate Research Questions

When identifying a research question, researchers to date often follow more or less established scientific theories. The empirical work is then conducted with a priority on

methodological rigor, entailing a focus on hypothesis testing, experiments, sophisticated methodologies, and statistical analyses (Anderson et al., 2001; Rozin, 2009). Of course, conducting research based on sound theoretical work and according to high methodological standards is an indispensable precondition for reliable and useful research results. It has, however, been frequently stressed (e.g., Baumeister, Vohs, & Funder, 2007; Diener, 2006; Rozin, 2006) that current psychological research tends to overemphasize theory testing without having first sufficiently clarified that the issues being addressed are practically significant. Moreover, a focus solely on theory testing might narrow its impact for practice because such a focus runs the risk of overlooking practically relevant factors and processes. Additionally, such a focus does not use the chance to enthuse practitioners for the research question early in the process and also neglects the specific potential that the combination of practice and research has in informing new research (cf. Aram & Salipante, 2003; Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006).

A first step in considering practice and theory similarly could be to start with real-world phenomena in the field of interest. Initially, these phenomena could be extensively described and their foundations be examined, before a theory is formulated or adopted and related hypotheses are tested (Diener, 2006; Rozin, 2009). The additional advantage of such an initial phenomenological approach is that issues taken from concrete negotiation cases as well as practitioners' ideas, impressions, and experiences can be incorporated at an early stage of a research project, which in turn increases practitioners' interest in this research (e.g., Gelade, 2006). The following measures may also prove helpful in guiding the search for both practically relevant and theoretically interesting research questions: (a) (linguistic) analyses of existing negotiation protocols from political, societal, or business organizations, (b) historical documents, newspaper reports, or films covering previous negotiations in various domains, (c) direct and participative observations of current negotiations, (d) in-depth interviews with practitioners to learn more about important or unclear phenomena in negotiations, or (e) a generally more extensive two-way exchange between practitioners and researchers through continuous collaboration (see below). At this early stage, it may be further helpful not to start with an existing theoretical idea but with a general mindset of "informed curiosity" (Rozin, 2009; p. 438).

Thus, progress in producing practically relevant knowledge would be indicated by ample psychological negotiation research that is visibly informed by real-world phenomena. Such projects also allow for a more credible and regular framing of research in practical terms, and they further allow for clearer practical conclusions. These measures would in turn make psychological negotiation research more attractive to practitioners (cf. Gelade, 2006; see Gardner, Van Dyne, & Pierce, 2004, for an exemplary framing that is attractive for practitioners although being from another domain of industrial and organizational psychology).

Indicator 2: Research Programs with a Long-Term Time Horizon

Long-term research programs that include multiple studies that build on each other help to produce scientific knowledge that is practically useful (and not "lost before

translation”). Such long-term programs allow for achieving two different goals: First, they make it possible to combine the different approaches to investigating the object of study (e.g., laboratory and field studies), and thereby avoid the disadvantages that are inevitable when using one approach only. For example, conducting laboratory studies exclusively may “maximize the precision of control and measurement of variables related to the variables of interest” (McGrath, 1981; p. 184), while at the same time neglecting the other two general desiderata of behavioral research (maximize the generalizability with respect to populations and maximize existential realism of the context within which those behaviors are observed for the participants, McGrath, 1981). Second, long-term research programs enable an exchange between researchers and practitioners even before the concrete planning of a first study (see above). This a priori exchange may be particularly beneficial when relatively under-researched areas are focused (e.g., the emergence of impasses in negotiations; cf. Tripp & Sondak, 1992). Moreover, once a first study is conducted and a basic effect is demonstrated, a second exchange between researchers and practitioners may be particularly useful to integrate practitioners’ questions and needs, for instance, concerning the stability and context specificity of an effect. A long-term research program with a series of related studies further offers the chance to communicate with practitioners before and after any subsequent study is conducted. The resulting continuous two-way exchange represents the most obvious and effective way to produce science that is both theoretically sound and practically useful (Nonaka, 1994; Shapiro et al., 2007; Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006). A long-time perspective finally facilitates the application of grants from national or international science foundations that provide helpful resources for continuous collaborative research between practitioners and researchers. Applications for funding may even include sabbaticals for researchers in business practice or practitioners at business schools (Shapiro et al., 2007).

Therefore, we propose the time horizon of research programs as a second indicator of progress. This indicator would signal significant progress in the quality of generated knowledge when multiple articles are published containing several consecutive studies focusing on one basic finding. Moreover, advancement would also become obvious if much research is commonly conducted and published by practitioners and researchers (cf. Hodgkinson & Rousseau, 2009), and multiple (joint) grant proposals are written and are thus ultimately mentioned in publications on negotiation.

Indicator 3: Research Samples Consisting of Student Participants and True Professional Negotiators

In negotiation research so far, most projects start by investigating their research questions in the laboratory with undergraduate students (cf. Tables 1 and 2), most likely for economic reasons (accessibility). Admittedly, the accessibility of student participants for scientific scholars is an important factor that probably makes the majority of behavioral research possible in the first place, and it is, thus, reasonable not to relinquish student participants. In addition, it has been argued that the differences between students and professionals are not very pronounced, as many students will become professionals in

later years and that remaining differences carry no particular weight for the field of negotiation research (cf. Moore & Murnighan, 1999).

