negotiation and conflict management research

Negotiation and Conflict Management Research

Celebrating the Work of Jeanne M. Brett: Building Bridges and Making Connections

Wendi L. Adair,[1] Kristin J. Behfar,[2] Mara Olekalns,[3] and Debra L. Shapiro[4]

1 University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada
2 Darden School of Business, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, U.S.A.
3 Melbourne Business School, The University of Melbourne, Carlton, Vic., Australia
4 Robert H. Smith School of Business, University of Maryland – College Park, MD, U.S.A.

Keywords
negotiation, dispute resolution, culture, teams, conflict management.

Correspondence
Wendi L. Adair, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada; e-mail: wladair@uwaterloo.ca.

Abstract

In this tribute to the 2009 recipient of the International Association for Conflict Management Lifetime Achievement Award Winner, we celebrate the work of Jeanne M. Brett. Each of us highlights a few unique contributions from four areas of Jeanne's research: (a) getting disputes resolved (Debra Shapiro); (b) negotiating globally (Wendi Adair); (c) illuminating the shadow box of negotiation process (Mara Olekalns); and (d) managing team processes (Kristin Behfar). Together we identify common themes across these areas of Jeanne's research and invite Jeanne to reflect on future research opportunities and impart her words of wisdom to doctoral students and young scholars.

Jeanne M. Brett is a phenomenal scholar, whose research has influenced the way we think about and study conflict management and negotiation. Jeanne is a forward-thinking researcher and a builder of bridges connecting theories of conflict management, negotiation, culture, and teams. Her work has brought together conflict researchers with students and practitioners to integrate Western theories and Western scholars with global academic circles. Her strengths and contributions are evident not only in her collaborative and impactful scholarship, but Jeanne is also an innovative institution builder.

In the fall of 1981, the visionary work of Jeanne Brett was leading the Kellogg School of Management on a groundbreaking path: It was adding negotiation training to its MBA curriculum. Following the lead of Jeanne Brett, along with colleagues Roy Lewicki and Len Greenhalgh, numerous business schools began in the late 1980s to add negotiations to their master student curriculums. In many MBA programs, it is the most popular elective, and today, probably most business school professors and students cannot imagine their curriculum *without* a negotiation course. In 1986, Jeanne and a multidisciplinary group of Northwestern professors founded the Dispute Resolution Research Center (DRRC), which to this day is a major source for negotiation teaching materials for professors worldwide. Based in the pedagogical method of experiential learning, these materials not only teach students negotiation skills through stylized simulations of real-world negotiations, but they are also widely used in research investigating negotiation and conflict-management dynamics. Those of us who have written exercises distributed by DRRC know that Jeanne is a demanding editor, and so the exercises come with teaching notes, spreadsheets, class presentation advice, and most recently video-recorded online webinars with the exercise author.

We thank Michael Gross for inviting and shepherding this article, an anonymous NCMR reviewer for constructive feedback, and Shirli Kopelman and Anne Lytle for their friendly review that helped craft this tribute to Jeanne M. Brett. Authorship is alphabetical.

Volume 9, Number 4, Pages 292–308

The beneficiaries of Jeanne's founding and nurturing of the DRRC teaching materials are, as of spring 2016, over 80,000 consumers who are teachers, scholars, and recipients of its teaching or research insights (including business managers and executives). Furthermore, the DRRC supports negotiation research by funding research grants to doctoral students and faculty across an array of social science disciplines at Northwestern University. It supports the training of international scholars through the Negotiation and Mediation Research and Teaching Certificate program. The DRRC postdoctoral program has lured social psychologists into doing negotiation research and pursuing a career in a business school. The recent Research Residency program funds scholars around the world to spend three or six months working with a host at another university. The DRRC has also annually provided student scholarships to first-time attendees of the International Association for Conflict Management (IACM) conference, hosted preconference negotiation teaching workshops, and supported the annual Best Paper Award for the conflict management division of the Academy of Management. Jeanne's nurturance of all of these DRRC programs is testimony to her being one of our field's foremost institution builders.

In this tribute article to Jeanne M. Brett, the 2009 recipient of the IACM Lifetime Achievement Award, we celebrate her scholarship across four domains of her research that have touched our work. We reflect on some of Jeanne's noteworthy contributions chronologically mirroring the era when each of us worked most closely with Jeanne. Debra Shapiro shares her experience at Kellogg when Jeanne introduced the first negotiation course and developed her seminal interests–rights–power model of alternative dispute resolution. Wendi Adair summarizes how Jeanne and her students challenged and extended existing approaches for studying culture and negotiation, developing novel models and methods that are commonplace today. Mara Oleklans reviews how Jeanne opened the shadow box of negotiation process, uncovering novel and intricate factors related to negotiation strategy that link negotiation inputs and outputs. Kristin Behfar discusses Jeanne's contributions to the study of conflict in teams, highlighting her multilevel, multimethod approach. We discuss how Jeanne's empirical, theoretical, and practical contributions have advanced and continue to influence the field of negotiation and conflict management. We are honored to reflect on Jeanne's work and share what we see as key insights and common themes,

Figure 1. Jeanne M. Brett receiving IACM Lifetime Achievement Award, Kyoto, Japan, 2009. Pictured with Laurie Weingart.

as well as to enable her to share a few thoughts on her past and future work, as well as provide advice for scholars just beginning their career (Figure 1).

Building Bridges Connecting Negotiation and Dispute Resolution—Debra L. Shapiro

Without question, my experience developing a seminal negotiation course with Jeanne Brett and also teaching negotiations in the spring of 1983, while I was a doctoral student at Kellogg, increased my job marketability, and that of so many doctoral students since then. Indeed, UNC-Chapel Hill's Business School (where I started my academic career in fall 1986 and remained until 2003) asked me to bring to its curriculum the negotiation course I had successfully taught at Kellogg. I did this with the aid of DRRC (as is true still today for countless negotiation instructors); and at UNC, the negotiation course also quickly became one for which there was insufficient supply (a story that would repeat in business schools everywhere).

How Teaching or Studying Negotiation Illuminated the Need to Study Dispute-Resolving

Witnessing students negotiate a variety of business challenges term-after-term alerted me to the inextricability of negotiating and dispute-resolving. This is because in situations of both negotiation and dispute resolution, (a) there is disagreement (between a minimum of two parties) and (b) there is an effort, via communication, to convert disagreement to agreement. This intertwinement of negotiating and dispute-resolving is stronger in the third-party intervention of mediation than in arbitration, however, since arbitrators are primarily listeners and ultimate umpires whereas mediators are primarily discussion-facilitators.

My realization regarding the intertwinement of negotiating and dispute-resolving (with regard to mediation) led me enthusiastically to accept Jeanne's invitation to join her in a qualitative study of professional mediators at work. As we watched professional mediators work with representatives from labor and management to transform labor grievances into settlements, we took copious and highly descriptive notes that we later content-analyzed, coded, and subjected to chi-square analyses. Our findings, described in Shapiro, Drieghe, and Brett (1985), included the following: (a) mediators use a variety of tactics to encourage disputing parties to reach agreement, (b) these various tactics generally fall into four categories (dealmaking, shuttle diplomacy, pressuring the company, and pressuring the union), (c) mediators differ from each other in terms of the number and type of tactics they use, (d) mediators' tactical choices are influenced by the types of mediation outcomes they seek, and (e) the types of outcomes mediators seek are generally the outcomes they obtain. Cumulatively, these findings led Shapiro et al. (1985) to conclude that mediators engage in pattern-matching related to mediator-technique or mediation outcome sequences and, thus, are skilled tacticians akin to chess grand masters (Simon, 1979), *not* innate artists as described in prior qualitative work (Kolb, 1983).

The fact that mediators' behaviors influence the type of outcomes disputants obtain suggests, more precisely, that *communication qualities matter* in determining the quality of disputants' (and also negotiators') outcomes. Informed by many years of watching professional arbitrators, mediators, and negotiators at work, in 1988 Jeanne Brett (along with coauthors William Ury and Stephen Goldberg) wrote a book, *Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing Systems to Cut the Costs of Conflict.* Among other things, this book describes with uncanny succinctness the types of remarks that disputants speak: (a) "interests," (b) "rights," and (c) "power" (for an elaboration, see Brett, Goldberg, & Ury, 1990).

Power-oriented remarks threaten recipients with harmful consequences (e.g., a lawsuit, a relational severance, and/or negative publicity) if a specific request or demand is blocked or rejected; as such, a power-orientation also illustrates what Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1991) referred to as being "positional." Rights-oriented remarks state there is only one correct way to solve a disagreement and, thus, are

ideological as well as "positional" in nature. Rights-oriented remarks convey that those who oppose one's own view are *wrong*; and the defensiveness this provokes typically impedes creative thinking which is needed to craft integrative (win-win) solutions. Unlike power- or rights-oriented remarks, interest-oriented remarks emphasize the need (a) to understand the goal that underlies each side's expressed request and (b) to seek *multiple* possible ways to satisfy an underlying goal. Interest-oriented remarks are therefore more collaborative and (mutual) problem-solving in orientation than power- and rights-oriented remarks. Not surprisingly, therefore, Ury, Brett, and Goldberg (1988) also propose that disputes generally resolve more effectively (with lower transaction costs, lower likelihood of the dispute's recurrence, and higher relational as well as outcome satisfaction) when disputants express their viewpoints in ways that emphasize interests rather than power or rights (Figure 2).

Consistent with Ury et al.'s view, working with Jeanne and Anne Lytle (Brett, Shapiro, & Lytle, 1998) we predicted that higher quality (more integrative) agreements would likely occur in negotiations whose aim was to resolve a dispute when negotiators' or disputants' remarks were more proportionately interest-oriented rather than rights- or power-oriented. We tested this with a simulation involving two companies' CEOs who needed to resolve an interorganizational contractual dispute. In independent judges' content analysis of tape recordings made of participants' efforts to resolve the dispute, the more integrative agreements did indeed tend to be associated with negotiations marked by a higher proportion of interest-oriented (rather than power- or rights-oriented) remarks. Brett et al. (1998) also predicted and found that higher quality agreements tended to occur when rights- or power-oriented remarks were *combined*, or "mixed," with an interest-oriented remark. This mixture, we explained, conveys the ability to exert power yet a desire to behave benevolently (to find a mutually satisfying solution)—a message that likely strengthens the speaker's trustworthiness. Our finding that mixed communications in addition to mostly interest-oriented ones tend to be associated with high-quality agreements extended Ury et al.'s (1988) initial theorizing as follows: "Rights" and "power" remarks need *not* create conflict spirals, and hence need *not* lead to ineffective dispute resolution if these types of statements are *mixed* with interest-oriented remarks.

Figure 2. (from left) Stephen Goldberg, Jeanne Brett, and Bill Ury at Disputes Systems Design Conference, Northwestern University, 1989.

How Studying Dispute-Resolving Led to Questions about What Causes Procedural Justice?

Employee disputes with management are commonly resolved via third-party dispute resolution procedures, namely mediation or arbitration. Another question pursued in Jeanne Brett's work pertains to which of these procedures is perceived by disputants as more satisfying and fair—that is, to have more

procedural justice—and why. The focus on "why" is due to the need to understand the intervening variables that explain differences in the extent to which mediation or arbitration is perceived by disputants to have procedural justice. To study this, Jeanne and I (Shapiro & Brett, 1993) examined disputants' perceptions of procedural justice and of procedural qualities that we proposed would influence procedural justice.

We defined three procedural qualities: "process control" (e.g., the extent to which disputants were involved in the procedure, called "voice" by Folger, 1977), "outcome control" (e.g., the extent to which things said by the disputants influenced their dispute resolution decision), and third-party fairness (e.g., the degree to which the third party considered disputants' feelings and opinions). Unlike the predominantly laboratory-based or scenario-based (hypothetical) studies used to study antecedents to procedural justice, we assessed the latter perceptions in a natural field experiment involving 158 coal miners who had filed grievances against their employers and whose resolution occurred via mediation for half of the sample and via arbitration for the other half of the sample. Also unlike other studies, this was the first to theoretically and empirically compare within one study *three* intervening processes (instrumental, noninstrumental, and third-party enactment) that had been identified (and debated) in prior work as underlying perceptions of procedural justice.

As we predicted, all three procedural processes explained significant variance in procedural justice; however, these processes' explanatory power differed for disputants whose grievances were settled in mediation versus decided in arbitration. Specifically, as expected, procedural justice was explained more by an *instrumental* process in mediation (where disputants have outcome control) and explained more by a *noninstrumental* process in arbitration (where disputants' outcome is decided by the arbitrator, and hence where they lack outcome control). Since voice (process control) comprises mediation and arbitration, this study uniquely illuminated variation in *outcome control* as key in determining procedural justice, something that Shapiro and Brett (2005) note could not have been observed in prior tests of procedural justice antecedents that generally occurred in a "culture of authority" where decisions were made solely by authority figures (e.g., court judges, policemen, or bosses). Given the tendency for men (rather than women) to be judges, police, and bosses, it is also likely that a "culture of men" characterized the earliest tests of antecedents to procedural justice. This likely reduced scholars' ability to observe, also, the different ways in which male versus female managers intervene in employee disputes—as more recently theorized and found by Benharda, Brett, and Lempereur (2013).