Studies with true professional negotiators (e.g., real-estate agents, cf. Northcraft & Neale, 1987; or organizational buyers, cf. Clopton, 1984) indicate a narrowing of the divide and are crucial for at least two reasons: First, when certain findings are repeatedly shown in various studies using student samples, it is crucial to replicate these findings with professional negotiators (see above). Such validations secure generalizability and help to avoid that well-established laboratory findings such as the beneficial effect of specific and challenging goals on individual outcomes (cf. Zetik & Stuhlmacher, 2002) or the high prevalence of lose–lose outcomes in negotiations (cf. Thompson & Hrebec, 1996) are never replicated under more complex and “realistic” conditions (cf. Tables 1 and 2). Second, when researchers are unsure about the practical relevance of their object of study, an initial exploration of a specific phenomenon with a sample of professionals in a field study may even be a good starting point for a research project. Such an exploration confirms the relevance of the issue being studied, thereby ensuring that it is worth to investigate the underlying mechanisms. Moreover, explorations of phenomena or effects with professionals and/or in field studies increase practitioners’ acceptance and trust in the respective research (cf. Moore & Murnighan, 1999).

Progress related to the quality of generated knowledge in terms of our third indicator would be reflected in a greater proportion of (replication) studies being conducted and published with samples of professional negotiators. Important progress in this respect would especially be made by replicating well-established and prominent findings—like meta-analytic results—with such samples by default.

Indicator 4: Moderate/Intermediary Values of the Independent Variables

From a scientific perspective, it is often reasonable to manipulate assumed causal factors by creating two maximally different conditions (e.g., low vs. high epistemic motivation, no vs. full information about the other party’s payoffs or interests, expectation vs. no expectation of future interaction with the other negotiating party, etc.). This increases the chances to observe significant differences in the dependent variables. From an applied point of view, however, these extremely different conditions provide less insight as they might be rarely given or realized outside the laboratory. Here, the intermediary nuances of a continuum of possible conditions are often more relevant and interesting (e.g., What are the effects of moderate epistemic motivation on achieved negotiation outcomes? How do parties behave when there is a small chance that they will meet the other party again?, etc.).

An extension of the two extreme conditions with an intermediary condition is the most obvious possibility to reconcile the scientific and applied perspective. In this respect, it is important to note that such an extension is not necessarily a pure sacrifice for enhanced applicability of the conducted research. In contrast, intermediary conditions often bring about additional and valuable scientific insights, for instance by

detecting nonlinear relations between variables (e.g., the relation between an opponent's competitive reputation and own individual outcomes) or by demonstrating that differences in the dependent variables already occur with smaller differences in the independent variable (e.g., comparing goals of gradually increasing difficulty rather than assigning difficult and do-your-best or no goals at all).

A fourth indicator of significant progress in the quality of generated knowledge resembles the amount of (follow-up) studies that go beyond the rather conventional 2×2 designs by including intermediary conditions. Studies that measure rather than manipulate their independent variables further add to narrowing the gap.

Indicator 5: Different Negotiation Tasks within Lines of Research and an Increase in New Negotiation Tasks

Although well-established tasks in negotiation research (cf. Kelley, 1966; Pruitt & Lewis, 1975) have undoubted merits, it seems desirable that negotiation research varies its tasks or paradigms. Such variation allows for at least two crucial developments: First and most importantly, as specific operationalizations such as the applied negotiation task codetermine the observed results in empirical studies (cf. De Dreu, Giacomantonio, Shalvi, & Sligte, 2009; Ritov, 1996), it is crucial to vary the applied negotiation tasks *within* (and between) series of studies to validate the generalizability of the effects and detect possible method-artifacts. Ritov (1996), for example, nicely demonstrated such an artifact. The author showed that the often found buyer advantage in negotiations (cf. Neale, Huber, & Northcraft, 1987) can be at least partly explained by an anchoring effect inherently included in the procedure of the applied negotiation task: The buyers tend to anchor higher profits than sellers because the buyers' profits are presented in descending order in their profit schedules, while the sellers' profits were typically depicted in an ascending order. Obviously, specific effects (e.g., the buyer advantage) only represent practically useful and reliable knowledge when they are observed across different tasks, thereby reflecting the situational variability outside the laboratory.

Second, the induction of new tasks and paradigms affords the investigation of new types of behaviors and ultimately research questions that cannot be studied with the established tasks. Of course, this is not to say that previous research did not come up with important new tasks. However, we would like to illustrate that the development of new and/or slightly changed negotiation tasks may contribute to practically useful knowledge about negotiation. Even if the format of these tasks resembles an established negotiation task, changes of established tasks allow for such new insights, for a widening and perhaps even for a partial shift of the current perspective on negotiation processes.