In summary, Jeanne Brett's study of mediation, arbitration, and negotiation via multiple methodologies has enabled her to generate and test theory about how to resolve disagreements effectively. Such insights, as well as the rigorous yet nurturing manner in which working with Jeanne has enabled these, have added peace and joy to my life and the lives of countless others.

Making Global Connections—Wendi L. Adair

In the 1990s, Jeanne helped to shape and legitimize the emerging field of cross-cultural negotiation in the sphere of empirical negotiation research. Her thinking led researchers to look beyond cultural values as an explanatory mechanism in cross-cultural negotiation. Her theoretical conceptualization and systematic measurement of negotiation norms and culturally normative negotiation behaviors brought rigor to our methods and continue to drive our understanding of how culture shapes negotiation process and outcome.

A Builder of Theory: Connecting Cross-Cultural Psychology, Communication, and Negotiation

When I arrived at the Kellogg School of Management in 1995, Jeanne was already busy fertilizing the field of cross-cultural negotiation. Empirical cross-cultural negotiation research was in its nascent stages,

meaning there was not a dominant research paradigm recognized. Jeanne fixed this, writing two papers with her graduate students that would give cross-cultural researchers interested in negotiation and other workplace interactions a standard set of guidelines around theory and design. Jeanne recognized the breadth and complexity of culture not to discourage researchers, but to challenge them with careful construct definition and rigorous designs, to rule out the possibility of alternative explanations. The paper appearing in *Research in Organizational Behavior* tackles the conceptualization of culture, addresses six cross-cultural research design issues, and proposes cross-cultural analytic techniques to develop "a paradigm to test the generalizability of mid-range theory across cultures" (Lytle, Brett, Barsness, Tinsley, & Janssens, 1995, p. 168).

The authors' subsequent chapter begins by reviewing the major research perspectives (e.g., emic vs. etic; positivist vs. interpretive) that define research space for both deductive, confirmatory and inductive, ethnographic research approaches, followed by three types of cross-cultural hypotheses (Brett, Tinsley, Janssens, Barsness, & Lytle, 1997). For cross-cultural researchers in conflict management, this paper models culture not only as a main effect and mediator, but also as a potential moderator of well-established negotiation processes. As a new graduate student passionate about the study of culture, Jeanne's approach was inspiring and full of possibilities, in stark contrast to other perspectives in my department, where people were heard to remark that culture is a meaningless variable and certainly too messy to study pre-tenure.

At a time when most researchers were focused on cultural values in general, and individualism–collectivism in particular, Jeanne turned our attention toward cultural norms as an alternative explanatory variable. In contrast to values, which are motivating and guiding principles defining what is important in life, norms are unspoken rules and guidelines that define appropriate and expected behavior in a given situation. Building on the rich literature in anthropology and communication, Jeanne and her coauthors began to define and test negotiation norms in the United States (information exchange) and Japan (power and distributive tactics; Brett & Okumura, 1998) and conflict resolution norms in the United States (discussing interests and synthesizing issues) and Hong Kong (concern for the collective and concern for authority; Tinsley & Brett, 2001). More recent work examines both norm complexity and situational primes to explain cultural variation in how managers (vs. peers) utilize authoritative (vs. participative) mediation strategies in China, Japan, and the United States (Brett, Tinsley, Shapiro, & Okumura, 2007).

My research with Jeanne on negotiation norms in the United States, Japan, Hong Kong, Israel, Russia, Thailand, France, and Brazil was guided by her rigor and consistency in design, translation, data collection, and data analyses. We examined intracultural dyads in a comparative cross-cultural study and uncovered explanations for why U.S. and Japanese negotiators achieve high joint-gain solutions in a complex, integrative negotiation, while Chinese and Russian negotiators do not. Japanese normative negotiation strategies are more similar to Chinese and Russian strategies, for example, use of power, distributive tactics, and offers, than U.S. strategies, for example, direct information sharing, questions, and answers. The variable we found the high joint-gain Japanese and U.S. negotiators shared in common was a cultural norm specifying that information exchange is expected and appropriate in negotiation. Conceptualizing negotiation as an information sharing process allowed U.S. and Japanese negotiators to uncover optimal solutions despite using very different normative negotiation strategies. Our coauthors were current and former graduate students and colleagues around the world. We presented this work, which later appeared in Negotiation Journal (Adair et al., 2004; Brett, Adair, Lempereur, Okumura, Shikhirev, Tinsley, & Lytle, 1998), as an international panel of scholars at the 1998 IACM conference. This was during the era of Michael Jordan, Scottie Pippen, and Dennis Rodman's Chicago Bulls, and I will always remember the pride I felt when our discussant Kwok Leung (for a recent tribute to his work, see Bond, van de Vijver, Morris, & Gelfand, 2016) referred to us as the cross-cultural negotiation "dream team."

Jeanne has promoted the cross-fertilization of negotiation theory with cross-cultural psychology, communication, and decision theories. Michele Gelfand and Jeanne edited *The Handbook of Negotiation and Culture* (Gelfand & Brett, 2004), a volume containing 20 paired chapters written by leading scholars, presenting a segment of negotiation research in the West (e.g., negotiator cognition, emotion in negotiation) alongside current research testing and extending those concepts cross-culturally. A companion article identifies the assumptions behind negotiation theory in the West and presents alternative assumptions in other parts of the world, for example, contrasting Western economic capital motivations and Pareto optimality goals with Eastern motivations to build social capital and strong networks (Brett & Gelfand, 2006).

Building Methods: Measuring Intra- and Intercultural Negotiation Processes

Defining culturally normative negotiation strategies was a rigorous undertaking that included both inductive and deductive approaches to apply the negotiation coding scheme developed by Jeanne and her students (Weingart, Bennett, & Brett, 1993) to the study of culture and negotiation. We surveyed and incorporated literature from the fields of communication, anthropology, cross-cultural psychology, and international management to develop predictions about negotiation strategies that will be normative in cultures that are more low- versus high-context, low- versus high-power distance, and individualistic versus collectivistic. We validated and tested the revised coding scheme with transcripts from the Cartoon negotiation simulation collected by Jeanne's team of researchers around the world. We coded hundreds of 90-min negotiation transcripts from native English speakers, foreign-language speakers in translation, and bilingual speakers negotiating interculturally in English. Through this work, we established systematic, empirical evidence of multiple strategic paths to uncovering high joint-gain agreements (Adair & Brett, 2005; Adair, Okumura, & Brett, 2001; Adair, Weingart, & Brett, 2007).