A fifth indicator of progress in the quality of generated knowledge is determined by scholars who habitually apply different negotiation tasks within (and across) their series of consecutive studies to demonstrate the robustness of their findings. Studies that come up with tasks of high existential realism would also add to this indicator (i.e., tasks that maximize the realism of the context within which the behavior of interest is observed; McGrath, 1981).

Indicator 6: Negotiations Are Conceptualized as Interactions across Time

A recent analysis by Bendersky and McGinn (2010) indicates that most of the existing research projects conceptualize negotiations as separable incidents (or one-shot negotiations) rather than across time (i.e., several consecutive negotiations). In fact, only a 6% fraction of the studies published in top tier journals from 1990 to 2005 were studies with multiple negotiation rounds (Bendersky & McGinn, 2010). A further 25% proportion investigated some effect of one negotiation on another (Bendersky & McGinn, 2010). To additionally substantiate the notion that negotiations are relatively rarely conceptualized as incidents across time and to avoid a biased assessment of the literature by focusing on specific journals for the limited time span of 1990–2005, we conducted a literature search in PsycInfo. Using several combinations of key words (“negotiation”, “bargaining”, “multi-round”, “negotiation round”, “round”, “time”), we retrieved 26 studies with consecutive negotiations (cf. Table 3), which represent a small fraction of the hundreds of publications with one-shot negotiations. A longer time perspective is, however, quite important from a knowledge production perspective, as practitioners in today’s global and competitive markets need to know which strategies may help them to achieve not only optimal one-time outcomes but also a positive relationship with their partners in negotiations.

Interestingly, focusing on a longer time perspective is not necessarily costly. The inclusion of simple questions (cf. Curhan et al., 2006), such as exploring the involved persons’ desire for future negotiations (cf. Oliver, Balakrishnan, & Barry, 1994), is already useful to extend the time perspective and get clues on the sustainability of negotiation strategies. A respective literature search using PsycInfo (search words: “negotiation”, “bargaining”, “conflict”, “desire of future negotiation”, “desire of future interaction”, and “future interaction”) revealed that only 15 of several hundred

Table 3

Overview of the Studies with Multiple Negotiation Rounds or a Time Perspective that Exceeds a One-Shot Negotiation

Studies with multiple negotiation rounds*	Curhan, Efenbein, and Eisenkraft (2010); Reb (2010); Van Kleef and De Dreu (2010); Naquin and Kurtzberg (2009); Anderson and Shirako (2008); Cotter and Henley (2008); Steinel, Abele, and De Dreu (2007); O’Connor, Arnold, and Burris (2005); Bereby-Meyer, Moran, and Unger-Aviram (2004); Moore (2004); Boles, Croson, and Murnighan (2000); Stevens and Gist (1997); Arunachalam and Dilla (1995); Mannix, Tinsley, and Bazerman (1995); Hilty and Carnevale (1993); Ravenscroft, Haka, and Chalos (1993); Arunachalam and Dilla (1992); Thompson (1992); Thompson (1990a); Thompson (1990b); Kette (1986); Bazerman, Baglozzi, and Neale (1985); Crott and Müller (1976); Wall (1976); Laing and Morrison (1973); Schoeninger and Wood (1969)
---	---

Note. *This literature search does not report studies on negotiation training which typically have at least two negotiation rounds to validate that learning has in fact taken place.

Table 4

Overview of the Studies Assessing Negotiators' Desire for Future Negotiation Interaction and Treating Affective States as Dependent Variables

Studies assessing negotiators' desire for future negotiation interaction	Curhan et al. (2010); Reb (2010); Van Kleef and De Dreu (2010); Curhan et al. (2009); Kass (2008); Curhan et al. (2006); Mueller and Curhan (2006); Brockner, De Cremer, van den Bos, and Chen (2005); O'Connor et al. (2005); Naquin (2003); Naquin and Paulson (2003); O'Connor and Arnold (2001); Purdy, Nye, and Balakrisnan (2000); Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, and Raia (1997); Oliver et al. (1994)
Studies treating affective states as dependent variables	Curhan et al. (2010); Oza, Srivastava, and Koukova (2010); Wang, Lim, and Guo (2010); Curhan et al. (2009); Kray and Gelfand (2009); Kass (2008); Lim and Yang (2008); Kernan, Hunt, and Conlon (2007); Ma (2007); Sevdalis and Harvey (2007); Sevdalis, Petrides, and Harvey (2007); Curhan et al. (2006); Mueller and Curhan (2006); Aquino and Becker (2005); Hunt and Kernan (2005); Olekalns, Robert, Probst, Smith, and Carnevale (2005); Penarroja, Lira, Ripoll, and Zornoza (2005); Davidson, McElwee, and Hannan (2004); Der Foo, Efenbein, Tan, and Aik (2005); Kwon and Weingart (2004); Novemsky and Schweitzer (2004); Van Kleef, De Dreu and Manstead (2004); Ketelaar and Au (2003); Naquin (2003); Galinsky, Seiden, Kim, and Medvec (2002); Schwartz, Ward, Monterosso, Lyubomirsky, White, and Lehmann (2002); O'Connor and Arnold (2001); Olk and Elvira (2001); Gillespie, Brett, and Weingart (2000); Purdy et al. (2000); Hegtvedt and Killian (1999); Pilutla and Murnighan (1996); Watson and Hoffmann (1996); Thompson, Valley, and Kramer (1995); Neu and Graham (1994); Oliver et al. (1994); Shapiro and Bies (1994); Conlon and Ross (1993); Lawler and Yoon (1993); Shankar (1993); Lewicki and Rubin (1973)

retrieved studies report this kind of dependent variable (see the upper row of Table 4), which renders future inclusions of the negotiators' desire for future interaction a valuable endeavor. Alternatively, the study design can also be simply extended to a second negotiation (or even several negotiations) with the same or another partner to extend the time perspective.