Cultural-anthropologist Edward Hall proposed that in low-context cultures the meaning of a message can be taken at face value, whereas in high-context cultures the meaning must be inferred from surrounding nonverbal actions and messages (Hall, 1976). Our empirical research revealed that in negotiations, these communication differences are reflected in preferences for more or less direct information sharing (priority information vs. offers), respectively. Comparing U.S. and Japanese negotiators, Jeanne, Laurie Weingart, and I (2007) again showed that directly sharing priority information was characteristic of U.S. negotiators, whereas indirectly sharing information through multiple offers was characteristic of Japanese negotiators. The role of offers as information exchange for Japanese negotiators was evident because the early and consistent exchange of offers helped them uncover joint-gain solutions. This was in contrast to the distributive anchoring effect of early offers for U.S. negotiators, who were more likely to share information directly through statements and questions about preferences and priorities. These different information strategies flow on to affect how value is created by U.S. and Japanese negotiators: Intracultural joint gains were highest when negotiators opened their negotiations with culturally normative information strategies. Joint gains were lower in U.S.–Japanese negotiations because information strategies were mismatched.

Another major methodological breakthrough is what I call the "Jeanne Brett sampling check." Culture is a complex variable that resides at the group level but is enacted at the individual level through the expression of a group's shared values, norms, and meaning systems. Because culture is multifaceted and complex, researchers face challenges when trying to isolate a single value or norm as a cultural explanatory mechanism at the individual level. Hence, we often see the broad categorical variable "culture" as an independent variable, which can raise questions about sample validity. Jeanne's response to this challenge was to introduce a "sampling check" which, like a manipulation check in purely experimental design, provides empirical evidence that one's cultural samples reflect the underlying constellation of values and norms that are theorized to drive predicted behaviors or attitudes. For example, when predicting U.S. and Japanese distributive negotiation strategy based on cultural values for egalitarianism versus

hierarchy, showing empirically that my Japanese sample endorses stronger values for hierarchy and my U.S. sample endorses stronger values for egalitarianism bolsters support for a significant main effect, even if there is not a significant mediation effect due to the many other aspects of culture that can be in play within the sample.

Connecting Researchers and Practitioners

Jeanne always keeps practitioners and students in sight. She regularly publishes research translations for practitioners in *Negotiation Journal* and *Harvard Business Review* (Alon & Brett, 2007; Brett, Behfar, & Kern, 2006; Brett, Friedman, & Behfar, 2009) and has shared interesting reflections on the nexus between practice and research (Brett, 2014). *Negotiating Globally*, now in its 3rd edition, summarizes and translates decades of research by Jeanne and her colleagues, conveying scientific findings in a language accessible to managers and MBA students. Jeanne builds bridges connecting literatures, audiences, nations, and people. Her commitment to meaningful and impactful research that is anything but quick and easy has greatly influenced my own research questions and goals as an academic (Figure 3).

Connecting Negotiation Inputs and Outputs: Illuminating the Shadow Box of Negotiation Process—Mara Olekalns

The Chicago Art Institute houses one of my favorite art collections, the shadow boxes of Joseph Cornell. These boxes, on first encounter, appear to be a random collection and placement of bric-a-brac in rather murky and dark boxes. But each box lights up at the touch of a button revealing a thoughtful placement of *objets trouvee* that tells an engaging and often moving story. What do Cornell's shadow boxes have in common with Jeanne's analysis of negotiation processes? To me, the parallels are obvious. On first

Figure 3. Jeanne M. Brett receiving Academy of Management Distinguished Educator Award, Seattle, WA, 2003. Also pictured (from left) Susan Ashford, Michele Gelfand, Shirli Kopelman, Becky Bennett, Miriam Erez, Wendi Adair, Anne Lytle, Laurie Weingart, Maddy Janssens, Zoe Barsness.

encounter, coded transcripts of negotiations are rather murky and daunting. Each set of transcripts throws out a sensemaking challenge and invites researchers to shine a light into the murkiest corners of the negotiation process. Few researchers rise to the challenge, and even fewer do so with Jeanne's meticulous approach. Engaging with the shadow box, Jeanne has shed light on strategy in cross-cultural negotiations, team negotiations, and disputes.

Global Shadow Boxes

As noted above, Jeanne has shed light on cultural variations in the use of two forms of information sharing (*direct* via priority information vs. *indirect* via offers) and also two forms of influence (*rational* via facts and arguments vs. *affective* via appeals to status and rank). Adair and Brett (2005) explored how low- and high-context communication styles influence the way that negotiation strategies are sequenced, that is, how a negotiator responds to a counterpart's strategy. Contrasting dyads in which both negotiators have a high- or low-context style with "mixed" dyads showed that high-context dyads' strategy patterns differ from those of low- or mixed-context dyads. Several strategies (rational persuasion, offers, and priority information) elicited *offers* in high-context but not in low- or mixed-context dyads. Conversely, two strategies (affective persuasion, priority information) elicited *priority information* in low- and mixed-context dyads but not in high-context dyads. These patterns again suggest that cultures differ in their willingness to offer indirect or direct information.

We also gain insight into the cultural differences in the goals that underpin information strategies. These analyses give a fresh perspective on strategy use by considering *strategy-in-context*, that is, by examining the behaviors that cluster around a focal strategy. As noted above, based on their examination of how tightly information clusters around offers, Adair et al. (2007) conclude that U.S. negotiators use offers for information consolidation, whereas Japanese negotiators use offers for information gathering. Kern, Lee, Aytug, and Brett (2012) provide a more fine-grained analysis of strategy-in-context by focusing on the strategies that cluster around the pronoun "you." Their analysis, which compares Korean and U.S. negotiators, shows that seeking priority information clusters around the use of "you" for Korean but not U.S. negotiators. Kern et al. (2012) conclude that Korean negotiators use "you" to reduce the social distance between negotiators.

More recent research gives insight into the impact of *interpersonal context* in shaping negotiators' strategies. Comparing U.S. and Indian negotiators suggests that propensity to trust underpins strategy preferences. Indian negotiators, who report low trust in others, favor the more self-protective strategy that combines single offers with rational influence; U.S. negotiators, who report high trust in others, favor the more open strategy of giving and seeking priority information (Gunia, Brett, Nandkeolyar, & Kamdar, 2011). Finally, in a comparison of honor, face, and dignity cultures, which are distinguished by the source through which one maintains self-esteem, Aslani et al. (2016) show that dignity cultures favor information sharing whereas face and honor cultures favor both forms of persuasion, and demonstrate that these preferences are mediated by cultural differences in competitive aspirations. These two studies present us with a more nuanced understanding of negotiators' strategy preferences by linking them to underlying goals.

Multiparty Shadow Boxes

Jeanne, together with her coauthors, has made significant inroads into our understanding of negotiation processes in multiparty negotiations. Summarized in "*Baubles, bangles and beads: Modeling the evolution of negotiating groups over time*," her analyses of multiparty negotiations provide a progressively more nuanced understanding of the factors at play in these negotiations (Brett, Weingart, & Olekalns, 2004).

A phase analysis shows that the processes in multiparty negotiations parallel those in two-party negotiations, starting with a distributive phase and ending with an integrative phase. Analyzing phases in

multiparty negotiations also shows that negotiators switch either strategic orientation (integrative, distributive) or strategic function (action, information), but rarely switch both at the same time. This phase analysis also gives insight into the strategies that either explicitly address process or the need to reach agreement enabling negotiators to move from a distributive phase to an integrative phase (Olekalns, Brett, & Weingart, 2003).

Processes are also influenced by group composition. Comparing groups that varied in the number of cooperators and individualists in the group reveals differences in both the strategies that negotiators use and how those strategies are sequenced (Weingart, Brett, Olekalns, & Smith, 2007). A central finding here is that cooperators adjust their strategies according to group composition, whereas individualists do not. For example, Weingart et al. (2007) showed that as the number of cooperators in a group increases, so does the use of integrative information and value creation strategies. Cooperators in dominantly cooperative groups also sequence their strategies differently from those in balanced individualist or dominantly individualistic groups. When the entire group is cooperative, individuals are more likely to combine distributive strategies (distributive information, value claiming) in sequences, whereas when they are in a minority, they are more likely to combine integrative (integrative information, value claiming) in sequences. Further analysis of all-cooperator groups shows that when they are instructed to consider issues sequentially, they focus on establishing and maintaining an integrative process by reinforcing reciprocity norms and by responding to priority information with expressions of mutuality and follow-up questions (Weingart et al., 1993).

Differences in negotiators' motives also affect their outcomes in multiparty negotiations. Cooperators, but not individualists, progressively increase their individual outcomes as they increase their use of integrative strategies—integrative information and value creation—seemingly because cooperators are more likely to persist in the use of integrative strategies than individualists (Kern, Brett, & Weingart, 2005). All-individualist groups who are instructed to consider issues sequentially obtain poorer joint outcomes than groups with both cooperators and individualists, and those instructed to consider issues simultaneously (Weingart et al., 1993). It is plausible that the inability to create value in these groups occurs because individualists' preferences for persuasion and single-issue offers are enhanced when they are instructed to consider issues sequentially. Jointly, these findings suggest that cooperators gain greater benefit from value-consistent behaviors than individualists (Kern et al., 2005).

Disputant Shadow Boxes

The power–rights–interests analysis of disputes is one of the best known frameworks for understanding how disputes are interpreted and managed (Ury et al., 1988; Shapiro, this article). Partnering this big picture approach to disputes, Jeanne provides a more nuanced analysis of how the language of disputants can affect whether and when disputes are resolved. Starting with the impact of emotional expression on resolution, this stream of research broadens our understanding of the factors at play in dispute resolution by contrasting language that gives or attacks face, that is, that signals respect or disrespect of the other person. Focusing on the specific *words* that disputants use demonstrates the critical impact of individuals' linguistic choices on the dispute resolution process.

Giving face promotes settlement. In eBay disputes, settlement is more likely when individuals convey respect for the other party either by speaking for themselves or by providing an explanation for the unsatisfactory transaction (Brett, Olekalns, Friedman, Goates, Anderson, & Lisco, 2007). In child-custody mediations, a shift away from blaming (he, she) similarly predicts settlement (Olekalns, Brett, & Donohue, 2010). In both eBay disputes and child-custody mediations, matching language that gives face promotes settlement. In transactional disputes, settlement is predicted by the reciprocation of problem-solving. In child-custody mediations, settlement occurs when husbands converge to their wives' (higher) expressions of positive emotion or when wives converge to their husbands' (lower) use of self-referents (I, we) over time (Friedman et al., 2004; Olekalns et al., 2010).

Attacking face impedes settlement. When claimants in an eBay dispute express negative emotions or when they issue commands (should, ought, must), settlement is less likely (Brett, Olekalns et al., 2007). In child-custody mediations, an increasing expression of negative emotions and increasing attacks on the other person similarly lead to impasse (Olekalns et al., 2010). Linguistic matching again plays a role in predicting outcomes, but matching face attacks only affects outcomes in eBay disputes. When a dispute is initiated with expressions of anger, it elicits reciprocal anger from the other party, and the individuals fail to reach agreement (Friedman et al., 2004).

Shadow Boxes Illuminated?

One of the themes that shine through to me is how often I have written *"Jeanne and her coauthors."* Jeanne is a researcher who willingly shares her time and insights to foster new research relationships. Early in my relationship with Jeanne, she talked about two strategies to research. One is to single-mindedly follow the well-lit path of your own interests; the other is to be sidetracked and wander down more murky paths that offer new possibilities. And so it is that I chose the latter and followed the breadcrumbs that Jeanne laid out to entice me down new paths. These paths have both challenged me and enriched my research whenever I return to my comfortable, well-lit path. Like the shadow boxes that I cherish, my collaboration with Jeanne has engaged me in bringing light and order to the seemingly chaotic world of negotiation processes.

Connecting the Study of Negotiation and Teams—Kristin Behfar

Jeanne's body of work focusing on negotiation and culture has made a significant contribution to the study of team process, managing diverse teams, and team conflict resolution. She has done this in three important ways. First, while her work often uses teams as a context to study dispute resolution, the methods she has used to study the actions and reactions among individuals (e.g., affective and informational influence tactics, distributive and integrative orientations, sequences for creating joint gains) have pioneered the systematic empirical study of team processes. Second, and related to this, her findings in cross-cultural negotiations have been instrumental to the development of one of the first true multilevel team theories, integrating individual identity into adaptive team processes (Janssens & Brett, 2006). Third, her work is epistemologically elegant and integrative. Her work sets an example for the field of using multiple methods to examine complex social phenomena. Her ability to draw upon disparate bodies of literature in psychology, social psychology, political science, economics, and organizational behavior has been a source of thought leadership in the field, and is a characteristic trademark of the sophistication of her writing and theorizing about processes in teams.