Consequently, a sixth indicator is length of time perspective in negotiation studies. In particular, this might be indicated by longitudinal studies containing several negotiation rounds with the same or another counterpart that replicate well-established and prominent findings initially shown in one-shot negotiations.

Indicator 7: The Inclusion of Multiple Classes of Dependent Variables

The choice of the dependent variables is an important decision that either facilitates or impedes the production of practically relevant knowledge. At first sight, it might seem comprehensible that researchers base their hypotheses mainly on one class of dependent variables (e.g., individual or joint economic outcomes, fairness of economic outcomes,

socio-emotional outcomes, impasse rate, negotiation time, costs, etc.). At closer inspection, however, multiple dependent variables are useful as dissociation or trade-offs concerning these dependent variables might occur that can only be detected when more than one class of dependent variables is considered. These dissociations are important for practitioners, as they allow for a more reliable assessment of the pros and cons when applying a certain negotiation strategy, and therefore for the usefulness and applicability of scientific knowledge. The standardized application of a set of multiple dependent variables thus seems to be desirable and quite helpful to compare different interventions and moderators, but at the same time not overly laborious. Candidates for such a standard set of dependent variables might include economic outcomes both for each party individually and overall, actual fairness of negotiation outcomes, socio-emotional outcomes including the willingness to negotiate again with the same partner (cf. Curhan et al., 2006), and negotiation time.

To substantiate how many studies to date went beyond the assumed main dependent variable of economic outcomes and focused on affective responses resulting from negotiations, we conducted a literature search in PsycInfo (search words: “negotiation”, “bargaining”, “outcome satisfaction”, “affective reaction”, “emotional reaction”, “affect”, and “emotion”; for the search results, see the lower column of Table 4). The search revealed 41 articles that focused on affective or socio-emotional outcomes. Interestingly, this work was mostly published in the last decade, showing that this type of dependent variable has only recently, but increasingly received research attention in this field.

Obviously, the seventh indicator of practically relevant knowledge production, i.e., inclusion of multiple dependent variables, already suggests a somewhat narrowed divide in this respect. Further progress would be made if the results related to these dependent variables are reported even if they are not affected by the independent variables because such a practice would allow easier and more reliable conclusions as to the practical usefulness of the observed scientific findings.

Indicator 8: Follow-Up Studies Investigate Practically Relevant Moderators by Default

Once a phenomenon or basic effect is shown in an initial study, follow-up research can obviously take different directions. While it is important for the theoretical understanding of the observed findings to reveal their underlying mechanisms, it is also important to intentionally challenge the findings’ robustness by investigating a standard set of practically relevant moderators.

Thus, the eighth indicator resembles the replication of well-established and prominent findings with a set of the most practically relevant moderators. Among those moderators are gender of involved persons (women vs. men; same vs. mixed-gender negotiations), further sample characteristics (e.g., student vs. nonstudent samples), setting (laboratory vs. field study), time perspective (one-shot vs. repeated negotiations), culture (e.g., negotiations within one culture vs. negotiations between cultures), types of counterparts (e.g., counterparts assigned to the same vs. another level of the manipulated independent variables), communication mode (face-to-face vs. computer-mediated negotiations), types

of dependent variables (e.g., economic vs. socio-emotional outcomes), or types of negotiation situations (e.g., distributive vs. integrative negotiations).

Conclusion

Examining the current size of the practitioner–researcher divide in psychological negotiation research, we found that negotiation research successfully transmits its knowledge to the relevant practitioner groups. Therefore, knowledge of psychological negotiation research does not seem to be “lost in translation” (Shapiro et al., 2007). However, psychological negotiation research can improve the production of knowledge that is both theoretically sound and practically relevant. While much of this research is conducted with high levels of methodological rigor, practical relevance and applicability appear to be less prioritized and, thus, the knowledge produced runs the risk of being “lost before translation” (Shapiro et al., 2007). Based on this analysis, we proposed indicators that allow monitoring the development of psychological negotiation research in terms of its quest to produce practically relevant knowledge.