Informing the Study of Team Process

Jeanne's body of work has pioneered the study of team process through careful documentation and prediction of how the actions and reactions (i.e., processes) between individuals, and the balance they strike between self-interest and achieving an integrative purpose, impact joint gains or losses. As noted above, Jeanne and her colleagues have examined patterns of information exchange and contentious tactics in multiparty negotiation settings (Brett et al., 1998; Weingart et al., 2007). When I began working with Jeanne, we extended this work by examining how teams manage multiple co-occurring types of conflict. We conducted a large-scale field study of negotiating teams and found that teams that wrestle with difficult internal conflict of interests (i.e., within the team) are more adaptive than those that do not. This is because addressing internal conflict of interests invokes internal integrative bargaining practices which provide a model for the team to resolve its other affective and procedural conflicts. This is important not

only for strategy preparation within a team, but also for maintaining team discipline at the negotiation table (Brett et al., 2009; Friedman, Behfar, & Brett, 2015).

It is an understatement to say that Jeanne's body of work on dispute resolution has provided a theoretical and empirical foundation for the study of team process, shedding light on why teams experience process losses or gains in a wide range of team activities, including communication, problem-solving, dealing with emotion, and understanding members' positions (Brett, 2014). She has extended concepts of strategy planning or BATNA (best alternative to negotiated agreement), information sharing, and constituency management from negotiation theory to team decision making (Brett, 1991). This has provided teams researchers with many new avenues for research, and practicing managers with concrete advice on how open team boundaries should be to external constituencies, the use of planning matrices to address task and relationship conflict, and the use of a second alternative, or BATNA, to help direct team attention and define group decision rules.

A Pioneer in Multilevel Team Theorizing

Jeanne's cross-cultural conflict resolution research has also provided the field with one of the earliest models for developing a true multilevel team theory. Janssens and Brett's (2006) fusion model of a globally intelligent teams shifts from treating differences as a structural component of a team or an "input" to building theory about how allowing differences to coexist can translate into effective group-level processes. Their novel integration of theorizing about how individual identity can be preserved via meaningful participation in subgroups provides one of the first deliberate multilevel theories in the field—one that is able to capture the complexity (they call it "fusion vs. con-fusion") of dynamic team processes. In subsequent work, this theory generated empirical evidence for why fusion processes are effective: Groups develop a norm related to metacognition—or a reflective practice of "thinking more about how they think" about the most meaningful and pluralistic orientation toward interacting (Crotty & Brett, 2012).

An Elegant Theorist

Another admirable hallmark of Jeanne's research on teams is that it is phenomenologically driven. Her work has given the field a concrete understanding of the many ways that national culture influences team process. With her colleagues, for example, she developed an important theoretical perspective on cross-cultural resolution of emotion-laden conflicts in teams. They make a compelling case that the literature is overly focused on the "talk it out" method of conflict resolution, overlooking more aesthetic and culturally attuned modes of communicating through metaphors, stories, music, or visual cues (Von Glinow, Shapiro, & Brett, 2004). In another study, which resulted in a "most popular" *Harvard Business Review* paper, Jeanne and her colleagues identified the conflicts or challenges that are unique versus shared between same-culture and multicultural teams. This research also identified an important implication for managers of multicultural teams: Intervening in conflict often created dependencies on the manager, rather than enhancing team learning about how to adapt or change normative expectations together (Behfar, Kern, & Brett, 2006; Brett et al., 2006). Jeanne and colleagues' body of work in this area generated important insights into how leaders of multicultural teams can intervene in ways that might help versus hinder multicultural collaboration and that increase a team's ability to adapt rather than depend on the leader (Brett, 2014).

Her Integrative Gift

Finally, one of Jeanne's most important gifts to the study of teams is the model she provides for epistemological honesty and phenomenologically driven curiosity. Early in my career, she inspired me to approach, rather than avoid, difficult questions and puzzles, and I learn from her every single time we

talk about research. This is a sentiment echoed by most who know her. She almost instinctively gives the field an example of how to correctly use a diverse set of methods (both quantitative and qualitative) to tackle complex problems while integrating theorizing from multiple disciplines. Her research demonstrates a deep concern for how people experience teams in organizations (e.g., Kirkman, Shapiro, Novelli, & Brett, 1996) and has an impressive influence on the practicing manager in the fields of dispute resolution and leading across cultures. Jeanne has made an enduring impact on the study of group processes, inspiring many generations of scholars both past and future.

Common Themes

There are several themes running through the four research streams we have chosen to highlight in this celebration of Jeanne Brett's work. Jeanne approaches negotiation and conflict management with a scientific eye able to see both big picture and microprocesses. Seeing the big picture has enabled Jeanne to find connections across fields, such as negotiation and dispute resolution, and levels, for example, her multilevel theory of multicultural team fusion. Jeanne approaches negotiation as a function of how people interact and communicate, allowing her to uncover important microprocesses, such as strategy choice and response patterns, that are a function of cultural background, social value orientation, and team composition. Several of her key papers were mentioned by more than one of us, illustrating the connections and impact Jeanne has made across topics and levels of inquiry. One theme that emerges consistently and powerfully across Jeanne's work is that fundamental values (about resource allocation, sources of self-esteem, how much to say and how much to leave unsaid) influence negotiators' strategy choice, linguistic expression, and patterns of interaction, which have a direct impact on whether agreement is reached and how much value is created.

It is rare to find a scholar whose work impacts, and continually impacts, the practice of management (e.g., negotiating, dispute-intervening, team-managing) and the teaching of these management practices as well as the theoretical and empirical study of all of these management practices. As evident in all four sections above, a remarkable quality of Jeanne's work is the sheer number and diversity of her coauthors —measured via multiple dimensions (gender, race, ethnicity, nationality). It is no surprise Jeanne has been honored with both the Academy of Management's Distinguished Educator Award (2003) and the International Association for Conflict Management (IACM) Lifetime Achievement Award (2009). Although diversity often highlights competing perspectives, we are confident all of Jeanne's coauthors would agree: We feel blessed to have worked with her and to still be learning from Jeanne M. Brett's multitheoretical, multilevel, multimethod, and multi-inspiring example! We brainstormed together to pose questions that would enable those who have not yet had the opportunity to directly work with Jeanne Brett, to get a glimpse of how she approaches research.