Achieving significant progress in terms of the resulting indicators involves concerted efforts of varying difficulty: Some of these efforts indeed imply changes in common practices (e.g., including negotiation time or socio-emotional outcomes as standard measures), but they are neither extremely time-consuming nor costly and could be directly implemented. Other indicators such as a more mandatory focus on professional samples or the consultation of professional negotiation experts at the start of a research project involve rather unusual steps. These steps may postpone the publishing of the received results in scientific journals because establishing a contact with professionals and recruiting them for collaborative research may consume time that is not needed for pure laboratory research. Compared to the possible gain in practical relevance of possible findings, this loss of time does not appear to be sufficiently severe to restrain from these measures. A third group of indicators (e.g., focusing similarly on practical phenomena and theory-driven effects, or reporting a standard set of dependent measures) suggest more general changes in the practice of writing and reviewing scientific manuscripts, grant proposals, and nomination for scientific prizes (cf. Rozin, 2009). However, we consider these changes in the general practice of psychological negotiation research as very effective to narrow the existing practitioner–researcher gap in this field. Moreover, continuously monitoring these indicators and analyzing related contingencies might also help to reconsider existing institutional pressures, constraints and incentive structures that contribute to the practitioner–researcher divide (cf. Anderson et al., 2001).

References

- Allen, M., Donohue, W., & Stewart, B. (1990). Comparing hardline and softline bargaining strategies in zero-sum situations using meta-analysis. In M. A. Rahim (Ed.), *Theory and research in conflict management* (pp. 87–104). New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Allred, K. G., Mallozzi, J. S., Matsui, F., & Raia, C. P. (1997). The influence of anger and compassion on negotiation performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 70, 175–187.

- Aquino, K., & Becker, T. E. (2005). Lying in negotiations: How individual and situational factors influence the use of neutralization strategies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 661–679.
- Anderson, N., Herriot, P., & Hodgkinson, G. P. (2001). The practitioner–researcher divide in industrial, work and organizational (IWO) psychology: Where are we now, and where do we go from here? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 391–411.
- Aram, J. D., & Salipante, P. F. (2003). Bridging scholarship in management: Epistemological reflections. *British Journal of Management*, 14, 189–205.
- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95% – Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63, 602–614.
- Arunachalam, V., & Dilla, W. (1992). Computer-mediated communication and structured interaction in transfer pricing negotiation. *Journal of Information Systems*, 6, 149–170.
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 396–403.
- Bazerman, M. H., Bagliozzi, T., & Neale, M. A. (1985). Integrative bargaining in a competitive market. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 35, 294–313.
- Bazerman, M. H., & Neale, M. A. (1992). *Negotiating rationally*. New York: Free Press.
- Bendersky, C., & McGinn, K. L. (2010). Open to negotiation: Phenomenological assumptions and knowledge dissemination within organizational studies. *Organization Science*, 21, 781–797.
- Bereby-Meyer, Y., Moran, S., & Unger-Aviram, E. (2004). When performance goals deter performance: Transfer of skills in integrative negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 93, 142–154.
- Boles, T. L., Croson, R. T. A., & Murnighan, J. K. (2000). Deception and retribution in repeated ultimatum bargaining. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 83, 235–259.
- Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & McGinn, K. L. (2005). Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 951–965.
- Brockner, J., De Cremer, D., van den Boos, K., & Chen, Y.-R. (2005). The influence of interdependent self-construal on procedural fairness effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 96, 155–167.
- Chertkoff, J. M., & Conley, M. (1967). Opening offer and frequency of concessions as bargaining strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 181–185.
- Clopton, S. W. (1984). Seller and buying firm factors affecting industrial buyers' negotiation behavior and outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21, 39–53.
- Conlon, D. E., & Ross, W. H. (1993). The effects of partisan third parties on negotiator behavior and outcome perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 280–290.
- Cotter, M. J., & Henley, J. A. (2008). First-offer disadvantage in zero-sum game negotiation outcomes. *Journal of Business To Business Marketing*, 15, 25–44.
- Crott, H. W., & Müller, G. F. (1976). Der Einfluss des Anspruchsniveaus und der Erfahrung auf Ergebnis und Verlauf dyadischer Verhandlungen bei vollständiger Information über die Gewinnmöglichkeiten. [The influence of aspiration level and experience on the outcomes and process of dyadic negotiation under full information about the pay-offs.]. *Zeitschrift für experimentelle und angewandte Psychologie*, 23, 548–568.
- Curhan, J. R., Elfenbein, H. A., & Eisenkraft, N. (2010). The objective value of subjective value: A multi-round negotiation study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40, 690–709.

- Curhan, J. R., Elfenbein, H. A., & Kilduff, G. J. (2009). Getting off on the right foot: Subjective value versus economic value in predicting longitudinal job outcomes from job offer negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 524–534.
- Curhan, J. R., Elfenbein, H. A., & Xu, A. (2006). What do people care about when they negotiate? Mapping the domain of subjective value in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 493–512.
- Dalton, D. R., Todor, W. D., & Owen, C. L. (1987). Sex effects in workplace justice outcomes: A field assessment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52*, 156–159.
- Davidson, J. A., McElwee, G., & Hannan, G. (2004). Trust and power as determinants of conflict resolution strategy and outcome satisfaction. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 10*, 275–292.
- De Dreu, C. K. W. (2001). IACM president responds to September 11th Attacks on the US. *Signal Newsletter of the International Association for Conflict Management, 17*, 1–2.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Giacomantonio, M., Shalvi, S., & Sligte, D. (2009). Getting stuck or stepping back: Effects of obstacles and construal level in the negotiation of creative solutions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 542–548.
- Der Foo, M., Elfenbein, H. A., Tan, H. H., & Aik, V. C. (2005). Emotional intelligence and negotiation: The tension between creating and claiming value. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 15*, 411–429.
- Diener, E. (2006). Editorial. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 1–4.
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Friedman, R. (2002). New perspectives on teaching about conflict: Simulations, cases, and exercises. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 13*, 318–319.
- Galinsky, A. D., & Mussweiler, T. (2001). First offers as anchors: The role of perspective-taking and negotiator focus. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 657–669.
- Galinsky, A. D., Seiden, V., Kim, P. H., & Medvec, V. H. (2002). The dissatisfaction of having your first offer accepted: The role of counterfactual thinking in negotiations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 271–283.
- Gardner, D. G., Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). The effects of pay level on organization-based self-esteem and performance: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*, 307–322.
- Gelade, G. A. (2006). But what does it mean in practice? The Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology from a practitioner perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79*, 153–160.
- Gillespie, J., Brett, J. M., & Weingart, L. R. (2000). Interdependence, social motives, and outcome satisfaction in multiparty negotiation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 779–797.
- Halpert, J. A., Stuhlmacher, A. F., Crenshaw, J. L., Litcher, C. D., & Bortel, R. (2010). Paths to negotiation success. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 3*, 91–116.
- Harinck, F., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van Vianen, A. (2000). The impact of conflict issues on fixed-pie perceptions, problem solving, and integrative outcomes in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*, 329–358.
- Hegtvedt, K. A., & Killian, C. (1999). Fairness and emotions: Reactions to the process and outcomes of negotiations. *Social Forces, 78*, 269–303.

- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61–135.
- Hilty, J. A., & Carnevale, P. J. (1993). Black-hat/white-hat strategy in bilateral negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 444–469.
- Hodgkinson, G. P., & Rousseau, D. M. (2009). Bridging the rigor-relevance gap in management research: It's already happening! *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 534–546.
- Honeyman, C., Cohen, J., & De Palo, G. (2009). Special section: Second generation global negotiation education. Introduction: Negotiation teaching 2.0. *Negotiation Journal*, 25, 141–146.
- Hunt, C. S., & Kernan, M. C. (2005). Framing negotiations in affective terms: Methodological and preliminary theoretical findings. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 16, 128–157.
- Johns, G. (1993). Constraints on the adoption of psychology-based personnel practices: Lessons from organizational innovation. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 569–592.
- Kass, E. (2008). Interactional justice, negotiator outcome satisfaction, and desire for future negotiations: RESPECT at the negotiating table. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 19, 319–338.
- Kelley, H. H. (1966). A classroom study of the dilemmas in interpersonal negotiations. In K. Archibald (Ed.), *Strategic interaction and conflict*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, University of California.
- Kernan, M. C., Hunt, C. S., & Conlon, D. E. (2007). Expectancy disconfirmation and negotiator reactions across negotiation episodes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 143–162.
- Ketelaar, T., & Au, W. T. (2003). The effects of feeling guilt on the behaviour of uncooperative individuals in repeated social bargaining games: An affect-as-information interpretation of the role of emotion in social interaction. *Cognition and Emotion*, 17, 429–453.
- Kette, G. (1986). Attributions restore consistency in bargaining with liked/disliked partners. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 16, 257–277.
- Kray, L. J., & Gelfand, M. J. (2009). Relief versus regret: The effect of gender and negotiating norm ambiguity on reactions to having one's first offer accepted. *Social Cognition*, 27, 418–436.
- Kwon, S., & Weingart, L. R. (2004). Unilateral concessions from the other party: Concession behavior, attributions and negotiation judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 263–278.
- Laing, J. D., & Morrison, R. J. (1973). Coalitions and payoffs in three-person sequential games: Initial tests of two formal models. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 3, 3–26.
- Lawler, E. J., & Yoon, J. (1993). Power and the emergence of commitment behavior in negotiated exchange. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 465–481.
- Le, H., Oh, I.-S., Shaffer, J., & Schmidt, F. (2007). Implications of methodological advances for the practice of personnel selection: How practitioners benefit from meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21, 6–15.
- Lewicki, R. J., & Rubin, J. Z. (1973). Effects of variations in the informational clarity of threats and promises upon interpersonal bargaining. *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 137–138.
- Lewicki, R. L., Saunders, D. M., Minton, J. W., & Barry, B. (2009). *Negotiation: Readings, exercises and cases* (6th ed.). Burr Ridge, IL: McGraw-Hill.
- Lim, J., & Yang, Y. P. (2008). Exploring computer-based multilingual negotiation support for English – Chinese dyads: Can we negotiate in our native languages. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 27, 139–151.