The Final Words go to Jeanne

We conclude with a handful of questions to Jeanne to further illuminate her research contributions and provide insights to future scholars:

What Initially Motivated you to Study Dispute Resolution?

In my master's program in industrial relations at Illinois, we had to take collective bargaining. We read Walton and McKersie's A Behaviorial Theory of Labor Negotiations (1965). I was fascinated. When a few years later, as a PhD student in I/O psychology, I got the opportunity to work on a field study of why workers join unions, I jumped at it (Getman, Goldberg, & Herman, 1976). When we finished that project Steve Goldberg and I turned to trying to understand the dynamics of wildcat strikes in the coal industry. That project turned into the conceptualization of IRP (interests, rights, power) and dispute systems design (Ury et al., 1988). With the wildcat strike studies and the follow up studies

on grievance mediation, I found myself contributing to the new field of negotiation and dispute resolution. I started the negotiation course at Kellogg in 1981 and then worked with Roy Lewicki and Len Greenhalgh to introduce teaching this new course to business school faculty like me, trained in psychology and eager to teach a course that was both relevant to students and grounded in research.

Which Two or Three Findings from Your Body of Work Do You Consider to be the Most Interesting?
Negotiating to resolve disputes is related to but not quite the same as negotiating to close deals. (In dispute resolution, BATNAs are linked; negative emotions almost always precede negotiations; negotiators need to focus on minimizing costs rather than maximizing gains.) Also that interest-based mediation really can resolve disputes when negotiations between disputants fail and why. (Empathy and respect conveyed by mediator to disputants; disputants' outcome control; a mediator who is a good interest-based negotiator.)

Negotiators from different cultures use strategy in systematically different ways to achieve joint gains. Negotiators from Western dignity cultures tend to share information about interests and priorities early in the negotiation and then put that information into multi-issue offers in the second half of the negotiation. Negotiators from South Asian and Middle Eastern honor cultures tend not to share information about interests and priorities out of concern for being taken advantage of; instead they negotiate very defensively and competitively. Negotiators from East Asian face cultures, in what seems to be culturally inconsistent behavior, tend to negotiate defensively and competitively, using lots of offers, but some can extract information about interests and priorities from the pattern of offers. Some negotiators from Latin American, honor cultures, share information about interests and priorities and others do not.

What are the Research Questions you would Still Like to Answer?
I think I understand the cultural explanations for these differences in the use of negotiation strategy, but I'd like to be able to show them empirically. That's mostly what I'm working on now.

What Advice do you have for Building a Successful Career as a Conflict Management Scholar?
Graduate training is key. I so benefitted from mine. Invest in learning a broad variety of qualitative methods to develop hypotheses, and quantitative methods, and all the statistics that go with them, to test quantitative hypotheses. Learn to interview and respect what real people engaged in real conflict experiences tell you. Work on writing! Learn to use the literature to tell a story that either develops new theory or elaborates and extends current theory.

What has been Most Rewarding in your Career?
The people! Those who helped me get started; those whom I worked with as graduate students; those with whom DRRC threw me into contact.

References

Adair, W. L., & Brett, J. M. (2005). The negotiation dance: Time, culture, and behavioral sequences in negotiation. *Organization Science*, *16*, 33–51. doi:10.1287/orsc.1040.0102

Adair, W. L., Brett, J. M., Lempereur, A., Okumura, T., Shikhirev, P., Tinsley, C., et al. (2004). Culture and negotiation strategy. *Negotiation Journal*, *20*, 87–111. doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.2004.00008.x

Adair, W. L., Okumura, T., & Brett, J. M. (2001). Negotiation behavior when cultures collide: the United States and Japan. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 371–385. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.371

Adair, W. L., Weingart, L., & Brett, J. M. (2007). The timing and function of offers in U.S. and Japanese negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1056–1068. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1056

Alon, I., & Brett, J. M. (2007). Perceptions of time and their impact on negotiations in the Arabic-speaking Islamic world. *Negotiation Journal*, *23*, 55–73. doi:10.1111/j.1571-9979.2007.00127.x

Aslani, S., Ramirez-Marin, J., Brett, J. M., Yao, J., Semnani-Azad, Z., Zhang, Z., et al. (2016). Dignity, face, and honor cultures: A study of negotiation strategy and outcomes in three cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. doi:10.1002/job.2095

Behfar, K., Kern, M., & Brett, J. M. (2006). Managing challenges in multicultural teams. In Y. Chen (Ed.), *Research on managing groups and teams: National culture and groups* (Vol. 9, pp. 233–262). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Press.

Benharda, I., Brett, J. M., & Lempereur, A. (2013). Gender and role in conflict management: Female and male managers as third parties. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *6*, 79–93. doi:10.1111/ncmr.12004

Bond, M. H., van de Vijver, F. J. R., Morris, M. W., & Gelfand, M. J. (2016). Working with Kwok Leung: Reflections from four grateful collaborators. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *9*, 81–97. doi:10.1111/ncmr.12067

Brett, J. M. (1991). Negotiating group decisions. *Negotiation Journal*, *7*, 291–310. doi:10.1007/BF01000432

Brett, J. M. (2014). *Negotiating globally: How to negotiate deals, resolve disputes, and make decisions across cultural boundaries*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brett, J. M., Adair, W. L., Lempereur, A., Okumura, T., Shikhirev, P., Tinsley, C., et al. (1998). Culture and joint gains in negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, *14*, 61–86. doi:10.1023/A:1024610404410

Brett, J. M., Behfar, K., & Kern, M. (2006). Managing multicultural teams. *Harvard Business Review*, *84*, 84–91.

Brett, J. M., Friedman, R., & Behfar, K. (2009). How to manage your negotiating team. *Harvard Business Review*, *87*, 105–109.

Brett, J. M., & Gelfand, M. J. (2006). A cultural analysis of the underlying assumptions of negotiation theory. In L. Thompson (Ed.), *Negotiation theory and research* (pp. 173–201). Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.