- Ma, Z. (2007). Chinese conflict management styles and negotiation behaviours: An empirical test. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7, 101–119.
- Mannix, E. A., Tinsley, C. H., & Bazerman, M. (1995). Negotiating over time: Impediments to integrative solutions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62, 241–251.
- McGrath, J. E. (1981). Dilemmatics: The study of research choices and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 15, 179–210.
- Moore, D. A. (2004). Myopic prediction, self-destructive secrecy, and the unexpected benefits of revealing final deadlines in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 94, 125–139.
- Moore, D. A., & Murnighan, J. K. (1999). Alternative models of the future of negotiation research. *Negotiation Journal*, 15, 347–353.
- Mueller, J. S., & Curhan, J. R. (2006). Emotional intelligence and counterpart mood induction in a negotiation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 17, 110–128.
- Naquin, C. E. (2003). The agony of opportunity in negotiation: Number of negotiable issues, counterfactual thinking, and feelings of satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 91, 97–107.
- Naquin, C. E., & Kurtzberg, T. R. (2009). Team negotiation and perception of trustworthiness: The whole versus the sum of the parts. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 13, 133–150.
- Naquin, C. E., & Paulson, G. D. (2003). Online bargaining and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 113–120.
- Neale, M. A., Huber, V. L., & Northcraft, G. B. (1987). The framing of negotiations: Contextual versus task frames. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 39, 228–241.
- Neu, J., & Graham, J. L. (1994). A new methodological approach to the study of interpersonal influence tactics: A 'test drive' of a behavioral scheme. *Journal of Business Research*, 29, 131–144.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5, 14–37.
- Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1987). Expert, amateurs, and real estate: An anchoring-and-adjustment perspective on property pricing decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 39, 228–241.
- Novemsky, N., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2004). What makes negotiators happy? The differential effects of internal and external social comparisons on negotiator satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 95, 186–197.
- O'Connor, K. M., & Arnold, J. A. (2001). Distributive spirals: Negotiation impasses and the moderating role of disputant self-efficacy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 84, 148–176.
- O'Connor, K. M., Arnold, J. A., & Burris, E. R. (2005). Negotiators' bargaining histories and their effects on future negotiation Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 350–362.
- Olekalns, M., & Brett, J. M. (2008). Beyond the deal: Next generation negotiation skills. Introduction to the Special Issue. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 1, 309–314.
- Olekalns, M., Robert, C., Probst, T., Smith, P. L., & Carnevale, P. (2005). The impact of message frame on negotiators' impressions, emotions, and behaviors. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 16, 379–402.

- Oliver, R. L., Balakrishnan, P. V., & Barry, B. (1994). Outcome satisfaction in negotiation: A test of expectancy confirmation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *60*, 252–275.
- Olk, P., & Elvira, M. (2001). Friends and strategic agents: The role of friendship and discretion in negotiating strategic alliances. *Group & Organization Management*, *26*, 124–164.
- Ordonez, L. D., Schweitzer, M. E., Galinsky, A. D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). Goals gone wild: The systematic side effects of overprescribing goal setting. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *23*, 6–16.
- Orr, D., & Guthrie, C. (2006). Anchoring, information, expertise, and negotiation: New insights from meta-analysis. *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, *21*, 597–623.
- Oza, S. S., Srivastava, J., & Koukova, N. T. (2010). How suspicion mitigates the effect of influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *112*, 1–10.
- Penarroja, V., Lira, E. M., Ripoll, P., & Zornoza, A. (2005). Efectos de la interacción entre el medio de comunicación y la presión temporal percibida sobre el rendimiento grupal y la satisfacción con los resultados en tareas de negociación. [The effects of the interaction between communication media and perceived time pressure on group performance and outcome satisfaction in negotiation tasks.]. *Revista de Psicología Social Aplicada*, *15*, 83–99.
- Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2000). *The knowing-doing gap: How smart companies turn knowledge into action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pillutla, M. M., & Murnighan, J. K. (1996). Unfairness, anger, and spite: Emotional rejections of ultimatum offers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *68*, 208–224.
- Pinkley, R. L. (2006). President's corner. *Signal Newsletter of the International Association for Conflict Management*, *22*, 4–6.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Lewis, S. A. (1975). Development of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *31*, 621–633.
- Purdy, J. M., Nye, P., & Balakrishnan, P. V. (2000). The impact of communication media on negotiation outcomes. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, *11*, 162–187.
- Ravenscroft, S. P., Haka, S. F., & Chalos, P. (1993). Bargaining behavior in a transfer pricing experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *55*, 414–443.
- Reb, J. (2010). The influence of past negotiations on negotiation counterpart preferences. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, *19*, 457–477.
- Ritov, I. (1996). Anchoring in simulated competitive market negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *67*, 16–25.
- Rogers, E. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press.
- Rozin, P. (2006). Domain denigration and process preference in academic psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *1*, 365–376.
- Rozin, P. (2009). What kind of empirical research should we publish, fund, and reward? A different perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*, 435–439.
- Rynes, S. L., Giluk, T. L., & Brown, K. C. (2007). The very separate worlds of academic and practitioner publications in human resource management: Implications for evidence-based management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 987–1008.
- Schoeningher, D. W., & Wood, W. D. (1969). Comparison of married and ad hoc mixed-sex dyads negotiating the division of a reward. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *5*, 483–499.
- Schwartz, B., Ward, A., Monterosso, J., Lyubomirsky, S., White, K., & Lehman, D. R. (2002). Maximizing versus satisficing: Happiness is a matter of choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 1178–1197.

- Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 515–530.
- Sevdalis, N., & Harvey, N. (2007). Biased forecasting of postdecisional affect. *Psychological Science, 18*, 678–681.
- Sevdalis, N., Petrides, K. V., & Harvey, N. (2007). Trait emotional intelligence and decision-related emotions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 1347–1358.
- Shankar, G. (1993). Negotiation strategies and the nature of channel relationships. *Journal of Marketing Research, 30*, 183–203.
- Shapiro, D. L., & Bies, R. J. (1994). Threats, buffers, and disclaimers in negotiations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 60*, 14–35.
- Shapiro, D. L., Kirkman, B. L., & Courtney, H. G. (2007). Perceived causes and solutions of the translation problem in management research. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*, 249–266.
- Steinel, W., Abele, A., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2007). Effects of experience and advice on process and performance in negotiations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*, 533–550.
- Stevens, C. K., & Gist, M. E. (1997). Effects of self-efficacy and goal-orientation training on negotiation skill maintenance: What are the mechanisms? *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 955–978.
- Straus, S. E., Richardson, W. S., Glasziou, P., & Haynes, R. B. (2005). *Evidence-based medicine: How to practice and teach EBM* (3rd ed.). Edinburgh: Elsevier.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Citera, M. (2005). Hostile behavior and profit in virtual negotiation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 20*, 69–93.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., Citera, M., & Willis, T. (2007). Gender differences in virtual negotiation: Theory and Research. *Sex Roles, 57*, 329–339.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 653–677.
- Swaab, R. I., & Swaab, D. F. (2009). Sex differences in the effects of visual contact and eye contact in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 129–136.
- Thompson, L. L. (1990a). Negotiation behavior and outcomes: Empirical evidence and theoretical issues. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 515–532.
- Thompson, L. L. (1990b). The influence of experience on negotiation performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26*, 528–544.
- Thompson, L. L. (1992). A method for examining learning in negotiation. *Group Decision and Learning, 1*, 71–84.
- Thompson, L. L. (2008). *The mind and heart of the negotiator* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Thompson, L. L., & Hrebec, D. (1996). Lose-lose agreements in interdependent decision making. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 396–409.
- Thompson, L. L., & Leonardelli, G. L. (2004a). The big bang: The evolution of negotiation research. *Academy of Management Executive, 18*, 113–117.
- Thompson, L. L., & Leonardelli, G. L. (2004b). Why negotiation is the most popular business school course. *Ivey Business Journal, 4*, 1–7.
- Thompson, L., Valley, K. L., & Kramer, R. M. (1995). The bittersweet feeling of success: An examination of social perception in negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*, 467–492.

- Thompson, L. L., Wang, J., & Gunia, B. C. (2010). Negotiation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 491–515.
- Tripp, T., & Sondak, H. (1992). An evaluation of dependent measures in negotiation studies: Impasse rates and pareto-efficiency. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 51, 273–295.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Johnson, P. E. (2006). Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 802–821.
- Van Kleef, G. A., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2010). Longer-term consequences of anger expression in negotiation: Retaliation or spillover? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 253–260.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004). The interpersonal effects of anger and happiness in negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 57–76.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., Pietroni, D., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2006). Power and emotion in negotiation: Power moderates the interpersonal effects of anger and happiness on concession making. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 557–581.
- Wall, J. A. (1976). Effects of sex and opposing representatives bargaining orientation on intergroup bargaining. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 55–61.
- Wang, Z., Lim, J., & Guo, X. (2010). Negotiator satisfaction in NSS-facilitated negotiation. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 19, 279–300.
- Watson, C., & Hoffmann, L. R. (1996). Managers as negotiators: A test of power versus gender as predictors of feelings, behavior, and outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 63–85.
- Yukl, G. (1974). Effects of the opponent's initial offer, concession magnitude and concession frequency on bargaining behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 323–335.
- Zetik, D. C., & Stuhlmacher, A. F. (2002). Goal setting and negotiation performance: A meta-analysis. *Group Processes and Interpersonal Relations*, 5, 35–52.
-

Joachim Hüffmeier is a Lecturer of Organizational Psychology at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster. He studies intra- and intergroup processes in negotiations, process gains in teams and abilities that are relevant in teamwork. His work appears in (among others) *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, and *Motivation and Emotion*.

Stefan Krumm is a Lecturer of Organizational Psychology at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster. He studies knowledge, skills, and abilities which are relevant in virtual teamwork as well as individual differences cognitive processes. His work appears in (among others) *Intelligence, Learning and Individual Difference*, and *Journal of Individual Differences*.

Guido Hertel holds a chair of Organizational and Business Psychology at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität in Münster, Germany. His current research interests include process gains in teams, electronic human resource management, demographic changes, and conflict management in organizations. His work appears in (among others) *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *Human Resource Management Review*, and *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Guido Hertel works also as consultant for organizations.