Brett, J. M., Goldberg, S. B., & Ury, W. L. (1990). Designing systems for resolving disputes in organizations. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 162–170. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.162

Brett, J. M., & Okumura, T. (1998). Inter-and intracultural negotiation: US and Japanese negotiators. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 495–510. doi:10.2307/256938

Brett, J. M., Olekalns, M., Friedman, R., Goates, N., Anderson, C., & Lisco, C. (2007). Sticks and stones: Language, face and on-line dispute resolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 85–100. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2007.24161853

Brett, J. M., Shapiro, D. L., & Lytle, A. (1998). Breaking the bonds of reciprocity in negotiations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 410–424. doi:10.2307/257081

Brett, J. M., Tinsley, C. H., Janssens, M., Barsness, Z., & Lytle, A. (1997). New approaches to the study of culture in industrial/organizational psychology. In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 75–129). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Brett, J. M., Tinsley, C. H., Shapiro, D. L., & Okumura, T. (2007). Intervening in employee disputes: How and when will managers from China, Japan and the USA act differently? *Management and Organization Review*, *3*, 183–204. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00070.x

Brett, J. M., Weingart, L., & Olekalns, M. (2004). Baubles, bangles and beads: Modeling the evolution of negotiating groups over time. In S. Blount, B. Mannix & M. Neale (Eds.), *Research on managing groups and teams: Time in groups* (Vol. 6). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Crotty, S. K., & Brett, J. M. (2012). Fusing creativity: Cultural metacognition and teamwork in multicultural teams. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *5*, 210–234. doi:10.1111/j.1750-4716.2012.00097.x

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

Folger, R. (1977). Distributive and procedural justice: Combined impact of "voice" and improvement on experienced inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 108–119. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.35.2.108

Friedman, R., Behfar, K., & Brett, J. M. (2016). Managing co-occurring conflicts in teams. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, *25*, 501–536. doi:10.1007/s10726-015-9450-x

Friedman, R., Brett, J. M., Anderson, C., Olekalns, M., Goates, N., & Lisco, C. (2004). The positive and negative effects of anger on disputes: Evidence from electronically-mediated disputes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 369–376. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.2.369

Gelfand, M. J., & Brett, J. M. (2004). *The handbook of negotiation and culture*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

Getman, J. G., Goldberg, S. B., & Herman, J. B. (1976). *Union representation elections: Law and reality*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gunia, B. C., Brett, J. M., Nandkeolyar, A. K., & Kamdar, D. (2011). Paying a price: Culture, trust, and negotiation consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*, 774–789. doi:10.1037/a0021986

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Janssens, M., & Brett, J. M. (2006). Cultural intelligence in global teams: A fusion model of collaboration. *Group & Organization Management*, *31*, 124–153. doi:10.1177/1059601105275268

Kern, M., Brett, J. M., & Weingart, L. (2005). Getting the floor: Motive-consistent strategy and individual outcomes in multi-party negotiations. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, *14*, 21–41. doi:10.1007/s10726-005-3874-7

Kern, M., Lee, S., Aytug, Z. G., & Brett, J. M. (2012). Bridging social distance in inter-cultural negotiations: "You" and the bi-cultural negotiator. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *23*, 173–191. doi:10.1108/10444061211218294

Kirkman, B. L., Shapiro, D. L., Novelli Jr, L., & Brett, J. M. (1996). Employee concerns regarding self-managing work teams: A multidimensional justice perspective. *Social Justice Research*, *9*, 47–67. doi:10.1007/BF02197656

Kolb, D. M. (1983). *The mediators*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lytle, A. L., Brett, J. M., Barsness, Z. I., Tinsley, C. H., & Janssens, M. (1995). A paradigm for confirmatory cross-cultural research in organizational-behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews*, *17*, 167–214.

Olekalns, M., Brett, J. M., & Donohue, W. (2010). Words are all I have: Linguistic cues as predictors of settlement in divorce mediation. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *3*, 145–168. doi:10.1111/j.1750-4716.2010.00053.x

Olekalns, M., Brett, J. M., & Weingart, L. (2003). Phases, transitions and interruptions: The processes that shape agreement in multi-party negotiations. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *14*, 191–211. doi:10.1108/eb022898

Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. M. (1993). Comparing three processes underlying judgments of procedural justice: A field study of mediation and arbitration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 1167. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1167

Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. M. (2005). What is the role of control in organizational justice? In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 155–177). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shapiro, D. L., Drieghe, R., & Brett, J. M. (1985). Mediator behavior and the outcome of mediation. *Journal of Social Issues*, *41*, 101–114. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1985.tb00857.x

Simon, H. A. (1979). Information processing models of cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *30*, 363–396. doi:10.1146/annurev.ps.30.020179.002051

Tinsley, C. H., & Brett, J. M. (2001). Managing workplace conflict in the United States and Hong Kong. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *85*, 360–381. doi:10.1006/obhd.2000.2944

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

Von Glinow, M. A., Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. M. (2004). Can we talk, and should we? Managing emotional conflict in multicultural teams. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*, 578–592. doi:10.5465/AMR.2004.14497611

Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: An analysis of a social interaction system*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Weingart, L. R., Bennett, R. J., & Brett, J. M. (1993). The impact of consideration of issues and motivational orientation on group negotiation process and outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 504–517. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.3.504

Weingart, L., Brett, J. M., Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. L. (2007). Conflicting social motives in negotiating groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 994–1010. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.994

Wendi L. Adair is an Associate Professor of Organizational Psychology at the University of Waterloo in Ontario, Canada. She earned her Ph.D. from the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern

University. Her primary research is on negotiation and conflict management in the global workplace, focusing on cross-cultural interactions both within and across national borders. Other areas of research include communication context, multicultural teams, and cultural identity at work.

Kristin J. Behfar is an Associate Professor of Leadership and Organizational Behavior at the Darden School of Business, University of Virginia. She earned her Ph.D. from the Johnson School at Cornell University and did the KTAG post-doctoral fellowship at the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University. Her research focuses on conflict management, team processes, and variance in leadership practices around the world.

Mara Olekalns is a Professor of Management (Negotiations) at the Melbourne Business School and an Honorary Professor in the Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences at the University of Melbourne. Her primary research focus is on communication processes, including communication sequences, in negotiation. More recently, her research has explored trust, turning points and adversity, gender and micro-ethical judgments in negotiation.

Debra L. Shapiro (Ph.D., Northwestern University) is the Clarice Smith Professor of Management at the University of Maryland's (UMD's) Smith School of Business, formerly the Willard J. Graham Distinguished Professor at UNC-Chapel-Hill's Business School. She is currently President of the Academy of Management (AOM) and an AOM Fellow. Debra's research centers on strategies for managing conflict (e.g., perceived injustice) in organizations.